Usenet Newsgroup Archive: rec.radio.amateur.policy

2003-03 - 2003-04

These Usenet messages were preserved as a plain-text archive. This PDF was generated by Digital Library of Amateur Radio & Communications from the source text file in 2026.

Date span: 2003-03-01 through 2003-04-30

Source text: rec.radio.amateur.policy.txt

Source item: https://archive.org/details/usenet-rec

Messages included in this PDF: 3,963

Message records with no readable body available in the source text: 1

Messages are presented chronologically by archived date.

Binary or encoded payloads are not printed as blocks of encoded text; a placeholder appears where such material was detected. The original source text is unchanged.

1. Twithed 'selective disregard' myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 00:19:05 UTC
From: "Mr. X"
Message-ID: <zGKdneN51ZceYcKjXTWcrg@comcast.com>
Source record: 62338

From: (twistedhed@webtv.net) Twistedhed
Subject: Re: They all fall down
Date: Fri, Feb 28, 2003
>my selective rule disregard of DX and freeband

From: Twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
Subject: Re: Hey Jer, ask Riley...
Date: Mon, 7 Oct 2002
>We selectively disregard certain rules.

From: Twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
Subject: Re: The FAME of N8WWM!!!
Date: 2003-02-27
>I respect all the FCC rules and selectively
>disregard two...period.

From: Twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
Subject: Re: Interesting happenings above 30 Mhz
Date: 2002-10-29
>I respect all radio law except for a few minor laws I

>selectively disregard, such as
>DX and freebanding on 555 and a few others.

From: Twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
Subject: Re: Hams on the wrong NG
Date: 2002-06-24
>I will selectively disregard any law/rule
>I do not agree with..always have, always will.

From: Twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
Subject: Re: Do Truckers use 10 meters ?
Date: 2002-11-04
>How many times you want me to say I selectively
>disregard certain rules such as dx and freebanding?

UNLICENSED RADIO OPERATION or operation of radio
transmitting equipment without a license (outside the
frequency limits of the citizens band) is a violation
of Section 301 of the Communications Act of 1934, as
amended, 47 U.S.C. Section 301. Such operation will
subject you to fine or imprisonment, as well as an in
rem seizure of radio transmitting equipment, in
cooperation with the United States Attorney for your
jurisdiction. Fines normally range from $7,500 to
$10,000.

Therefore your "freebanding" is not a selective
disregard for certain rules, it is a violation of the
Communications Act of 1934.

2. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 00:46:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6002C5.DAE4639@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62339

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EE0F2.FAF9DC75@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5DA624.42BBDC48@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > > > Larry didn't receive left-handed compliment.
> > > > > >
> > > > > He did if he read your post.
> > > > >
> > > > I don't think you can presume to speak for him on how he feels about my
> > > > statement.
> > > >
> > > I can recognize a left-handed compliment when I see one, even if I
> > > didn't receive it.
> >
> > I'm sure you have your hands full with those which you have received.
> > Please allow Larry to decide for himself if he has received one.
> >
> > Len's, as I'm sure you noticed, was not left-handed.
> >
> Len is direct. You are smug. Left-handed is more your style.

Don't you think my comment to Len was direct? Did it somehow appear as
left-handed to you?

I'll wear "smug" as defined in the Random House College Dictionary:

smug - 1. contentedly confident of one's own respectability, ability,
superiority, or correctness.

Note that the definition doesn't use "and" but rather "or". I'm
contentedly confident in my ability and correctness.

Dave K8MN

3. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 00:51:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6003CB.9CCF7689@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62340

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDF27.7032976D@earthlink.net>...
>
> > Are you by chance attempting to ask a question (in which you attempt to
> > put words in my mouth) and then supplying your own answer?
> >
> > I never did any of the things I've outlined above. I've certainly
> > never:
> >
> > 1. announced here that I'd be doing something that I changed my mind
> > and decided not to do.
> >
> > 2. announced here that I'd never do something then reversed myself.
> >
> > Nice try, Kim.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Dave, I certainly hope that you've changed your mind about working
> Frenchmen on 6M out of band.

I didn't have to change anything, Brian. I was at no time out of band.
As I've told you several times previously, you need to address the issue
with individual French ops (you DO have their calls, don't you?) or with
the French PTT.

I do hope you'll note that there is no reversal of my position.

Dave K8MN

4. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 00:51:58 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87llzz3o41.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62293

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
>>>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>
>>>How does "technical service" exclude it being a hobby? Stop
>>>being absurd. It *is* a hobby. It has always been a hobby.
>>>And that is why they call it the "Amateur" Radio Service.
>>
>> It's called "Amateur" because we are prohibited from receiving money for
>>what we do. That many persons do what they do in the "Aamteur" radio service
>>in a professional manner is a matter of record.
>
> "Aamteur?!?" Forgot the Prozac dose again? :-)
>
> Doing amateur work in a professional manner? :-)
>
> Oh, yes, by-the-book, the official book of course, in jargon,
> expressions, and (by all means) morse code. Relaying all
> those vital-to-the-nation messages along the NTS. Playing
> in those "radio sport" contests to qualify as emergency-
> trained operators. :-)

Now now Len, don't get excited over trivial things. You *know*
that all those messages are good practice for the big day when
duty will call... when the very survival of the human race will
depend on the ability of the Aamteur Radio Service to provide
the country with well trained Morse code radio operators.

(BTW, I just latched onto a fairly nice old wireline telegraph
relay made by Signal Electric Company for all of $22 on eBay.
Several people bid on it, but it was labeled as a "Key and
Sounder" and I guess it didn't look like much, what with no key
in the pictures. I take it none of them realized what it was.
They were probably all ham operators. They'd pay $75 for a key
that was machine manufactured by the thousands, and pass up an
antique that was made by hand.)

>> For many it's a hobby. For many others it's a tool...a means to an end.
>
> In Sgt Steam Yaputz' case it is a surrogate for life in the
> corpse, er, Corps. :-)

Your sense of humor overwhelms your common senses sometimes, but
I can't say that such cracks are wrong either...

>>That many use it as a hobby is fact. That it is MORE than a hobby is also a
>>fact.
>
> Oh, dear, the "fact" fantasy again. Yes, some use amateur
> radio as a whole lifestyle away from work, imagining all
> kinds of heroic high-altitude, low-opening derring-do and
> saving the Titanic over and over again.

Hey, whatever turns their crank, right?

If you are saying we shouldn't define the rules and regulations
by what is best for those guys... well, that makes too much sense!

>>>I said "It's a hobby folks". I did *not* say that it can't be
>>>other things too, so claiming I've said "just a hobby" when I
>>>have not is deliberate fabrication on your part. You even put
>>>it in quotes. Shame on you.
>>
>> No "shame on you" required. If you say "It's a hobby, folks", without
>any
>>other qualifiers, that's ALL you said. That's where the confusion enters.
>
> Floyd isn't confused, Sgt Yaputz. You are.
>
> Avocation, hobby, fun, recreation is all it is. Amateur radio
> isn't vital to national security, national defense, or anything
> else except as a fantasy-land for a minority within. If US

Old Hiram just rolled over in his grave? (No, but lots of Sgt
Yaputz's just had conniption fits.)

> amateur radio were suddenly removed, the USA would continue
> to function just fine without it, losing nothing but some loud
> complaining from its life-stylers.

Now that is just *not* true. If that happened, all of these people
would have even more time to devote to political ideology. Rush
and his ilk would need more telephone lines, and talk radio would
advance another step up the economic ladder.

The country definitely benefits from the distraction that the
Amateur Radio Service provides. So don't you be disparaging it!

>>>It *is* a hobby, and you might as well a get used to it. Get used
>>>to the new FCC license structure too, it isn't going away soon.
>>
>> You're right.. And it's probably going to get MORE socialistic in it's
>>structure before it's all over.
>
> "Socialistic?!?" :-)

See what I mean (above)! It's dem *liberals*!

>> The sad truth is that's it's all too true. No one's really required to
>>KNOW the material necessary to become licensed, let alone upgrade to Amateur
>>Extra. Yes, many DO "know" the material. Most don't.
>
> Two four-year-olds "passed the test" well before the Restructuring
> of 99-412 R&O.
>
> Are you really serious about thinking that four-year-olds "know the
> material?!?"
>
> I don't think you are being serious...

He thinks he's being serious. (But I heard you laughing as you
first read that, all the way here. I thought it was another
earth quake and was expecting to hear that Anchorage has slid
into the Pacific Ocean.)

>> Try and discuss it here!
>
> Not a problem to me but I expect you will have the usual SOP
> (Standard Off-color Pejoratives) to issue in snarlygrams. :-)
>
>> All I can say is "Good Luck"..!
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, no famous phrases like "fair winds and..." and other
> phine phrases? Just "good luck?!?" :-)

All I can say is "You sure hit it on the head with that post, Len."

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

5. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 00:53:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E600461.31E02205@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62341

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDC26.811EA4C9@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5E4E75.DCB6F894@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5DA38A.B1E9D5FD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5CDEE0.FB871EAD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > > > > > It has to be both, Brian.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You must be right. I did leave and I didn't leave. Its settled.
> > > > >
> > > > > I agree that it is settled. You told us one thing and did another.
> > > > > That's one reason I'm not apt to trust you. Consider yourself chided
> > > > > once again.
> > > > >
> > > > > Cecil - Would never go for the Extra
> > > > > Len - Going for the Extra "right out of the box"
> > > > > Alec Baldwin - Leaving America if George Bush is elected
> > > > > Kim - Leaving r.r.a.p.
> > > > > Brian - Leaving r.r.a.p. but says he never left
> > >
> > > Yet you documented that I never left.
> >
> > I documented it? How, pray tell, could I do that?
>
> Quite easily. With a post to rrap.

I can't document any such thing with a post here. You told us you were
leaving. You told us you never left.

Go for it, Slim.

Dave K8MN
```

6. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 00:55:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6004ED.870375A0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62342

Brian wrote:
>
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030227185259.23275.00000686@mb-da.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >Date: 2/27/03 5:04 PM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0302271504.bcd8c48@posting.google.com>
> >
> > >> > In context, FY is former Yugoslavia.
> > >>
> > >> ...then why not write "former Yugoslavia"?
> > >
> > >To see if you would trip and fall down?
> > >
> > >It is a common enough abbreviation in war planning circles.
> >
> > Oh? So now you are an associate of the Brookings Institute?
> >
> > >I screwed
> > >up and thought amateurs radio operators were adept at abbreviations
> > >considering the CW handicap.
> > >
> >
> > What handicap?
>
> Abbreviations abound because of the tediousness of spelling out words.
> Either that or CW ops don't spell very well and hide it through
> abbreviations.

"Tediousness" doesn't enter into the equation. Abbreviations are used
to save *time*. There are a number of commonly used abbreviations.
"FY" isn't among them.

Dave K8MN

7. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 00:59:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6005A2.D1AFFA35@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62343

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDCD1.49847E44@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5E4C6D.7351BA43@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > In context, FY is former Yugoslavia.
> > > >
> > > > ...then why not write "former Yugoslavia"?
> > >
> > > To see if you would trip and fall down?
> > >
> > > It is a common enough abbreviation in war planning circles.
> >
> > Not many of us are involved in war planning circles.
>
> With all the coverage in the news, its unfortunate that you missed it.

I saw plenty of information about the states which made up the former
Yugoslavia. I didn't see any coverage of "war planning cirlces" and I
didn't hear one single person refer to "FY".

> > > I screwed up...
> >
> > Agreed.
> >
> > >... and thought amateurs radio operators were adept at abbreviations
> > > considering the CW handicap.
> >
> > Play it any way you want. Last week you thought Phil was going to
> > contact some Spanish stations.
>
> He may have for all I know. He never did say what an EA was.

Apparently it is commonly known in his professional circles. Material
about the FCC and attorneys has appeared frequently in the news. It is
unfortunate that you missed it.

Dave K8MN

8. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 01:05:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62344

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDD72.DB32D50D@earthlink.net>...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > > In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
> > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > >
> > > > >Can legitimate communication take place at 5wpm?
> > > >
> > > > Sure -
> > >
> > > But only assuming that both operators are able to stay awake!
> >
> > Right-o. We mustn't confuse legitimate (yet very slooooooooow)
> > communications and proficiency in use of a mode.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Why not? The desired communication took place, according to both of your comments.

Why not? Because the two are not one and the same. We'll never know if
"desired" communications can take place at five words per minute unless
the desire is to go v e r y s l o w l y.

Would you call a driver who can safely drive a car at speeds no higher
than fifteen miles per hour a proficient driver? Would you call someone
who can play "Stardust" perfectly but only at half its normal tempo, a
proficient pianist?

Someone who can send and receive morse at five words per minute is on
the low end of mediocrity.

Dave K8MN

9. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 01:08:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6007EF.785AAF4F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62345

```
W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E5EDF27.7032976D@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3E5E4E75.DCB6F894@earthlink.net...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:<3E5DA38A.B1E9D5FD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:<3E5CDEE0.FB871EAD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave, my absence never happened. I had an Immediate change
> of
> > > heart.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Now you tell us you never left the group. Sorry I simply
> can't
> > > trust
> > > > > > > > > you.
> > > > > > > > > You seem to be quite unreliable.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I had an immediate change of heart, which you noticed and made
> note
> > > > > > > > > of, then chided me for not hooking up with Kim and Alec.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Now you tell us I left.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Which is it?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > It has to be both, Brian.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You must be right. I did leave and I didn't leave. Its settled.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I agree that it is settled. You told us one thing and did another.
> > > > > > That's one reason I'm not apt to trust you. Consider yourself chided
> > > > > > once again.
> > > > >
```

> > > > Cecil - Would never go for the Extra
> > > > Len - Going for the Extra "right out of the box"
> > > > Alec Baldwin - Leaving America if George Bush is elected
> > > > Kim - Leaving r.r.a.p.
> > > > Brian - Leaving r.r.a.p. but says he never left
> > > > Richard Nixon - You won't have Dick Nixon to kick around any more (he
> > > > finally made good on that one)
> >
> > > Are you perchance implying that you have never said one thing and done
> > > another, or changed your mind, or did the complete opposite of what you
> > > said? Yeah, right...
> >
> > Are you by chance attempting to ask a question (in which you attempt to
> > put words in my mouth) and then supplying your own answer?
> >
> > I never did any of the things I've outlined above. I've certainly
> > never:
> >
> > 1. announced here that I'd be doing something that I changed my mind
> > and decided not to do.
> >
> > 2. announced here that I'd never do something then reversed myself.
> >
> > Nice try, Kim.
> >
N
>
> You know, Dave, there *are* other forms of masturbation than mental... You
> might try some of them.

You're certainly true to form, Kim. You have a unique ability to
portray yourself in the worst way. Are we to assume that you couldn't
come up with a real rebuttal to what I wrote?

Dave K8MN

10. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 01:12:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6008BB.C0F1708A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62346

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0302271959.13311bfd@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E5E4C6D.7351BA43@earthlink.net>...
> >> Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> > You might want to try picking yourself up and dusting yourself off.
> >> > You've been taking a lot of falls lately.
> >>
> >> You have a very active fantasy life and, no doubt, you believe what
> >> you've written.
> >>
> >>The only fantasies I've seen here were Han's story of Little Billy
> >>Beeper, Larry's broken leg on the mountain, and Dick's New Madrid
> >>disaster. But he can't work CW away from the power mains, so he's not
> >>able to save the day.
>
> Dickie's "New Madrid" thing happened well before he was
> born with a gold J-38 in his nose and rather before radio
> was born. But, he read all about it in a book so he's an
> expert and can coach all of us who've ridden out actual
> earthquakes.
>
> For official fantasies, I rather like the State Department
> Heathkit Course used for training its "key" people. Just
> think, foreign policy of the United States of America based
> on a defunct kit company in Michigan. :-)

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

11. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 01:17:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6009E0.AC4FAC5B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62347

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E5E8C0C.EE243D33@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:
>
> >Robert Casey wrote:
> >
> >> Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> > We do have human failings. Forgive us. Please allow me to lay
> >> > prostrate on a cold damp floor and whip myself with split palm fronds
> >> > till my back bleeds, while chanting, "Forgive me Father for I have
> >> > Sinned, I've not used CW since 1987."
> >>
> >> We break out the "Woff Fong" for that. See the ARRL web page
> >> for an explanation....
> >>
> >In his case we may be able to add some fangs to that "Fong".
>
> There's NO "woff fong" on any ARRL page. There IS a
> "whouff hong" if that's needed for a symbol. It must have
> meant something significant in 1914...it's looked like two
> pieces of scrap wood crudely fastened together over the
> last half-century. The rettysnitch had lots of sharp points.

Nice of you to add the correction on spelling, even if it is wrong.
Try Wouff Hong. Maybe you can research the uggerumph for us too, Len.

> Imagine that...grown men revering two pieces of scrap wood
> and not being carpenters...in a radio club.

None of it concerns you. Imagine that.

Dave K8MN

12. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 01:20:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E600ABE.818BA434@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62348

```
Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E5DA624.42BBDC48@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E5CD67E.888574B6@earthlink.net>...
> >> > Brian wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E564F03.72EB24C0@earthlink.net>...
> >> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > > In article <20030220061433.23241.00000015@mb-da.aol.com>,
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >> > > > > writes:
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > > >Also gave a good indication of propagation. Back when a 1000 mile
> >contact was
> >> > > > > >a major accomplishment, this was an important feature.
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > > Maybe you could help out K3LT complete his WAS? He seems
> >> > > > > to have difficulty getting out...
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Oh, I think it is all relative, Leonard. Compared, for example, to
> >your
> >> > > > progress on WAS, his performance is stellar.
> >> > >
> >> > > Smug Dave offers a left-handed compliment to Novice Larry.
> >> >
> >> > Larry didn't receive left-handed compliment.
> >>
> >> He did if he read your post.
> >
> >I don't think you can presume to speak for him on how he feels about my
> >statement.
> >
> >> > Larry has done fine,
> >> > especially when his low power and less than ideal antennas are
> >> > considered. Larry wasn't called a Novice.
> >>
> >> Larry is a novice Award seeker. Is being a novice an insult?
```

> >
> >You wrote "Novice Larry". Is that a compliment?
> >
> >> > Brian is just reading between
> >> > the lines again. Do you consider Len's comment to Larry about his WAS a
> >> > compliment to Larry?
> >>
> >> You're kidding, right? When did those two ever have anything nice to
> >> say about each other?
> >
> >No, I wasn't kidding. I don't think Len's comment was intended to be a
> >compliment to Larry.
> >
> >> > Len Anderson isn't even in the game. He's a never-WAS.
> >>
> >> Perhaps.
> >
> >There's no "perhaps" to it.
> >
> >> But not everyone seeks awards whether they're "in the game"
> >> or not.
> >
> >Wrong. Not everyone who is in the game seeks (amateur radio) awards.
> >Those who are not in the game cannot seek (amateur radio) awards. Len
> >can play a game of Visit All States or e-mail all states or telephone
> >all states.
> >
> >In the mean time, Shhhhhh! Len's very hard at work. He's trying to
> >think of a way out of the N2EY profile conundrum.
>
> Poor baby. I've been working*, not concerning self with
> middle-aged adolescents indulging in their own aroma therapy
> (attar of stinky slinging) in wordplay. Pays fairly well, too. :-)

You, of course, have it backwards. You do the slinging. Then comes the
N2EY quote. Poor baby.

> Tell us, munchkin of many keys, was there a State Dept. Heath
> Course in Getting Along With People?

You interested in taking the course?

Dave K8MN

13. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 01:22:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E600B1C.F8E8375E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62349

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0302270948.1c88ff71@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message
> >>
> >> >> >> It's a hobby folks.
> > >
> > >Some folks get all worked up over the word "hobby". I think it's
> > >because the word conjures up an image of triviality, low or
> > >non-existent standards of knoweldge or skill, not contributing
> > >anything really meaningful to society, and/or being purely for the fun
> > >of those involved.
>
> Good grief, can't have such terrible "trivialities" here!
>
> Everyone MUST be serious-minded!
>
> It's a pejorative thing, very low standard to actually have
> FUN or RECREATION in a HOBBY?
>
> Oy gevalt!
>
> >So, Floyd, how about defining what "hobby" means in the Amateur Radio
> >context?
>
> How's about another Sermon on the Antenna Mount from the
> distinguished cloggyman at the pulpit? Show us all where we
> went wrong on considering a hobby as a hobby? Tell all how
> to achieve nirvana in the present life by adopting the lifestyle of
> amateur radio as a savior?
>
> Be SERIOUS now...

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

14. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 01:52:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228205233.15471.00000179@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 62255

In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Why not? Because the two are not one and the same. We'll never know if
>"desired" communications can take place at five words per minute unless
>the desire is to go v e r y s l o w l y.

O h , m y , l i s t e n i n g t o V O A s l o w
E n g l i s h a g a i n ? : -)

>Would you call a driver who can safely drive a car at speeds no higher
>than fifteen miles per hour a proficient driver?

A proper driver in a zone posted at 15 MPH. :-)

>Would you call someone
>who can play "Stardust" perfectly but only at half its normal tempo, a
>proficient pianist?

Hoagy Charmichael on a tranquilizer overdose? :-)

>Someone who can send and receive morse at five words per minute is on
>the low end of mediocrity.

Heh heh heh.

No wonder you are only "accepted" in the Archaic Radiotelegraph
Service!

15. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 01:52:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228205235.15471.00000181@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 62253

In article <3E6009E0.AC4FAC5B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Nice of you to add the correction on spelling, even if it is wrong.
>Try Wouff Hong. Maybe you can research the uggerumph for us too, Len.
>
>> Imagine that...grown men revering two pieces of scrap wood
>> and not being carpenters...in a radio club.
>
>None of it concerns you. Imagine that.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, if "it doesn't concern me," how can I obey
your powerful commands to "research" it?

Here's some news, colonel: "Radio clubs" are not exclusively
devoted to just amateur radio. Imagine that!

Back to your remedial Heath Course, foreign service man.

Try for a Dale Carneigie Course while you're at it. That will
do wonders for your acceptance in the ARS. :-)

16. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 01:52:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228205235.15471.00000180@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 62254

In article <3E6002C5.DAE4639@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Len is direct. You are smug. Left-handed is more your style.
>
>Don't you think my comment to Len was direct? Did it somehow appear as
>left-handed to you?

More like "underhanded" and not even original. Can't come up
with original stuff? :-)

>I'll wear "smug" as defined in the Random House College Dictionary:
>
>smug - 1. contentedly confident of one's own respectability, ability,
>superiority, or correctness.
>
>Note that the definition doesn't use "and" but rather "or". I'm
>contentedly confident in my ability and correctness.

You are out standing in your field. Now stay there...

17. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 01:52:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228205236.15471.00000182@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 62251

In article <3E6007EF.785AAF4F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> You know, Dave, there *are* other forms of masturbation than mental... You
>> might try some of them.
>
>You're certainly true to form, Kim. You have a unique ability to
>portray yourself in the worst way. Are we to assume that you couldn't
>come up with a real rebuttal to what I wrote?

Heh heh...that IS a rebuttal to your writing... :-)

Good one, too.

Give my regards to Alec and Kim Basinger...whatever their
ham calls are... :-)

18. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 01:52:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228205237.15471.00000183@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 62256

In article <3E6004ED.870375A0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
>news:<20030227185259.23275.00000686@mb-da.aol.com>...
>> > >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>> > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> > >Date: 2/27/03 5:04 PM Central Standard Time
>> > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0302271504.bcd8c48@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> > >> > In context, FY is former Yugoslavia.
>> > >>
>> > >> ...then why not write "former Yugoslavia"?
>> > >
>> > >To see if you would trip and fall down?
>> > >
>> > >It is a common enough abbreviation in war planning circles.
>> >
>> > Oh? So now you are an associate of the Brookings Institute?
>> >
>> > >I screwed
>> > >up and thought amateurs radio operators were adept at abbreviations
>> > >considering the CW handicap.
>> > >
>> >
>> > What handicap?
>>
>> Abbreviations abound because of the tediousness of spelling out words.
>> Either that or CW ops don't spell very well and hide it through
>> abbreviations.
>
>"Tediousness" doesn't enter into the equation. Abbreviations are used
>to save *time*. There are a number of commonly used abbreviations.
>"FY" isn't among them.

Can't get your CW rate up? Electro-mechanical teleprinters
have been doing 100 WPM steady since the beginning
1970s. Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

19. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 01:52:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228205240.15471.00000184@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 62257

In article <3E6005A2.D1AFFA35@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E5EDCD1.49847E44@earthlink.net>...
>> > Brian wrote:
>> > >
>> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E5E4C6D.7351BA43@earthlink.net>...
>> > > > Brian wrote:
>> > > > >
>> > > > > In context, FY is former Yugoslavia.
>> > > > >
>> > > > ...then why not write "former Yugoslavia"?
>> > > >
>> > > To see if you would trip and fall down?
>> > >
>> > > It is a common enough abbreviation in war planning circles.
>> >
>> > Not many of us are involved in war planning circles.
>>
>> With all the coverage in the news, its unfortunate that you missed it.
>
>I saw plenty of information about the states which made up the former
>Yugoslavia. I didn't see any coverage of "war planning cirlces" and I
>didn't hear one single person refer to "FY".

Hello? Ever hear of "Fiscal Year," colonel?

CPAs refer to it a lot...

>> > >... and thought amateurs radio operators were adept at abbreviations
>> > > considering the CW handicap.
>> >
>> > Play it any way you want. Last week you thought Phil was going to
>> > contact some Spanish stations.
>>
>> He may have for all I know. He never did say what an EA was.
>
>Apparently it is commonly known in his professional circles. Material
>about the FCC and attorneys has appeared frequently in the news. It is
>unfortunate that you missed it.

Yes, it is unfortunate you don't know what a Fiscal Year is...

[back to the Heath course for you, old-timer...]

20. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 01:52:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228205241.15471.00000185@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 62350

In article <3E6003CB.9CCF7689@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I do hope you'll note that there is no reversal of my position.

Then we'll have to guess at the Whouff Hong placement? :-)

21. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 01:52:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228205242.15471.00000186@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 62252

In article <3E6008BB.C0F1708A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Poor baby, still nursing that bruised ego? :-)

Go back to your official State Dept. Heath Course. That's
a good lad...

22. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 01:57:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228205714.23598.00000543@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 62258

In article <87d6ld4hrs.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message
>>>
>>> >> >> It's a hobby folks.
>>
>>Some folks get all worked up over the word "hobby". I think it's
>>because the word conjures up an image of triviality, low or
>>non-existent standards of knoweldge or skill, not contributing
>>anything really meaningful to society, and/or being purely for the fun
>>of those involved.
>
>Why would anyone conjure up that notion?

See below

>Amateur astronomers
>have discovered a lot of interesting things, so have amateur
>geologists, amateur botonists, and we could list several other
>very technical fields where amateur activities are not
>necessarily trivial.

Of course! No argument there. Same is true of amateur radio operators.
>
>Of course *some* of what they do is indeed trivial. Maybe even
>a majority of what they do... but after all, heh heh, we're
>discussing hobbies.
>
>>So, Floyd, how about defining what "hobby" means in the Amateur Radio
>>context?
>
>Is that any different that what "hobby" means in any other
>context? It's an avocation, or what a person likes to do when
>they aren't engaged in their vocation.

Would you call a volunteer fireman a hobbyist?

73 de Jim, N2EY

23. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 01:57:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 62259

In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E5EDD72.DB32D50D@earthlink.net>...
>> > Dick Carroll wrote:
>> > >
>> > > N2EY wrote:
>> > >
>> > > > In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
>> > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> > > >
>> > > > >Can legitimate communication take place at 5wpm?
>> > > >
>> > > > Sure -
>> > >
>> > > But only assuming that both operators are able to stay awake!
>> >
>> > Right-o. We mustn't confuse legitimate (yet very slooooooooow)
>> > communications and proficiency in use of a mode.
>> >
>> > Dave K8MN
>>
>> Why not? The desired communication took place, according to both of your
>comments.
>
>Why not? Because the two are not one and the same. We'll never know if
>"desired" communications can take place at five words per minute unless
>the desire is to go v e r y s l o w l y.
>
>Would you call a driver who can safely drive a car at speeds no higher
>than fifteen miles per hour a proficient driver?

No, I'd say that person had some basic driving skills.

>Would you call someone
>who can play "Stardust" perfectly but only at half its normal tempo, a
>proficient pianist?
>
No, I'd say that person had some basic piano skills.

>Someone who can send and receive morse at five words per minute is on
>the low end of mediocrity.

I disagree!

Someone who can send and receive morse at no more than five words per minute has some basic Morse code skills. Such a person is not proficient - yet.

And the sending test disappeared in the USA about 20 years ago.

The stated goal was elimination of the Morse proficiency test. That's been accomplished in the USA, because the remaining test is a basic skill test, not a proficiency test.

73 de Jim, N2EY

Be careful about playing the end of the band too closely, since the multivibrator is down for revamping.

>

24. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 03:38:45 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87smu721tm.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62298

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>Is that any different that what "hobby" means in any other
>>context? It's an avocation, or what a person likes to do when
>>they aren't engaged in their vocation.
>
>Would you call a volunteer fireman a hobbyist?

That's a non sequitur. What does "volunteer" have to do with it being hobby or not? Nothing. It means the person is donating their time, whether it is a hobbist or a professional.

However, for many (probably most) of them it is indeed a hobby. That is one reason there are very few totally volunteer fire departments, and the usual "volunteer" fire department is a mixed crew, where the professionals run the show and the volunteers take up the slack.

And if you've ever had anything to do with trying to manage volunteers in anything as serious and technical in nature as a fire department, you *know* that treating volunteers the same as professionals will get you 1) ousted or 2) lonely. They will rebel and either throw you out or leave themselves!

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

25. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 03:45:30 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <u2b06vo3s5569hvmk8f4qlsmiufcm239l8@4ax.com>
Source record: 62297

On Thu, 27 Feb 2003 05:15:35 GMT, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
wrote:

> Kode-hating Karl, we know were you're coming from and you are NOT worth even

<snip>

How is deliberately misspelling something supposed to make it more
sinister?

26. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 03:49:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030228224932.14887.00000107@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 62260

In article <3E5D0CF1.6F0EAB1C@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>> That would be so only if it were true. Actually, it's just another
>> indication of the crude, simple workings of W5TIT's mind!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> You DO mean W5BOOB don't you?

Dick:

She's a boob, all right! Any woman who chooses such a crude, puerile,
sexually-
suggestive, and demeaning call sign would have to be!

73 de Larry, K3LT

27. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 03:49:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030228224932.14887.00000108@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 62262

In article <f45722ac.0302261920.66e9014a@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> > > Oh, I think it is all relative, Leonard. Compared, for example, to
>your
>> > > progress on WAS, his performance is stellar.
>> >
>> > Smug Dave offers a left-handed compliment to Novice Larry.
>>
>> Larry didn't receive left-handed compliment.
>
>He did if he read your post.
>
>Larry has done fine,
>> especially when his low power and less than ideal antennas are
>> considered. Larry wasn't called a Novice.
>
>Larry is a novice Award seeker. Is being a novice an insult?

Brian:

I take no offense at being called a "novice Award seeker." Inasmuch
as I'm not a Liberal, it is not in my nature to take offense lightly.

> Brian is just reading between
>> the lines again. Do you consider Len's comment to Larry about his WAS a
>> compliment to Larry?
>
>You're kidding, right? When did those two ever have anything nice to
>say about each other?

I'm sure Lennie has many fine points to his character, of which nice
things can be said. The problem we have with him in this newsgroup is
that the finest "point" he shows us is apparently on his head!

73 de Larry, K3LT

28. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 03:49:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030228224933.14887.00000110@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 62261

In article <f45722ac.0302271959.13311bfd@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>
>The only fantasies I've seen here were Han's story of Little Billy
>Beeper, Larry's broken leg on the mountain, and Dick's New Madrid
>disaster. But he can't work CW away from the power mains, so he's not
>able to save the day.

Han's story? Hmmm, I wasn't aware that we had a member of this
newsgroup by the name of Han. Does Mr. Han post from Hong Kong, or
the Chinese mainland?

73 de Larry, K3LT

29. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 03:49:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030228224933.14887.00000109@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 62263

In article <3E5EE0F2.FAF9DC75@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> I can recognize a left-handed compliment when I see one, even if I
>> didn't receive it.
>
>I'm sure you have your hands full with those which you have received.
>Please allow Larry to decide for himself if he has received one.
>
>Len's, as I'm sure you noticed, was not left-handed.
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

When it comes to compliments from Lennie, I guess I have no choice
but to take them from whichever hand they're offered.

73 de Larry, K3LT

30. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 04:06:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302282006.34d90d26@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62264

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E5E8BAC.7A423601@att.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >Can legitimate communication take place at 5wpm?
> >
> > Sure -
>
> But only assuming that both operators are able to stay awake!

Dick, wake up. Time for another dose of Geritol.

31. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 04:07:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302282007.5ac29bc2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62265

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5EDD72.DB32D50D@earthlink.net>...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > > In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >Can legitimate communication take place at 5wpm?
> > >
> > > Sure -
> >
> > But only assuming that both operators are able to stay awake!
>
> Right-o. We mustn't confuse legitimate (yet very slooooooooow)
> communications and proficiency in use of a mode.
>
> Dave K8MN

We mustn't forget that FISTS claims that "Accuracy Transcends Speed."

32. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 04:12:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E603302.5FB1D8DC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62266

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E6009E0.AC4FAC5B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Nice of you to add the correction on spelling, even if it is wrong.
> >Try Wouff Hong. Maybe you can research the uggerumph for us too, Len.
> >
> >> Imagine that...grown men revering two pieces of scrap wood
> >> and not being carpenters...in a radio club.
> >
> >None of it concerns you. Imagine that.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, if "it doesn't concern me," how can I obey
> your powerful commands to "research" it?

So you view "Maybe you can research" as a "powerful command"? Well,
kindly old gent, the Wouff Hong is of no concern of yours and you were
not prevented from researching anything on it (except maybe the
spelling).

> Here's some news, colonel: "Radio clubs" are not exclusively
> devoted to just amateur radio. Imagine that!

I guess it depends on how you grasp them.

> Back to your remedial Heath Course, foreign service man.

> Try for a Dale Carneigie Course while you're at it. That will
> do wonders for your acceptance in the ARS. :-)

I don't have any problem in the "ARS", Leonard, old boy. Then again,
what would you know of that? You aren't a part of the "ARS".

Dave K8MN

33. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 04:16:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6033CA.49A27B11@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62267

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E6002C5.DAE4639@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Len is direct. You are smug. Left-handed is more your style.
> > >
> > >Don't you think my comment to Len was direct? Did it somehow appear as
> > >left-handed to you?
> >
> > More like "underhanded" and not even original. Can't come up
> > with original stuff? :-)

Who owns the term "Never-WAS", Len? Was your comment about Larry's WAS
underhanded?

> > >I'll wear "smug" as defined in the Random House College Dictionary:
> > >
> > >smug - 1. contentedly confident of one's own respectability, ability,
> > >superiority, or correctness.
> > >
> > >Note that the definition doesn't use "and" but rather "or". I'm
> > >contentedly confident in my ability and correctness.
> >
> > You are out standing in your field. Now stay there...

Talk about lack of originality....

Dave K8MN

34. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 04:18:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E60347D.9EC2BDFE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62268

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E6007EF.785AAF4F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> You know, Dave, there *are* other forms of masturbation than mental... You
> >> might try some of them.
> > >
> >You're certainly true to form, Kim. You have a unique ability to
> >portray yourself in the worst way. Are we to assume that you couldn't
> >come up with a real rebuttal to what I wrote?
>
> Heh heh...that IS a rebuttal to your writing... :-)
>
> Good one, too.

No, actually it isn't a rebuttal, much less a good one. Kim muses,
answers and reaches a faulty conclusion.

> Give my regards to Alec and Kim Basinger...whatever their
> ham calls are... :-)

I think they share your fate. They're among the non-participants in
amateur radio.

Dave

35. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 04:22:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E60355A.1F8C2718@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62269

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E6005A2.D1AFFA35@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E5EDCD1.49847E44@earthlink.net>...
> >> > Brian wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E5E4C6D.7351BA43@earthlink.net>...
> >> > > > Brian wrote:
> >> > > >
> >> > > > > In context, FY is former Yugoslavia.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > ...then why not write "former Yugoslavia"?
> >> > >
> >> > > To see if you would trip and fall down?
> >> > >
> >> > > It is a common enough abbreviation in war planning circles.
> >> >
> >> > Not many of us are involved in war planning circles.
> >>
> >> With all the coverage in the news, its unfortunate that you missed it.
> >
> >I saw plenty of information about the states which made up the former
> >Yugoslavia. I didn't see any coverage of "war planning cirlces" and I
> >didn't hear one single person refer to "FY".
>
> Hello? Ever hear of "Fiscal Year," colonel?
>
> CPAs refer to it a lot...

That's nice, Len. Brian wasn't referring to "Fiscal Year". You can go
back to your nap now.

> >> > >... and thought amateurs radio operators were adept at abbreviations
> >> > > considering the CW handicap.
> >> >
> >> > Play it any way you want. Last week you thought Phil was going to
> >> > contact some Spanish stations.
> >>
> >> He may have for all I know. He never did say what an EA was.

> >
> >Apparently it is commonly known in his professional circles. Material
> >about the FCC and attorneys has appeared frequently in the news. It is
> >unfortunate that you missed it.
>
> Yes, it is unfortunate you don't know what a Fiscal Year is...

How'd you reach that conclusion?

> [back to the Heath course for you, old-timer...]

Woke up from that nap? Well, you seem to have missed the part where the Heath course was a portion of a course I took about fifteen years ago. Make yourself some tea and watch the telly, won't you?

Dave K8MN

36. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 04:23:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E60359E.61914972@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62270

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E6003CB.9CCF7689@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >I do hope you'll note that there is no reversal of my position.
>
> Then we'll have to guess at the Whouff Hong placement? :-)

Get back to me when you learn how to spell it.

Dave K8MN

37. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 04:25:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E60361E.59EFB854@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62271

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E6008BB.C0F1708A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Poor baby, still nursing that bruised ego? :-)
>
> Go back to your official State Dept. Heath Course. That's
> a good lad...

It seems beyond your control avoid proving Jim's profile.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

38. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 04:30:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E603723.E990353C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62272

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0302261920.66e9014a@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> > > Oh, I think it is all relative, Leonard. Compared, for example, to
> >your
> >> > > progress on WAS, his performance is stellar.
> >> >
> >> > Smug Dave offers a left-handed compliment to Novice Larry.
> >>
> >> Larry didn't receive left-handed compliment.
> >
> >He did if he read your post.
> >
> >Larry has done fine,
> >> especially when his low power and less than ideal antennas are
> >> considered. Larry wasn't called a Novice.
> >
> >Larry is a novice Award seeker. Is being a novice an insult?
>
> Brian:
>
> I take no offense at being called a "novice Award seeker." Inasmuch
> as I'm not a Liberal, it is not in my nature to take offense lightly.

Just so you are clear on this, Larry: I did not call you a "novice award
seeker" at any point. That came from Brian.

Dave K8MN

39. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 04:32:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6037A7.23BE47E8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62273

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3E5EE0F2.FAF9DC75@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> I can recognize a left-handed compliment when I see one, even if I
> >> didn't receive it.
> > >
> > >I'm sure you have your hands full with those which you have received.
> > >Please allow Larry to decide for himself if he has received one.
> > >
> > >Len's, as I'm sure you noticed, was not left-handed.
> > >
> > >Dave K8MN
>
> Dave:
>
> When it comes to compliments from Lennie, I guess I have no choice
> but to take them from whichever hand they're offered.

Len absolutely oozes sincerity.

Dave K8MN

40. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 04:34:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E603824.DF80D6D2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62274

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDD72.DB32D50D@earthlink.net>...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > > In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
> > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > >
> > > > >Can legitimate communication take place at 5wpm?
> > > >
> > > > Sure -
> > >
> > > But only assuming that both operators are able to stay awake!
> >
> > Right-o. We mustn't confuse legitimate (yet very slooooooooow)
> > communications and proficiency in use of a mode.

> We mustn't forget that FISTS claims that "Accuracy Transcends Speed."

That's fine. If your top end is five words per minute, better slow it
down to three, just in case.

Dave K8MN

41. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 04:54:08 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <31906AD18E400E53.E61F747690105727.ED684EA16232D9B7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62275

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E6007EF.785AAF4F@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3E5EDF27.7032976D@earthlink.net...
> > > W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3E5E4E75.DCB6F894@earthlink.net...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:<3E5DA38A.B1E9D5FD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:<3E5CDEE0.FB871EAD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave, my absence never happened. I had an Immediate
change
> > of
> > > > > heart.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Now you tell us you never left the group. Sorry I simply
> > can't
> > > > > trust
> > > > > > > > > you.
> > > > > > > > > You seem to be quite unreliable.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I had an immediate change of heart, which you noticed and
made
> > note
> > > > > > > > > of, then chided me for not hooking up with Kim and Alec.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Now you tell us I left.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Which is it?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > It has to be both, Brian.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > You must be right. I did leave and I didn't leave. Its
settled.
```

> > > > >
> > > > > I agree that it is settled. You told us one thing and did
another.
> > > > > That's one reason I'm not apt to trust you. Consider yourself
chided
> > > > > once again.
> > > > >
> > > > > Cecil - Would never go for the Extra
> > > > > Len - Going for the Extra "right out of the box"
> > > > > Alec Baldwin - Leaving America if George Bush is elected
> > > > > Kim - Leaving r.r.a.p.
> > > > > Brian - Leaving r.r.a.p. but says he never left
> > > > > Richard Nixon - You won't have Dick Nixon to kick around any more
(he
> > > > > finally made good on that one)
> > >
> > > > Are you perchance implying that you have never said one thing and
done
> > > > another, or changed your mind, or did the complete opposite of what
you
> > > > said? Yeah, right...
> > >
> > > Are you by chance attempting to ask a question (in which you attempt
to
> > > put words in my mouth) and then supplying your own answer?
> > >
> > > I never did any of the things I've outlined above. I've certainly
> > > never:
> > >
> > > 1. announced here that I'd be doing something that I changed my mind
> > > and decided not to do.
> > >
> > > 2. announced here that I'd never do something then reversed myself.
> > >
> > > Nice try, Kim.
> > >
> N
> >
> > You know, Dave, there *are* other forms of masturbation than mental...
You
> > might try some of them.
>
> You're certainly true to form, Kim. You have a unique ability to
> portray yourself in the worst way. Are we to assume that you couldn't
> come up with a real rebuttal to what I wrote?
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Well, I did come up with a real rebuttal, but I see it is mental masturbation you enjoy more. So be it...

Kim W5TIT

42. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 06:44:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301014427.09822.00000048@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 62280

In article <3E603824.DF80D6D2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> We mustn't forget that FISTS claims that "Accuracy Transcends Speed."
>
>That's fine. If your top end is five words per minute, better slow it
>down to three, just in case.

Poor baby, you really DID have a bad hair day today, didn't you?
[all three strands...]

Tomorrow is another time for you in the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
Service.

Beep, beep.

43. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 06:44:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301014427.09822.00000049@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 62284

In article <20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>Someone who can send and receive morse at no more than five words per minute
>has some basic Morse code skills. Such a person is not proficient - yet.
>
>And the sending test disappeared in the USA about 20 years ago.
>
>The stated goal was elimination of the Morse proficiency test. That's been
>accomplished in the USA, because the remaining test is a basic skill test,
>not a proficiency test.

Who became a god and "stated morse PROFICIENCY test?"

NCTAs are after the removal of ALL morse code tests.

You're getting weird, Reverend Jim. Take a Taxi home
after your run.

44. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 06:44:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301014428.09822.00000050@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 62281

In article <20030228205714.23598.00000543@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Would you call a volunteer fireman a hobbyist?

Firemen put OUT fires. Outraged PCTAs start them.

Has US amateur radio now turned into some kind of Fire Brigade or Service? Has it mutated into Arsonist Radio Service?

Somehow you are generating the wrong endorphins from that running...tsk, tsk, tsk.

You aren't being SERIOUS enough!

45. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 06:44:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301014429.09822.00000052@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 62276

In article <3E6037A7.23BE47E8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> When it comes to compliments from Lennie, I guess I have no choice
>> but to take them from whichever hand they're offered.
>
>Len absolutely oozes sincerity.

...and you just ooze. Tsk, tsk, tsk. <phew! yuck!>

46. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 06:44:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301014429.09822.00000053@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 62279

In article <3E6033CA.49A27B11@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> >Note that the definition doesn't use "and" but rather "or". I'm
>> >contentedly confident in my ability and correctness.
>>
>> You are out standing in your field. Now stay there...
>
>Talk about lack of originality....

No, we aren't talking about you, Herr Robust.

Go study your Hun-to-English dictionary and get back to them.

47. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 06:44:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301014429.09822.00000051@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 62287

In article <3E600B1C.F8E8375E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <c2356669.0302270948.1c88ff71@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>> (N2EY) writes:
>>
>> >Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message
>> >>
>> >> >> >> It's a hobby folks.
>> >
>> >Some folks get all worked up over the word "hobby". I think it's
>> >because the word conjures up an image of triviality, low or
>> >non-existent standards of knoweldge or skill, not contributing
>> >anything really meaningful to society, and/or being purely for the fun
>> >of those involved.
>>
>> Good grief, can't have such terrible "trivialities" here!
>>
>> Everyone MUST be serious-minded!
>>
>> It's a pejorative thing, very low standard to actually have
>> FUN or RECREATION in a HOBBY?
>>
>> Oy gevalt!
>>
>> >So, Floyd, how about defining what "hobby" means in the Amateur Radio
>> >context?
>>
>> How's about another Sermon on the Antenna Mount from the
>> distinguished cloggyman at the pulpit? Show us all where we
>> went wrong on considering a hobby as a hobby? Tell all how
>> to achieve nirvana in the present life by adopting the lifestyle of
>> amateur radio as a savior?
>>
>> Be SERIOUS now...
>
>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic

>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Be SERIOUS now... :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk...even Dale Carneigie couldn't help either of you.

48. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 06:44:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301014430.09822.00000054@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 62278

In article <20030228224932.14887.00000108@mb-mu.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>I'm sure Lennie has many fine points to his character, of which nice
>things can be said. The problem we have with him in this newsgroup is
>that the finest "point" he shows us is apparently on his head!

Poor baby...bus ran into gridlock today? Next time take a
grid leak. :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

49. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 06:44:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301014431.09822.00000055@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 62288

In article <3E600ABE.818BA434@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E5DA624.42BBDC48@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Brian wrote:
>> >>
>> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<3E5CD67E.888574B6@earthlink.net>...
>> >> > Brian wrote:
>> >> > >
>> >> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<3E564F03.72EB24C0@earthlink.net>...
>> >> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> > > > >
>> >> > > > > In article <20030220061433.23241.00000015@mb-da.aol.com>,
>> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>> >> > > > > writes:
>> >> > > > >
>> >> > > > > >Also gave a good indication of propagation. Back when a 1000
>mile
>> >contact was
>> >> > > > > >a major accomplishment, this was an important feature.
>> >> > > > >
>> >> > > > > Maybe you could help out K3LT complete his WAS? He seems
>> >> > > > > to have difficulty getting out...
>> >> > > >
>> >> > > > Oh, I think it is all relative, Leonard. Compared, for example,
>to
>> >your
>> >> > > > progress on WAS, his performance is stellar.
>> >> > >
>> >> > > Smug Dave offers a left-handed compliment to Novice Larry.
>> >> >
>> >> > Larry didn't receive left-handed compliment.
>> >>
>> >> He did if he read your post.
>> >
>> >I don't think you can presume to speak for him on how he feels about my
>> >statement.

>> >
>> >> > Larry has done fine,
>> >> > especially when his low power and less than ideal antennas are
>> >> > considered. Larry wasn't called a Novice.
>> >>
>> >> Larry is a novice Award seeker. Is being a novice an insult?
>> >
>> >You wrote "Novice Larry". Is that a compliment?
>> >
>> >> > Brian is just reading between
>> >> > the lines again. Do you consider Len's comment to Larry about his WAS
>a
>> >> > compliment to Larry?
>> >>
>> >> You're kidding, right? When did those two ever have anything nice to
>> >> say about each other?
>> >
>> >No, I wasn't kidding. I don't think Len's comment was intended to be a
>> >compliment to Larry.
>> >
>> >> > Len Anderson isn't even in the game. He's a never-WAS.
>> >>
>> >> Perhaps.
>> >
>> >There's no "perhaps" to it.
>> >
>> >> But not everyone seeks awards whether they're "in the game"
>> >> or not.
>> >
>> >Wrong. Not everyone who is in the game seeks (amateur radio) awards.
>> >Those who are not in the game cannot seek (amateur radio) awards. Len
>> >can play a game of Visit All States or e-mail all states or telephone
>> >all states.
>> >
>> >In the mean time, Shhhhhh! Len's very hard at work. He's trying to
>> >think of a way out of the N2EY profile conundrum.
>>
>> Poor baby. I've been working*, not concerning self with
>> middle-aged adolescents indulging in their own aroma therapy
>> (attar of stinky slinging) in wordplay. Pays fairly well, too. :-)
>
>You, of course, have it backwards. You do the slinging. Then comes the
>N2EY quote. Poor baby.

"Sling?" No sling. :-)

Still can't get up to speed on originality, slimmo? :-)

Sooner or later you are going to have to learn to think for
yourself in here. So far, there's little sign of it...

You do a lot of snarling and nastygrams, hardly "smug."

>> Tell us, munchkin of many keys, was there a State Dept. Heath
>> Course in Getting Along With People?
>
>You interested in taking the course?

Not if it turns out your kind...! :-)

50. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 06:44:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301014432.09822.00000056@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 62282

In article <3E60359E.61914972@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E6003CB.9CCF7689@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >I do hope you'll note that there is no reversal of my position.
>>
>> Then we'll have to guess at the Whouff Hong placement? :-)
>
>Get back to me when you learn how to spell it.

Well, that "reply" ended any speculation on your position or
placement... :-)

51. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 06:44:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301014432.09822.00000057@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 62285

In article <3E60347D.9EC2BDFE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E6007EF.785AAF4F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >> You know, Dave, there *are* other forms of masturbation than mental...
>You
>> >> might try some of them.
>> >
>> >You're certainly true to form, Kim. You have a unique ability to
>> >portray yourself in the worst way. Are we to assume that you couldn't
>> >come up with a real rebuttal to what I wrote?
>>
>> Heh heh...that IS a rebuttal to your writing... :-)
>>
>> Good one, too.
>
>No, actually it isn't a rebuttal, much less a good one. Kim muses,
>answers and reaches a faulty conclusion.

Incorrect, Herr Robust, it was a fine rebuttal, so much so
that you cannot counter it without trapping yourself in the
usual bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

>> Give my regards to Alec and Kim Basinger...whatever their
>> ham calls are... :-)
>
>I think they share your fate. They're among the non-participants in
>amateur radio.

Ah, but I completed a Heath Course a very long time ago.

You buckle down and get to work finishing yours...

52. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 06:44:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301014433.09822.00000058@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 62286

In article <3E603302.5FB1D8DC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>So you view "Maybe you can research" as a "powerful command"? Well,
>kindly old gent, the Wouff Hong is of no concern of yours and you were
>not prevented from researching anything on it (except maybe the
>spelling).

There's as much proper spelling of a fictitious article as
there is a proper translation of Hunnish. :-)

Get some better tailoring on your uniform, colonel, your
boots are too tight...

>> Here's some news, colonel: "Radio clubs" are not exclusively
>> devoted to just amateur radio. Imagine that!
>
>I guess it depends on how you grasp them.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...radio exists in many different forms. If you had
completed that Heath Course 15 years ago, you would have
learned that.

>> Back to your remedial Heath Course, foreign service man.
>
>
>> Try for a Dale Carneigie Course while you're at it. That will
>> do wonders for your acceptance in the ARS. :-)
>
>I don't have any problem in the "ARS", Leonard, old boy. Then again,
>what would you know of that? You aren't a part of the "ARS".

I wouldn't want to associate with the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
Seniors, long-timer.

Now, you go off and work real hard on restoring that BC-348,
long-timer. Be careful with it, it's 60 years old if a day. Do
you have the TM for it? Do you understand what the TM says?
Do you need a TM translation into Hunnish?

53. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 06:44:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301014434.09822.00000060@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 62277

In article <3E60355A.1F8C2718@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Woke up from that nap? Well, you seem to have missed the part where the
>Heath course was a portion of a course I took about fifteen years ago.
>Make yourself some tea and watch the telly, won't you?

Still haven't completed that Heath Course after 15 years?

Incredible...!

54. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 06:44:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301014434.09822.00000059@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 62283

In article <3E60361E.59EFB854@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Oh, my, still no originality from the colonel.

If you would stop the bad Otto Preminger imitation you
might have an inspiration for originality...tsk, tsk, tsk.

55. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 08:47:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301034710.16370.00000234@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62289

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/28/03 5:01 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302281501.4eef08a2@posting.google.com>

>S-t-e-v-e, its not a matter of speed. Its a matter of accuracy.
>
>Like the FISTS website states, "Accuracy Transcends Speed."

Regardless of speed, you have yet to render an answer to the question,
"WHAT HANDICAP?"

Sorry for the caps...Slower wasn't what you needed in order to understand
the question...I thought perhaps louder might help.

Got an answer yet?

Steve, K4YZ

56. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 08:55:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301035512.16370.00000235@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62290

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/28/03 7:52 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030228205242.15471.00000186@mb-df.aol.com>

>Poor baby, still nursing that bruised ego?

Geeeeee.....That's funny.

Especially coming from a Putz who is ALL ABOUT brusided egos.

Whose only reason-de-guerre in this forum is to salve his own wounded ego
and to attempt to emasculate anyone who dares to think they might know
something about a radio that Lennie the Creep doesn't know.

Sheesh. What a scumbag.

57. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 08:59:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301035941.16370.00000236@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62291

>Subject: Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/28/03 12:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030228135153.29016.00000532@mb-fy.aol.com>

>>You know, Dave, there *are* other forms of masturbation than mental... You
>>might try some of them.
>
> ROTFL!

Ya know, Lennie, you shouldn't be laughing when in most of the people are laughing AT you, not WITH you......

Steve, K4YZ

58. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 09:02:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301040231.16370.00000237@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62292

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/28/03 11:56 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030228125633.14389.00001213@mb-mw.aol.com>

>How many "Rosie the Riveters" got BSMEs back then, old-timer,
> and what does it have to do with amateur radio?

Since when do YOU get promoted to "moderator", Lennie?

More of your "I Can Wander Off Topic, But Noone Else Can" BS, Lennie?

No wonder you're such a classic putz.

Steve

59. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 09:07:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301040743.16370.00000238@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62294

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/28/03 7:52 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030228205240.15471.00000184@mb-df.aol.com>

>>Yugoslavia. I didn't see any coverage of "war planning cirlces" and I
>>didn't hear one single person refer to "FY".
>
> Hello? Ever hear of "Fiscal Year," colonel?

I guess keeping something "in context" would be a bit of a stretch for you,
eh, Your Scuminess?

>Yes, it is unfortunate you don't know what a Fiscal Year is...

Unfortunate that you don't know what "adult supervison" is, Lennie.
Perhaps if you got some you might act a bit more your alleged age.

But I doubt it.

Steve, K4YZ

60. Re: Icing problems on Yagi antennas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 09:24:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301042408.16370.00000239@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62295

>Subject: Re: Icing problems on Yagi antennas
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/28/03 12:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030228135150.29016.00000530@mb-fy.aol.com>

>Icing on antennas is usually caused by precipitation freezing
> on antenna components. ["water from the sky"] *

>* deliberate wording to yield an "opening" for those who cannot get
> along with others without fighting personalities instead of topics.

In otherwords, "I am trolling for a fight".

You didn't need to "spell it out" for us, Lennie...you made it absolutely clear when you ate up 4000+ bytes of bandwidth with your reply, only to follow it with this slap in the face...:

> Note: This newsgroup is for amateur radio policy arguments,
> not about antenna problems. Rec.radio.amateur.antennas is
> the appropriate venue for antenna discussion

Guess it was "beyond" you to say "Hey Montysmoke...Meet me in rec.radio.amateur.antennas and I'll be glad to answer your question", or to even just answer his question and be glad enough to know that you imparted some of your omnipotent knowledge on one of the Unwashed Masses....

Nope. Wasn't enough for you. Had to play NG Hall Monitor too.

You finally got a dance with the Prom Queen, but then you peed on her shoes...

Why am I not surprised...?!?!

Sheesh...What a SCUMMY Putz!

Steve, K4YZ

61. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 09:39:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301043929.16370.00000240@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62296

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>Date: 2/28/03 6:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <87llzz3o41.fld@barrow.com>

>Your sense of humor overwhelms your common senses sometimes, but
>I can't say that such cracks are wrong either...

I guess stuff like Lennie's CAN overwhelm the humor senses of folks who
get excited over watching polar bears mate and walrus sunbathe.

>> Oh, dear, the "fact" fantasy again. Yes, some use amateur
>> radio as a whole lifestyle away from work, imagining all
>> kinds of heroic high-altitude, low-opening derring-do and
>> saving the Titanic over and over again.
>
>Hey, whatever turns their crank, right?

Or unless the only crank that get's turned in Barrow is done in one's own
igloo...?!?!

>> Avocation, hobby, fun, recreation is all it is. Amateur radio
>> isn't vital to national security, national defense, or anything
>> else except as a fantasy-land for a minority within. If US
>
>Old Hiram just rolled over in his grave?

I doubt it, but several federal agencies including the DoS, DoD, FEMA and
others don't see it that way...But hey, who are THEY to know...?!?!

>See what I mean (above)! It's dem *liberals*!

Whew! Sure sounds like Lennie!

>>> The sad truth is that's it's all too true. No one's really required
>to
>>>KNOW the material necessary to become licensed, let alone upgrade to
>Amateur
>>>Extra. Yes, many DO "know" the material. Most don't.
>>
>> Two four-year-olds "passed the test" well before the Restructuring
>> of 99-412 R&O.
>>
>> Are you really serious about thinking that four-year-olds "know the
>> material?!?"
>>
>> I don't think you are being serious...

>
>He thinks he's being serious. (But I heard you laughing as you
>first read that, all the way here. I thought it was another
>earth quake and was expecting to hear that Anchorage has slid
>into the Pacific Ocean.)

That's not "laughing" you hear, Floyd, unless it's Lennie forgetting to use his "Gas-X" again.

I dare you to stand outside a test session, survey 10 people over what was tested, and tell me how many people can "discuss" the core material.

Yes...I am being serious. I know seriousness is a bit of a stretch for Lennie, and I am getting my ideas about you.

>All I can say is "You sure hit it on the head with that post, Len."

Yep. I was right.

Steve, K4YZ

62. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 10:46:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301054610.19843.00000266@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 62299

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>Date: 2/28/03 9:38 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <87smu721tm.fld@barrow.com>

>And if you've ever had anything to do with trying to manage
>volunteers in anything as serious and technical in nature as a
>fire department, you *know* that treating volunteers the same as
>professionals will get you 1) ousted or 2) lonely. They will
>rebel and either throw you out or leave themselves!

Where in the Blue Blazes did you come up with THAT...?!?!

I HAVE been a volunteer fireman STN 352/Horsham Township in PA, and Cagle Mountain VFD, Sequatchie County, TN) and I can tell you the FIRST thing that will get you welcomed, appreciated and thanked is to treat us like professionals.

What frozen orifice did THIS come from...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

63. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 11:11:32 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87of4v1guz.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62300

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>>Date: 2/28/03 6:51 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <87llzz3o41.fld@barrow.com>
>
>>Your sense of humor overwhelms your common senses sometimes, but
>>I can't say that such cracks are wrong either...
>
> I guess stuff like Lennie's CAN overwhelm the humor senses of folks who
>get excited over watching polar bears mate and walrus sunbathe.

How would you know?

When you are reduced the point of nothing to say other than an
attempt a insulting the place where a person lives, things tend
to go down hill fast for you. Sheesh, that's even a step below
trying to insult the person rather than discuss the issues.

Since you don't know, watching polar bears and walrus (along with
a lot of other very interesting marine life) is indeed far more
exciting and probably a great deal more useful than anything the
average person is ever lucky enough to be able to engage in.
There aren't many positions here for marine biologists, hence
the ones that are available are highly sought after by marine
scientists.

>>> Oh, dear, the "fact" fantasy again. Yes, some use amateur
>>> radio as a whole lifestyle away from work, imagining all
>>> kinds of heroic high-altitude, low-opening derring-do and
>>> saving the Titanic over and over again.
>>
>>Hey, whatever turns their crank, right?
>
> Or unless the only crank that get's turned in Barrow is done in one's own
>igloo...?!?!

Is that supposed to mean something?

>>> Avocation, hobby, fun, recreation is all it is. Amateur radio
>>> isn't vital to national security, national defense, or anything
>>> else except as a fantasy-land for a minority within. If US
>>
>>Old Hiram just rolled over in his grave?
>
> I doubt it, but several federal agencies including the DoS, DoD, FEMA and

>others don't see it that way...But hey, who are THEY to know...?!?!

A lot more than you apparently do!

> I dare you to stand outside a test session, survey 10 people over what was
>tested, and tell me how many people can "discuss" the core material.

So what? Do you actually think that is significant in some way?

Regardless, if it is true in your area it reflects poorly on *you*.
Why aren't you and others doing a better job of mentoring?

> Yes...I am being serious. I know seriousness is a bit of a stretch for
>Lennie, and I am getting my ideas about you.

Len seems to be the most serious regular here. Near as I can tell
he actually understands the _significance_ of these discussions, and
treats them accordingly.

I may just put everyone else into the killfile, and read only what
he says. That sure would improve the SNR.

>>All I can say is "You sure hit it on the head with that post, Len."
>
> Yep. I was right.

I'm honored.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

64. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 11:13:09 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87k7fj1gsa.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62151

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 2/28/03 12:51 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030228135153.29016.00000532@mb-fy.aol.com>
>
>>>You know, Dave, there *are* other forms of masturbation than mental... You
>>>might try some of them.
>>
>> ROTFL!
>
> Ya know, Lennie, you shouldn't be laughing when in most of the people are
>laughing AT you, not WITH you......
>
>Steve, K4YZ

You'd best learn how to count.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

65. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 11:35:58 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87fzq71fq9.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62152

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>>Date: 2/28/03 9:38 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <87smu721tm.fld@barrow.com>
>
>>And if you've ever had anything to do with trying to manage
>>volunteers in anything as serious and technical in nature as a
>>fire department, you *know* that treating volunteers the same as
>>professionals will get you 1) ousted or 2) lonely. They will
>>rebel and either throw you out or leave themselves!
>
> Where in the Blue Blazes did you come up with THAT...?!?!
>
> I HAVE been a volunteer fireman STN 352/Horsham Township in PA, and Cagle
>Mountain VFD, Sequatchie County, TN) and I can tell you the FIRST thing that
>will get you welcomed, appreciated and thanked is to treat us like
>professionals.
>
> What frozen orifice did THIS come from...?!?!

Apparently I have a *lot* more experience than you!

At management, that is.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

66. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 12:55:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301075550.11101.00000035@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 62153

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>Date: 3/1/03 5:35 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <87fzq71fq9.fld@barrow.com>

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:
>>>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>>>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>>>Date: 2/28/03 9:38 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <87smu721tm.fld@barrow.com>
>>
>>>And if you've ever had anything to do with trying to manage
>>>volunteers in anything as serious and technical in nature as a
>>>fire department, you *know* that treating volunteers the same as
>>>professionals will get you 1) ousted or 2) lonely. They will
>>>rebel and either throw you out or leave themselves!
>>
>>Where in the Blue Blazes did you come up with THAT...?!?!
>>
>> I HAVE been a volunteer fireman STN 352/Horsham Township in PA, and
>Cagle
>>Mountain VFD, Sequatchie County, TN) and I can tell you the FIRST thing that
>>will get you welcomed, appreciated and thanked is to treat us like
>>professionals.
>>
>> What frozen orifice did THIS come from...?!?!
>
>Apparently I have a *lot* more experience than you!

I doubt it. Not from the silly assertion YOU just made!

One of the PRINICPAL leadership milestones in EMS and Fire Suppression is
to treat volunteers no differently than professionals...repect them, listen to
them, include them in the decision making process.

>At management, that is.

Of what? A McDonalds? KFC?

Obviously you don't take much of the policy and leadership criteria from
IAFC, NAEMT or NREMT seriously, Floyd.

Let me review....: >Apparently I have a *lot* more experience than you!

BBBWWWHAHAHA

Thanks, Floyd!...I needed that!

Sheesh!~

Steve, K4YZ

67. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 13:17:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301081734.11101.00000036@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 62154

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>Date: 3/1/03 5:11 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <87of4v1guz.fld@barrow.com>

>How would you know?

How do you know that I don't?

>When you are reduced the point of nothing to say other than an
>attempt a insulting the place where a person lives, things tend
>to go down hill fast for you. Sheesh, that's even a step below
>trying to insult the person rather than discuss the issues

Floyd, I realize that you're in a remote spot...just found this NG and are taking great pleasure jumping in with both feet, but that and a fin will get you a cup of overpriced Java at Starbuck's.

YOU seem to be taking just as much liberty with jumping to conclusions about people as anyone, so your "holier than thou" chastizing is about as relevent as white-out in a snow storm.

>Since you don't know...(SNIP)

Ooooops...Just read ME the Riot Act about "insulting the person" and you slide right in to telling me what I know or don't know.

Pot/kettle/black.

(UNSNIP)...

> watching polar bears and walrus (along with
>a lot of other very interesting marine life) is indeed far more
>exciting and probably a great deal more useful than anything the
>average person is ever lucky enough to be able to engage in.

I have no doubt that it's a lot of fun and very educational. But I dare say some of the things I have had the plasure and honor of "engage(ing) in" have been a just-a-tad bit more useful to OTHER persons than watching wildlife.

>There aren't many positions here for marine biologists, hence
>the ones that are available are highly sought after by marine
>scientists.

I am sure. The relevence here is...?!?!

>> Or unless the only crank that get's turned in Barrow is done in one's
>own
>>igloo...?!?!

>
>Is that supposed to mean something?

No more or less than anything you've offered, Floyd.

>>I doubt it, but several federal agencies including the DoS, DoD, FEMA
>and
>>others don't see it that way...But hey, who are THEY to know...?!?!
>
>A lot more than you apparently do!

And judging from the content of your posts, Floyd, a GREAT deal more than
you!

>> I dare you to stand outside a test session, survey 10 people over what
>was
>>tested, and tell me how many people can "discuss" the core material.
>
>So what? Do you actually think that is significant in some way?

Only if we are discssing what people really KNOW about radio theory and/or
practice and what they memorized to pass a test.

>Regardless, if it is true in your area it reflects poorly on *you*.
>Why aren't you and others doing a better job of mentoring?

It's true in MANY areas, Floyd. I have had the opportunity to participate
in VE exams in the northeast, the midwest, west coast and the south. The same
problems exist coast-to-coast.

>Len seems to be the most serious regular here. Near as I can tell
>he actually understands the _significance_ of these discussions, and
>treats them accordingly.

Un huh...Right. Lennie has zero-point-zero days (unless you count this
forum and "relevent") in practical Amateur Radio issues. He is not a licensee,
does not participate in local or national programs, and stands to suffer (or
benefit from) none of the consequences of policy matters that may be imposed
upion Amateur Radio.

>I may just put everyone else into the killfile, and read only what
>he says. That sure would improve the SNR.

And it would ALSO say a lot about your choice of fiction over facts.
Leonard is a documented pathological liar. If that's your chosen source of
"information", all I can say is "more power to ya"...

>>>All I can say is "You sure hit it on the head with that post, Len."
>>
>>Yep. I was right.
>
>I'm honored

Only if you like being made a fool of. If it is, then you're on the right track.

Steve, K4YZ

68. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 13:18:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301081842.11101.00000037@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 62155

>Subject: Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran
>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>Date: 3/1/03 5:13 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <87k7fj1gsa.fld@barrow.com>

>You'd best learn how to count.

I'm doing fine. Perhaps a trip through Google might help you with YOUR
math, Floyd.

Steve, K4YZ

69. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 14:50:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303010650.37bbe3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62156

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E600461.31E02205@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDC26.811EA4C9@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5E4E75.DCB6F894@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5DA38A.B1E9D5FD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5CDEE0.FB871EAD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > It has to be both, Brian.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > You must be right. I did leave and I didn't leave. Its settled.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I agree that it is settled. You told us one thing and did another.
> > > > > > > > > That's one reason I'm not apt to trust you. Consider yourself chided
> > > > > > > > > once again.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Cecil - Would never go for the Extra
> > > > > > > > > Len - Going for the Extra "right out of the box"
> > > > > > > > > Alec Baldwin - Leaving America if George Bush is elected
> > > > > > > > > Kim - Leaving r.r.a.p.
> > > > > > > > > Brian - Leaving r.r.a.p. but says he never left
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Yet you documented that I never left.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I documented it? How, pray tell, could I do that?
> > > > >
> > > > > Quite easily. With a post to rrap.
> > > >
> > > > I can't document any such thing with a post here.

So you lied?

70. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 15:03:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303010703.14de4e2b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62157

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030301034710.16370.00000234@mb-cs.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 2/28/03 5:01 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0302281501.4eef08a2@posting.google.com>
>
> >S-t-e-v-e, its not a matter of speed. Its a matter of accuracy.
> >
> >Like the FISTS website states, "Accuracy Transcends Speed."
>
> Regardless of speed, you have yet to render an answer to the question,
> "WHAT HANDICAP?"
>
> Sorry for the caps...Slower wasn't what you needed in order to understand
> the question...I thought perhaps louder might help.
>
> Got an answer yet?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, I think it would be ovbious to anyone who is familiar with
Morse code.

I'll let you answer your own question by answering this question.

Why are so many abbreviations, Q-codes, numbergrams necessary, and the
pursuit of the shortest callsign possible?

None-the-less, accuracy transcends speed.

71. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 15:07:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303010707.6f86ea10@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62158

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E6004ED.870375A0@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030227185259.23275.00000686@mb-da.aol.com>...
> > > >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> > > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > > >Date: 2/27/03 5:04 PM Central Standard Time
> > > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0302271504.bcd8c48@posting.google.com>
>
> > > >> > In context, FY is former Yugoslavia.
> > > >>
> > > >> ...then why not write "former Yugoslavia"?
> > > > >
> > > >To see if you would trip and fall down?
> > > > >
> > > >It is a common enough abbreviation in war planning circles.
> > >
> > > Oh? So now you are an associate of the Brookings Institute?
> > >
> > > >I screwed
> > > >up and thought amateurs radio operators were adept at abbreviations
> > > >considering the CW handicap.
> > > > >
> > >
> > > What handicap?
> >
> > Abbreviations abound because of the tediousness of spelling out words.
> > Either that or CW ops don't spell very well and hide it through
> > abbreviations.
>
> "Tediousness" doesn't enter into the equation. Abbreviations are used
> to save *time*.

Yes it does, and yes they do.

There are a number of commonly used abbreviations.
> "FY" isn't among them.

Is EA among them?

72. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 15:08:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303010708.b50069b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62159

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030228224933.14887.00000110@mb-mu.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0302271959.13311bfd@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >
> >The only fantasies I've seen here were Han's story of Little Billy
> >Beeper, Larry's broken leg on the mountain, and Dick's New Madrid
> >disaster. But he can't work CW away from the power mains, so he's not
> >able to save the day.
>
> Han's story? Hmmm, I wasn't aware that we had a member of this
> newsgroup by the name of Han. Does Mr. Han post from Hong Kong, or
> the Chinese mainland?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Minnesota Han

73. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 15:16:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303010716.785bb80c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62160

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E6002C5.DAE4639@earthlink.net>...

> I'll wear "smug" as defined in the Random House College Dictionary:

You don't have a choice, Dave. It's part of your personality.

> smug - 1. contentedly confident of one's own respectability, ability,
> superiority, or correctness.
>
> Note that the definition doesn't use "and" but rather "or".

Noted. So choose one (1).

I'm
> contentedly confident in my ability and correctness.

Ooops. You tried to grab more than one.

> Dave K8MN

Try superiority. Its a better fit.

74. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 15:19:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303010719.69400a91@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62161

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030228224933.14887.00000109@mb-mu.aol.com>...
> In article <3E5EE0F2.FAF9DC75@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> I can recognize a left-handed compliment when I see one, even if I
> >> didn't receive it.
> >
> >I'm sure you have your hands full with those which you have received.
> >Please allow Larry to decide for himself if he has received one.
> >
> >Len's, as I'm sure you noticed, was not left-handed.
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Dave:
>
> When it comes to compliments from Lennie, I guess I have no choice
> but to take them from whichever hand they're offered.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Ditto Dave.

75. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 17:06:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301120630.23598.00000549@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 62162

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of February 28, 2003:

Novice - 35,264 (decrease of 14,065)
Tech - 250,573 (increase of 45,179)
Tech Plus - 88,477 (decrease of 57,457)
General - 140,170 (increase of 27,493)
Advanced - 84,019 (decrease of 15,763)
Extra - 103,550 (increase of 24,800)
Total - 684,979 (increase of 10,187)

73 de Jim, N2EY

76. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 17:06:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301120631.23598.00000550@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 62163

In article <87smu721tm.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>>
>>>Is that any different that what "hobby" means in any other
>>>context? It's an avocation, or what a person likes to do when
>>>they aren't engaged in their vocation.
>>
>>Would you call a volunteer fireman a hobbyist?
>
>That's a non sequitur.

Actually, it's a serious question.

>What does "volunteer" have to do with it
>being hobby or not?

The fact that the volunteer is unpaid. And does the firefighting activities as
something he/she "likes to do when not engaged in their vocation".

>Nothing. It means the person is donating
>their time, whether it is a hobbist or a professional.

How many volunteer firefighters are also professional firefighters? Are those
volunteer firefighters who are not also professional firefighters therefore
hobbyists?
-
>
>However, for many (probably most) of them it is indeed a hobby.
>That is one reason there are very few totally volunteer fire
>departments, and the usual "volunteer" fire department is a
>mixed crew, where the professionals run the show and the
>volunteers take up the slack.

Very true.
>
>And if you've ever had anything to do with trying to manage
>volunteers in anything as serious and technical in nature as a
>fire department, you *know* that treating volunteers the same as
>professionals will get you 1) ousted or 2) lonely. They will
>rebel and either throw you out or leave themselves!

All depends on what you mean by "treating volunteers the same as
professionals".

Amateur radio is serious and technical, too, for many hams.
>
But the question remains: Would you call volunteer firefighters who are not also professional firefighters "hobbyists"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

btw, watching walruses and polar bears in their natural environment sounds really interesting! The "IQ test" puzzler took a tiny bit of thinking until the little light went on.

Here's one I just heard on "Car Talk":

A young man visits Egypt and sees the pyramids. He is very impressed. He returns home, marries and raises a son. When the son is grown, he sends the son to Egypt to see the pyramids. Both father and son only visit Egypt and the pyramids once. The puzzling part is that the father makes his visit in 1995 and the son visits in 1969.

77. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 17:45:54 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <873cm70ylp.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62167

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:
>
> One of the PRINICPAL leadership milestones in EMS and Fire Suppression is
>to treat volunteers no differently than professionals...repect them, listen to
>them, include them in the decision making process.

Your perception of "professional" seems to be a bit out of
whack, but that comes as no surprise.

What you don't do with volunteers that you do with the pro's is
treat them like they are required to do what management decides
needs to be done. The level of leadership necessarily has to be
on a much higher plane, or they get annoyed and go home! And they
may just stay there too.

I can't recall the exact quote, but it is something along the lines
of "Leadership is the art of convincing others to do what you want
them to, and to think it was their idea to do it." Leadership isn't
necessarily part of managing professionals, but it is essential with
volunteers.

That is the primary reason that professionals are usually hired
to be the backbone of EMS or fire departments.

>>At management, that is.
>
> Of what? A McDonalds? KFC?
>
> Obviously you don't take much of the policy and leadership criteria from
>IAFC, NAEMT or NREMT seriously, Floyd.

You are fantasizing a little much there.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

78. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 17:48:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E60F27D.3E3118A2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62164

```
W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E6007EF.785AAF4F@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3E5EDF27.7032976D@earthlink.net...
> > > > W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3E5E4E75.DCB6F894@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:<3E5DA38A.B1E9D5FD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:<3E5CDEE0.FB871EAD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Dave, my absence never happened. I had an Immediate
> change
> > > > of
> > > > > heart.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Now you tell us you never left the group. Sorry I simply
> > > can't
> > > > > trust
> > > > > > > > > > you.
> > > > > > > > > > You seem to be quite unreliable.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > I had an immediate change of heart, which you noticed and
> made
> > > note
> > > > > > > > > > of, then chided me for not hooking up with Kim and Alec.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Now you tell us I left.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Which is it?
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > It has to be both, Brian.
> > > > > > > > >
```

> > > > > > > You must be right. I did leave and I didn't leave. Its
> settled.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I agree that it is settled. You told us one thing and did
> another.
> > > > > > > That's one reason I'm not apt to trust you. Consider yourself
> chided
> > > > > > > once again.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Cecil - Would never go for the Extra
> > > > > > > Len - Going for the Extra "right out of the box"
> > > > > > > Alec Baldwin - Leaving America if George Bush is elected
> > > > > > > Kim - Leaving r.r.a.p.
> > > > > > > Brian - Leaving r.r.a.p. but says he never left
> > > > > > > Richard Nixon - You won't have Dick Nixon to kick around any more
> (he
> > > > > > > finally made good on that one)
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Are you perchance implying that you have never said one thing and
> done
> > > > > > another, or changed your mind, or did the complete opposite of what
> you
> > > > > > said? Yeah, right...
> > > > >
> > > > > Are you by chance attempting to ask a question (in which you attempt
> to
> > > > > put words in my mouth) and then supplying your own answer?
> > > > >
> > > > > I never did any of the things I've outlined above. I've certainly
> > > > > never:
> > > > >
> > > > > 1. announced here that I'd be doing something that I changed my mind
> > > > > and decided not to do.
> > > > >
> > > > > 2. announced here that I'd never do something then reversed myself.
> > > > >
> > > > > Nice try, Kim.
> > > > >
> > > N
> > >
> > > You know, Dave, there *are* other forms of masturbation than mental...
> You
> > > might try some of them.
> >
> > You're certainly true to form, Kim. You have a unique ability to
> > portray yourself in the worst way. Are we to assume that you couldn't
> > come up with a real rebuttal to what I wrote?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >

>
> Well, I did come up with a real rebuttal, but I see it is mental
> masturbation you enjoy more. So be it...

That's an interesting presumption on your part. It appears that you had no real rebuttal since you didn't bother to post one. Instead you came up with a question for me but you supplied your own answer.

What part of my of statement was not true--that Brian said he was leaving and that he know tells us he never left? Was it the portion about you, Len, Alec Baldwin, Cecil, Brian and Richard Nixon telling us one thing and doing the opposite?

Dave K8MN

79. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 17:52:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E60F380.8DC98F9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62165

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E603824.DF80D6D2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> We mustn't forget that FISTS claims that "Accuracy Transcends Speed."
> > >
> > >That's fine. If your top end is five words per minute, better slow it
> > >down to three, just in case.
>
> Poor baby, you really DID have a bad hair day today, didn't you?
> [all three strands...]
>
> Tomorrow is another time for you in the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
> Service.
>
> Beep, beep.

Poor, sad Leonard. I use modes other than CW as I choose. You do what
you can in amateur radio. I'll do what I want.

Good luck in working your way up to that five word per minute plateau.

Dave K8MN

80. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 17:55:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E60F450.A23CB40C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62166

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E6033CA.49A27B11@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> >Note that the definition doesn't use "and" but rather "or". I'm
> >> >contentedly confident in my ability and correctness.
> >>
> >> You are out standing in your field. Now stay there...
> >
> >Talk about lack of originality....
>
> No, we aren't talking about you, Herr Robust.
>
> Go study your Hun-to-English dictionary and get back to them.

Them? Are they all over you again, Len?

Dave K8MN

81. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 18:04:30 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87y93zyndd.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62171

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>>Date: 3/1/03 5:11 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <87of4v1guz.fld@barrow.com>
>
>>How would you know?
>
> How do you know that I don't?

What you said was moronic. That isn't proof positive, but
it generally provides an excellent clue.

>>When you are reduced the point of nothing to say other than an
>>attempt a insulting the place where a person lives, things tend
>>to go down hill fast for you. Sheesh, that's even a step below
>>trying to insult the person rather than discuss the issues
>
> Floyd, I realize that you're in a remote spot...just found this NG and are
>taking great pleasure jumping in with both feet, but that and a fin will get
>you a cup of overpriced Java at Starbuck's.
>
> YOU seem to be taking just as much liberty with jumping to conclusions
>about people as anyone, so your "holier than thou" chastizing is about as
>relevent as white-out in a snow storm.

What part of your response is it that you think excuses your
behavior? It appears to be an ill implemented attempt at
obfuscation, first you clip your original gibberish out of the
quotes and then you discuss something totally unrelated as if it
had significance.

>>Since you don't know...(SNIP)
>
> Ooooops...Just read ME the Riot Act about "insulting the person" and you
>slide right in to telling me what I know or don't know.

So? You *clearly* indicated that you didn't know. How does my
response, intended to inform, compare to your need to insult
people?

You seem to be another clone of Dick and Larry. You've reduced
everything to personal insults and can't provide a single shred
of logical thought nor evidence of any kind to support your
assertions.

There is no point in bothering to try exchanging ideas with
anyone with that kind of an attitude.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

82. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 18:10:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E60F7CB.3C6E17B6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62168

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E600461.31E02205@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDC26.811EA4C9@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5E4E75.DCB6F894@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5DA38A.B1E9D5FD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5CDEE0.FB871EAD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > > > > > > > It has to be both, Brian.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > You must be right. I did leave and I didn't leave. Its settled.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I agree that it is settled. You told us one thing and did another.
> > > > > > > > > That's one reason I'm not apt to trust you. Consider yourself chided
> > > > > > > > > once again.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Cecil - Would never go for the Extra
> > > > > > > > Len - Going for the Extra "right out of the box"
> > > > > > > > Alec Baldwin - Leaving America if George Bush is elected
> > > > > > > > Kim - Leaving r.r.a.p.
> > > > > > > > Brian - Leaving r.r.a.p. but says he never left
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Yet you documented that I never left.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I documented it? How, pray tell, could I do that?
> > > > >
> > > > > Quite easily. With a post to rrap.
> > >
> > > I can't document any such thing with a post here.
>
```

> So you lied?

No, Brian, I did not. We have your word on the matter and we have it both ways---0-180-0-180-0-180-0. Is it starting to dawn on you why Ed Hare departed the group?

Dave K8MN

83. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 18:24:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E60FB11.CA516235@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62169

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E6002C5.DAE4639@earthlink.net>...
>
> > I'll wear "smug" as defined in the Random House College Dictionary:
>
> You don't have a choice, Dave. It's part of your personality.
>
> > smug - 1. contentedly confident of one's own respectability, ability,
> > superiority, or correctness.
> >
> > Note that the definition doesn't use "and" but rather "or".
>
> Noted. So choose one (1).
>
> I'm
> > contentedly confident in my ability and correctness.
>
> Ooops. You tried to grab more than one.

>
> Try superiority. Its a better fit.

Oh, I'm not involved in New Age Newspeak and I don't believe in political correctness, Brian. In everything I do, I am: superior to some, inferior to others, on an even footing with others. When I'm superior, I'm contentedly confident of my superiority.

Maybe I she be more congnizant of the possibility that you'll get your feelings hurt if I'm seen to superior to you in something. I wouldn't want to hurt your self-esteem.

Even Len has to be superior to me in at least one way....hmmmm...Oh, I have it! Len is much more patient than I am. I would not have the patience to wait for several decades to become a radio amateur after becoming "interested".

Dave K8MN

84. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 18:33:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E60FD1E.B02F8309@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62170

Brian wrote:
>
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030228224933.14887.00000109@mb-mu.aol.com>...
> > In article <3E5EE0F2.FAF9DC75@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >> I can recognize a left-handed compliment when I see one, even if I
> > >> didn't receive it.
> > >
> > >I'm sure you have your hands full with those which you have received.
> > >Please allow Larry to decide for himself if he has received one.
> > >
> > >Len's, as I'm sure you noticed, was not left-handed.
> > >
> > >Dave K8MN
> >
> > Dave:
> >
> > When it comes to compliments from Lennie, I guess I have no choice
> > but to take them from whichever hand they're offered.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Ditto Dave.

Brilliant, Brian! Okay.

When it comes to compliments from Lennie, I guess I have no choice but
to take them from whichever hand they're offered.

Dave K8MN

85. Re: Twithed 'selective disregard' myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 21:32:46 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v629qac41oga89@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62172

And this has what to do with amateur radio policy?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

--

Make Unlimited phone calls from your PC to ANY phone in the World!
http://www.eboom.com/free/
"Mr. X" <. ..-. ..-@..-. .com> wrote in message
news:zGKdneN51ZceYcKjXTWcrg@comcast.com...
> From: (twistedhed@webtv.net) Twistedhed
> Subject: Re: They all fall down
> Date: Fri, Feb 28, 2003
> >my selective rule disregard of DX and freeband
>
> From: Twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
> Subject: Re: Hey Jer, ask Riley...
> Date: Mon, 7 Oct 2002
> >We selectively disregard certain rules.
>
> From: Twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
> Subject: Re: The FAME of N8WWM!!!
> Date: 2003-02-27
> >I respect all the FCC rules and selectively
> >disregard two...period.
>
> From: Twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
> Subject: Re: Interesting happenings above 30 Mhz
> Date: 2002-10-29
> >I respect all radio law except for a few minor laws I
>
> >selectively disregard, such as
> >DX and freebanding on 555 and a few others.
>
> From: Twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
> Subject: Re: Hams on the wrong NG
> Date: 2002-06-24
> >I will selectively disregard any law/rule
> >I do not agree with..always have, always will.
>
> From: Twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
> Subject: Re: Do Truckers use 10 meters ?
> Date: 2002-11-04

> >How many times you want me to say I selectively
> >disregard certain rules such as dx and freebanding?
>
>
> UNLICENSED RADIO OPERATION or operation of radio
> transmitting equipment without a license (outside the
> frequency limits of the citizens band) is a violation
> of Section 301 of the Communications Act of 1934, as
> amended, 47 U.S.C. Section 301. Such operation will
> subject you to fine or imprisonment, as well as an in
> rem seizure of radio transmitting equipment, in
> cooperation with the United States Attorney for your
> jurisdiction. Fines normally range from $7,500 to
> $10,000.
>
> Therefore your "freebanding" is not a selective
> disregard for certain rules, it is a violation of the
> Communications Act of 1934.
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.458 / Virus Database: 257 - Release Date: 2/24/03

86. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-01 23:50:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301185051.19542.00000241@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 62173

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/1/03 9:03 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303010703.14de4e2b@posting.google.com>
>

>> Sorry for the caps...Slower wasn't what you needed in order to
>understand
>> the question...I thought perhaps louder might help.
>>
>> Got an answer yet?

>Steve, I think it would be ovbious to anyone who is familiar with
>Morse code.

No...It's not "obvious".

You say something's a "handicap"..I consider a "handicap" to be some kind
of limiting factor.

I want to know what YOU think the hanicap is.

>I'll let you answer your own question by answering this question.

NO...I want a statement from you answering the question I posed. If I
wanted to play word games, I'd engage Lennie of my 11 year old.

>Why are so many abbreviations, Q-codes, numbergrams necessary, and the
>pursuit of the shortest callsign possible?

Why don't you tell me? YOU are the one insisting that thee's some kind of
"handiocap"...?

>None-the-less, accuracy transcends speed.

Whic still does not answer the question posed to YOU, Brain...WHAT
HANDICAP...?

Steve, K4YZ

87. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 00:04:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301190448.19542.00000242@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 62174

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>Date: 3/1/03 11:45 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <873cm70ylp.fld@barrow.com>

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:
>>
>> One of the PRINICPAL leadership milestones in EMS and Fire Suppression
>is
>>to treat volunteers no differently than professionals...repect them, listen
>to
>>them, include them in the decision making process.
>
>Your perception of "professional" seems to be a bit out of
>whack, but that comes as no surprise.

Oh...?!?! You mean treating them as if they can do the same same if not
better job as someone who get's "paid" for it is "out of whack"...?!?!

>What you don't do with volunteers that you do with the pro's is
>treat them like they are required to do what management decides
>needs to be done. The level of leadership necessarily has to be
>on a much higher plane, or they get annoyed and go home! And they
>may just stay there too.

Now I am certain that you have no experience "leading" anything...At least
for vey long. I certainly wouldn't tolerate a person like you "leading" me
anywhere. You seem a bit Napoleonic.

>I can't recall the exact quote, but it is something along the lines
>of "Leadership is the art of convincing others to do what you want
>them to, and to think it was their idea to do it." Leadership isn't
>necessarily part of managing professionals, but it is essential with
>volunteers.

And even MORE certain. "Leadership isn't necessarily part of managing
professionals..." Whew! Floyd old man you ARE out in left field! NAME for me
ONE corporation or service that isn't rife with "manager" at all levels...?!?!?

>That is the primary reason that professionals are usually hired
>to be the backbone of EMS or fire departments.

"Professionals" are often hired to "be the backbone" of EMS and fire
systems in order to have a 24/7 coverage where volunteers often can't make the
coverage.

>>>At management, that is.
>>
>> Of what? A McDonalds? KFC?
>>
>> Obviously you don't take much of the policy and leadership criteria
>from
>>IAFC, NAEMT or NREMT seriously, Floyd.
>
>You are fantasizing a little much there.

Well then, Floyd, why don't you just go ahead and tell us ALLL ABOUT your "managing volunters", OK?

So far, NOTHING you have cited comes even CLOSE to anything I have EVER experienced, and I have had numerous "volunteer" experiences, from Red Cross, to VFD to the Civil Air Patrol.

I think you're a bit "snow blind", Floyd.

Steve

88. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 00:09:47 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87u1emzl10.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62176

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Nothing. It means the person is donating
>>their time, whether it is a hobbist or a professional.
>
>How many volunteer firefighters are also professional firefighters? Are those
>volunteer firefighters who are not also professional firefighters therefore
>hobbyists?

A *lot* of professional firefighters are also members of
volunteer fire departments.

A lot of people who could best be described as hobbyist are also
are members of volunteer fire departments.

The same is true of rescue squads.

>btw, watching walruses and polar bears in their natural environment sounds
>really interesting! The "IQ test" puzzler took a tiny bit of thinking until the
>little light went on.

Yes, I'm surprised that nobody wanted to argue that too...

>Here's one I just heard on "Car Talk":
>
>A young man visits Egypt and sees the pyramids. He is very impressed. He
>returns home, marries and raises a son. When the son is grown, he sends the son
>to Egypt to see the pyramids. Both father and son only visit Egypt and the
>pyramids once. The puzzling part is that the father makes his visit in 1995 and
>the son visits in 1969.

Sounds like word games...

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

89. Welcome to RRAP, Floyd..You Fit Right In

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 00:23:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301192340.11169.00000052@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 62175

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>Date: 3/1/03 12:04 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <87y93zyndd.fld@barrow.com>

>
>What you said was moronic. That isn't proof positive, but
>it generally provides an excellent clue.

OK, Lennie...I mean Floyd. I see where you are going. We've been there
already.

>> YOU seem to be taking just as much liberty with jumping to conclusions
>>about people as anyone, so your "holier than thou" chastizing is about as
>>relevent as white-out in a snow storm.
>
>What part of your response is it that you think excuses your
>behavior?

What part of your's excuses you?

>It appears to be an ill implemented attempt at
>obfuscation, first you clip your original gibberish out of the
>quotes and then you discuss something totally unrelated as if it
>had significance.

No "obfuscation" here, Floyd.

>So? You *clearly* indicated that you didn't know. How does my
>response, intended to inform, compare to your need to insult
>people?

If you feel insulted, Floyd, perhaps it's becasue you are in turn
insulting. Your entry to this forum is to jump in with both guns blazing and
to start adding flames to already intense flame fest. If you don't like
"heat", then may I suggest something in asbestos...?!?!

I see nothing from you that is substantial in the "policy" discusssion"
realm. Just jumped right in with Lennie and statrted swinging with the rest of
them.

Pot/kettle/black.

>You seem to be another clone of Dick and Larry.

As you are of Lennie and Brain. Pot/kettle/black. The only difference is
that you have a license. (As does Brian...Brian just doesn't know the
difference between "authority" and "eligibility")

>You've reduced
>everything to personal insults and can't provide a single shred
>of logical thought nor evidence of any kind to support your
>assertions.

For what? Elimination of the code test, Floyd? THAT has already been addressed by the FCC, and until WRC-03 addresses it later this year and the treaty is itself ammended, there's nothing else to discuss.

On the otherhand I have gone to some lengths to discuss other iminent policy issues in this forum and they always get pulled back to the same "name calling" events and round-and-round over the test.

>There is no point in bothering to try exchanging ideas with
>anyone with that kind of an attitude.

What ideas, Floyd? You don't like the code test? Whoopie. The FCC has said it doesn't either and will drop the test when it is no longer bound by treaty.

I don't particularly like it, but have clearly said in this forum that it is destined to happen, and have accepted it.

There are other issues to address. But TRY and get any two people in this forum to address them more than three or four posts before it becomes yet again another code test flame fest.

Welcome aboard, Floyd. You fit right in.

Steve, K4YZ

90. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 00:38:01 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <4E0853F123E9B6FA.7FC9F032A1324FA4.DCC479AACA16D3CB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62180

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E60F27D.3E3118A2@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > > >
> > > > You know, Dave, there *are* other forms of masturbation than
mental...
> > You
> > > > might try some of them.
> > >
> > > You're certainly true to form, Kim. You have a unique ability to
> > > portray yourself in the worst way. Are we to assume that you couldn't
> > > come up with a real rebuttal to what I wrote?
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> >
> > Well, I did come up with a real rebuttal, but I see it is mental
> > masturbation you enjoy more. So be it...
>
> That's an interesting presumption on your part. It appears that you had
> no real rebuttal since you didn't bother to post one. Instead you came
> up with a question for me but you supplied your own answer.
>
> What part of my of statement was not true--that Brian said he was
> leaving and that he know tells us he never left? Was it the portion
> about you, Len, Alec Baldwin, Cecil, Brian and Richard Nixon telling us
> one thing and doing the opposite?
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Dave, where in my post did I even *imply* that I said was not true? Where?
Since you'll be unable to provide the answer to that question--because I did
not imply that you stated anything untrue--I will go back to my original
implication. You seem to set yourself apart from saying and doing things
that you'll later change your mind about. Here's my question...again...to
you: are you saying that you have never, ever done or said anything that you
later changed your mind about? If not, then quit pointing out others as if
they've made a cardinal sin.

Keep mentally masturbating...there's probably more in your mind's capability
than anything else.

Kim W5TIT

91. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 00:42:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301194248.27873.00000886@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 62177

In article <3E5985FD.C8F86FEC@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>>
>> In case I forgot to mention it at the time: Congrats on your upgrade! Hope
>you
>> are enjoying the new privileges.
>>
>
>Thanks. HF is a lot of fun. Most of my hamming is on HF nowadays.

Glad you're enjoying it!

73 de Jim, N2EY

92. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 00:44:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6153CA.58B5BD1B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62178

```
Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E600ABE.818BA434@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E5DA624.42BBDC48@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Brian wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >> >news:<3E5CD67E.888574B6@earthlink.net>...
> >> >> > Brian wrote:
> >> >> > >
> >> >> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >> >news:<3E564F03.72EB24C0@earthlink.net>...
> >> >> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >> > > > >
> >> >> > > > > In article <20030220061433.23241.00000015@mb-da.aol.com>,
> >> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >> >> > > > > writes:
> >> >> > > > >
> >> >> > > > > >Also gave a good indication of propagation. Back when a 1000
> >mile
> >> >contact was
> >> >> > > > > >a major accomplishment, this was an important feature.
> >> >> > > > >
> >> >> > > > > Maybe you could help out K3LT complete his WAS? He seems
> >> >> > > > > to have difficulty getting out...
> >> >> > > >
> >> >> > > > Oh, I think it is all relative, Leonard. Compared, for example,
> >to
> >> >your
> >> >> > > > progress on WAS, his performance is stellar.
> >> >> > >
> >> >> > > Smug Dave offers a left-handed compliment to Novice Larry.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Larry didn't receive left-handed compliment.
> >> >>
> >> >> He did if he read your post.
> >> >
```

> >> >I don't think you can presume to speak for him on how he feels about my
> >> >statement.
> >> >
> >> >> > Larry has done fine,
> >> >> > especially when his low power and less than ideal antennas are
> >> >> > considered. Larry wasn't called a Novice.
> >> >>
> >> >> Larry is a novice Award seeker. Is being a novice an insult?
> >> >
> >> >You wrote "Novice Larry". Is that a compliment?
> >> >
> >> >> > Brian is just reading between
> >> >> > the lines again. Do you consider Len's comment to Larry about his WAS
> >a
> >> >> > compliment to Larry?
> >> >>
> >> >> You're kidding, right? When did those two ever have anything nice to
> >> >> say about each other?
> >> >
> >> >No, I wasn't kidding. I don't think Len's comment was intended to be a
> >> >compliment to Larry.
> >> >
> >> >> > Len Anderson isn't even in the game. He's a never-WAS.
> >> >>
> >> >> Perhaps.
> >> >
> >> >There's no "perhaps" to it.
> >> >
> >> >> But not everyone seeks awards whether they're "in the game"
> >> >> or not.
> >> >
> >> >Wrong. Not everyone who is in the game seeks (amateur radio) awards.
> >> >Those who are not in the game cannot seek (amateur radio) awards. Len
> >> >can play a game of Visit All States or e-mail all states or telephone
> >> >all states.
> >> >
> >> >In the mean time, Shhhhhh! Len's very hard at work. He's trying to
> >> >think of a way out of the N2EY profile conundrum.
> >>
> >> Poor baby. I've been working*, not concerning self with
> >> middle-aged adolescents indulging in their own aroma therapy
> >> (attar of stinky slinging) in wordplay. Pays fairly well, too. :-)
> >
> >You, of course, have it backwards. You do the slinging. Then comes the
> >N2EY quote. Poor baby.
>
> "Sling?" No sling. :-)
>
> Still can't get up to speed on originality, slimmo? :-)

I have yet to improve on Shakespeare, Dylan Thomas, P.J. O'Rourke or
Jim's profile of you. If something is right, it is right.

> Sooner or later you are going to have to learn to think for
> yourself in here. So far, there's little sign of it...

Have someone explain it to you.

> You do a lot of snarling and nastygrams, hardly "smug."

I do a lot of snarling and nastygrams? Hell, Leonard, you're the KING.
Just how do you think the N2EY profile of you came into being?

> >> Tell us, munchkin of many keys, was there a State Dept. Heath
> >> Course in Getting Along With People?
> >
> >You interested in taking the course?
>
> Not if it turns out your kind...! :-)

Now I'll take THAT as a compliment.

Dave K8MN

93. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 00:49:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E61550F.9469EC72@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62179

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E60347D.9EC2BDFE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E6007EF.785AAF4F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >> You know, Dave, there *are* other forms of masturbation than mental...
> >You
> >> >> might try some of them.
> >> >
> >> >You're certainly true to form, Kim. You have a unique ability to
> >> >portray yourself in the worst way. Are we to assume that you couldn't
> >> >come up with a real rebuttal to what I wrote?
> >>
> >> Heh heh...that IS a rebuttal to your writing... :-)
> >>
> >> Good one, too.
> >
> >No, actually it isn't a rebuttal, much less a good one. Kim muses,
> >answers and reaches a faulty conclusion.
>
> Incorrect, Herr Robust, it was a fine rebuttal, so much so
> that you cannot counter it without trapping yourself in the
> usual bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

...and you can't avoid fulfilling the N2EY profile.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >> Give my regards to Alec and Kim Basinger...whatever their
> >> ham calls are... :-)
> >
> >I think they share your fate. They're among the non-participants in
> >amateur radio.

>
> Ah, but I completed a Heath Course a very long time ago.

If only you had successfully ompleted an amateur radio licensing exam a very long time ago...

> You buckle down and get to work finishing yours...

I finished the Heath course and the larger course it was a part of. I finished taking all of the amateur radio licensing exams decades ago. Now you buckle down and get to work finishing yours, kindly old gent.

Dave K8MN

94. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 01:02:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E61581C.DD63035C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62181

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E603302.5FB1D8DC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >So you view "Maybe you can research" as a "powerful command"? Well,
> >kindly old gent, the Wouff Hong is of no concern of yours and you were
> >not prevented from researching anything on it (except maybe the
> >spelling).
>
> There's as much proper spelling of a fictitious article as
> there is a proper translation of Hunnish. :-)

The man who wrote the tale has every right to establish the spelling and
he did so. One doesn't get to see a photograph of a "ficticious
article" very often.
So we have a name and an article. You've still blown the spelling of it
twice.

> Get some better tailoring on your uniform, colonel, your
> boots are too tight...

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

You just can't keep from stepping in the bucket, Leonard.

> >> Here's some news, colonel: "Radio clubs" are not exclusively
> >> devoted to just amateur radio. Imagine that!
> >
> >I guess it depends on how you grasp them.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...radio exists in many different forms. If you had
> completed that Heath Course 15 years ago, you would have
> learned that.

Clubs exist in many forms as well. The stout hickory types work well.
Of course amateur radio clubs are those with which most of us here are
quite familiar.

> >> Back to your remedial Heath Course, foreign service man.
> >

> >
> >> Try for a Dale Carneigie Course while you're at it. That will
> >> do wonders for your acceptance in the ARS. :-)
> >
> >I don't have any problem in the "ARS", Leonard, old boy. Then again,
> >what would you know of that? You aren't a part of the "ARS".
>
> I wouldn't want to associate with the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
> Seniors, long-timer.

That's a great sour grapes rejoinder, Leonard.

> Now, you go off and work real hard on restoring that BC-348,
> long-timer. Be careful with it, it's 60 years old if a day. Do
> you have the TM for it? Do you understand what the TM says?

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> Do you need a TM translation into Hunnish?

If I did, I wouldn't ask a guy who can't spell "Attila".

Dave K8MN

95. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 01:03:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E615872.2BCA9678@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62182

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E60355A.1F8C2718@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Woke up from that nap? Well, you seem to have missed the part where the
> >Heath course was a portion of a course I took about fifteen years ago.
> >Make yourself some tea and watch the telly, won't you?
>
> Still haven't completed that Heath Course after 15 years?
>
> Incredible...!

Brian Burke, meet Leonard Anderson. Len, meet Brian Burke. You two
have much in common.

Dave K8MN

96. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 01:06:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E615901.214C5C6A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62183

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E60361E.59EFB854@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Oh, my, still no originality from the colonel.
>
> If you would stop the bad Otto Preminger imitation you
> might have an inspiration for originality...tsk, tsk, tsk.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

What a dilemma, Len. If you post in your typical manner, you fulfill
the profile. You're an awfully big help toward that end when you go
into your "big lie" and "Goebbels" routine. It'd be difficult to
improve upon N2EY's words.

Dave K8MN

97. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 01:27:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030301202733.23139.00000866@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62184

In article <87u1emzl10.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>>Nothing. It means the person is donating
>>>their time, whether it is a hobbist or a professional.
>>
>>How many volunteer firefighters are also professional firefighters? Are
>>those
>>volunteer firefighters who are not also professional firefighters therefore
>>hobbyists?
>
>A *lot* of professional firefighters are also members of
>volunteer fire departments.

Sure - and a lot aren't.
>
>A lot of people who could best be described as hobbyist are also
>are members of volunteer fire departments.
>
>The same is true of rescue squads.

Ah - but does that make volunteer fire departments and rescue squads "a hobby"?
>
>>btw, watching walruses and polar bears in their natural environment sounds
>>really interesting! The "IQ test" puzzler took a tiny bit of thinking until
>the
>>little light went on.
>
>Yes, I'm surprised that nobody wanted to argue that too...
>
Betcha a lotta folks didn't figure it out, even though you gave such obvious
clues..

>>Here's one I just heard on "Car Talk":
>>
>>A young man visits Egypt and sees the pyramids. He is very impressed. He
>>returns home, marries and raises a son. When the son is grown, he sends the
>>son
>>to Egypt to see the pyramids. Both father and son only visit Egypt and the
>>pyramids once. The puzzling part is that the father makes his visit in 1995
>>and
>>the son visits in 1969.
>

>Sounds like word games...
>
Naw, just a typical Car Talk nonautomotive puzzler.

73 de Jim, N2EY

98. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 01:31:41 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87ptpazh8i.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62185

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:
>>I can't recall the exact quote, but it is something along the lines
>>of "Leadership is the art of convincing others to do what you want
>>them to, and to think it was their idea to do it." Leadership isn't
>>necessarily part of managing professionals, but it is essential with
>>volunteers.
>
> And even MORE certain. "Leadership isn't necessarily part of managing
>professionals..." Whew! Floyd old man you ARE out in left field! NAME for me
>ONE corporation or service that isn't rife with "manager" at all levels...?!?!?

Ever read Dilbert? Scott Adams worked in the telecommunications
industry when he started developing the Dilbert character, and
for years it was simply an inside joke about telecommunications
management.

Trust me, you can run huge corporate enterprises with wall to
wall managers, and still not have an ounce of leadership to be
found anywhere.

Do that with a volunteer organization, and pretty soon the number
of volunteers begins to approach zero.

>>That is the primary reason that professionals are usually hired
>>to be the backbone of EMS or fire departments.
>
> "Professionals" are often hired to "be the backbone" of EMS and fire
>systems in order to have a 24/7 coverage where volunteers often can't make the
>coverage.

Now *think* for a minute why the head honcho doesn't just assign
a volunteer to the mid-shift, or weekends, or weekdays, or
whatever it is that nobody asks for. Do that a few times and
see how many volunteers you've got.

Actually, you've got it backwards anyway. Volunteers are used
to round out the coverage so that you don't have to hire a full
crew 24/7.

> Well then, Floyd, why don't you just go ahead and tell us ALLL ABOUT your
>"managing volunters", OK?

Think in terms of "founding member"...

> So far, NOTHING you have cited comes even CLOSE to anything I have EVER
>experienced, and I have had numerous "volunteer" experiences, from Red Cross,
>to VFD to the Civil Air Patrol.

I have served multiple elected terms on the Board of Directors
of more than one EMS organization, including one of the regional
non-profit corporations mandated by the State of Alaska to
provide oversight, training and certification of EMS providers.

Did you actually manage any part of anything?

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

99. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 01:34:24 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87llzyzh3z.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62186

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:
>
> You say something's a "handicap"..I consider a "handicap" to be some kind
>of limiting factor.

Hmmm... horse races betting and golf matches aside, what's it all mean to you?

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

100. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 03:11:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E61764D.4992053@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62187

W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E60F27D.3E3118A2@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > You know, Dave, there *are* other forms of masturbation than
> mental...
> > > > You
> > > > > > might try some of them.
> > > > >
> > > > You're certainly true to form, Kim. You have a unique ability to
> > > > portray yourself in the worst way. Are we to assume that you couldn't
> > > > come up with a real rebuttal to what I wrote?
> > > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > Well, I did come up with a real rebuttal, but I see it is mental
> > > masturbation you enjoy more. So be it...
> >
> > That's an interesting presumption on your part. It appears that you had
> > no real rebuttal since you didn't bother to post one. Instead you came
> > up with a question for me but you supplied your own answer.
> >
> > What part of my of statement was not true--that Brian said he was
> > leaving and that he know tells us he never left? Was it the portion
> > about you, Len, Alec Baldwin, Cecil, Brian and Richard Nixon telling us
> > one thing and doing the opposite?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> Dave, where in my post did I even *imply* that I said was not true? Where?
> Since you'll be unable to provide the answer to that question--because I did
> *not* imply that you stated anything untrue--I will go back to my original
> implication.

Good. Glad you have no dispute over what I stated. Your "original
implication" was one you answered yourself.

> You seem to set yourself apart from saying and doing things
> that you'll later change your mind about. Here's my question...again...to
> you: are you saying that you have never, ever done or said anything that you

> later changed your mind about? If not, then quit pointing out others as if
> they've made a cardinal sin.

I have never made a statement here or to the press over which I've had
to publicly eat crow. This isn't a case of, "I believe I'll have
spinach with that--oh, I've changed my mind". If you believe I'm
setting myself apart from you, Brian, Cecil, Len, Richard Nixon and Alec
Baldwin, you are 100% correct.

> Keep mentally masturbating...there's probably more in your mind's capability
> than anything else.

You can always get the answer you like if you make 'em up yourself.

Dave K8MN

101. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 03:14:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E61772B.E2C6A1E5@att.net>
Source record: 62188

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <f45722ac.0302271959.13311bfd@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >
> >The only fantasies I've seen here were Han's story of Little Billy
> >Beeper, Larry's broken leg on the mountain, and Dick's New Madrid
> >disaster. But he can't work CW away from the power mains, so he's not
> >able to save the day.
>
> Han's story? Hmmm, I wasn't aware that we had a member of this
> newsgroup by the name of Han. Does Mr. Han post from Hong Kong, or
> the Chinese mainland?

Pay no mind to Slim, Larry, he's being stupid as usual. While he was still in diapers I was working CW from a 65 Chevy Malibu with a WRL Duobander that was designed for SSB only. His usual clueless remarks still are just that.

102. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 03:20:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E61786B.DD20089F@att.net>
Source record: 62189

Dave Heil wrote:

>
> Len absolutely oozes sincerity.
>

Nope, that odor is NOT the smell of sincerity.

103. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 04:30:34 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87fzq6z8yd.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62190

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net> writes:
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>>
>>>>Nothing. It means the person is donating
>>>>their time, whether it is a hobbist or a professional.
>>>
>>>How many volunteer firefighters are also professional firefighters? Are
>>>those
>>>volunteer firefighters who are not also professional firefighters therefore
>>>hobbyists?
>>
>>A *lot* of professional firefighters are also members of
>>volunteer fire departments.
>
>Sure - and a lot aren't.

So your original statement had no logical significance. Some
are, some aren't, and it has nothing to do with Amateur Radio.

>>A lot of people who could best be described as hobbyist are also
>>are members of volunteer fire departments.
>>
>>The same is true of rescue squads.
>
>Ah - but does that make volunteer fire departments and rescue squads "a hobby"?

It is for the volunteers... ;-)

One more reason that who ever it was that thought "hobby" was
somehow a degrading description should realize that it is not.

>>> The "IQ test" puzzler took a tiny bit of thinking until
>>the
>>>little light went on.
>>
>>Yes, I'm surprised that nobody wanted to argue that too...
>>
>Betcha a lotta folks didn't figure it out, even though you gave such obvious
>clues..

I suspect most readers did, and those who didn't (as well as
those who did) aren't really interested in that subject for
discussion in this newsgroup. I can't argue with that kind of
good sense.

(BTW, if you want a _good_ puzzle from that, figure out how you
can watch the sun either come up or go down in the west.)

>>>Here's one I just heard on "Car Talk":
>>>
>>>A young man visits Egypt and sees the pyramids. He is very impressed. He
>>>returns home, marries and raises a son. When the son is grown, he sends the
>>>son
>>>to Egypt to see the pyramids. Both father and son only visit Egypt and the
>>>pyramids once. The puzzling part is that the father makes his visit in 1995
>>>and
>>>the son visits in 1969.
>>
>>Sounds like word games...
>>
>Naw, just a typical Car Talk nonautomotive puzzler.

I remember hearing it once too. Car Talk isn't exactly my
favorite program, but we have 2 radio stations here, KBRW AM,
and FM. There are times when Car Talk is the best radio program
on, as bad as that may be. Whatever, I don't remember the key
to the puzzle, but as a I said above it seems to be a twist on
words, and one doesn't necessarily see the obvious.

The difference between that and the IQ test was that it was the
person who originally asked the question who didn't see the
obvious; but the children who are answering definitely might.
The answer from a child who lives near the Arctic circle will
depend on which part of their life has been the most
influential, indoor activities such as school and reading or TV,
as opposed to outdoor activities where they would use first hand
observations, once the are old enough to know basic compass
directions, to decide where the sun comes up or goes down.

One odd thing is that I have used that example a number of times
and the responses to it are intriguing to say the least. People
who are good at trouble shooting electronic circuits (e.g., most
readers in this group) are usually logical to a fault, and the
logic of that example is so obvious that even if they've never
thought about it before they see the point in an instant. On
the other hand, the last time I mentioned that on Usenet it was
in a discussion about education where most of the participants
were home schooling their children or at least thinking about
it. Almost all of them argued that the test was valid and any
child should be taught by the age of 8 or 9 that the *rest* of
the world knows the sun comes up in the east, even if it doesn't
where they live. I was just floored by the arrogance of such a
view of the world!

It reminds me of... people who insist that the higher speed CW
proficiency is a necessary part of Amateur Radio *because* it
was required of them at some point. (Which reminds me that
we keep a Draft Board enabled too, just because males born

before 1955 or so had to sign up a long time ago too.)

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

104. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 04:58:24 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <9EA09DFBB3B3338D.D0DCB85C9AFCD954.BC70F9C89FBC7882@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62191

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E61764D.4992053@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3E60F27D.3E3118A2@earthlink.net...
> > > W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > > You know, Dave, there *are* other forms of masturbation than
> > mental...
> > > > > You
> > > > > > might try some of them.
> > > > >
> > > > > You're certainly true to form, Kim. You have a unique ability to
> > > > > portray yourself in the worst way. Are we to assume that you
couldn't
> > > > > come up with a real rebuttal to what I wrote?
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Well, I did come up with a real rebuttal, but I see it is mental
> > > > masturbation you enjoy more. So be it...
> > >
> > > That's an interesting presumption on your part. It appears that you
had
> > > no real rebuttal since you didn't bother to post one. Instead you
came
> > > up with a question for me but you supplied your own answer.
> > >
> > > What part of my of statement was not true--that Brian said he was
> > > leaving and that he know tells us he never left? Was it the portion
> > > about you, Len, Alec Baldwin, Cecil, Brian and Richard Nixon telling
us
> > > one thing and doing the opposite?
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> >
> > Dave, where in my post did I even *imply* that I said was not true?
Where?
> > Since you'll be unable to provide the answer to that question--because I
did
```

> > *not* imply that you stated anything untrue--I will go back to my
original
> > implication.
>
> Good. Glad you have no dispute over what I stated. Your "original
> implication" was one you answered yourself.
>
> > You seem to set yourself apart from saying and doing things
> > that you'll later change your mind about. Here's my
question...again...to
> > you: are you saying that you have never, ever done or said anything that
you
> > later changed your mind about? If not, then quit pointing out others as
if
> > they've made a cardinal sin.
>
> I have never made a statement here or to the press over which I've had
> to publicly eat crow. This isn't a case of, "I believe I'll have
> spinach with that--oh, I've changed my mind". If you believe I'm
> setting myself apart from you, Brian, Cecil, Len, Richard Nixon and Alec
> Baldwin, you are 100% correct.
>

Here?! To the press?! Are those the only two venues to which you accredit your life? You are no different from me, from Brian, from Cecil, Len, Richard Nixon, Alec Baldwin, nor anyone else, Dave. Though you seem to persist in a delusion of yourself in perfect grandeur--you're nothing short of human and we all, all say and/or think things that we change our minds on.

> >
> > Keep mentally masturbating...there's probably more in your mind's
capability
> > than anything else.
>
> You can always get the answer you like if you make 'em up yourself.
>
> Dave K8MN

And you apparently love to delude yourself with making your answers up. You've stuck your foot in your mouth this time, Dave.

Kim W5TIT

105. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 05:22:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030302002244.10456.00000894@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 62193

In article <87llzz3o41.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>>
>>>>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>>
>>>>How does "technical service" exclude it being a hobby? Stop
>>>>being absurd. It *is* a hobby. It has always been a hobby.
>>>>And that is why they call it the "Amateur" Radio Service.
>>>
>>> It's called "Amateur" because we are prohibited from receiving money
>for
>>>what we do. That many persons do what they do in the "Aamteur" radio
>service
>>>in a professional manner is a matter of record.
>>
>> "Aamteur?!?" Forgot the Prozac dose again? :-)
>>
>> Doing amateur work in a professional manner? :-)
>>
>> Oh, yes, by-the-book, the official book of course, in jargon,
>> expressions, and (by all means) morse code. Relaying all
>> those vital-to-the-nation messages along the NTS. Playing
>> in those "radio sport" contests to qualify as emergency-
>> trained operators. :-)
>
>Now now Len, don't get excited over trivial things. You *know*
>that all those messages are good practice for the big day when
>duty will call... when the very survival of the human race will
>depend on the ability of the Aamteur Radio Service to provide
>the country with well trained Morse code radio operators.

Yes, I saw "Independence Day" also... :-)

>(BTW, I just latched onto a fairly nice old wireline telegraph
>relay made by Signal Electric Company for all of $22 on eBay.
>Several people bid on it, but it was labeled as a "Key and
>Sounder" and I guess it didn't look like much, what with no key
>in the pictures. I take it none of them realized what it was.
>They were probably all ham operators. They'd pay $75 for a key
>that was machine manufactured by the thousands, and pass up an
>antique that was made by hand.)

Neat-o! The only morse key I saw in any military installation
anywhere was a gold-plated old WW2 key used as a desk
ornament in an office. All the rest of the keys have been in
museums...or in a couple of "ham shacks" (which may have
been the same as...). :-)

>>> For many it's a hobby. For many others it's a tool...a means to an
>end.
>>
>> In Sgt Steam Yaputz' case it is a surrogate for life in the
>> corpse, er, Corps. :-)
>
>Your sense of humor overwhelms your common senses sometimes, but
>I can't say that such cracks are wrong either...

Heh, thanks, but you should have seen it the year before
US amateur restructuring, especially that PCTA paragon,
Jim Kehler, KH2D, long absent from here but, thankfully,
still among the living.

The PCTA syndrome is founded on fantasy, maintained
by myth born over 70 years ago.

>>>That many use it as a hobby is fact. That it is MORE than a hobby is also
>a
>>>fact.
>>
>> Oh, dear, the "fact" fantasy again. Yes, some use amateur
>> radio as a whole lifestyle away from work, imagining all
>> kinds of heroic high-altitude, low-opening derring-do and
>> saving the Titanic over and over again.
>
>Hey, whatever turns their crank, right?

Those cranks are turning themselves...but just go around in
circles. :-)

>If you are saying we shouldn't define the rules and regulations
>by what is best for those guys... well, that makes too much sense!

No, it just means that I don't fall for Orwellism and the
Newspeak (or whatever George called it) where fiction and
myth become "truth," all PCTA opinions become "truth,"
and any dissent becomes a "lie." Dissent to ARRL party
lines is a "pejorative" or a heresy.

The "nyah-nyah" troupe of players might have a semblance
of "truth" of excludence of unlicensed humans if the FCC
required their staff and commissioners to be licensed in every
radio service. They just don't comprehend that many, many
others have been involved in radio other than amateur radio
and could care less what the Newington nabobs preach.

>>>>I said "It's a hobby folks". I did *not* say that it can't be
>>>>other things too, so claiming I've said "just a hobby" when I
>>>>have not is deliberate fabrication on your part. You even put
>>>>it in quotes. Shame on you.
>>>
>>> No "shame on you" required. If you say "It's a hobby, folks", without
>>any
>>>other qualifiers, that's ALL you said. That's where the confusion enters.
>>
>> Floyd isn't confused, Sgt Yaputz. You are.
>>
>> Avocation, hobby, fun, recreation is all it is. Amateur radio
>> isn't vital to national security, national defense, or anything
>> else except as a fantasy-land for a minority within. If US
>
>Old Hiram just rolled over in his grave? (No, but lots of Sgt
>Yaputz's just had conniption fits.)

That always happens to the poor babies. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>> amateur radio were suddenly removed, the USA would continue
>> to function just fine without it, losing nothing but some loud
>> complaining from its life-stylers.
>
>Now that is just *not* true. If that happened, all of these people
>would have even more time to devote to political ideology. Rush
>and his ilk would need more telephone lines, and talk radio would
>advance another step up the economic ladder.

Hmmm...hadn't considered that aspect...I would imagine all
the frustrated, cut-off hammateurs would just become
pickled in aspect. :-)

>The country definitely benefits from the distraction that the
>Amateur Radio Service provides. So don't you be disparaging it!

Yes, morse code proficiency will help rid the world from alien
invaders out of outer space...or outre' space, whichever works.

On the other hand (literally), the cellular telephone is most
definitely satisfying at least 50 million Americans since,
according to our Census Bureau, one out of three is a cell-
phone subscriber. Each cellphone is a little two-way radio.

>>>>It *is* a hobby, and you might as well a get used to it. Get used
>>>>to the new FCC license structure too, it isn't going away soon.
>>>
>>> You're right.. And it's probably going to get MORE socialistic in
>it's
>>>structure before it's all over.
>>
>> "Socialistic?!?" :-)
>

>See what I mean (above)! It's dem *liberals*!

:-)

>>> The sad truth is that's it's all too true. No one's really required to
>>>KNOW the material necessary to become licensed, let alone upgrade to
>Amateur
>>>Extra. Yes, many DO "know" the material. Most don't.
>>
>> Two four-year-olds "passed the test" well before the Restructuring
>> of 99-412 R&O.
>>
>> Are you really serious about thinking that four-year-olds "know the
>> material?!?"
>>
>> I don't think you are being serious...
>
>He thinks he's being serious.

I'm not at all sure what Sgt Yaputz is "thinking" since I've
classified that USMC-dropout as a full-bore terminal flip-out.

I'm not convinced that the PCTA regulars in here are rational
anymore. They can't argue the subject of the code test but
keep resorting to little personalized nastygrams. Some, like
Reverend Jim, insist on "being serious" on any of their
pronouncements except that the pronouncements are only
pro their own nouns and sound like usual league propaganda
from 50 years ago.

>(But I heard you laughing as you
>first read that, all the way here. I thought it was another
>earth quake and was expecting to hear that Anchorage has slid
>into the Pacific Ocean.)

:-)

>>> Try and discuss it here!
>>
>> Not a problem to me but I expect you will have the usual SOP
>> (Standard Off-color Pejoratives) to issue in snarlygrams. :-)
>>
>>> All I can say is "Good Luck"..!
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk, no famous phrases like "fair winds and..." and other
>> phine phrases? Just "good luck?!?" :-)
>
>All I can say is "You sure hit it on the head with that post, Len."

Thank you again. But, I have to reiterate that the PCTA nasty-
grammers just can't focus on the subjects, but want to fight one
for their morse Gippers because they fear loss of prestige,
further wounding of their egos, and a seemingly total inability to

change with the times.

It's amazing how these PCTAs insist on a distinct status of their quos without a decent change of quos, trying vainly to keep things as "their" amateur radio was when they were very young and just brain-washed into "the service." That may be why the amateur state of the radio art is maintained by the Tuna Tin Transmitters and repeats of the one-tube regenerative receiver in the US ham periodicals. Turf and tuna...is it any wonder that others smell something fishy? :-)

Watch this space and Sgt Yaputz go totally ballistic with his icy BM bombs in here. :-)

106. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 05:22:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030302002247.10456.00000895@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 62192

In article <3E60FB11.CA516235@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E6002C5.DAE4639@earthlink.net>...
>>
>> > I'll wear "smug" as defined in the Random House College Dictionary:
>>
>> You don't have a choice, Dave. It's part of your personality.
>>
>> > smug - 1. contentedly confident of one's own respectability, ability,
>> > superiority, or correctness.
>> >
>> > Note that the definition doesn't use "and" but rather "or".
>>
>> Noted. So choose one (1).
>>
>> I'm
>> > contentedly confident in my ability and correctness.
>>
>> Ooops. You tried to grab more than one.
>
>>
>> Try superiority. Its a better fit.
>
>Oh, I'm not involved in New Age Newspeak and I don't believe in
>political correctness, Brian. In everything I do, I am: superior to
>some, inferior to others, on an even footing with others. When I'm
>superior, I'm contentedly confident of my superiority.

...then you are unable to judge either "superiority, even-
footedness, or inferiority." Your problem, no one else's.

>Maybe I she be more congnizant of the possibility that you'll get your
>feelings hurt if I'm seen to superior to you in something. I wouldn't
>want to hurt your self-esteem.

Incorrect. You WANT to hurt others that don't agree with
you. It's been demonstrated many times in here.

>Even Len has to be superior to me in at least one way....hmmmm...Oh, I
>have it! Len is much more patient than I am. I would not have the
>patience to wait for several decades to become a radio amateur after
>becoming "interested".

Tsk, tsk, tsk. "Interested in radio" got a big boost on being assigned to Army station ADA back in February, 1953...and that included VHF, UHF, and microwave "radio" as well as HF "radio." The word "radio" is put in quotes (there's no italics font available) because that includes ELECTRONICS. Radio is a subset of electronics.

When a station has 36 transmitters, all of which are 1 KW or above [43 by 1956, at least four running 40 KW], reaching across the Pacific, working 24/7, doing an important task during a heightening Cold War, it tends to pale the self-important league propaganda of "having one's own radio (!) and working the world!" Face it, there wasn't ANY State Department radio station anywhere in the world then or now to compare with ADA...and ADA was only about the third largest Army communications station in the 1950s.

RADIO has many different forms. It's primary function is to enable communications. Some radio is two-way and some radio is one-way (as in broadcasting or the NIST services). MOST RADIO in the world is operated, run, maintained by professionals, whether you care to admit it or not. Amateur radio is a minor activity in the entirety of radio on this world, "amateur" in that it is not done for pecuniary interest (i.e., not for money). Amateur radio is a hobby, a recreation, an activity engaged in for the fun of it, not some para-military service and not as some kind of Peace Corps kind of service. Fantasy and imagining amateurs are "really professionals" is a lot of nonsense, self-puffery that does not do anything for the hobby other than make the expounders appear foolish.

I became a professional in electronics and radio back in 1956 and electronics and radio became my career choice in 1958. Several companies and corporations have paid me a salary for four decades (and one continues with a retirement benefit) which was comfortable but not extravagant. I've written about radio-electronics in both professional and amateur publications, judged first by respective editors (none of whom I knew), then by readers. No complaints. My sole patent award is for radio.

YOU cannot "judge" me in any way, shape, or form as to the subjects of radio, electronics, or radio-electronics. You haven't done as much as I have, haven't worked the EM spectrum as widely as I have, have no evidence of original design work in radio or electronics. All you have is long tenure as a licensee in amateur radio, a hobby activity...and a smug, arrogant, over-superior attitude to those who won't agree with you. All you are capable of doing in radio-electronics is pejorating persons YOU don't like through the kind of postings you issue.

To continue the infantile iteration of "nyah-nyah, I've got a license and you don't" serves only to make yourself look like some kind of sociopathic adolescent with delusions of being a deity.

Amateurs are not radio deities and very, very, very few approach the "professionalism" in radio that some self-delusional sociopaths think is done in a hobby/recreational radio activity.

You can continue with the personal pejoratives, infantile imprecations, snide silliness, and general attempts at igniting a flame war from now to forever. That may make you feel "superior" but it is all unproductive nonsense. You have not achieved any "superiority" you feel you richly deserve. I can keep on replying for as long as I continue in this world. Patience and a long background of professional writing lets me counter your little nastygrams better, faster, higher, and stronger than you for an unlimited amount of time. But, doing such countering is unproductive and does NOT address any policy issues whatsoever on anything approaching debate on any issues.

Since no FCC staffer or commissioner is required to have any sort of US amateur radio license in order to MAKE amateur radio regulations, you have absolutely NO valid reason to forbid or insult anyone not having been granted an amateur radio license. You do it because you LIKE to do the mental masturbation thing with all those pejoratives against others who dare sully your pristine white pronouncements.

107. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 05:55:49 UTC
From: SWL <Dynamic@Anon.com>
Message-ID: <b3s6cv$os7$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 62194

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:9EA09DFBB3B3338D.D0DCB85C9AFCD954.BC70F9C89FBC7882@lp.airnews.net...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E61764D.4992053@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3E60F27D.3E3118A2@earthlink.net...
> > > > W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You know, Dave, there *are* other forms of masturbation than
> > > mental...
> > > > > You
> > > > > > > might try some of them.
> > > > > >
> > > > > You're certainly true to form, Kim. You have a unique ability
to
> > > > > portray yourself in the worst way. Are we to assume that you
> couldn't
> > > > > come up with a real rebuttal to what I wrote?
> > > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > Well, I did come up with a real rebuttal, but I see it is mental
> > > > masturbation you enjoy more. So be it...
> > > >
> > > That's an interesting presumption on your part. It appears that you
> had
> > > no real rebuttal since you didn't bother to post one. Instead you
> came
> > > up with a question for me but you supplied your own answer.
> > >
> > What part of my of statement was not true--that Brian said he was
> > > leaving and that he know tells us he never left? Was it the portion
> > > about you, Len, Alec Baldwin, Cecil, Brian and Richard Nixon telling
> us
> > > one thing and doing the opposite?
> > >
> > Dave K8MN
> > >
> >
> > Dave, where in my post did I even *imply* that I said was not true?

> Where?
> > > Since you'll be unable to provide the answer to that question--because
I
> did
> > > *not* imply that you stated anything untrue--I will go back to my
> original
> > > implication.
> >
> > Good. Glad you have no dispute over what I stated. Your "original
> > implication" was one you answered yourself.
> >
> > > You seem to set yourself apart from saying and doing things
> > > that you'll later change your mind about. Here's my
> question...again...to
> > > you: are you saying that you have never, ever done or said anything
that
> you
> > > later changed your mind about? If not, then quit pointing out others
as
> if
> > > they've made a cardinal sin.
> >
> > I have never made a statement here or to the press over which I've had
> > to publicly eat crow. This isn't a case of, "I believe I'll have
> > spinach with that--oh, I've changed my mind". If you believe I'm
> > setting myself apart from you, Brian, Cecil, Len, Richard Nixon and Alec
> > Baldwin, you are 100% correct.
> >
>
> Here?! To the press?! Are those the only two venues to which you
accredit
> your life? You are no different from me, from Brian, from Cecil, Len,
> Richard Nixon, Alec Baldwin, nor anyone else, Dave. Though you seem to
> persist in a delusion of yourself in perfect grandeur--you're nothing
short
> of human and we all, all say and/or think things that we change our minds
> on.
>
> > >
> > > Keep mentally masturbating...there's probably more in your mind's
> capability
> > > than anything else.
> >
> > You can always get the answer you like if you make 'em up yourself.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> And you apparently love to delude yourself with making your answers up.
> You've stuck your foot in your mouth this time, Dave.
>

> Kim W5TIT
>
(this from one whose head is emplanted in her lower regions...but at least
her ears are warm)

108. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 12:59:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA876A43.11C6E%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62195

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> As of February 28, 2003:
>
> Novice - 35,264 (decrease of 14,065)
> Tech - 250,573 (increase of 45,179)
> Tech Plus - 88,477 (decrease of 57,457)
> General - 140,170 (increase of 27,493)
> Advanced - 84,019 (decrease of 15,763)
> Extra - 103,550 (increase of 24,800)
> Total - 684,979 (increase of 10,187)

Wow, where are all those Novice and Tech Plus license holders going? If you subtract the Advanced decrease from the Extra increase (assuming all upgraded), that leaves only 9037 license holders coming from the other license classes to Extra. Add that to the General increase (again assuming all upgraded), that means that only 36,530 Novice to Tech Plus could have possibly upgraded. Yet we see a decrease of 71,522 license holders just between the Novice and Tech Plus alone. And, of course, you have to assume that some Techs upgraded, which means that even more Novice and Tech Plus license holders have slipped out.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

109. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 13:13:27 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Xrn8a.8853$hj.2207675@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 62196

Remember, Tech Plus is being renewed as just plain Tech
now ... so some of the Tech Plus probably upgraded, while
others simply renewed, contributing to the increase in Techs.

Carl - wk3c

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA876A43.11C6E%stewart@say.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > As of February 28, 2003:
> >
> > Novice - 35,264 (decrease of 14,065)
> > Tech - 250,573 (increase of 45,179)
> > Tech Plus - 88,477 (decrease of 57,457)
> > General - 140,170 (increase of 27,493)
> > Advanced - 84,019 (decrease of 15,763)
> > Extra - 103,550 (increase of 24,800)
> > Total - 684,979 (increase of 10,187)
>
>
> Wow, where are all those Novice and Tech Plus license holders going? If
> you subtract the Advanced decrease from the Extra increase (assuming all
> upgraded), that leaves only 9037 license holders coming from the other
> license classes to Extra. Add that to the General increase (again assuming
> all upgraded), that means that only 36,530 Novice to Tech Plus could have
> possibly upgraded. Yet we see a decrease of 71,522 license holders just
> between the Novice and Tech Plus alone. And, of course, you have to assume
> that some Techs upgraded, which means that even more Novice and Tech Plus
> license holders have slipped out.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>
> ----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

110. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 14:09:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6210A0.50802402@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62197

W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E61764D.4992053@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3E60F27D.3E3118A2@earthlink.net...
> > > > W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > You know, Dave, there *are* other forms of masturbation than
> > > mental...
> > > > > > You
> > > > > > > might try some of them.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You're certainly true to form, Kim. You have a unique ability to
> > > > > > portray yourself in the worst way. Are we to assume that you
> couldn't
> > > > > > come up with a real rebuttal to what I wrote?

> > > > > Well, I did come up with a real rebuttal, but I see it is mental
> > > > > masturbation you enjoy more. So be it...
> > > > >
> > > > That's an interesting presumption on your part. It appears that you
> had
> > > > no real rebuttal since you didn't bother to post one. Instead you
> came
> > > > up with a question for me but you supplied your own answer.
> > > >
> > > > What part of my of statement was not true--that Brian said he was
> > > > leaving and that he know tells us he never left? Was it the portion
> > > > about you, Len, Alec Baldwin, Cecil, Brian and Richard Nixon telling
> us
> > > > one thing and doing the opposite?

> > > Dave, where in my post did I even *imply* that I said was not true?
> Where?
> > > Since you'll be unable to provide the answer to that question--because I
> did
> > > *not* imply that you stated anything untrue--I will go back to my
> original
> > > implication.
> >
> > Good. Glad you have no dispute over what I stated. Your "original

> > implication" was one you answered yourself.
> >
> > > You seem to set yourself apart from saying and doing things
> > > that you'll later change your mind about. Here's my
> question...again...to
> > > you: are you saying that you have never, ever done or said anything that
> you
> > > later changed your mind about? If not, then quit pointing out others as
> if
> > > they've made a cardinal sin.
> >
> > I have never made a statement here or to the press over which I've had
> > to publicly eat crow. This isn't a case of, "I believe I'll have
> > spinach with that--oh, I've changed my mind". If you believe I'm
> > setting myself apart from you, Brian, Cecil, Len, Richard Nixon and Alec
> > Baldwin, you are 100% correct.
> >
>
> Here?! To the press?! Are those the only two venues to which you accredit
> your life?

That is not what I wrote.

> You are no different from me, from Brian, from Cecil, Len,
> Richard Nixon, Alec Baldwin, nor anyone else, Dave.

I'm quite different than those mentioned above. I made no public
statement here which I'd have to eat. I made no public statement to the
media which I'd have to eat.

> Though you seem to
> persist in a delusion of yourself in perfect grandeur--you're nothing short
> of human and we all, all say and/or think things that we change our minds
> on.

I've never claimed perfection. I'm claiming that I've not made some
goofy public statement which I'll have to retract upon changing my
mind. Not everyone feels compelled to blurt out something in haste
which will later make that person look foolish.

> > >
> > > Keep mentally masturbating...there's probably more in your mind's
> capability
> > > than anything else.
> >
> > You can always get the answer you like if you make 'em up yourself.

> And you apparently love to delude yourself with making your answers up.
> You've stuck your foot in your mouth this time, Dave.

Pay attention. You asked the question and made up the answer. That's
your foot and your mouth. I didn't say what you attempted to attribute
to me.

Dave K8MN

111. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 14:19:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030302091916.13805.00000334@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 62198

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>Date: 3/1/03 7:31 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <87ptpazh8i.fld@barrow.com>

>> "Professionals" are often hired to "be the backbone" of EMS and fire
>>systems in order to have a 24/7 coverage where volunteers often can't make
>the
>>coverage.
>
>Now *think* for a minute why the head honcho doesn't just assign
>a volunteer to the mid-shift, or weekends, or weekdays, or
>whatever it is that nobody asks for. Do that a few times and
>see how many volunteers you've got.

When I was running EMS regularly we carried pagers and responded from the residence (or barracks in my case). No "shift" to be assigned to. We did, however, "sign up" for days of responsibility, and again, I never knew of ANY occassion when we did not respond due to a lack of volunteers.

To the best of my knowledge, Station 352 never failed to roll a unit due to a lack of responders.

>Actually, you've got it backwards anyway. Volunteers are used
>to round out the coverage so that you don't have to hire a full
>crew 24/7.

In some urban areas, perhaps. In many SUBurban areas volunteers ARE the crew. Period.

In Hatboro/Horsham, (only 10 minutes from Philadelphia) there were only three "full-time" personnel...Two in the firehouse and one on the squad. They did most of the maintenance, and would often take the equipment to the fireground where the volunteers would respond directly to. The Squad never left the station without at least a driver (the "full time guy) and one EMT or Paramedic on board.

>> Well then, Floyd, why don't you just go ahead and tell us ALLL ABOUT
>your
>>"managing volunters", OK?
>
>Think in terms of "founding member"...

Of?

>I have served multiple elected terms on the Board of Directors
>of more than one EMS organization, including one of the regional

>non-profit corporations mandated by the State of Alaska to
>provide oversight, training and certification of EMS providers.

Congratulations. Now you're on igloo patrol. I am impressed.

I am not much impressed by "EMS Managers" or "Boards of Directors". EMS Managers, much like Boards of Nursing are turf-grabbing, me-first egoists who have held the advancement of EMS back from where it could be.

The simple fact that you can open the Annual copy of EMS Magazine to the section on state licensing requirements and find 50 different programs answers the question about what "EMS Managers" do for EMS.

If you're one of the "founders" of some EMS related organization, congratulations. But please don't brag on being an "EMS Manager" to me...there's too much to do and too much self-inflicted bureacracy to impress me.

>Did you actually manage any part of anything?

Yep.

Steve, K4YZ

112. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 15:10:31 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns933248FE07E0Dpookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 62199

Does the word "trim" have any meaning to you guys?

Bill, W7TI

113. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 15:27:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030302102714.15554.00000262@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62200

>Subject: Re: Callsign etiquette?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/1/03 11:22 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030302002247.10456.00000895@mb-ma.aol.com>

>In article <3E60FB11.CA516235@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>writes:

>>I would not have the
>>patience to wait for several decades to become a radio amateur after
>>becoming "interested".

> Tsk, tsk, tsk. "Interested in radio" got a big boost on being
> assigned to Army station ADA back in February...(SNIP)

Nothing addressed here about AMATEUR radio, although that's waht Dave
addressed.

>When a station has 36 transmitters...(SNIP)

Nothing addressed here about AMATEUR radio, although that's what Dave
addressed.

>RADIO has many different forms. It's primary function is to
> enable communications.

Ya think...?!?!

(MORE STUFF SNIPPED)

>Amateur radio is a hobby, a recreation...(SNIP)

...for some.

UNSNIP...>an
> activity engaged in for the fun of it, not some para-military
> service and not as some kind of Peace Corps kind of service.

In some places it's those things too.

>Fantasy and imagining amateurs are "really professionals"
> is a lot of nonsense, self-puffery that does not do anything
> for the hobby other than make the expounders appear foolish.

The only "expounder" who appeas foolish here is you, Your Foolishness.

>I became a professional in...(SNIP)

...nothing related to Amateur Radio.

>YOU cannot "judge" me in any way, shape, or form as to the
> subjects of radio, electronics, or radio-electronics.

Sure we can. YOU put it ehre for us to see, then by golly we can do with
it as we please.

>You haven't
> done as much as I have, haven't worked the EM spectrum as
> widely as I have, have no evidence of original design work in
> radio or electronics.

Ooooooooohhhhh...we are (un)impressed. Yet another "me me me" recital
from His Omnipotence about his Excellence In Radio Achievement.

>All you have is long tenure as a licensee
> in amateur radio, a hobby activity...and a smug, arrogant, over-
> superior attitude to those who won't agree with you.

I love it when some scumbag takes great pains to scream "me me me" in a
public forum and then has the temerity to call someone ELSE "arrogant" in the
same breath.

>All you are
> capable of doing in radio-electronics is pejorating persons YOU
> don't like through the kind of postings you issue.

Whew. Another Pot/Kettle/Black alert has just been issued for Lennie the
Lame!

>To continue the infantile iteration of "nyah-nyah, I've got a license
> and you don't" serves only to make yourself look like some kind
> of sociopathic adolescent with delusions of being a deity.

Well...He DOES have a license, and NYAHNYAHNYAH on you, Oh Unlicensed One!
I have one! A couple of elementary schoolers I know and a few middle schoolers
I know have one too...As do a few housewives and a handful of Astronaust and
Cosmonauts.

But YOU, "Mr. I've Been Doing It Longer/Better/Farther/Further", do NOT
have one.

So what are YOU going to do about it?

>Amateurs are not radio deities and very, very, very few approach
> the "professionalism" in radio that some self-delusional sociopaths
> think is done in a hobby/recreational radio activity.

But those very very very few are MORE than you, Lennie. An Army of
One...Putziness Personnified. Slumminess Sanctified...

>You can continue with the personal pejoratives, infantile
> imprecations, snide silliness, and general attempts at
> igniting a flame war from now to forever.

As can you. Most of the crap that flies in here is a direct result of
your instigation, Your Spinelessness.

>Since no FCC staffer or commissioner is required to have any
> sort of US amateur radio license in order to MAKE amateur
> radio regulations, you have absolutely NO valid reason to
> forbid or insult anyone not having been granted an amateur
> radio license.

Hmmmm...I am trying to figure out how you came to the conclusion that since FCC staffers are unlicensed, it bears any weight on what we call YOU, Lennie.

How YOU act and how YOU write in this forum and WHAT you write in this forum is what determines what we will call you or whether or not we will "play nice" with you.

YOU have certainly not extended that courtesy to US!

>You do it because you LIKE to do the mental
> masturbation thing with all those pejoratives against others
> who dare sully your pristine white pronouncements.

Pot/Kettle/Black.

I know...You're sitting in front of that screen reading this shaking your head saying "no, no, NO...", but while you ARE shaking your head, I will be on the radio doing all those radio things you CAN'T do because you haven't got what it takes to pass an Amateur examination.

And Lennie..."mental masturbation"...?!?! Is that your best shot?
Sheesh!

Steve, K4YZ

114. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 15:28:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030302102805.25154.00000545@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 62201

In article <BA876A43.11C6E%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> As of February 28, 2003:
>>
>> Novice - 35,264 (decrease of 14,065)
>> Tech - 250,573 (increase of 45,179)
>> Tech Plus - 88,477 (decrease of 57,457)
>> General - 140,170 (increase of 27,493)
>> Advanced - 84,019 (decrease of 15,763)
>> Extra - 103,550 (increase of 24,800)
>> Total - 684,979 (increase of 10,187)
>
>
> Wow, where are all those Novice and Tech Plus license holders going?

Several places:

- As Carl points out, since April 15, 2000, all Tech Pluses who renew become
Techs.

- Some are upgrading to General or Extra. And Novices who pass Element 2 (only)
get a Tech, not a Tech Plus.

- Some are license expirations and cancellations. Of the expirations, some will
renew in the grace period.

>If
>you subtract the Advanced decrease from the Extra increase (assuming all
>upgraded),

Bad assumption. The attrition rate due to expirations can be considerable.

>that leaves only 9037 license holders coming from the other
>license classes to Extra. Add that to the General increase (again assuming
>all upgraded), that means that only 36,530 Novice to Tech Plus could have
>possibly upgraded. Yet we see a decrease of 71,522 license holders just
>between the Novice and Tech Plus alone. And, of course, you have to assume
>that some Techs upgraded, which means that even more Novice and Tech Plus
>license holders have slipped out.

Your models are oversimplified, Dwight. Expirations and cancellations are
considerable, and Tech-Plus-renewal-as-Tech even more of a factor.

You may want to consider the following comparisons:

Novice+Tech+TechPlus total changes since restructuring

Tech+TechPlus total changes since restructuring

both in absolute numbers and percentages.

73 de Jim, N2EY

115. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 15:41:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E622623.5020202@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62202

Bill, W7TI wrote:

> Does the word "trim" have any meaning to you guys?

Obviously not, Bill.

It's okay though, because the content value is directly proportional to the readability of the message. And soo many of these messages are quite unreadable.

- Mike KB3EIA -

116. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 17:01:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6238F6.50E7A979@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62203

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E60FB11.CA516235@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E6002C5.DAE4639@earthlink.net>...

> >
> >Oh, I'm not involved in New Age Newspeak and I don't believe in
> >political correctness, Brian. In everything I do, I am: superior to
> >some, inferior to others, on an even footing with others. When I'm
> >superior, I'm contentedly confident of my superiority.
>
> ...then you are unable to judge either "superiority, even-
> footedness, or inferiority." Your problem, no one else's.

Sure I can, Leonard. If I spike a volleyball and observe that you
can't, I can make a judgement that my spike is superior to yours. If we
play each other in checkers and I can consistently win while observing
that you consistently lose, I can judge that I'm a better checker player
than you. If we each won at checkers when playing each other, I'd be
able to judge that we are on an even footing.

Your statement doesn't wash.

> >Maybe I she be more congnizant of the possibility that you'll get your
> >feelings hurt if I'm seen to superior to you in something. I wouldn't
> >want to hurt your self-esteem.
>
> Incorrect. You WANT to hurt others that don't agree with
> you. It's been demonstrated many times in here.

I've judged, just now, that your ability to comprehend a tongue-in-cheek
comment is not very good. By the way, what shall we call what you
demonstrate in here?

> >Even Len has to be superior to me in at least one way....hmmmm...Oh, I
> >have it! Len is much more patient than I am. I would not have the
> >patience to wait for several decades to become a radio amateur after
> >becoming "interested".
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. "Interested in radio" got a big boost on being
> assigned to Army station ADA back in February, 1953...and

> that included VHF, UHF, and microwave "radio" as well as
> HF "radio." The word "radio" is put in quotes (there's no italics
> font available) because that includes ELECTRONICS. Radio
> is a subset of electronics.

Nope. Your declared interest was in amateur radio over a period of
decades.

<snip of your military radio history>
<snip of the "different forms" of radio>
<snip of Len's observation of the place of amateur radio>
<snip of yet another iteration of Len's professional career>

> YOU cannot "judge" me in any way, shape, or form as to the
> subjects of radio, electronics, or radio-electronics.

Sure I could. I haven't done so because I don't feel that I have enough
information--that and the fact that I don't much care.

> You haven't done as much as I have,...

I'm just guessing that you don't really have any information about
whether that is the case or not. Would this be a case of you denouncing
me for what you perceive to be a superior attitude while donning such an
attitude yourself?
I'm confident that I've done a number of things which you haven't
done--like passing the Novice, General, Advanced and Extra class amateur
radio licensing exams.

> ...haven't worked the EM spectrum as widely as I have,

There's another one about which you have no information. Trying to
establish your superiority?

>... have no evidence of original design work in radio or electronics.

I've never claimed that I've done radio or electronics design work. I
have claimed that I've been a licensed radio amateur for nearly forty
years. This newsgroup is not about original design work in radio or
electronics.

> All you have is long tenure as a licensee in amateur radio, a hobby > activity...

I've judged your statement to be incorrect. That is not all I have. It
is, however, an important one here in a newsgroup devoted to amateur
radio.

> ...and a smug, arrogant, over-
> superior attitude to those who won't agree with you.

Remember, I've agreed to "smug". I'm not being arrogant and I have no
idea what "over-superior" is. Did you just make that up?

> All you are
> capable of doing in radio-electronics is pejorating persons YOU

> don't like through the kind of postings you issue.

That's another bad call on your part through your lack of information. The guy you describe could easily be yourself.

> To continue the infantile iteration of "nyah-nyah, I've got a license
> and you don't" serves only to make yourself look like some kind
> of sociopathic adolescent with delusions of being a deity.

No "nyah-nyahs" are needed. I have a license because I wanted one. I took all of the exams available. You have declared an interest in amateur radio spanning several decades, yet you took no action toward obtaining a license.
If the code is your stumbling block, a no-code license has been available for more than a decade. Several years ago, the regs were changed so that the highest morse speed required for any class of amateur radio license above the no-code ticket is a lentissimo 5 wpm. You've not taken advantage of any of these changes to obtain an amateur radio license. That tells us that your several decades of interest do not run very deep.

You would have us believe that you, a non-participant in amateur radio, know best how to shape its regulation. I'm in disagreement with you.

>
> You can continue with the personal pejoratives, infantile
> imprecations, snide silliness, and general attempts at
> igniting a flame war from now to forever. That may make you
> feel "superior" but it is all unproductive nonsense. You have
> not achieved any "superiority" you feel you richly deserve.

Again, you could be describing yourself as outlined in the profile provided by N2EY:

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> I can keep on replying for as long as I continue in this world.

It isn't how long you can keep replying, Leonard. It is how many people you can influence or sway toward your position.

> Patience and a long background of professional writing lets
> me counter your little nastygrams better, faster, higher, and
> stronger than you for an unlimited amount of time.

You haven't exhibited much patience and there are times when your writing speaks more to "long" than "background". When is this proposed "better, faster, higher and stronger" to begin? Does your "unlimited

amount of time" indicate an attempt to do what you've previously claimed that you did--work 24/7?

> But, doing
> such countering is unproductive and does NOT address any
> policy issues whatsoever on anything approaching debate on
> any issues.

The "countering" is what you do most frequently. You've actually devoted very little of your time toward important things (for you) such as preventing children from obtaining amateur radio licenses. Your stake in amateur radio policy is a very small one. You aren't even a participant.

> Since no FCC staffer or commissioner is required to have any
> sort of US amateur radio license in order to MAKE amateur
> radio regulations, you have absolutely NO valid reason to
> forbid or insult anyone not having been granted an amateur
> radio license. You do it because you LIKE to do the mental
> masturbation thing with all those pejoratives against others
> who dare sully your pristine white pronouncements.

FCC staffers are paid to regulate amateur radio. You aren't. It is their job.
You've not been forbidden from commenting nor is anyone forbidden from ridiculing your ideas, your windy diatribes or your pompous manner.

You are insulted because your are insulting. You are insulted because you'd tell us how amateur radio should be run while you have very limited knowledge of amateur radio. You are made light of because you've expressed a decades-long interest in amateur on which you have never acted.

Dave K8MN

117. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 17:13:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E623B94.6EBAE562@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62204

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <87llzz3o41.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
> writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> >>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:
> >>
> >>>>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net

>
> On the other hand (literally), the cellular telephone is most
> definitely satisfying at least 50 million Americans since,
> according to our Census Bureau, one out of three is a cell-
> phone subscriber. Each cellphone is a little two-way radio.

That's neat, Len, and something which you probably thought no one here realized. The cellphone user isn't required to obtain a license and must pay to use the short-ranged cellphone. Maybe the cellphone could be the answer for you. You could use it instead of participating in amateur radio.

> I'm not convinced that the PCTA regulars in here are rational
> anymore. They can't argue the subject of the code test but
> keep resorting to little personalized nastygrams. Some, like
> Reverend Jim, insist on "being serious" on any of their
> pronouncements except that the pronouncements are only
> pro their own nouns and sound like usual league propaganda
> from 50 years ago.

Len, Len, Len, come back to reality. YOU do "little personalized nastygrams" on a regular basis. YOU persist in using terms like "Reverend Jim", "Herr Oberst" and the like. You take pot shots at amateur radio and at the ARRL.
Are you telling us that you think you are acting in a rational manner?

Dave K8MN

118. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 19:00:55 UTC
From: Skinny <NoBS@Anon.com>
Message-ID: <b3tkd0bpi0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 62205

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:4E0853F123E9B6FA.7FC9F032A1324FA4.DCC479AACA16D3CB@lp.airnews.net...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E60F27D.3E3118A2@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > > >
> > > > > You know, Dave, there *are* other forms of masturbation than
> mental...
> > > You
> > > > > might try some of them.
> > > > >
> > > > You're certainly true to form, Kim. You have a unique ability to
> > > > portray yourself in the worst way. Are we to assume that you
couldn't
> > > > come up with a real rebuttal to what I wrote?
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > >
> > > Well, I did come up with a real rebuttal, but I see it is mental
> > > masturbation you enjoy more. So be it...
> >
> > That's an interesting presumption on your part. It appears that you had
> > no real rebuttal since you didn't bother to post one. Instead you came
> > up with a question for me but you supplied your own answer.
> >
> > What part of my of statement was not true--that Brian said he was
> > leaving and that he know tells us he never left? Was it the portion
> > about you, Len, Alec Baldwin, Cecil, Brian and Richard Nixon telling us
> > one thing and doing the opposite?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> Dave, where in my post did I even *imply* that I said was not true?
Where?
> Since you'll be unable to provide the answer to that question--because I
did
> *not* imply that you stated anything untrue--I will go back to my original
> implication. You seem to set yourself apart from saying and doing things
> that you'll later change your mind about. Here's my question...again...to
> you: are you saying that you have never, ever done or said anything that
you

> later changed your mind about? If not, then quit pointing out others as
if
> they've made a cardinal sin.
>
> Keep mentally masturbating...there's probably more in your mind's
capability
> than anything else.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
Poor Kim..has to turn her wall mirror sideways to see both sides of her
hips....

119. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 20:29:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030302152900.04150.00000150@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 62206

In article <Xrn8a.8853$hj.2207675@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>Remember, Tech Plus is being renewed as just plain Tech
>now ... so some of the Tech Plus probably upgraded, while
>others simply renewed, contributing to the increase in Techs.

Carl, Had it not been for the Technician class license
creation over a dozen years ago, US amateur radio
licensees would have DECREASED in number now by
over one hundred thousand. The vast majority of US
amateur radio license increases in the last dozen years
came about through the Technician class. Novice class
licensees had been continuously dropping in that same
time. PCTAs cannot see that...they see only what they
want to see and that is the OLD ways, the way They did
it in their long-ago youth.

More modern folks are just not impressed by "proficiency
in morse code as the primus inter pares of amateur radio.

This browns off the PCTAs no end since they desperately
need to regain their self-imposed titles of "King of the Hill"
in the OLD class structure of US ham radio. PCTAs are
outraged by this because their entire fantasyland mental
picture of amateur radio has evaporated. They cannot stand
reality and have lost their mental anchor in the safe harbor
of morse mythology. Pity them.

120. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 20:29:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030302152903.04150.00000151@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 62208

In article <3E6238F6.50E7A979@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> ...then you are unable to judge either "superiority, even-
>> footedness, or inferiority." Your problem, no one else's.
>
>Sure I can, Leonard. If I spike a volleyball and observe that you
>can't, I can make a judgement that my spike is superior to yours.

Spike, amateur radio isn't volleyball and the only "net" is the
one used to tie you down to keep you from floating away [due
to over-generation of internal gas not alleviated by all the gas
vented in here]

>If we
>play each other in checkers and I can consistently win while observing
>that you consistently lose, I can judge that I'm a better checker player
>than you.

Amateur radio isn't comparable to a game of checkers except
the average technical proficiency of ex-state employees is
confined to trying to move little round flat things on a checker-
board.

>If we each won at checkers when playing each other, I'd be
>able to judge that we are on an even footing.

You've been on a slippery slope so long you don't realize the
ground underfoot is flat.

>Your statement doesn't wash.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, to the down-and-dirty old-time hard-liner of
old-tyme hum radio, modern environment seems "unclean."

>I've judged, just now, that your ability to comprehend a tongue-in-cheek
>comment is not very good.

Correction: "Tongue-in-cheek comments" have to be done
without the tongue protruding. Yours sticks out.

>By the way, what shall we call what you
>demonstrate in here?

Call it caustic commentary, snide snickering, powerful parody
on the fat fantasy foibles of old-tyme hum radio, slimmo.

I hold up a cleaned mirror and point out the reflections are
the flaws in the image, not the mirror. PCTAs don't realize
that their Emperor's Clothes are invisible to the rational.

>Nope. Your declared interest was in amateur radio over a period of
>decades.

Oberst Heil seems to be so intrigued by his own visage in
the mirror that he cannot read coherently.

ONE of my many interests is RADIO. All of it, not just the
hobby of amateur radio. Fascinating stuff to all but the would-
be emperors trying on fantasy clothes.

>> YOU cannot "judge" me in any way, shape, or form as to the
>> subjects of radio, electronics, or radio-electronics.
>
>Sure I could. I haven't done so because I don't feel that I have enough
>information--that and the fact that I don't much care.

YOU cannot "judge" me in any way, shape, or form as to the
subjects of radio, electronics, or radio-electronics.

Your only "judgemental" ability is to act enraged/irritated/bellicose
when your precious opinions are not agreed with or taken as the
magnificent oratory you think it is...

>> You haven't done as much as I have,...
>
>I'm just guessing that you don't really have any information about
>whether that is the case or not. Would this be a case of you denouncing
>me for what you perceive to be a superior attitude while donning such an
>attitude yourself?

A description of factual message content, general attitude of
alleged "superiority" has been pointed out to you and the rest
of the readers. The image is there for all to see. That you
cannot see the same image is due to the astigmatic condition
of the ego. See your "I" doctor for treatment.

>I'm confident that I've done a number of things which you haven't
>done--like passing the Novice, General, Advanced and Extra class amateur
>radio licensing exams.

Some time ago. The world has changed since.

Let us know how your Heathkit Course (official, from state) is
coming along. Then we can talk about "comparing exams"
and your misguided thinking that radio "superiority" is all due
to amateurism.

>> ...haven't worked the EM spectrum as widely as I have,
>
>There's another one about which you have no information. Trying to
>establish your superiority?

No, not "superiority." State Department communications radio
bands are known, though not widely and certainly not via the
ivy-league publications of ARRL. Those bands do not go as low
as the US military's bands nor as high as the US military's bands.

>>... have no evidence of original design work in radio or electronics.
>
>I've never claimed that I've done radio or electronics design work.

...except for "restoration" of a BC-348 (?) HF radio receiver
probably built 60 years ago.

>I have claimed that I've been a licensed radio amateur for nearly forty
>years.

Which is about as meaningful as being a licensed vehicle driver
in two states and military service for over 52 years. :-)

>This newsgroup is not about original design work in radio or
>electronics.

Quite true. This newsgroup is devoted to snarly superior old-
tymers in hum radio shouting and hollering snarlygrams that
The Way Of Their Youth (long ago) is The Way of amateurism
today.

In the last earth revolution time this newsgroup is about a
militant snarly's insistence that amateur fire departments and
amateur emergency medical technicians are as good as or
better than professionals in those fields. That also includes
the snarly wailing from an amateur in state radio of long ago
demanding honor and respect for correspondence course
equivalents.

>I've judged your statement to be incorrect.

It's not for you to "judge," yer lardship.

>That is not all I have.

It is all you can use.

>It
>is, however, an important one here in a newsgroup devoted to amateur
>radio.

This newsgroup is supposedly about radio amateur POLICY,
not "devotion to amateur radio."

"Devotion to amateur radio" is done by the Church of St. Hiram,
aka ARRL. Learn to separate church, state, and reality.

>> ...and a smug, arrogant, over-
>> superior attitude to those who won't agree with you.
>
>Remember, I've agreed to "smug". I'm not being arrogant and I have no

>idea what "over-superior" is. Did you just make that up?

Your "agreement" is not binding anyone. The strings in
that binding keep unravaling.

You ARE arrogant, bellicose, and confrontational when there
is no need to be that way. YOUR attitude must prevail and
reinforcement is done by misdirection into things like physical
volleyball or mental checkers.

>No "nyah-nyahs" are needed. I have a license because I wanted one. I
>took all of the exams available. You have declared an interest in
>amateur radio spanning several decades, yet you took no action toward
>obtaining a license.

As I've said, I HAVE an interest in RADIO, ALL radio, and have
been interested in that technology for 6 decades.

As to "taking action" I will recount the Heilianspeak "necessities:"

I wanted a commercial radio license 47 years ago...I took all of the
exams available, passing all of them in one sitting.* I made radio-
electronics my lifetime career choice. In Heilianspeak that is
apparently "no action?!?"

>If the code is your stumbling block, a no-code license has been
>available for more than a decade.

Misdirection...as usual. Removal of the morse code test is
NOT for my personal gain or anything else. Removal of the
code test will affect ALL US citizens desiring an amateur
radio license.

Oberst Heil cannot Issue Orders so he attempts misdirection
into pejoratives on personalities again. There is NO case for
the retention of any morse code test for any kind of radio
operator license. The morse code test should be removed to
modernize and simplify regulatory beaurocracy.

>... That tells us that your several decades of interest do
>not run very deep.

Yes, it "tells you something," but only as a message-point
device to attempt putting down others who don't worship yer
lardship's mighty morse accomplishments in amateurism.

Wow! Think of that...a whole working career in radio-
electronics including retirement from regular hours and
THIS IS INSUFFICIENT DEPTH FOR JUDGEMENT!!!!

>You would have us believe that you, a non-participant in amateur radio,
>know best how to shape its regulation.

Oberst Heil got zapped by the twin lightning bolts on his
choking high collar again. Impedes judgement by stopping

the cold blood flowing in his neurons.

Newsflash, Spike: The Communications Act of 1934 did not require the FCC staff or commissioners to be licensed as any kind of amateurs in order to MAKE regulations, JUDGE regulations, MODIFY regulations, or DELETE regulations in and about US amateur radio. The much later Telecommunications Act didn't change that.

Already-licensed US radio amateurs do NOT have any legal "judgement" powers, do NOT have any "authority" of enforcement in or about US amateur radio more than any other US citizen, licensed or not. Oberst Heil demands both to be true yet they are not. All Oberst Heil can issue for General Orders in his "where-macht" is some non-regulations of Turf, a Territorial Imperative, aka "squatter's rights." He should stay squatting there and not try to squat in here. Such is unseemly.

>I'm in disagreement with you.

Poor baby.

121. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 20:29:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030302152904.04150.00000152@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 62207

In article <3E6153CA.58B5BD1B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Still can't get up to speed on originality, slimmo? :-)
>
>I have yet to improve on Shakespeare, Dylan Thomas, P.J. O'Rourke or
>Jim's profile of you.

You have yet to learn to get along with NCTAs, grasshopper.

>If something is right, it is right.

Sorry, Your Most Eminent godhood, but that is just an OPINION.

OPINIONs are neither "right" nor "wrong" unless they go against
the overwhelming viewpoint of the majority. PCTAs are in a
minority or a minority in a HOBBY activity involving radio.

>> Sooner or later you are going to have to learn to think for
>> yourself in here. So far, there's little sign of it...
>
>Have someone explain it to you.

You can't explain yourself. You need help.

>Just how do you think the N2EY profile of you came into being?

Because poor Jimmie Miccolis couldn't be King of the Hill (the
newsgroup) in his daily editorials, got his virtual ears tweaked
and virtual nose honked...so Reverend Jim tried to run me over
with his virtual Taxi. He doesn't steer well...tsk, tsk, tsk.

You keep working on that official state department Heathkit
Course. Keep everyone informed on progress so all can see
how a Superior Being Of Ham Radio does it. That will be a
boon to the Young People as a Role Model.

122. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-02 21:41:24 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87vfz1xx8b.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62209

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:
> If you're one of the "founders" of some EMS related organization,
>congratulations. But please don't brag on being an "EMS Manager" to

You asked if I had any management experience. I do, and it is
extensive. I gave you the briefest answer possible. So you say
that is bragging and then you make more attempts at disrespect
by calling it "igloo patrol" and claiming that management of EMS
is "turf-grabbing, me-first egoists".

You are demonstrating a lack of understanding of management and
leadership functionality; which does explain why your discussion
of policy (for both EMS and ARS) matters is so inherently flawed.

>me...there's too much to do and too much self-inflicted bureacracy to impress
>me.
>
>>Did you actually manage any part of anything?
>
> Yep.

Your own schedule and your own pager, no doubt.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

123. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 22:47:25 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <A2EFADAC4E5DC745.CA52CA80AF1CC19A.F32AA95B1BC5E8DE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62210

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E6210A0.50802402@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT wrote:
> >
>
> > You are no different from me, from Brian, from Cecil, Len,
> > Richard Nixon, Alec Baldwin, nor anyone else, Dave.
>
> I'm quite different than those mentioned above. I made no public
> statement here which I'd have to eat. I made no public statement to the
> media which I'd have to eat.
>

What do you mean "which I'd have to eat." You say that as though stating
something and later changing one's mind is something to be embarrassed
about!!??

> >
> > Though you seem to
> > persist in a delusion of yourself in perfect grandeur--you're nothing
short
> > of human and we all, all say and/or think things that we change our
minds
> > on.
>
> I've never claimed perfection. I'm claiming that I've not made some
> goofy public statement which I'll have to retract upon changing my
> mind. Not everyone feels compelled to blurt out something in haste
> which will later make that person look foolish.
>

It really is quite baffling what your idea/imipression of goofy is, and then
what you feel others should feel foolish about. There is nothing that I
feel foolish about. I change my mind quite often, and don't ever look back,
Dave.

>
> > And you apparently love to delude yourself with making your answers up.
> > You've stuck your foot in your mouth this time, Dave.
>
> Pay attention. You asked the question and made up the answer. That's
> your foot and your mouth. I didn't say what you attempted to attribute
> to me.
>
> Dave K8MN

>

Well, to end it all, you've quite a large foot in an even larger mouth...

Kim W5TIT

124. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 00:30:48 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Ymx8a.656744$HG.123127573@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 62211

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030302152900.04150.00000150@mb-bk.aol.com...
> More modern folks are just not impressed by "proficiency
> in morse code as the primus inter pares of amateur radio.

Do you really believe that a 5-wpm exam constitutes "primus inter pares?" I sure don't. The no-code Tech ticket is available to anyone who wishes to become a licensed ARO without the "hassle" of the code, hence...no "barrier" to AR.

> This browns off the PCTAs no end since they desperately
> need to regain their self-imposed titles of "King of the Hill"
> in the OLD class structure of US ham radio.

What's a PCTA?

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

125. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 02:58:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030302215849.09289.00002436@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 62213

In article <3E603723.E990353C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> >Larry is a novice Award seeker. Is being a novice an insult?
>>
>> Brian:
>>
>> I take no offense at being called a "novice Award seeker." Inasmuch
>> as I'm not a Liberal, it is not in my nature to take offense lightly.
>
>Just so you are clear on this, Larry: I did not call you a "novice award
>seeker" at any point. That came from Brian.
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

Yes, I know that Brian was the culprit (as usual), which is why my
remark was addressed to him!

73 de Larry, K3LT

126. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 02:58:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030302215850.09289.00002437@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 62212

In article <3E6037A7.23BE47E8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Dave:
>>
>> When it comes to compliments from Lennie, I guess I have no choice
>> but to take them from whichever hand they're offered.
>
>Len absolutely oozes sincerity.
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

Oh, is that what it is? I thought he had eaten too much garlic!

73 de Larry, K3LT

127. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 03:38:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E62CE19.18D6B630@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62214

W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E6210A0.50802402@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> >
> > > You are no different from me, from Brian, from Cecil, Len,
> > > Richard Nixon, Alec Baldwin, nor anyone else, Dave.
> >
> > I'm quite different than those mentioned above. I made no public
> > statement here which I'd have to eat. I made no public statement to the
> > media which I'd have to eat.
> >
>
> What do you mean "which I'd have to eat." You say that as though stating
> something and later changing one's mind is something to be embarrassed
> about!!??

You had to eat your words, Kim and you don't even have the sense to be
embarrassed about it.

> > > Though you seem to
> > > persist in a delusion of yourself in perfect grandeur--you're nothing
> short
> > > of human and we all, all say and/or think things that we change our
> minds
> > > on.
> >
> > I've never claimed perfection. I'm claiming that I've not made some
> > goofy public statement which I'll have to retract upon changing my
> > mind. Not everyone feels compelled to blurt out something in haste
> > which will later make that person look foolish.
> >
>
> It really is quite baffling what your idea/imipression of goofy is, and then
> what you feel others should feel foolish about. There is nothing that I
> feel foolish about. I change my mind quite often, and don't ever look back,
> Dave.

It shouldn't be too baffling, Kim. Your statement and Brian's about
leaving the newsgroup, Cecil's about never tackling the Extra, Len's
about getting one "right out of the box", Richard Nixon's about not
having Dick Nixon to kick around anymore and Alec Baldwin's about
leaving the country are goofy statements which are enough to make them

feel foolish.

> >
> > > And you apparently love to delude yourself with making your answers up.
> > > You've stuck your foot in your mouth this time, Dave.
> >
> > Pay attention. You asked the question and made up the answer. That's
> > your foot and your mouth. I didn't say what you attempted to attribute
> > to me.

> Well, to end it all, you've quite a large foot in an even larger mouth...

You have room for both your feet and one of mine in your yap?

Dave K8MN

128. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 03:39:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E62CE88.8FFDDB06@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62215

Bert Craig wrote:
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030302152900.04150.00000150@mb-bk.aol.com...
> > More modern folks are just not impressed by "proficiency
> > in morse code as the primus inter pares of amateur radio.
>
> Do you really believe that a 5-wpm exam constitutes "primus inter pares?" I
> sure don't. The no-code Tech ticket is available to anyone who wishes to
> become a licensed ARO without the "hassle" of the code, hence...no "barrier"
> to AR.
>
> > This browns off the PCTAs no end since they desperately
> > need to regain their self-imposed titles of "King of the Hill"
> > in the OLD class structure of US ham radio.
>
> What's a PCTA?

Len's opponent in civil debate over the morse code testing non-issue.

Dave K8MN

129. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 04:27:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E62D98E.9DDE1670@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62216

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E6238F6.50E7A979@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> ...then you are unable to judge either "superiority, even-
> >> footedness, or inferiority." Your problem, no one else's.
> >
> >Sure I can, Leonard. If I spike a volleyball and observe that you
> >can't, I can make a judgement that my spike is superior to yours.
>
> Spike, amateur radio isn't volleyball and the only "net" is the
> one used to tie you down to keep you from floating away [due
> to over-generation of internal gas not alleviated by all the gas
> vented in here]

Apparently you misunderstand. I didn't write that volleyball is amateur
radio.
I used an analogy about judging superiority and inferiority. There are
numerous nets in amateur radio.

> >If we
> >play each other in checkers and I can consistently win while observing
> >that you consistently lose, I can judge that I'm a better checker player
> >than you.
>
> Amateur radio isn't comparable to a game of checkers except
> the average technical proficiency of ex-state employees is
> confined to trying to move little round flat things on a checker-
> board.

Apparently you misunderstand. I didn't write that checkers is
comparable to amateur radio. I used an analogy to demonstrate my
ability to judge superiority or inferiority. I don't know what the
ex-state employee thing could be. Someone working on California state
roads?

> >If we each won at checkers when playing each other, I'd be
> >able to judge that we are on an even footing.
>
> You've been on a slippery slope so long you don't realize the
> ground underfoot is flat.

What did you find in my statement to disagree with?

> >Your statement doesn't wash.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, to the down-and-dirty old-time hard-liner of
> old-tyme hum radio, modern environment seems "unclean."

No, your claim about being able to judge superiority is a false one.

> >I've judged, just now, that your ability to comprehend a tongue-in-cheek
> >comment is not very good.
>
> Correction: "Tongue-in-cheek comments" have to be done
> without the tongue protruding. Yours sticks out.

Why, Leonard, you'd have no way of knowing that.

> >By the way, what shall we call what you
> >demonstrate in here?
>
> Call it caustic commentary, snide snickering, powerful parody
> on the fat fantasy foibles of old-tyme hum radio, slimmo.

You mean like:

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> I hold up a cleaned mirror and point out the reflections are
> the flaws in the image, not the mirror. PCTAs don't realize
> that their Emperor's Clothes are invisible to the rational.

Have you actually met any of the rational?

> >Nope. Your declared interest was in amateur radio over a period of
> >decades.
>
> Oberst Heil seems to be so intrigued by his own visage in
> the mirror that he cannot read coherently.
>
> ONE of my many interests is RADIO. All of it, not just the
> hobby of amateur radio. Fascinating stuff to all but the would-
> be emperors trying on fantasy clothes.

My reading skills are fine. Do you want a chance to check the Google
archives before being embarrassed this time? You declared a several
decades long interest in *amateur* radio.

> >> YOU cannot "judge" me in any way, shape, or form as to the
> >> subjects of radio, electronics, or radio-electronics.
> >
> >Sure I could. I haven't done so because I don't feel that I have enough

> >information--that and the fact that I don't much care.
>
> YOU cannot "judge" me in any way, shape, or form as to the
> subjects of radio, electronics, or radio-electronics.

Sure I could. I haven't done so because I don't feel that have enough
information--that and the fact that I don't much care.

> Your only "judgemental" ability is to act enraged/irritated/bellicose
> when your precious opinions are not agreed with or taken as the
> magnificent oratory you think it is...

You must have me confused with someone else. Does this jog your memory?

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >> You haven't done as much as I have,...
> >
> >I'm just guessing that you don't really have any information about
> >whether that is the case or not. Would this be a case of you denouncing
> >me for what you perceive to be a superior attitude while donning such an
> >attitude yourself?
>
> A description of factual message content, general attitude of
> alleged "superiority" has been pointed out to you and the rest
> of the readers. The image is there for all to see. That you
> cannot see the same image is due to the astigmatic condition
> of the ego. See your "I" doctor for treatment.

Better check with your psychologist wife. Isn't the above a form of
transference? I just love your, "You haven't done as much as I have"
line.
You little humbug you.

> >I'm confident that I've done a number of things which you haven't
> >done--like passing the Novice, General, Advanced and Extra class amateur
> >radio licensing exams.
>
> Some time ago. The world has changed since.

That's right. It has become easier for someone to pass those exams.
All the less excuse for not having tackled them as you told us you
would.

> Let us know how your Heathkit Course (official, from state) is
> coming along. Then we can talk about "comparing exams"
> and your misguided thinking that radio "superiority" is all due

> to amateurism.

"State", Leonard, "State", not "state". You wrote of my reading comprehension but you've know been corrected twice (this makes a third time). The Heath General Class theory course was included as part of a course I took over fifteen years ago. It was completed fifteen years ago. I finished the larger course fifteen years ago. I hope this clears things up for you. If not, have someone read it to you.

> >> ...haven't worked the EM spectrum as widely as I have,
> >
> >There's another one about which you have no information. Trying to
> >establish your superiority?
>
> No, not "superiority." State Department communications radio
> bands are known, though not widely and certainly not via the
> ivy-league publications of ARRL. Those bands do not go as low
> as the US military's bands nor as high as the US military's bands.

Your comments grow more irrational. State Department communications "radio bands" are known by those who need to know. You'd be one of the "not widely".
Why would the ARRL ever write about them? I guess we're back to your not knowing what I've done in the military, amateur radio and governmental service.
You'll have to limit yourself to guessing.

> >>... have no evidence of original design work in radio or electronics.
> >
> >I've never claimed that I've done radio or electronics design work.
>
> ...except for "restoration" of a BC-348 (?) HF radio receiver
> probably built 60 years ago.

You equate restoration with design work? What does my restoration of a vintage piece of receiving equipment have to do with anything? Does it bother you?

> >I have claimed that I've been a licensed radio amateur for nearly forty
> >years.
>
> Which is about as meaningful as being a licensed vehicle driver
> in two states and military service for over 52 years. :-)

You seem to forget where you're posting. This is an amateur radio newsgroup.
I'm a radio amateur. You're a guy who has claimed an interest in amateur radio spanning several decades. Somehow actually acting on that interest has eluded you.

> >This newsgroup is not about original design work in radio or
> >electronics.
>

> Quite true. This newsgroup is devoted to snarly superior old-
> tymers in hum radio shouting and hollering snarlygrams that
> The Way Of Their Youth (long ago) is The Way of amateurism
> today.

Then how do you explain your presence?

> In the last earth revolution time this newsgroup is about a
> militant snarly's insistence that amateur fire departments and
> amateur emergency medical technicians are as good as or
> better than professionals in those fields. That also includes
> the snarly wailing from an amateur in state radio of long ago
> demanding honor and respect for correspondence course
> equivalents.

I never worked in "state radio". I suppose your statement could have
some truth in it except for the parts where you write that anyone
demanded honor and respect and the part about correspondence courses?
Where did you ever get the idea that I took any correspondence courses?
We might add the part about "of long ago". I was working up until two
years ago. Why not work up the corrections and run 'em by us?

> >I've judged your statement to be incorrect.
>
> It's not for you to "judge," yer lardship.

Then I guess it isn't up to you to judge whether I can judge, O Foghorn
Lenhorn.

> >That is not all I have.
>
> It is all you can use.

Seems to be another case of your not having enough information.

> >It
> >is, however, an important one here in a newsgroup devoted to amateur
> >radio.
>
> This newsgroup is supposedly about radio amateur POLICY,
> not "devotion to amateur radio."
>
> "Devotion to amateur radio" is done by the Church of St. Hiram,
> aka ARRL. Learn to separate church, state, and reality.

"Devoted to amateur radio" doesn't mean "devotion to amateur radio",
Leonid.
Learn to read.

> >> ...and a smug, arrogant, over-
> >> superior attitude to those who won't agree with you.
> >
> >Remember, I've agreed to "smug". I'm not being arrogant and I have no

> >idea what "over-superior" is. Did you just make that up?
>
> Your "agreement" is not binding anyone. The strings in
> that binding keep unravaling.
>
> You ARE arrogant, bellicose, and confrontational when there
> is no need to be that way. YOUR attitude must prevail and
> reinforcement is done by misdirection into things like physical
> volleyball or mental checkers.

Mental checkers? I didn't write about any "mental checkers". I find
you arrognat, bellicose, confrontational and sans amateur radio license,
you bystander you.

> >No "nyah-nyahs" are needed. I have a license because I wanted one. I
> >took all of the exams available. You have declared an interest in
> >amateur radio spanning several decades, yet you took no action toward
> >obtaining a license.
>
> As I've said, I HAVE an interest in RADIO, ALL radio, and have
> been interested in that technology for 6 decades.

My warm congratulations! Your claimed interest in amateur radio over
several decades is the one which keeps tripping you up.

> As to "taking action" I will recount the Heilianspeak "necessities:"
>
> I wanted a commercial radio license 47 years ago...I took all of the
> exams available, passing all of them in one sitting.* I made radio-
> electronics my lifetime career choice. In Heilianspeak that is
> apparently "no action?!?"

I can't understand your thought process. Someone writes of your taking
no action toward obtaining an amateur radio license and you respond with
something about getting a commercial license 47 years ago. You equate
"no action" in obtaining an amateur radio license with "no action" in
obtaining a commercial license. You're different.

> >If the code is your stumbling block, a no-code license has been
> >available for more than a decade.
>
> Misdirection...as usual. Removal of the morse code test is
> NOT for my personal gain or anything else. Removal of the
> code test will affect ALL US citizens desiring an amateur
> radio license.

Yours is the misdirection. I wrote that if the code is YOUR stumbling
block, the no-code license is available to you.

> Oberst Heil cannot Issue Orders so he attempts misdirection
> into pejoratives on personalities again. There is NO case for
> the retention of any morse code test for any kind of radio
> operator license. The morse code test should be removed to

> modernize and simplify regulatory beaurocracy.

Did you think I ordered you to obtain a no-code amateur license? You
are confused again. You know, there must be some kind of case for
retention of a morse test 'cuz that FCC you are fond of informing us
about has retained it despite your bleatings, at least for HF access.

> >... That tells us that your several decades of interest do
> >not run very deep.
>
> Yes, it "tells you something," but only as a message-point
> device to attempt putting down others who don't worship yer
> lardship's mighty morse accomplishments in amateurism.

You already know that I use a number of modes. I can do that, according
to Part 97. If you feel "put down", I'm sure you'll learn to deal with
it in time.

> Wow! Think of that...a whole working career in radio-
> electronics including retirement from regular hours and
> THIS IS INSUFFICIENT DEPTH FOR JUDGEMENT!!!!

Don't confuse your career with amateur radio. Your career doesn't count
at all toward a ham license. You'll still have to pass the exams.

> >You would have us believe that you, a non-participant in amateur radio,
> >know best how to shape its regulation.
>
> Oberst Heil got zapped by the twin lightning bolts on his
> choking high collar again. Impedes judgement by stopping
> the cold blood flowing in his neurons.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> Newsflash, Spike: The Communications Act of 1934 did not
> require the FCC staff or commissioners to be licensed as any
> kind of amateurs in order to MAKE regulations, JUDGE
> regulations, MODIFY regulations, or DELETE regulations in and
> about US amateur radio. The much later Telecommunications
> Act didn't change that.

You aren't the FCC. They're paid to regulate amateur radio.

> Already-licensed US radio amateurs do NOT have any legal
> "judgement" powers, do NOT have any "authority" of enforcement
> in or about US amateur radio more than any other US citizen,
> licensed or not. Oberst Heil demands both to be true yet they
> are not. All Oberst Heil can issue for General Orders in his

> "where-macht" is some non-regulations of Turf, a Territorial
> Imperative, aka "squatter's rights." He should stay squatting there
> and not try to squat in here. Such is unseemly.

I see that you have a new adjective working for you--"legal". You don't have any "legal" judgement about what is best for amateur radio. You aren't even a participant in amateur radio. As to the rest of your irrational rant:

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

130. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 04:37:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E62DC1A.2E4CF2B1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62217

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E6153CA.58B5BD1B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Still can't get up to speed on originality, slimmo? :-)
> > >
> > >I have yet to improve on Shakespeare, Dylan Thomas, P.J. O'Rourke or
> > >Jim's profile of you.
>
> You have yet to learn to get along with NCTAs, grasshopper.

I haven't found a need for getting along with you, Foghorn.

> >If something is right, it is right.
>
> Sorry, Your Most Eminent godhood, but that is just an OPINION.

It certainly is, Leonardo. It is my opinion.

> OPINIONs are neither "right" nor "wrong" unless they go against
> the overwhelming viewpoint of the majority. PCTAs are in a
> minority or a minority in a HOBBY activity involving radio.

I didn't write that my *opinion* was right. I wrote that the writings
of Shakespeare, P.J. O'Rourke and N2EY were right. You are a definite
minority, Leonid. You're a non-participant in amateur radio in a
newsgroup filled with radio amateurs. Get used to being a wall flower.

> >Just how do you think the N2EY profile of you came into being?
>
> Because poor Jimmie Miccolis couldn't be King of the Hill (the
> newsgroup) in his daily editorials, got his virtual ears tweaked
> and virtual nose honked...so Reverend Jim tried to run me over
> with his virtual Taxi. He doesn't steer well...tsk, tsk, tsk.

Bzzzzt! Thanks for playing but that's not correct.

It's because of things like "poor Jimmie", "King of the Hill", "daily
editorials", "virtual ears tweaked and virtual nose honked", "Reverend
Jim", "Tsk, tsk, tsk", "poor baby". You're an uncivil and unpleasant
man.

> You keep working on that official state department Heathkit
> Course. Keep everyone informed on progress so all can see
> how a Superior Being Of Ham Radio does it. That will be a
> boon to the Young People as a Role Model.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

You're compelled to fulfill the profile. You can't help it.

Dave K8MN

131. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 04:56:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E5EC592.BBE31E00@att.net>
Source record: 62218

N2EY wrote:

> Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message
> >
> > >> >> It's a hobby folks.
>
> Some folks get all worked up over the word "hobby". I think it's
> because the word conjures up an image of triviality, low or
> non-existent standards of knoweldge or skill, not contributing
> anything really meaningful to society, and/or being purely for the fun
> of those involved.

Precisely what he implied, in spades.

Ain't it neat? RRAP is now joined by an Ice Cold Troll from the North Pole!

>
>
> So, Floyd, how about defining what "hobby" means in the Amateur Radio
> context?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

132. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 04:56:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E5EC638.8BCD784C@att.net>
Source record: 62219

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 2/27/03 5:04 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0302271504.bcd8c48@posting.google.com>
>
> >> > In context, FY is former Yugoslavia.
> >>
> >> ...then why not write "former Yugoslavia"?
> >
> >To see if you would trip and fall down?
> >
> >It is a common enough abbreviation in war planning circles.
>
> Oh? So now you are an associate of the Brookings Institute?
>
> >I screwed
> >up and thought amateurs radio operators were adept at abbreviations
> >considering the CW handicap.
> >
>
> What handicap?

Steve just because the FCC gave them a get-out-of-CW chit doesn't mean
that it cancels their handicap!
With most of them it's congenital.

133. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 04:56:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6192A3.E57CFC83@att.net>
Source record: 62220

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>
> I think you're a bit "snow blind", Floyd.

Naw, he's just the Troll from the North Pole. Said so himself, early on. Not worth even reading.

134. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 04:57:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E62E096.950323EB@att.net>
Source record: 62221

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>
> I think you're a bit "snow blind", Floyd.

Naw, he's just the Troll from the North Pole. Said so himself, early
on. Not worth
even reading.

135. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 07:17:54 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b3viu325rt@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 62233

Not by a longshot.... whether someone gets paid or not is irrelavent.
Volunteer firefighters work without compensation (except reimbursements such
as replacing damaged clothing or supplies). "Part-Paid/On-Call"
firefighters work for a certain amount per run. This applies from when the
time the "tones" go off, till the incident commander "clears" with dispatch.
All other time spent involved with the department is considered usually
volunteer.

The other end of the spectrum are, of course full-time/career firefighters.
Either way (in Michigan at least) the amount of time is almost the same
spent with working for a volly or part-paid as with a full-time/career in
regards to training, paperwork, work details etc. Hardly a hobby.

Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

(snippage)
>
> >>So, Floyd, how about defining what "hobby" means in the Amateur Radio
> >>context?
> >
> >Is that any different that what "hobby" means in any other
> >context? It's an avocation, or what a person likes to do when
> >they aren't engaged in their vocation.
>
> Would you call a volunteer fireman a hobbyist?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

136. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 07:33:02 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b3viu435rt@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 62232

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030301120631.23598.00000550@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <87smu721tm.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson
<floyd@ptialaska.net>
> writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >>>
> >>>Is that any different that what "hobby" means in any other
> >>>context? It's an avocation, or what a person likes to do when
> >>>they aren't engaged in their vocation.
> >>
> >>Would you call a volunteer fireman a hobbyist?
> >
> >That's a non sequitur.
>
> Actually, it's a serious question.
>
> >What does "volunteer" have to do with it
> >being hobby or not?
>
> The fact that the volunteer is unpaid. And does the firefighting
activities as
> something he/she "likes to do when not engaged in their vocation".

Believe me, volunteer or not, the level of work is still the same. We have to fill out the same paperwork, train as many hours, etc. The main choice for alot of vollys/part-paid-on-call firefighters for getting involved in the first place is for to serve the community. (and the excitement factor is there as well too I am sure! :)

>
> >Nothing. It means the person is donating
> >their time, whether it is a hobbist or a professional.
>
> How many volunteer firefighters are also professional firefighters? Are
those
> volunteer firefighters who are not also professional firefighters
therefore
> hobbyists?

Depends, some full-time departments don't have a problem with someone also being on a volly dept. and some do. I believe alot of it has to do with the damned unions. Biggest deal there is if someone gets hurt while on the volly department, is it fair for the full-time department to have to pay for

the time off?? (and other associated costs.....

> -
> >
> >However, for many (probably most) of them it is indeed a hobby.
> >That is one reason there are very few totally volunteer fire
> >departments, and the usual "volunteer" fire department is a
> >mixed crew, where the professionals run the show and the
> >volunteers take up the slack.
>
> Very true.

Speaking for our department, we usually have at least 6 of 16 show up on every run we have and sometimes even more. Never have missed a call, where the truck hasn't rolled as far as I can remember with our department. There has always been at least 1 or 2 rolling with our trucks.

> >
> >And if you've ever had anything to do with trying to manage
> >volunteers in anything as serious and technical in nature as a
> >fire department, you *know* that treating volunteers the same as
> >professionals will get you 1) ousted or 2) lonely. They will
> >rebel and either throw you out or leave themselves!
>
> All depends on what you mean by "treating volunteers the same as
> professionals".

Only difference is the pay!!!!!! In fact you get even more respect in the volly departments I think than in full-time departments. Volunteers are professionals. The fact that they sleep at thier own houses and not at the firebarn is about the only difference. Volunteers by their very own nature are more likely to get involved and also (when there is positive leadership) be led to great sucesses more over than full-timers. For the purposes of discussion here, I am going with volly/partime versus full-timers as the distinctions here.

>
> Amateur radio is serious and technical, too, for many hams.
> >
> But the question remains: Would you call volunteer firefighters who are
not
> also professional firefighters "hobbyists"?

Not in the least... look above.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

137. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 07:35:50 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b3viu545rt@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 62231

> So your original statement had no logical significance. Some
> are, some aren't, and it has nothing to do with Amateur Radio.
>
> >>A lot of people who could best be described as hobbyist are also
> >>are members of volunteer fire departments.
> >>
> >>The same is true of rescue squads.
> >
> >Ah - but does that make volunteer fire departments and rescue squads "a
hobby"?
>
> It is for the volunteers... ;-)
>

It may be for some members of a volly department. For the rest it is either
"the second full time job" or the desire to serve their community.

Maybe either one of you should post these questions in alt.firefighters ??

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

138. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 07:37:09 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b3viu655rt@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 62230

My hat's off to ya Len, finally something worth looking at, that has come
from your keyboard!!!!! Thats funny as hell!!!!!!

Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> writes:
>
> >Would you call a volunteer fireman a hobbyist?
>
> Firemen put OUT fires. Outraged PCTAs start them.

139. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 07:44:01 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b3viu765rt@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 62229

Jeessh..... Looks like you better go out and bust those people with the
following callsign (call area irrelavent in this case!)

KC#UNT

I know that either that callsign has been issued or is getting pretty damned
close to becoming issued in the 8 callsign district!

If you REALLY believe your statements about Kims callsign, then we better
see ya go after the suffix of ASS, SEX, FUK, DIK, MUF, NUT, and probably
others that you can think of..... and get these people busted or nagg them
equally. Otherwise it is mere hypocrisy.

Ryan

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030228224932.14887.00000107@mb-mu.aol.com...
> In article <3E5D0CF1.6F0EAB1C@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
writes:
>
> >> That would be so only if it were true. Actually, it's just another
> >> indication of the crude, simple workings of W5TIT's mind!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> > You DO mean W5BOOB don't you?
>
> Dick:
>
> She's a boob, all right! Any woman who chooses such a crude, puerile,
> sexually-
> suggestive, and demeaning call sign would have to be!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

140. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 09:28:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303042805.27873.00000902@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 62222

For a historical context, here are some numbers on the growth of US amateur radio in the past 30 years or so. All numbers are rounded off but are accurate to within 2%. Sources are various Callbooks and US census data.:

US Hams:

1970: 270,000
1980: 350,000
1990: 514,000
2000: 680,000

Growth Rate:

1970 to 1980: 29.6% (120,000 net growth)
1980 to 1990: 46.8% (164,000 net growth)
1990 to 2000: 32.2% (166,000 net growth)

Oddly enough, percentage growth slowed down after the introduction of code test waivers and the Tech lost its code test. The total net growth in the '90s was almost exactly the same as in the '80s, even though the US population was larger.

As a percentage of the total US population:

Year - US population/annual growth - US hams - % hams
1970: 203 million 270,000 0.133%
1980: 227 million 350,000 0.154%
1990: 249 million 514,000 0.206%
2000: 281 million 680,000 0.242%

US hams as a percentage of population increased 0.021% in the '70s, 0.052% in the '80s and 0.036% in the '90s. So the growth slowed down after the introduction of code test waivers and the Tech lost its code test.

It stands to reason that if code testing were an 'unnecessary, arbitrary, and distasteful (to many) barriers to entry', those who were interested, but dissuaded by those unnecessary barriers would "jump in." when the 'barriers' were eliminated. Except that's not what happened, in either absolute number of hams or percentage growth. Growth in total hams was almost exactly the same during the '90s, compared to the '80s, and the percentage growth actually dropped.

73 de Jim, N2EY

141. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 10:57:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303055728.14768.00000327@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 62223

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/2/03 2:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030302152900.04150.00000150@mb-bk.aol.com>

>Carl, Had it not been for the Technician class license
> creation over a dozen years ago, US amateur radio
> licensees would have DECREASED in number now by
> over one hundred thousand.

This is an assertion of fact. From which cryatal ball did you glean it?

>This browns off the PCTAs no end since they desperately
> need to regain their self-imposed titles of "King of the Hill"
> in the OLD class structure of US ham radio

Nope. Not in the least. However YOU need to believe it does in order to
sleep at night. Benadryl would have been much more effective.

>PCTAs are
> outraged by this because their entire fantasyland mental
> picture of amateur radio has evaporated.

Again, you need to believe this in order to sleep at night. It's
foolishness on your part, Lennie.

>They cannot stand
> reality and have lost their mental anchor in the safe harbor
> of morse mythology. Pity them.

Pity you having to make it up.

Sheesh.

Steve, K4YZ

142. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 11:02:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA88A08E.11D65%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62224

"N2EY" wrote:

> Your models are oversimplified, Dwight. Expirations
> and cancellations are considerable, and Tech-Plus-
> renewal-as-Tech even more of a factor.

Not at all, Jim. Even if you factor in the transfer of Tech-Plus to Tech,
it still adds up to a lot of license holders dropping out instead of
upgrading.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

143. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 11:06:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303060648.14768.00000328@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 62225

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>Date: 3/2/03 3:41 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <87vfz1xx8b.fld@barrow.com>

>I gave you the briefest answer possible.

That was an answer? Sure hope you didn't spend a lot of money on a college education then.

>You are demonstrating a lack of understanding of management and
>leadership functionality; which does explain why your discussion
>of policy (for both EMS and ARS) matters is so inherently flawed.

And in your 20 year absence from Amateur Radio practice, what experience did you gain in Amateur Radio matters to lay claim to this?

>Your own schedule and your own pager, no doubt.

That's one of the downsides of volunteers...Yes, "(my) schedule and (my) own pager". Again, never once did that station fail to roll to a call due to a lack of volunteers.

And three posts later I STILL don't see any expression of interest in any Amateur Radio policy matters from you, other that perpetuating this Lenniesque flamethrowing.

Your point?

Steve, K4YZ

144. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 12:42:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303030442.2406304e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62226

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030301185051.19542.00000241@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/1/03 9:03 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303010703.14de4e2b@posting.google.com>
> >
>
> >> Sorry for the caps...Slower wasn't what you needed in order to
> understand
> >> the question...I thought perhaps louder might help.
> >>
> >> Got an answer yet?
>
> >Steve, I think it would be ovbious to anyone who is familiar with
> >Morse code.
>
> No...It's not "obvious".
>
> You say something's a "handicap"..I consider a "handicap" to be some kind
> of limiting factor.
>
> I want to know what YOU think the hanicap is.
>
> >I'll let you answer your own question by answering this question.
>
> NO...I want a statement from you answering the question I posed. If I
> wanted to play word games, I'd engage Lennie of my 11 year old.
>
> >Why are so many abbreviations, Q-codes, numbergrams necessary, and the
> >pursuit of the shortest callsign possible?
>
> Why don't you tell me? YOU are the one insisting that thee's some kind of
> "handiocap"...?
>
> >None-the-less, accuracy transcends speed.
>
> Whic still does not answer the question posed to YOU, Brain...WHAT
> HANDICAP...?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Welp, Steve, I don't have to dance to that fiddle you're playing, and
I choose not to.

Unable to think on your own and do a little deductive reasoning,
you'll just have to consider it one of life's unsolved mysteries.

Best of luck to you, though.

Brian

145. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 12:47:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303030447.f97f5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62227

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030228125633.14389.00001213@mb-mw.aol.com>...
> In article <3E5E8D3D.477E8EF0@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

> > There were probably a few Rose Riveters who made Mechanical Engineer after
> >the war, too.
>
> The fictional name during WW2 was "Rosie the Riveter," not
> 'Rose Riveter.' Even a popular song at the time. You must
> have been too young to remember, old-timer. Ham radio was
> deactivated for the duration of the war.

He confuses "Rosie the Riveter" with those Smokey Bear commercials
where the little girl tells her dad it's not "Smokey THE Bear," it's
just "Smokey Bear."

146. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 12:50:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303030450.48f7216d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62228

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E61772B.E2C6A1E5@att.net>...

> Pay no mind to Slim, Larry, he's being stupid as usual. While he was still
> in diapers I was working CW from a 65 Chevy Malibu with a WRL Duobander
> that was designed for SSB only. His usual clueless remarks still are just
> that.

Of course I wasn't still in diapers in 1965. Sheesh. The older you
get, the better you wuz.

And what was the range of that Malibu with the extension cord reaching
the power mains?

147. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 13:00:17 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87adgcwqou.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62234

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:
> That was an answer? Sure hope you didn't spend a lot of money on a college
>education then.

plonk

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

148. A GREAT Programfor CW Newbies!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 14:41:23 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <nQJ8a.7591$oY6.2994@nwrdny03.gnilink.net>
Source record: 62235

This post is particularly aimed at any newbies (Myself, very much included.) that might be reading the newsgroup. Here is the link to download G4FON's 'Koch Method CW Trainer' as well as KB2TQX's 'KochRX.'

http://www.qsl.net/g4fon/CW%20Trainer.htm

Lemme tell you, this makes learning and practicing CW really fun, almost like a PC game. Download and install both into the same directory and then start off with two characters. KochRX allows you to enter the sent Morse character on your keyboard and at the end of the session (You can vary the time and speed.) it'll compare actual sent vs. what you've typed and grade it.

My 5-yr. old daughter and I usually practice with me sending on a code practice oscillator and her saying the character but now she competes against herself trying to get the "high score." I just set the pgm to send her E, T, A, N, I, & M (That's all she knows for now.) with an 'Actual Character Speed' of 15-wpm and 'Effective Code Speed' of 5-wpm....and viola! Use KochRX to run the G4FON software so it'll be just like a game. Give it a shot, it's really quite fun. :-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

149. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 14:47:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303094728.19428.00000309@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 62236

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/3/03 6:42 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303030442.2406304e@posting.google.com>

>Welp, Steve, I don't have to dance to that fiddle you're playing, and
>I choose not to.

Brian-to-English translation: I made a statement that I cannot or will
not explain because even I do not understand what I said.

>Unable to think on your own and do a little deductive reasoning,
>you'll just have to consider it one of life's unsolved mysteries

Brain-to-English translation: I am too cowardly to explain what I said
because after reading what I wrote I realize an answer might make me look even
MORE foolish.

>Best of luck to you, though.

No luck needed, Brain. Got you figured out pretty good, I think.

Steve, K4YZ

150. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 14:50:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303095057.19428.00000310@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 62237

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>Date: 3/3/03 7:00 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <87adgcwqou.fld@barrow.com>

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:

>> That was an answer? Sure hope you didn't spend a lot of money on a
>college
>>education then.
>
>plonk

Still waiting on the Amateur Radio related opinions, Floyd.

Or was this just an exercise in flamethrowing and mudslinging?

Steve, K4YZ

151. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 14:58:09 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns933346E5D258Fpookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 62238

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030303042805.27873.00000902@mb-mj.aol.com:

> For a historical context, here are some numbers on the growth of US
> amateur radio in the past 30 years or so.

Interesting stats, Jim.

We're not used to arguing with actual facts on this newsgroup however.
Don't let it happen again. :-)

--
Bill, W7TI

152. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 16:48:21 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0303030848.405f1925@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62239

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

> Dale Reich, K8AD, of Seville Ohio, has petitioned the FCC to require
> sellers of two-way voice or data equipment to keep on file a buyer's
> name, address, telephone number and any future information.
> This, when selling a radio that
> required licensing under the current FCC rules.
> The sale of Ham radios to non-licensed persons is not illegal.
> Perhaps this line of thinking should be addressed but until it is you can
> look forward to unending "pirate" operations on the Ham bands.

Every so often some control-freak dufus comes up with the mistaken
idea of placing restrictions on the wide availability of
amateur radio equipment and supplies. These are the folks who
suggest it be a crime to own amateur equipment without a
license, and who are not thrilled about the fact that
Radio Shack sells a line of UHF/VHF amateur equipment right out
under the nose of the impressionable public. I suspect they
don't like the idea that soldering guns and schematics are
openly sold to those without the proper credentials also.

While it is easy, on the surface, to agree with their
goal (keeping amateur equipment out of the hands of
bootleggers), I feel the attitude that amateur equipment
should be treated as some sort of controlled substance is
short-sighted and in fact damaging to our service.

I live in a large metropolitan area. We have one full
line amateur store in town. There are no other similar stores
in the whole state. In the four states which border us, there
are 2 more amateur radio stores. THAT'S IT! In 5 states, there
are only 3 stores! In the whole country, my guess is that there
are less than four dozen stores selling amateur radio equipment,
antennas, and supplies! It is as though we were some secret
society, bent on concealing our presence from the world.

Not all that many years ago, there were at least 6
electronic stores here in town which sold amateur equipment
(not exclusively, but they all had a good selection). Add to
that two Heathkit stores, and even the Sears stores sold amateur
transceivers for awhile. (Yes, Virginia, right there along with
the Craftsman sockets and Silvertone TV sets.) In the same era,
Radio Row in NYC was blocks of wall-to-wall storefronts catering
to electronics experimenters. Popular Science magazine had a
regular column about amateur radio, and occasional construction
articles. Every second little town had an amateur radio club.

Amateur Radio was a populist, Joe SixPack kind of hobby.

During those years it was easy for a person to get
interested in being an amateur, to shop around for the best
deal on equipment, and to meet an Elmer. We were visible to
the public, and well regarded.

Then somewhere along the line came the magic of 1-800
shopping, amateur radio marketing became streamlined, and
radio stores disappeared from Hometown America. With the demise
of the local radio store, all the Elmers disappeared into their
shacks and newcomers flounder around in fancy four-color ads in
back of CQ and QST magazine, trying to decide how to be a ham.
Clubs floundered, in part due to the loss of hams around the
coffee pot in the back of the local electronics part store.

Rather than continuing to restrict the availability of
amateur equipment, as though we were selling assault weapons
or recreational pharmaceuticals, I vote for opening up the market.
Let's have radios for sale in the strip malls alongside the video
games, Lionel trains, and mountain bikes. And it won't hurt if a
few of us put on our Elmer-suits and lurk around to spot the
likely recruits.

When they outlaw ham gear, only outlaws will be hams.

73, de Hans, K0HB

---

153. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 17:27:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303122758.23139.00000917@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62240

In article <BA88A08E.11D65%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>
>> Your models are oversimplified, Dwight. Expirations
>> and cancellations are considerable, and Tech-Plus-
>> renewal-as-Tech even more of a factor.
>
>
> Not at all, Jim. Even if you factor in the transfer of Tech-Plus to Tech,
>it still adds up to a lot of license holders dropping out instead of
>upgrading.
>
Sorry if I wasn't clear, Dwight. We seem to be saying the same thing different
ways. I agree that there are significant numbers of dropouts.

The main point is that the growth in Technicians is due to three factors - new
Techs, upgrades from Novice, and renewal of Tech Pluses as Techs. Counteracting
this are dropouts and upgrades.

73 de Jim, N2EY

154. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 17:27:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303122758.23139.00000916@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62241

In article <20030303055728.14768.00000327@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 03 Mar 2003 10:57:28 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 3/2/03 2:29 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030302152900.04150.00000150@mb-bk.aol.com>
>
>>Carl, Had it not been for the Technician class license
>> creation over a dozen years ago, US amateur radio
>> licensees would have DECREASED in number now by
>> over one hundred thousand.
>
> This is an assertion of fact.

No, Steve, it's obviously an opinion, even though it's worded as if it were a true fact.

The actual license numbers do not back up that opinion, though. The number of new hams in the '90s was almost exactly the same as in the '80s. Percentage growth actually declined.

> From which cryatal ball did you glean it?
>
It's wishful thinking, nothing more. The fact is that nobody knows what would have happened if things hadn't changed in 1990 and 1991.

>>This browns off the PCTAs no end since they desperately
>> need to regain their self-imposed titles of "King of the Hill"
>> in the OLD class structure of US ham radio

"Browns off"?

> Nope. Not in the least. However YOU need to believe it does in order to
>sleep at night. Benadryl would have been much more effective.
>
>> PCTAs are
>> outraged by this because their entire fantasyland mental
>> picture of amateur radio has evaporated.
>
> Again, you need to believe this in order to sleep at night. It's
>foolishness on your part, Lennie.

Steve - ever think the whole point of his postings might be to "brown you off"?
>
>>They cannot stand
>> reality and have lost their mental anchor in the safe harbor
>> of morse mythology. Pity them.
>
> Pity you having to make it up.
>
> Sheesh.
>
'zactly

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

155. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 17:44:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303030944.48f96c9a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62242

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDD72.DB32D50D@earthlink.net>...
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > N2EY wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > > >
> > > > > >Can legitimate communication take place at 5wpm?
> > > > >
> > > > > Sure -
> > > >
> > > > But only assuming that both operators are able to stay awake!
> > >
> > > Right-o. We mustn't confuse legitimate (yet very slooooooooow)
> > > communications and proficiency in use of a mode.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Why not? The desired communication took place, according to both of your comments.
>
> Why not? Because the two are not one and the same. We'll never know if
> "desired" communications can take place at five words per minute unless
> the desire is to go v e r y s l o w l y.

That sounds like the power requirement rules also. The OF's say they
"desire" a 40 over 9 signal report.

> Would you call a driver who can safely drive a car at speeds no higher
> than fifteen miles per hour a proficient driver?

This is an amateur radio topic newsgroup. Would you mind containing
your comments to amateur radio?

Would you call someone
> who can play "Stardust" perfectly but only at half its normal tempo, a
> proficient pianist?

This is an amateur radio topic newsgroup. Would you mind containing
your comments to amateur radio?

> Someone who can send and receive morse at five words per minute is on
> the low end of mediocrity.

Tell it to Riley.

156. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 17:54:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62243

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:

> >Someone who can send and receive morse at five words per minute is on
> >the low end of mediocrity.
>
> I disagree!
>
> Someone who can send and receive morse at no more than five words per minute
> has some basic Morse code skills. Such a person is not proficient - yet.

Even if sending and receiving are 100% accurate, and the desired
message gets through, you would classify the operator as less than
proficient?

> And the sending test disappeared in the USA about 20 years ago.

For all Morse exams regardless of speed, not just the 5wpm exam.

> The stated goal was elimination of the Morse proficiency test. That's been
> accomplished in the USA, because the remaining test is a basic skill test, not
> a proficiency test.

Really? Is that in Part 97? All of Title 34?

The rules don't even define what Morse Code is, let alone what are
basic skills or proficiency.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Be careful about playing the end of the band too closely, since the
> multivibrator is down for revamping.

You be careful.

157. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 17:56:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303030956.548ea85a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62244

```
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E603824.DF80D6D2@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDD72.DB32D50D@earthlink.net>...
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > N2EY wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > > >
> > > > > >Can legitimate communication take place at 5wpm?
> > > > >
> > > > > Sure -
> > > >
> > > > But only assuming that both operators are able to stay awake!
> > >
> > > Right-o. We mustn't confuse legitimate (yet very slooooooooow)
> > > communications and proficiency in use of a mode.
>
> > We mustn't forget that FISTS claims that "Accuracy Transcends Speed."
>
> That's fine. If your top end is five words per minute, better slow it
> down to three, just in case.

Just in case of what?
```

158. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 17:57:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303030957.25bbfc43@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62245

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E60F380.8DC98F9@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3E603824.DF80D6D2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >> We mustn't forget that FISTS claims that "Accuracy Transcends Speed."
> > > >
> > > >That's fine. If your top end is five words per minute, better slow it
> > > >down to three, just in case.
> > >
> > > Poor baby, you really DID have a bad hair day today, didn't you?
> > > [all three strands...]
> > >
> > > Tomorrow is another time for you in the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
> > > Service.
> > >
> > > Beep, beep.
> >
> > Poor, sad Leonard. I use modes other than CW as I choose. You do what
> > you can in amateur radio. I'll do what I want.
> >
> > Good luck in working your way up to that five word per minute plateau.
> >
> > Dave K8MN

It looks like your left hand is getting a workout.

159. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 18:02:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303031002.277fd71@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62246

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030303094728.19428.00000309@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/3/03 6:42 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303030442.2406304e@posting.google.com>
>
> >Welp, Steve, I don't have to dance to that fiddle you're playing, and
> >I choose not to.
>
> Brian-to-English translation: I made a statement that I cannot or will
> not explain because even I do not understand what I said.

Its also possible that you would not have the capacity to understand.

> >Unable to think on your own and do a little deductive reasoning,
> >you'll just have to consider it one of life's unsolved mysteries
>
> Brain-to-English translation: I am too cowardly to explain what I said
> because after reading what I wrote I realize an answer might make me look even
> MORE foolish.

I'm reminded of the Far-Side cartoon where the boy is at the door of
the "School For The Gifted." He's pushing, and the sign on the door
says, "Pull."

> >Best of luck to you, though.
>
> No luck needed, Brain. Got you figured out pretty good, I think.

I've got you nailed.

160. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 18:14:40 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303031014.642aacac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62247

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E60FB11.CA516235@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6002C5.DAE4639@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > I'll wear "smug" as defined in the Random House College Dictionary:
> >
> > You don't have a choice, Dave. It's part of your personality.
> >
> > > smug - 1. contentedly confident of one's own respectability, ability,
> > > superiority, or correctness.
> > >
> > > Note that the definition doesn't use "and" but rather "or".
> >
> > Noted. So choose one (1).

Which one are you going to choose?

> > I'm
> > > contentedly confident in my ability and correctness.
> >
> > Ooops. You tried to grab more than one.
>
> >
> > Try superiority. Its a better fit.
>
> Oh, I'm not involved in New Age Newspeak

"Superiority" is not New Age Newspeak. It was extracted as one choice
from your Random House College Dictionary definition.

and I don't believe in
> political correctness, Brian. In everything I do, I am: superior to
> some, inferior to others, on an even footing with others. When I'm
> superior, I'm contentedly confident of my superiority.
>
> Maybe I she be more congnizant of the possibility that you'll get your
> feelings hurt if I'm seen to superior to you in something. I wouldn't
> want to hurt your self-esteem.
>
> Even Len has to be superior to me in at least one way....hmmmm...Oh, I
> have it! Len is much more patient than I am. I would not have the
> patience to wait for several decades to become a radio amateur after
> becoming "interested".

I became interested in radio communication in the late 60's. Money was an issue, and then there were competing interests. I became licensed 1987. I often wonder had I been exposed to the pettiness of some long time amateurs if I would have pursued it at all.

161. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 18:17:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303031017.344c8a39@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62248

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E60FD1E.B02F8309@earthlink.net>...

> When it comes to compliments from Lennie, I guess I have no choice but
> to take them from whichever hand they're offered.
>
> Dave K8MN

You could also pretend to be gracious about it, without that smugness
showing through.

162. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 18:21:18 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <y2N8a.7928$oY6.78@nwrdny03.gnilink.net>
Source record: 62249

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0303030938.966d866@posting.google.com...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<Ymx8a.656744$HG.123127573@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030302152900.04150.00000150@mb-bk.aol.com...
> > > More modern folks are just not impressed by "proficiency
> > > in morse code as the primus inter pares of amateur radio.
> >
> > Do you really believe that a 5-wpm exam constitutes "primus inter pares?
I
> > sure don't.
>
> I think that many who have taken the code test would agree with you.
> But not all. I am one that disagrees. The code exam is probably the
> single biggest factor that keeps people moving on when they show an
> interest in amateur radio.

Then it's just about the numbers? If a person is interested enough, I assert
that he/she'll either begin with the Tech ticket and advance as their
interest grows.

> And todays Technician license isn't much of a draw.

50 MHz and up...at up to 1500 watts?!

> I suppose they could become CBers instead

vs. 40 ch. occupying 440 kHz of spectrum...

, learning how to cuss and
> jam, and wire up a toilet flushing sound module to their microphone.

I'm a CBer too, Brian...and I don't cuss OTA or use any of those silly noise
toys. What are you implying?

> Then when they finally decide to overcome the code obstacle, they've
> already become molded into the kind of radio operator that we probably
> don't want.

Do we really want to go there?

> I'd rather get them fresh.

I'd rather get 'em interested.

--
73 de Bert

WA2SI

163. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 18:23:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303031023.412a6a94@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62250

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030302215849.09289.00002436@mb-ch.aol.com>...

> Dave:
>
> Yes, I know that Brian was the culprit (as usual), which is why my
> remark was addressed to him!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Culprit? You take a left handed compliment from Dave and somehow I
become the "culprit."

Sheesh.

164. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 18:28:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303031028.668f2550@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62351

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E60F7CB.3C6E17B6@earthlink.net>...

> > > I can't document any such thing with a post here.
> >
> > So you lied?
>
> No, Brian, I did not. We have your word on the matter and we have it
> both ways---0-180-0-180-0-180-0. Is it starting to dawn on you why Ed
> Hare departed the group?

If you cannot document it, how did you arrive at "0-180-0-180-0-180-0?"

Which is it?

Did you say I left, or did you say I never left?

Did Ed leave because I said I was leaving, or did Ed leave because I dind't leave?

You've got a lot of 'splainin to do.

165. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 18:57:50 UTC
From: K3UD <K3UD@charter.net>
Message-ID: <030320031257500132%K3UD@charter.net>
Source record: 62352

In article <20030303042805.27873.00000902@mb-mj.aol.com>, N2EY
<n2ey@aol.com> wrote:

> For a historical context, here are some numbers on the growth of US amateur
> radio in the past 30 years or so. All numbers are rounded off but are accurate
> to within 2%. Sources are various Callbooks and US census data.:
>
> US Hams:
>
> 1970: 270,000
> 1980: 350,000
> 1990: 514,000
> 2000: 680,000
>
> Growth Rate:
>
> 1970 to 1980: 29.6% (120,000 net growth)
> 1980 to 1990: 46.8% (164,000 net growth)
> 1990 to 2000: 32.2% (166,000 net growth)

If the growth rate continues at the 2000 to February 2003 rates we
could be projecting about 720,800 hams by 2010 or about 40,800 net
growth (6%) Quite a difference from the last three decades.

73
George
K3UD

166. Re: A GREAT Programfor CW Newbies!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 19:29:27 UTC
From: "Lloyd, N0VFP" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e63a964$1_4@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 62353

Thanks for the heads up, i started using it myself, and I am 100% impressed!

Lloyd, N0VFP

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:nQJ8a.7591$oY6.2994@nwrdny03.gnilink.net...
> This post is particularly aimed at any newbies (Myself, very much
included.)
> that might be reading the newsgroup. Here is the link to download G4FON's
> 'Koch Method CW Trainer' as well as KB2TQX's 'KochRX.'
>
> http://www.qsl.net/g4fon/CW%20Trainer.htm
>
> Lemme tell you, this makes learning and practicing CW really fun, almost
> like a PC game. Download and install both into the same directory and then
> start off with two characters. KochRX allows you to enter the sent Morse
> character on your keyboard and at the end of the session (You can vary the
> time and speed.) it'll compare actual sent vs. what you've typed and grade
> it.
>
> My 5-yr. old daughter and I usually practice with me sending on a code
> practice oscillator and her saying the character but now she competes
> against herself trying to get the "high score." I just set the pgm to send
> her E, T, A, N, I, & M (That's all she knows for now.) with an 'Actual
> Character Speed' of 15-wpm and 'Effective Code Speed' of 5-wpm....and
viola!
> Use KochRX to run the G4FON software so it'll be just like a game. Give it
a
> shot, it's really quite fun. :-)
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

167. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 20:09:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E63B6D0.1F3F75@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62354

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDD72.DB32D50D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

> > > > Right-o. We mustn't confuse legitimate (yet very slooooooooow)
> > > > communications and proficiency in use of a mode.

> > > Why not? The desired communication took place, according to both of your comments.
> > >
> > Why not? Because the two are not one and the same. We'll never know if
> > "desired" communications can take place at five words per minute unless
> > the desire is to go v e r y s l o w l y.
>
> That sounds like the power requirement rules also. The OF's say they
> "desire" a 40 over 9 signal report.

Might sound like it to you. You're famous for trying to read something
other than what is written.

> > Would you call a driver who can safely drive a car at speeds no higher
> > than fifteen miles per hour a proficient driver?
>
> This is an amateur radio topic newsgroup. Would you mind containing
> your comments to amateur radio?

I thought perhaps you'd understand an analogy.

> Would you call someone
> > who can play "Stardust" perfectly but only at half its normal tempo, a
> > proficient pianist?
>
> This is an amateur radio topic newsgroup. Would you mind containing
> your comments to amateur radio?

Apparently you do understand an analogy but'd you'd like to dismiss it
because it voids your construct.

> > Someone who can send and receive morse at five words per minute is on
> > the low end of mediocrity.
>
> Tell it to Riley.

He already knows. You're the guy in the dark.

Dave K8MN

168. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 20:12:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E63B77C.CF61C719@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62355

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E603824.DF80D6D2@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDD72.DB32D50D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >Can legitimate communication take place at 5wpm?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Sure -
> > > > >
> > > > > But only assuming that both operators are able to stay awake!
> > > >
> > > > Right-o. We mustn't confuse legitimate (yet very slooooooooow)
> > > > communications and proficiency in use of a mode.
> > >
> > > We mustn't forget that FISTS claims that "Accuracy Transcends Speed."
> >
> > That's fine. If your top end is five words per minute, better slow it
> > down to three, just in case.
>
> Just in case of what?

Just in case your accuracy is thrown off at the breakneck speed of five
words per minute, of course. Five words per minute doesn't demonstrate
proficiency.

Dave K8MN

169. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 20:14:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E63B820.DC2954B1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62356

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E60F380.8DC98F9@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3E603824.DF80D6D2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >> We mustn't forget that FISTS claims that "Accuracy Transcends Speed."
> > > >
> > > >That's fine. If your top end is five words per minute, better slow it
> > > >down to three, just in case.
> > >
> > > Poor baby, you really DID have a bad hair day today, didn't you?
> > > [all three strands...]
> > >
> > > Tomorrow is another time for you in the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
> > > Service.
> > >
> > > Beep, beep.
> >
> > Poor, sad Leonard. I use modes other than CW as I choose. You do what
> > you can in amateur radio. I'll do what I want.
> >
> > Good luck in working your way up to that five word per minute plateau.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> It looks like your left hand is getting a workout.

What is it that you're trying to say, Brian? Are you in disagreement
with something I've written? Do you maintain that Len is already a ham?
Do you not think that five words per minute represents a plateau to
him. Do you think he has already achieved 5 wpm?

Dave K8MN

170. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 20:23:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E63BA2C.E39B9368@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62357

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E60FB11.CA516235@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6002C5.DAE4639@earthlink.net>...

> > Oh, I'm not involved in New Age Newspeak
>
> "Superiority" is not New Age Newspeak. It was extracted as one choice
> from your Random House College Dictionary definition.

The idea that no one is superior to another is New Age Newspeak. I
don't believe in it.

> > and I don't believe in
> > political correctness, Brian. In everything I do, I am: superior to
> > some, inferior to others, on an even footing with others. When I'm
> > superior, I'm contentedly confident of my superiority.
> >
> > Maybe I she be more congnizant of the possibility that you'll get your
> > feelings hurt if I'm seen to superior to you in something. I wouldn't
> > want to hurt your self-esteem.
> >
> > Even Len has to be superior to me in at least one way....hmmmm...Oh, I
> > have it! Len is much more patient than I am. I would not have the
> > patience to wait for several decades to become a radio amateur after
> > becoming "interested".
>
> I became interested in radio communication in the late 60's. Money
> was an issue, and then there were competing interests. I became
> licensed 1987.

Money was an issue for me too. I didn't let that stop me. I earned
some of it. I cajoled my parents for some of it. The sum total spent
wasn't much at all, just a little over a hundred dollars. I had
competing interests too. I found a way to pursue all of those.

> I often wonder had I been exposed to the pettiness of
> some long time amateurs if I would have pursued it at all.

I never encountered too much in the way of petty radio amateurs. I've
found the vast majority pleasant and helpful. Did you have that chip on
your shoulder back when you made your decision or did it show up

afterward?

Dave K8MN

171. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 20:25:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E63BA8E.2FD1EE0B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62358

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E60FD1E.B02F8309@earthlink.net>...
>
> > When it comes to compliments from Lennie, I guess I have no choice but
> > to take them from whichever hand they're offered.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> You could also pretend to be gracious about it, without that smugness
> showing through.

I'll be gracious as soon as I sense sincerity. I'm settled in for the
wait.

Dave K8MN

172. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 20:30:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E63BBA3.99F87C10@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62359

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E60F7CB.3C6E17B6@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > I can't document any such thing with a post here.
> > >
> > > So you lied?
> >
> > No, Brian, I did not. We have your word on the matter and we have it
> > both ways---0-180-0-180-0-180-0. Is it starting to dawn on you why Ed
> > Hare departed the group?
>
> If you cannot document it, how did you arrive at "0-180-0-180-0-180-0?"

That'd be from your original statement that you left and your recent
statement that you never left.

> Which is it?

It's still both, Brian.

> Did you say I left, or did you say I never left?

The issue isn't what I said. It is what you said then and what you tell
us now.

> Did Ed leave because I said I was leaving, or did Ed leave because I dind't leave?

No, Ed left because he found your cutesty-stupid routine tedious.

> You've got a lot of 'splainin to do.

<long silence follows while Brian waits>

Dave K8MN

173. Re: A GREAT Programfor CW Newbies!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 22:57:43 UTC
From: kevinnot2449@yahoo.co.uk
Message-ID: <3e63dd6e.4864086@text.news.ntlworld.com>
Source record: 62360

On Mon, 3 Mar 2003 13:29:27 -0600, "Lloyd, N0VFP"
<brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com> wrote:

>Thanks for the heads up, i started using it myself, and I am 100% impressed!
>
>Lloyd, N0VFP
>
>
>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>news:nQJ8a.7591$oY6.2994@nwrdny03.gnilink.net...
>> This post is particularly aimed at any newbies (Myself, very much
>included.)
>> that might be reading the newsgroup. Here is the link to download G4FON's
>> 'Koch Method CW Trainer' as well as KB2TQX's 'KochRX.'
>>
>> http://www.qsl.net/g4fon/CW%20Trainer.htm
>>
Snip
>> --
>> 73 de Bert
>> WA2SI
>>
>>
You might also like to go to http:www.megspace.com\sports\morsenet1
and check out the website and info on a Morse development room on eQSO
every day at 08:00zulu and 20:00 zulu.

174. Re: Welcome to RRAP, Floyd..You Fit Right In

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 22:58:12 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303031458.54047a8a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62362

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030301192340.11169.00000052@mb-mr.aol.com>...
>
> There are other issues to address. But TRY and get any two people in this
> forum to address them more than three or four posts before it becomes yet again
> another code test flame fest.

Blowtorch YZ, err, I meant Steve, why do you think that?

175. Re: A GREAT Programfor CW Newbies!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 22:58:15 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b40mlf$qj5$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62361

You know what I did to improve my CW? I got on the air. Dang ... what a concept.

Dan/W4NTI

"Lloyd, N0VFP" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:3e63a964$1_4@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com...
> Thanks for the heads up, i started using it myself, and I am 100% impressed!
>
> Lloyd, N0VFP
>
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:nQJ8a.7591$oY6.2994@nwrdny03.gnilink.net...
> > This post is particularly aimed at any newbies (Myself, very much
> included.)
> > that might be reading the newsgroup. Here is the link to download G4FON's
> > 'Koch Method CW Trainer' as well as KB2TQX's 'KochRX.'
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/g4fon/CW%20Trainer.htm
> >
> > Lemme tell you, this makes learning and practicing CW really fun, almost
> > like a PC game. Download and install both into the same directory and then
> > start off with two characters. KochRX allows you to enter the sent Morse
> > character on your keyboard and at the end of the session (You can vary the
> > time and speed.) it'll compare actual sent vs. what you've typed and grade
> > it.
> >
> > My 5-yr. old daughter and I usually practice with me sending on a code
> > practice oscillator and her saying the character but now she competes
> > against herself trying to get the "high score." I just set the pgm to send
> > her E, T, A, N, I, & M (That's all she knows for now.) with an 'Actual
> > Character Speed' of 15-wpm and 'Effective Code Speed' of 5-wpm....and
> viola!
> > Use KochRX to run the G4FON software so it'll be just like a game. Give it
> a
> > shot, it's really quite fun. :-)
> >

> > --
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
> >
>
>
>
>
> ------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

176. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 23:02:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303031502.54dc09d3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62363

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b3viu765rt@enews4.newsguy.com>...
> Jeessh..... Looks like you better go out and bust those people with the
> following callsign (call area irrelavent in this case!)
>
> KC#UNT
>
> I know that either that callsign has been issued or is getting pretty damned
> close to becoming issued in the 8 callsign district!
>
> If you REALLY believe your statements about Kims callsign, then we better
> see ya go after the suffix of ASS, SEX, FUK, DIK, MUF, NUT, and probably
> others that you can think of..... and get these people busted or nagg them
> equally. Otherwise it is mere hypocrisy.
>
> Ryan

Welp, if it works out that I can't get W0EX, I'll try for something
close like N0DIK.

177. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-03 23:07:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303031507.37f68a05@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62364

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E6003CB.9CCF7689@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDF27.7032976D@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > Are you by chance attempting to ask a question (in which you attempt to
> > > put words in my mouth) and then supplying your own answer?
> > >
> > > I never did any of the things I've outlined above. I've certainly
> > > never:
> > >
> > > 1. announced here that I'd be doing something that I changed my mind
> > > and decided not to do.
> > >
> > > 2. announced here that I'd never do something then reversed myself.
> > >
> > > Nice try, Kim.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Dave, I certainly hope that you've changed your mind about working
> > Frenchmen on 6M out of band.
>
> I didn't have to change anything, Brian.

We're speaking of your future course of action.

Do you intend to work other "amateurs" that you know are out of band?

178. Re: Welcome to RRAP, Floyd..You Fit Right In

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 00:25:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303192508.23360.00000681@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62365

>Subject: Re: Welcome to RRAP, Floyd..You Fit Right In
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/3/03 4:58 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303031458.54047a8a@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
>news:<20030301192340.11169.00000052@mb-mr.aol.com>...
>>
>> There are other issues to address. But TRY and get any two people in
>this
>> forum to address them more than three or four posts before it becomes yet
>again
>> another code test flame fest.
>
>Blowtorch YZ, err, I meant Steve, why do you think that?

Uhhhhhhh.......five years of PRACTICAL experience.

You know, Brian, actually getting out there and DOING something...

Steve, K4YZ
Steven J Robeson, LPN

179. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 00:26:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303192659.23360.00000682@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62366

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/3/03 12:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303031002.277fd71

>Its also possible that you would not have the capacity to understand.

It's possible, but in this case not probable.

>I'm reminded of the Far-Side cartoon where the boy is at the door of
>the "School For The Gifted." He's pushing, and the sign on the door
>says, "Pull."

You should. How long did you push on that door?

>I've got you nailed.

Not today.

Steven J Robeson, LPN

180. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 00:50:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303195006.19927.00000934@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62376

In article <e79dbd9b.0303030848.405f1925@posting.google.com>, k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB) cut-and-pasted an often-used pair of bells:

>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
>> Dale Reich, K8AD, of Seville Ohio, has petitioned the FCC to require
>> sellers of two-way voice or data equipment to keep on file a buyer's
>> name, address, telephone number and any future information.
>> This, when selling a radio that
>> required licensing under the current FCC rules.
>> The sale of Ham radios to non-licensed persons is not illegal.
>> Perhaps this line of thinking should be addressed but until it is you can
>> look forward to unending "pirate" operations on the Ham bands.
>
>Every so often some control-freak dufus comes up with the mistaken
>idea of placing restrictions on the wide availability of
>amateur radio equipment and supplies. These are the folks who
>suggest it be a crime to own amateur equipment without a
>license, and who are not thrilled about the fact that
>Radio Shack sells a line of UHF/VHF amateur equipment right out
>under the nose of the impressionable public. I suspect they
>don't like the idea that soldering guns and schematics are
>openly sold to those without the proper credentials also.

"Papers! Show your papers. That is an order!" said the
SS (Solder Slinger) man. :-)

>While it is easy, on the surface, to agree with their
>goal (keeping amateur equipment out of the hands of
>bootleggers), I feel the attitude that amateur equipment
>should be treated as some sort of controlled substance is
>short-sighted and in fact damaging to our service.

For years the filthy, evil, unlicensed (hack, ptui) CB
radios have been sold at Sears, the late Montgomery
Ward, Lowe's, K-Mart, Target, Kragen Auto Parts, as
well as Radio Shack retail outlets.

>I live in a large metropolitan area. We have one full
>line amateur store in town. There are no other similar stores
>in the whole state. In the four states which border us, there
>are 2 more amateur radio stores. THAT'S IT! In 5 states, there
>are only 3 stores! In the whole country, my guess is that there
>are less than four dozen stores selling amateur radio equipment,
>antennas, and supplies! It is as though we were some secret
>society, bent on concealing our presence from the world.

I think the Greater Los Angeles area qualifies as a "large metropolitan area." My wife and I went to a Ralphs market on Victory Boulevard in Burbank this morning (3.7 mile trip) and an HRO store was right across Buena Vista from that food market. I didn't go there but I know that they have a new double-front-width location in that same mini-mall with much more space inside and better fixtures, etc. HRO sells a lot of different radio equipment now compared to 25 years ago. I can find at least five other stores displaying amateur radio equipment for sale in just the San Fernando Valley area of L.A. (population about 1.5 million).

>Not all that many years ago, there were at least 6
>electronic stores here in town which sold amateur equipment
>(not exclusively, but they all had a good selection). Add to
>that two Heathkit stores, and even the Sears stores sold amateur
>transceivers for awhile. (Yes, Virginia, right there along with
>the Craftsman sockets and Silvertone TV sets.) In the same era,
>Radio Row in NYC was blocks of wall-to-wall storefronts catering
>to electronics experimenters. Popular Science magazine had a
>regular column about amateur radio, and occasional construction
>articles. Every second little town had an amateur radio club.
>Amateur Radio was a populist, Joe SixPack kind of hobby.

It was? :-) I got a subscription to Popular Science while in Junior High ("middle school" now) and it did NOT have any "regular column about amateur radio" 1946 to 1949. That must have been later? They did have some neat regenerative receiver and audio construction articles and a "wireless broadcaster." John Wood Campbell, editor of (then) Astounding Science Fiction magazine, had a two-part article on a wideband oscilloscope one could build. Campbell was an EE.

I grew up in northern Illinois, far from NYC's "radio row" and the sole "electronics store" in Rockford was H&H Electronics partnered by a couple of radio amateurs that started up about 1947 (Gene Hubbell, SK, ex-W9ERU, W7DI later, one H&H partner). Rockford had about 85,000 population then. No "coffee pot in the back (or front) at H&H." No "Elmers (in or out of elmer suits)" hanging around to help middle-schoolers. Emphasis in "radio" then was FM broadcasting, "Hi-Fi" music systems with magnetic tape recording (new at that time), and broadcast television received via elaborate antennas in the fringe area of Chicago TV reception 90 miles from there.

I recall only one "ham club" in the home town but there were no "Elmers," rather some OFs and WW2 veterans who had a like of strong drink..."beer can vertical" parties were a big "six-pack" adult thing that never resulted in stable or viable antennas. My "Elmers" were non-amateurs, instructors in middle school, later in high school, who were not confined to

amateurism.

>During those years it was easy for a person to get
>interested in being an amateur, to shop around for the best
>deal on equipment, and to meet an Elmer. We were visible to
>the public, and well regarded.

That seems to have been a geographic localized thing.
In the late 1940s "small towns" of 80K population had firm,
fair-trade prices on ready-built equipment or one ordered
out of the Allied or Newark catalogs.

>Then somewhere along the line came the magic of 1-800
>shopping, amateur radio marketing became streamlined, and
>radio stores disappeared from Hometown America. With the demise
>of the local radio store, all the Elmers disappeared into their
>shacks and newcomers flounder around in fancy four-color ads in
>back of CQ and QST magazine, trying to decide how to be a ham.
>Clubs floundered, in part due to the loss of hams around the
>coffee pot in the back of the local electronics part store.

The only "coffee pot" in a ham store I've encountered is the
local HRO...a Mr. Coffee appliance apparently made during
store opening time and never cleaned/refreshed afterwards.
"Across the hill" to the south in L.A., Jun's or Henry Radio
never had such, nor did Electronic City in Burbank. Retail
stores seem (oddly?) bent on SELLING, not acting as
"Elmers" or club surrogates.

Of course, I'm a relative newcomer, you understand, moving to
L.A. area in 1956 and owning this present house for 40 years.
I've been to NYC's fabled "radio row" in 1952 and found it not
quite as spectacular as legend would have it. :-)

However, all the cynicsm of the "lack of ham stores" has over-
looked something. Several somethings, in fact. Broadcast TV
happened in the late 1940s with much experimentation there
for the electronics hobbyist. "Hi-Fi" music systems was another
non-ham area wide open for personal experimentation, a benefit
being all sorts of music available in the home, reproduced as
faithfully as 1940s and 1950s technology allowed. The spread of
FM and color TV broadcasting opened more vistas for the
electronics hobbyist to tinker and enjoy. When Class D CB
was allocated in 1958 there was an initial surge in building CB
transceivers even though somewhat illegal but a wide acceptance
of short-range two-way radios for mobile population soon made
many different CB transceivers available on the consumer market.

The advent of the solid-state ear brought a flood of new venues
for the electronics experimenter...all sorts of home convenience
electronics, model aircraft radio control, "carrier current" quasi-
radios for intercoms, stereo music systems, novelties such as

light flashers, even closed-circuit TV one could put together for home or workplace. Once the microprocessor IC became a market item, the personal computer craze started in the mid-1970s and shows no sign of stopping today. Consumer electronics stores and chains appeared 30 years ago and continue today with a veritable treasure-trove of "adult toys" for enjoyment of life. Less than two miles from my house is Fry's Electronics, a huge super-market of consumer electronics from PCs and Macs to TVs and music systems, all kinds of telephones and their peripherals, and radios. Radios that include SWL receivers (many grades), FRS handhelds, CBs, cell phones, scanners (desktop and handheld), AM/FM music receivers, GPS handhelds, and RF signal generators (Fry's has a couple lines of test equipment). They sell electronics parts over the counter but such are oriented to today's market of non-ham electronics...an area of personal experimentation and hobby activity that is larger and wider than any amateur radio activity ever was (proved by market money values and number of parts, kind of parts).

>Rather than continuing to restrict the availability of
>amateur equipment, as though we were selling assault weapons
>or recreational pharmaceuticals, I vote for opening up the market.
>Let's have radios for sale in the strip malls alongside the video
>games, Lionel trains, and mountain bikes. And it won't hurt if a
>few of us put on our Elmer-suits and lurk around to spot the
>likely recruits.

It will hurt much more to recognize that the electronics world has CHANGED...and folks of 30-something and under aren't impressed by less-than-tolerant old-timers who think that only amateur radio is "real radio," much less "real electronics." This isn't 1903 of spark and coherers or even 1933 with electronics design anchored by the vacuum tube.

When seniors to teenagers have color TV of many channels, computers with Internet availability (one in five USA house-holds have some Internet access), digital cameras (both still and motion picture), FAX terminals at drug stores, "walkmen" for AM/FM/CD private listening, pairs of FRS handhelds for less than $50, CB sets at K-Mart for less than $100, auto boom-rooms, boom-boxes for their rooms, wireless door chimes, wireless control of home lights and appliances, kits for do-it-yourself CCTV, all kinds of telephone appliances, and that ever-growing growth on pedestrian ears called a cellphone, they aren't all that impressed by "working DX with CW on HF."

Seniors to teenagers KNOW that radio exists, that it works not by magic but by simple controls. They've grown up with it, seen it used by public safety, utility, business people, have watched nearly-instantenous international TV news for decades, have used direct-dial telephones to communicate far away with

perfect clarity.

That hoary old paradigm from the 1930s of "working DX with CW on HF" is out of date, obsolete. There's absolutely no need of any amateur "National Traffic System" to cheat on Western Union's telegram charges when they can get on-line with the Internet and Instant Message someone or send e-mail.

Re-enactment of historical events, complete with costuming and other artifacts of that history time are popular with a few folks. Maybe the attraction could be there, of reliving the past, when radio was just beeping and very simple. Maybe the attraction could be (gasp) "having one's very own radio station!" Plonk down the charge card and walk out with "one's very own radio station," follow instructions packed within the boxes, and install it. Voila, the plonker is now an automatic radio expert, able to talk two ways without wires! Amazing. No one else in the neighborhood has that! Except maybe the folks next door with the little cell phone or cordless phone or all the neighbors with CBs in their cars (as well as cell phones and GPS locators and back-seat color TVs taking DVDs, perhaps a digital music broadcast receiver from a satellite).

Pardon me for messing up your corn flakes but isn't much of all this ham operating just the same thing as CB with a license? With higher power, of course, and a pretty certificate on the wall to proclaim a federally-certified radio merit badge holder who passed a virtual PhD-level test to get it...not to mention the state-of-the-art ready-built equipment whistling and ringing its bells in a "shack."

Well, there's the pioneering aspect. There's a meeting held on this new band near 5 MHz to assess results of recent testing there. Important to the rest of the radio world? The rest of the radio world was using that new spectrum spot back before WW2. Another item in this weeks ham radio news is the one-way LF record on 136 KHz...using a 60-second dot time on OOK CW. Real morse proficiency required there, yessir!

There be no new paradigms there, senior.

181. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 00:50:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303195007.19927.00000935@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62377

In article <y2N8a.7928$oY6.78@nwrdny03.gnilink.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:f45722ac.0303030938.966d866@posting.google.com...
>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>news:<Ymx8a.656744$HG.123127573@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
>> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20030302152900.04150.00000150@mb-bk.aol.com...
>> > > More modern folks are just not impressed by "proficiency
>> > > in morse code as the primus inter pares of amateur radio.
>> >
>> > Do you really believe that a 5-wpm exam constitutes "primus inter pares?
>I
>> > sure don't.
>>
>> I think that many who have taken the code test would agree with you.
>> But not all. I am one that disagrees. The code exam is probably the
>> single biggest factor that keeps people moving on when they show an
>> interest in amateur radio.
>
>Then it's just about the numbers? If a person is interested enough, I assert
>that he/she'll either begin with the Tech ticket and advance as their
>interest grows.
>
>> And todays Technician license isn't much of a draw.
>
>50 MHz and up...at up to 1500 watts?!

That part of the spectrum is ALSO allocated to Extras and
Generals, plus the old Advanced class licensee, same
power limit.

>> I suppose they could become CBers instead
>
>vs. 40 ch. occupying 440 kHz of spectrum...
>
>, learning how to cuss and
>> jam, and wire up a toilet flushing sound module to their microphone.
>
>I'm a CBer too, Brian...and I don't cuss OTA or use any of those silly noise
>toys. What are you implying?

Calm yourself. You know very well what is CW (Conventional
Wisdom) and PC (Politically Correct) to so many long-time

amateur licensees. They regard Citizens Band Radio Service
users as equivalent to swine, uncouth non-humans unfit to
inhabit the "amateur" 11 meter band (that disappeared in 1958).

>> Then when they finally decide to overcome the code obstacle, they've
>> already become molded into the kind of radio operator that we probably
>> don't want.
>
>Do we really want to go there?

That "there" has already been "gone to." You know very well
the "CW and PC" mindset of some long-timers. Acknowledge
what was publicly overt in here and move on.

>> I'd rather get them fresh.
>
>I'd rather get 'em interested.

Then attend devotions at the Church of St. Hiram and Spread
the Word. Emphasize getting newbies while teeners and
ignore the tens of thousands of today's radio professionals
above 18 and not yet licensed as amateurs.

Professionals don't have the mindset of the devoted Believer
in olde tyme hum radio, are not devoted to the Teachings of
Morse, and know what the rest of the radio world is about.
Some professionals have the temerity to express dissent
about olde tyme hum radio and are not beloved of beeping.
Can you "interest" them by constant denigration that they
are "inferior" or will not show proper CW/PC obediance to
The Correct Way in hamdom?

182. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 00:50:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303195008.19927.00000936@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62375

In article <20030303122758.23139.00000917@mb-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Sorry if I wasn't clear, Dwight. We seem to be saying the same thing different
>ways. I agree that there are significant numbers of dropouts.
>
>The main point is that the growth in Technicians is due to three factors - new
>Techs, upgrades from Novice, and renewal of Tech Pluses as Techs.
>Counteracting this are dropouts and upgrades.

Prior to FCC 99-412 (the R&O establishing Part 97 restructuring, issued in December of 1999), the growth in US amateur radio licensees was primarily from the no-code-test Technician class. That growth was over a 9-year period.

The facts and figures were shown to you over three years ago and you then refused to acknowledge either the facts or figures as having anything to do with any code testing...yet the lack of necessary code test was so obvious that anyone trying to discount it was not arguing logically.

The persistent hue and cry from the PCTA regulars in here had a rationalization summarized by "just wait until renewal time (for those Techs) and you will see their numbers drop!" The first renewal period started and there was little drop-off of the continually-increasing Technician class numbers.

When Joe Speroni revised his website statistical tally to lump no-code-test Technicians with the old Technician Plusses, you went right along with that rationalization and discounting of the code test as having any influence...and refused to separate Technicians from Technician Plusses even though the FCC database clearly delineates between all classes. Note: Speroni is an obvious PCTA as indicated on his website.

As of time-now, you still insist on discounting any code test factor as influencing growth of the Technician class, "explaining" it as "Tech Plusses are renewed as Techs (if code test not taken)" or that no-code-test Technicians "upgraded." None of which explains the 9-year explosive (relative) growth of no-code-test Technician class numbers...which more than made up for the decrease in totals of US amateur licenses from the old other five license classes.

So far, on the basis of hundreds of past postings up to the time of this one, you've not shown any interpretive analyses which

are objective. They are all quite biased in favor of the code
test retention whether that is expressed overtly or implied.
The "interpretations" you make are subjective.

183. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 00:50:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303195010.19927.00000937@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62374

In article <Ymx8a.656744$HG.123127573@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030302152900.04150.00000150@mb-bk.aol.com...
>> More modern folks are just not impressed by "proficiency
>> in morse code as the primus inter pares of amateur radio.
>
>Do you really believe that a 5-wpm exam constitutes "primus inter pares?" I
>sure don't.

"Proficiency" in morse code has been defined by long-time
amateurs as what They tested to...namely greater than
20 WPM rate.

"First among equals" (literal translatin of Latin phrase) refers
to all the long-timer amateurs who keep telling everyone that
they are "first" when not telling everyone they are "superior."

>The no-code Tech ticket is available to anyone who wishes to
>become a licensed ARO without the "hassle" of the code, hence...no "barrier"
>to AR.

Of course, and all the no-code-test Technicians must ride in
the back of the privilege bus, not drink from the HF fountain,
and be the subject of ridicule shoveled on them by long-time
amateurs due to their "inferiority."

>> This browns off the PCTAs no end since they desperately
>> need to regain their self-imposed titles of "King of the Hill"
>> in the OLD class structure of US ham radio.
>
>What's a PCTA?

Pro-Code Test Advocate. The opposite of an NCTA or No Code
Test Advocate.

Those two acronyms have been in use for at least four years in
here. You are just now asking what it means?!?!?

184. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 00:50:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303195011.19927.00000938@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62368

In article <3E6238F6.50E7A979@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

185. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 00:50:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303195011.19927.00000939@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62370

In article <3E62D98E.9DDE1670@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

186. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 00:50:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303195012.19927.00000942@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62367

In article <3E62D98E.9DDE1670@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

187. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 00:50:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303195012.19927.00000941@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62369

In article <3E62D98E.9DDE1670@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

188. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 00:50:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303195012.19927.00000940@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62372

In article <3E62D98E.9DDE1670@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>

189. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 00:50:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303195013.19927.00000943@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62371

In article <3E62DC1A.2E4CF2B1@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

190. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 00:50:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303195014.19927.00000944@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62373

In article <f45722ac.0303031002.277fd71@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> >Welp, Steve, I don't have to dance to that fiddle you're playing, and
>> >I choose not to.
>>
>> Brian-to-English translation: I made a statement that I cannot or
>will
>> not explain because even I do not understand what I said.
>
>Its also possible that you would not have the capacity to understand.
>
>> >Unable to think on your own and do a little deductive reasoning,
>> >you'll just have to consider it one of life's unsolved mysteries
>>
>> Brain-to-English translation: I am too cowardly to explain what I
>said
>> because after reading what I wrote I realize an answer might make me look
>even
>> MORE foolish.
>
>I'm reminded of the Far-Side cartoon where the boy is at the door of
>the "School For The Gifted." He's pushing, and the sign on the door
>says, "Pull."
>
>> >Best of luck to you, though.
>>
>> No luck needed, Brain. Got you figured out pretty good, I think.
>
>I've got you nailed.

I wish he would cross his feet...we are running low on nails...

191. Re: A GREAT Programfor CW Newbies!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 03:04:00 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303220400.23511.00000252@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 62378

From: "Bert Craig" wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM:
>My 5-yr. old daughter and I usually practice with me sending on a code
>practice oscillator and her saying the character but now she competes
>against herself trying to get the "high score." I just set the pgm to send
>her E, T, A, N, I, & M (That's all she knows for now.)

This means she can spell "M E A N T I M E"!

From Dan/W4NTI:
>You know what I did to improve my CW? I got on the air. Dang ... what a
>concept.

Practice something and you will get better at it. Thats clever?

192. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 03:09:38 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <SNU8a.1309$wJ1.147824@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 62379

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

: There be no new paradigms there, senior.

Go take a stroll over to http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

193. Re: A GREAT Programfor CW Newbies!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 03:11:42 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303221142.23511.00000253@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 62380

>
>From: "Bert Craig" wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM:
>>My 5-yr. old daughter and I usually practice with me sending on a code
>>practice oscillator and her saying the character but now she competes
>>against herself trying to get the "high score." I just set the pgm to send
>>her E, T, A, N, I, & M (That's all she knows for now.)
>
>This means she can spell "M E A N T I M E"!

Also, the word "A N I M A T E".

194. Re: NAMBLA Member Douglas W. Adair N8WWM sings us a song!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 03:52:53 UTC
From: Fatty Arbuckle <no@example.com>
Message-ID: <cc91132c66bb1a0dcb3945fff8ce6917@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 62382
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap,alt.flame,alt.usenet.kooks

Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net> wrote:

> Why twisty, resorting to changing your nic now? No one else would defend
> you to that level.....

Dave, are you really that stupid, or are you just trying to help Douglas W. Adair N8WWM live down his own violations on the Rain Report so he can get back to crying about CB rule violations, posting gay porn binaries, pedophile fantasies, running BI>20 spew attacks on rec.radio.cb and forging Twistedhed to all groups in the rec.radio hierarchy with fellow net-abuser and outcast Leland C. Scott KC8LDO?

In any case, instead of defending Twistedhed, I merely pointed out that Douglas W. Adair N8WWM appears to enjoy writing original pieces featuring children, specifically boys, and gay sex. It's not like this is the first or even the second time Adair N8WWM has written original pedophilia songs.

Why are you, Dave Hall, so eager to defend Douglas W. Adair N8WWM from having his pedophile fantasies exposed and disseminated? Are you sympathetic to pedophile fantasy writers, assuming N8WWM hasn't -yet- raped children? Are you frightened that Adair will call you a "traitor to amateur radio", as he did the late Richard McCollum N BK, if you don't support his insane, abusive behavior? Does Twistedhed drive you crazy enough to support Doug Adair N8WWM who regularly uses the kind of "gutter language" you've spoken so vehemently against, Dave?

Your hypocrisy is positively shocking, Dave Hall N3CVJ.

The most likely explanation for your brainless follow-up is that you're just one anti-twistedhed k00k defending another. Appropriate groups added. When malicious clowns like you are involved, Dave N3CVJ, it's hard to tell, but I'm willing to explore it at length with you.

Regarding your baseless assertion that I am "twisty" under another "nic", one needs only to be able to read to realize that his posting style and mine are quite different. You obviously consider yourself quite intelligent, regardless of the fact that you're actually a blinkered, intellectually myopic hypocrite. Can't you at least read well enough to see the difference, Dave?

I've restored the post in question below my comments. Read it closely and decide whether your bitterness over being clobbered in debate after debate is worth defending a federal outlaw, homosexual stalker, racist and pedophile fantasy writer like Douglas W. Adair N8WWM just because he, too, is obsessed with "twisty".

Here are a few quotes from the ignorant, hypocritical racist pedophile fellow no-code ham radio hobbyist you're backing, Dave:

"Live like a nigger, die like a nigger."
<8f86ecaf.0111291029.6f6e6106@posting.google.com>

"I was sucking when I was 10..."
<20020307120558.91433.qmail@web20409.mail.yahoo.com>

"WHAT MATTERS IS YOU ARE A FAGGOT ASS COCK
SUCKER WITH A FUCKING UGLY ASS KID. YOU PROBABLY BUTT HUMP YOUR OWN
KID."
<3f8d1439.0206110732.34a362d4@posting.google.com>

"After
dark my FUGGLY kid made gas money for us by blowing 2 drivers in the
TA parking lot. He came back and kissed me passionately so I could
taste what he got to swallow. Yum Yum!
<7684f123.0212070023.34227f00@posting.google.com>

"Cuz, you see, my dad used to take me for rides on his bone
But I guess that's all over now since my daddy's gone."
<cf47b7c7.0111101134.78f41d44@posting.google.com>

"Your time to be reckoned with by the government is coming. Make no
mistake, you will be in for a shock cuz ya dont believe it. You are a
criminal and a traitor to amateur radio."
<e5604a02.0108081330.4e86961b@posting.google.com>

BEGIN RESTORE of <bb7b6da633242f03075b1ea99f3710b8@news.teranews.com>

>We OWN FAGGOT TWISTY <weowntwistyfag@yahoo.com>, who is really Douglas W.
>Adair N8WWM, a federal criminal from Toledo Ohio, was featured in the Rain
>Report recently for violating Federal Communications Law. This would
normally
>be just another example of an unpleasant, obese social retard with a ham
>license, but Douglas W. Adair N8WWM had, for a number of years prior to his
>violations, harassed and forged others, complained about eBay auctions and
>abused usenet regularly to combat FCC rule violations as an "antikeyclown".
>
>Details and audio at http://www.geocities.com/chiprshredr
>
>Thus, Douglas W. Adair is a ridiculous hypocrite (with the tiniest,
daintiest
>little hands ever seen on a grown man). Fortunately, he doesn't have the
good
>sense to lay low and continues to post his uniquely imbecilic rants, somehow
>hoping his hypocrisy will be forgotten. This presents a great opportunity
for
>those of us who enjoy verbally clubbing Douglas W. Adair N8WWM like a
>helpless, fag-laming baby seal.
>

>With that in mind, here is evidence that not only is Douglas W. Adair N8WWM
a
>federal criminal (see link above), but that he is also a homosexual and a
>pedophile due to his writing of a long and creepy song (deleted for brevity)
>featuring the following references to gay sex and children, specifically
>young boys :
>
>suck
>gay sex
>drop his pants
>pooper reamed out
>Sucking cock
>
>BOYS<--------------
>
>dick glop
>fag
>suck
>gay
>faggot
>dick
>jizz
>
>BOYS<--------------
>
>sucks
>sucks
>gay sex
>anal hole
>jizz
>suck
>dick
>lick
>goo
>fag
>gay
>
>BOY<---------------
>
>suck
>gay
>faggot
>dick
>jizz
>
>BOYS<--------------
>
>sucks
>fag
>sucks

>cock
>sucked
>fag
>fag
>dicks
>ass
>gay
>faggot
>dick
>jizz
>
>BOYS<---------------
>
>cock
>dick
>boner
>ass
>jizz
>gay
>faggot
>dick
>jizz
>
>BOYS<---------------
>
>fags
>dick
>jizz
>fag
>faggot
>gay
>faggot
>dick
>jizz
>
>BOYS<---------------
>
>Gay
>gay
>queer
>
>CHILDREN<-----------
>
>sucked
>gay
>faggot
>dick
>jizz
>
>BOYS<---------------

END RESTORE

--

"Google owns usenet dumbass"

-Douglas W. Adair N8WWM posting as "Twithed's Master" in
8f86ecaf.0111080538.296d13f6@posting.google.com>

195. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 03:53:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E642334.2070006@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62381

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <3E62D98E.9DDE1670@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:

Several times in fact! 8^)

>
>
>>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>>
>>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Heh, heh, good one, Leonard! When I saw the first post I thought maybe
you pushed the send button too soon, but after the fifth one I was
howling. Touche'!

- Mike KB3EIA -

196. Re: A GREAT Programfor CW Newbies!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 03:57:11 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E642420.3000901@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62383

Vshah101 wrote:

>>From: "Bert Craig" wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM:
>>
>>>My 5-yr. old daughter and I usually practice with me sending on a code
>>>practice oscillator and her saying the character but now she competes
>>>against herself trying to get the "high score." I just set the pgm to send
>>>her E, T, A, N, I, & M (That's all she knows for now.)
>>>
>>This means she can spell "M E A N T I M E"!
>>
>
> Also, the word "A N I M A T E".
>

and don't forget I AM MEAN.

- Mike KB3EIA -

197. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 03:57:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA898E5A.11E58%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62384

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> (snip) We seem to be saying the same thing different
> ways. I agree that there are significant numbers
> of dropouts. (snip)

We are saying the same thing, Jim. The whole point of my message was to draw attention to the number of dropouts (especially the Tech and Tech Plus license holders).

> The main point is that the growth in Technicians is due
> to three factors - (snip)

But I didn't say anything about the growth in Technicians. My only mention of Techs was the fact that some must have upgraded, suggesting even greater losses for the Novice and Tech Plus in my "oversimplified" model. ;)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

198. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 04:27:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030303232723.09900.00001939@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 62385

In article <b3viu765rt@enews4.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>Jeessh..... Looks like you better go out and bust those people with the
>following callsign (call area irrelavent in this case!)
>
>KC#UNT
>
>I know that either that callsign has been issued or is getting pretty damned
>close to becoming issued in the 8 callsign district!
>
>If you REALLY believe your statements about Kims callsign, then we better
>see ya go after the suffix of ASS, SEX, FUK, DIK, MUF, NUT, and probably
>others that you can think of..... and get these people busted or nagg them
>equally. Otherwise it is mere hypocrisy.
>
>Ryan

Ryan:

Any radio amateur who selected a Vanity call sign with one of the
aforementioned suffixes, with the intention of provoking purient interest,
and then flaunting same in this newsgroup, would, indeed, be treated
as Kim's "equal."

73 de Larry, K3LT

199. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 04:37:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E642DF9.752B88E9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62386

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6003CB.9CCF7689@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDF27.7032976D@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > Are you by chance attempting to ask a question (in which you attempt to
> > > > put words in my mouth) and then supplying your own answer?
> > > >
> > > > I never did any of the things I've outlined above. I've certainly
> > > > never:
> > > >
> > > > 1. announced here that I'd be doing something that I changed my mind
> > > > and decided not to do.
> > > >
> > > > 2. announced here that I'd never do something then reversed myself.
> > > >
> > > > Nice try, Kim.

> > > Dave, I certainly hope that you've changed your mind about working
> > > Frenchmen on 6M out of band.
> >
> > I didn't have to change anything, Brian.
>
> We're speaking of your future course of action.
>
> Do you intend to work other "amateurs" that you know are out of band?

I fully intend to operate where the FCC permits me to operate just as
I've always done and as I have done overseas under the jurisdiction of
foreign governments. I fully intend not to use a lookup table for each
DX QSO or to check the FCC database for domestic QSOs.

Other amateur stations need to worry about their own operations as they
are responsible to their regulatory agencies.

I believe you'll find that my view is essentially the same as it was
before.

Dave K8MN

200. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 04:39:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030303233916.09289.00002543@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 62387

In article <3E642334.2070006@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

> Heh, heh, good one, Leonard! When I saw the first post I thought maybe
>you pushed the send button too soon, but after the fifth one I was
>howling. Touche'!

...I'm just trying to help out... :-)

201. Re: A GREAT Programfor CW Newbies!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 04:50:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E64213A.DA51E10A@att.net>
Source record: 62388

Thankx Bert, I'll use and enjoy that right along with you.

Dick

Bert Craig wrote:

> This post is particularly aimed at any newbies (Myself, very much included.)
> that might be reading the newsgroup. Here is the link to download G4FON's
> 'Koch Method CW Trainer' as well as KB2TQX's 'KochRX.'
>
> http://www.qsl.net/g4fon/CW%20Trainer.htm
>
> Lemme tell you, this makes learning and practicing CW really fun, almost
> like a PC game. Download and install both into the same directory and then
> start off with two characters. KochRX allows you to enter the sent Morse
> character on your keyboard and at the end of the session (You can vary the
> time and speed.) it'll compare actual sent vs. what you've typed and grade
> it.
>
> My 5-yr. old daughter and I usually practice with me sending on a code
> practice oscillator and her saying the character but now she competes
> against herself trying to get the "high score." I just set the pgm to send
> her E, T, A, N, I, & M (That's all she knows for now.) with an 'Actual
> Character Speed' of 15-wpm and 'Effective Code Speed' of 5-wpm....and viola!
> Use KochRX to run the G4FON software so it'll be just like a game. Give it a
> shot, it's really quite fun. :-)
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

202. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 04:50:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6423B8.5DA1FF8C@att.net>
Source record: 62389

>
>
> Steve - ever think the whole point of his postings might be to "brown you off"?
>

Why, I thought we all knew that Lame Lennie aka AVeryFineSpeciMan is here for the express purpose of
"browning off" ham radio and everyone remotely involved in it. Ccept his little butty Brain "Mogodishu Slim"
BurkeTurkey. He's already embarassingly red (and brown) enough.

203. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 04:50:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6426FA.7D7FAA63@att.net>
Source record: 62390

Brian wrote:

>
> I became interested in radio communication in the late 60's. Money
> was an issue, and then there were competing interests. I became
> licensed 1987. I often wonder had I been exposed to the pettiness of
> some long time amateurs if I would have pursued it at all.

With your attitude toward ham radio it's tempting to say, damn shame you weren't. No one posting here is more petty than you.

204. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 04:50:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E642A42.F4854A9C@att.net>
Source record: 62391

Brian wrote:

> Welp, if it works out that I can't get W0EX, I'll try for something
> close like N0DIK.

I'm certain you'd wear that one very comfortably since it fits you to a
T!

205. Re: Hey twithed...where's that page again??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 05:11:34 UTC
From: Fatty Arbuckle <no@example.com>
Message-ID: <44c50ef61060cf20fe5faaa2e7fd7c51@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 62392
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.swap,alt.usenet.kooks,alt.flame

Sissy twithed's Owner <akcpagebusters@yahoo.com> was all:

> I think it sustained an injury....it was fatal too...yup...that
> sukka's flatlined...hehehe...the geocities mortuary will handle the
> arrangements.

Aww.. You didn't like my page, racist pedophile Douglas W. Adair N8WWM?

I'll just have to add some of your exemplary quotes to the new page, Doug.

http://members.odinsrage.com/chiprshredr/

> AKC RULES THE NG!!!

Suuuuuuure you do, you diseased, disgusting racist pedo-fantasy writer.

--
"Google owns usenet dumbass"
-Douglas W. Adair N8WWM in 8f86ecaf.0111080538.296d13f6@posting.google.com>

"Live like a nigger, die like a nigger."
<8f86ecaf.0111291029.6f6e6106@posting.google.com>

"I was sucking when I was 10..."
<20020307120558.91433.qmail@web20409.mail.yahoo.com>

"WHAT MATTERS IS YOU ARE A FAGGOT ASS COCK
SUCKER WITH A FUCKING UGLY ASS KID. YOU PROBABLY BUTT HUMP YOUR OWN
KID."
<3f8d1439.0206110732.34a362d4@posting.google.com>

"After
dark my FUGGLY kid made gas money for us by blowing 2 drivers in the
TA parking lot. He came back and kissed me passionately so I could
taste what he got to swallow. Yum Yum!
<7684f123.0212070023.34227f00@posting.google.com>

"Cuz, you see, my dad used to take me for rides on his bone
But I guess that's all over now since my daddy's gone."
<cf47b7c7.0111101134.78f41d44@posting.google.com>

"Your time to be reckoned with by the government is coming. Make no
mistake, you will be in for a shock cuz ya dont believe it. You are a
criminal and a traitor to amateur radio."
<e5604a02.0108081330.4e86961b@posting.google.com>

206. Re: Hey twithed...where's that page again??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 05:45:15 UTC
From: Scott <scott@scotti.sh!t>
Message-ID: <7gOdnQhd1OoDoPmjXTWc3g@comcast.com>
Source record: 62393
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Fatty Arbuckle wrote:
>
>
> http://members.odinsrage.com/chiprshredr/

I just compared the fat shape in the picture to the "Vagina Face"
picture in the page I have archived. It is the same body!

If I looked like that, I'd never put my face on a public web page!!!

LOL!

207. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 09:28:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304042812.27873.00000919@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 62395

In article <030320031257500132%K3UD@charter.net>, K3UD <K3UD@charter.net>
writes:

>In article <20030303042805.27873.00000902@mb-mj.aol.com>, N2EY
><n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
>> For a historical context, here are some numbers on the growth of US amateur
>> radio in the past 30 years or so. All numbers are rounded off but are
>accurate
>> to within 2%. Sources are various Callbooks and US census data.:
>>
>> US Hams:
>>
>> 1970: 270,000
>> 1980: 350,000
>> 1990: 514,000
>> 2000: 680,000
>>
>> Growth Rate:
>>
>> 1970 to 1980: 29.6% (120,000 net growth)
>> 1980 to 1990: 46.8% (164,000 net growth)
>> 1990 to 2000: 32.2% (166,000 net growth)
>
>If the growth rate continues at the 2000 to February 2003 rates we
>could be projecting about 720,800 hams by 2010 or about 40,800 net
>growth (6%) Quite a difference from the last three decades.
>
Indeed. As the code test requirements are eased, the growth goes down. Of
course correlation is not causation.

73 de Jim, N2EY

208. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 09:28:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 62394

In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>
>> >Someone who can send and receive morse at five words per minute is on
>> >the low end of mediocrity.
>>
>> I disagree!
>>
>> Someone who can send and receive morse at no more than five words per
>> minute
>> has some basic Morse code skills. Such a person is not proficient - yet.
>
>Even if sending and receiving are 100% accurate, and the desired
>message gets through, you would classify the operator as less than
>proficient?

If 5 wpm is the maximum Morse speed a person can do, regardless of
circumstances, I would not call that person "proficient".

Was that not clear from what I wrote?

It's not a put-down to describe such skills as entry-level.

The Morse test only requires either one solid minute out of five or correct
answers to seven of ten fill-in-the-blank questions. Nowhere near perfect copy
is required to pass.
>
>> And the sending test disappeared in the USA about 20 years ago.
>
>For all Morse exams regardless of speed, not just the 5wpm exam.

Was that not clear from what I wrote?
>
>> The stated goal was elimination of the Morse proficiency test. That's been
>> accomplished in the USA, because the remaining test is a basic skill test,
>> not a proficiency test.
>
>Really?

Yes, really.

>Is that in Part 97? All of Title 34?

You tell me where the term "Morse proficiency" appears in those documents.
>
>The rules don't even define what Morse Code is, let alone what are
>basic skills or proficiency.

Because such definitions are so self-evident as to be unnecessary.

73 de Jim, N2EY

209. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 10:27:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304052735.27873.00000921@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 62396

In article <20030303232723.09900.00001939@mb-fc.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>If you REALLY believe your statements about Kims callsign, then we better
>>see ya go after

(various suffixes)
>>Ryan
>
>Ryan:
>
>Any radio amateur who selected a Vanity call sign with one of the
>aforementioned suffixes, with the intention of provoking purient interest,
>and then flaunting same in this newsgroup, would, indeed, be treated
>as Kim's "equal."
>
Fun fact: The W6 version of Kim's call has been held by the same person since at least 1979. The holder's first name is Michael, which implies a male but doesn't prove it (remember actress Michael Learned?).

73 de Jim, N2EY

210. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 12:21:16 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303040421.5be22f6c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62397

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BA898E5A.11E58%stewart@say.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) We seem to be saying the same thing different
> > ways. I agree that there are significant numbers
> > of dropouts. (snip)
>
>
> We are saying the same thing, Jim. The whole point of my message was to
> draw attention to the number of dropouts (especially the Tech and Tech Plus
> license holders).

Ah - now I see your point.

But what is a reasonable dropout rate, given the various demographics
of today's hams? For example, I know quite a few local hams who got
started in amateur radio in the 80s as a retirement activity. Those
folks are now in their late 70s and early 80s. Sadly, some of them are
no longer with us.

Also, how does the dropout rate correlate to license class?
>
> > The main point is that the growth in Technicians is due
> > to three factors - (snip)
>
>
> But I didn't say anything about the growth in Technicians. My only mention
> of Techs was the fact that some must have upgraded, suggesting even greater
> losses for the Novice and Tech Plus in my "oversimplified" model. ;)

True :-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

211. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 12:44:24 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Ic19a.37229$x.17264@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 62398

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030303195010.19927.00000937@mb-cj.aol.com...
> In article <Ymx8a.656744$HG.123127573@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert
Craig"
> <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030302152900.04150.00000150@mb-bk.aol.com...
> >> More modern folks are just not impressed by "proficiency
> >> in morse code as the primus inter pares of amateur radio.
> >
> >Do you really believe that a 5-wpm exam constitutes "primus inter pares?"
I
> >sure don't.
>
> "Proficiency" in morse code has been defined by long-time
> amateurs as what They tested to...namely greater than
> 20 WPM rate.

"Long-time," Len? I've only been licensed for two years...

> "First among equals" (literal translatin of Latin phrase) refers
> to all the long-timer amateurs who keep telling everyone that
> they are "first" when not telling everyone they are "superior."

"Last among lazy." No translation required.

> >The no-code Tech ticket is available to anyone who wishes to
> >become a licensed ARO without the "hassle" of the code, hence...no
"barrier"
> >to AR.
>
> Of course, and all the no-code-test Technicians must ride in
> the back of the privilege bus, not drink from the HF fountain,
> and be the subject of ridicule shoveled on them by long-time
> amateurs due to their "inferiority."

Of course...NOT. No riding in the back of any bus, no code and no-code
fountains, and certainly no ridicule...just a string of approx. 130
characters from a pool of 43 sent over a 5 min. period from which one must:

a) Correctly identify 25 in a row. (Nos., prosigns, and punctuation count as
2, BTW.)

or

b) Answer 7 out of 10 fill in questions re. the aforementioned characters.

Now if you want to debate the "inequality of the system" just for the sake of debate, fine. But if you can truly say that the 5-wpm constitutes some sort of "barrier" to AR, I think that's pretty lame. It may be just a hobby to some, but it's a hobby that is facilitated via "privileges" granted by the federal gov't. Those privileges are earned. Wanna get on HF...just do it.

> >> This browns off the PCTAs no end since they desperately
> >> need to regain their self-imposed titles of "King of the Hill"
> >> in the OLD class structure of US ham radio.

Well now you've heard from one of the NEW generation.

> >What's a PCTA?
>
> Pro-Code Test Advocate. The opposite of an NCTA or No Code
> Test Advocate.
>
> Those two acronyms have been in use for at least four years in
> here. You are just now asking what it means?!?!?

Never gave it much thought before. Figured now was as good a time as any to ask. Take it easy, Len.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

212. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 12:53:08 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303040453.1a05ca0d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62399

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030303195008.19927.00000936@mb-cj.aol.com>...
> In article <20030303122758.23139.00000917@mb-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >Sorry if I wasn't clear, Dwight. We seem to be saying the same thing different
> >ways. I agree that there are significant numbers of dropouts.
> >
> >The main point is that the growth in Technicians is due to three factors - new
> >Techs, upgrades from Novice, and renewal of Tech Pluses as Techs.
> >Counteracting this are dropouts and upgrades.
>
> Prior to FCC 99-412 (the R&O establishing Part 97 restructuring,
> issued in December of 1999), the growth in US amateur radio
> licensees was primarily from the no-code-test Technician class.
> That growth was over a 9-year period.

> Prove it, Len. Show us your evidence, argument and conclusions.

I have a 1993 "winged horse" Callbook. It says that at time of
printing (late 1992) there were ~185,000 Technicians - code-tested and
and non-code-tested. No differentiation in the totals.
>
> The facts and figures were shown to you over three years ago

Where? By whom?

> and you then refused to acknowledge either the facts or figures
> as having anything to do with any code testing...

Incorrect.

> yet the lack of
> necessary code test was so obvious that anyone trying to
> discount it was not arguing logically.

You are making the classic error of assuming your conclusion, Len.
You're saying that anyone who disagrees with your conclusion is not
logical simply because they disagree. I point out errors in your
arguments, that's all. Like your assumption that all Technicians are
not code-tested.

Show us your facts and figures and let the readers decide.
>
> The persistent hue and cry from the PCTA regulars in here had
> a rationalization summarized by "just wait until renewal time
> (for those Techs) and you will see their numbers drop!"

That "persistent hue and cry" was by some folks, but not by me. I challenge you to come up with a single post of mine where I predicted anything about renewal percentages of Technician-class hams vs. other classes of license.

You lump all those who disagree with your faulty arguments as "PCTAs", and act as if we are all the same. We're not.

> The
> first renewal period started and there was little drop-off of the
> continually-increasing Technician class numbers.

Show us some figures to back up that claim. Be sure to compensate for the fact that all Technicians in the database are not necessarily non-code-tested.
>
> When Joe Speroni

The current license totals I post semimonthly every two weeks do not come from the AH0A site.

> revised his website statistical tally to lump
> no-code-test Technicians with the old Technician Plusses, you
> went right along with that rationalization and discounting of
> the code test as having any influence...

Incorrect. I do not know AH0A, have never even emailed him.

And the numbers I post here semimonthly DO separate Techs and Tech-Pluses. So you are incorrect again, Len. Mistaken. Just plain wrong.

> and refused to separate
> Technicians from Technician Plusses even though the FCC
> database clearly delineates between all classes.

Incorrect. I do not know AH0A, have never even emailed him.

And the numbers I post here semimonthly DO separate Techs and Tech-Pluses. So you are incorrect again, Len. Mistaken. Just plain wrong.

> Note: Speroni
> is an obvious PCTA as indicated on his website.

Does that mean his numbers are not accurate? What numbers would you have us use?
>
> As of time-now, you still insist on discounting any code test
> factor as influencing growth of the Technician class, "explaining"
> it as "Tech Plusses are renewed as Techs (if code test not
> taken)" or that no-code-test Technicians "upgraded."

Then explain to us why the growth of the US ham license totals from 1990 to 2000 was virtually the same as the growth from 1980 to 1990.

Explain why the percentage growth dropped after 1990. Also explain how you know what the growth would have been without the 1990 and 1991 changes.

> None of
> which explains the 9-year explosive (relative) growth of no-code-
> test Technician class numbers...which more than made up for
> the decrease in totals of US amateur licenses from the old other
> five license classes.

Show us some numbers, Len. Show us all the license classes and how their totals have changed from, say, 1970 to the present, to back up your claims. Be sure to separate code-tested from non-code-tested Techs from 1991 onwards.

Jim, N2EY

213. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 13:10:18 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <_A19a.9558$oY6.4542@nwrdny03.gnilink.net>
Source record: 62402

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030303195007.19927.00000935@mb-cj.aol.com...
> In article <y2N8a.7928$oY6.78@nwrdny03.gnilink.net>, "Bert Craig"
> <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:
>
> >"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >news:f45722ac.0303030938.966d866@posting.google.com...
> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> >news:<Ymx8a.656744$HG.123127573@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> >> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:20030302152900.04150.00000150@mb-bk.aol.com...
> >> > > More modern folks are just not impressed by "proficiency
> >> > > in morse code as the primus inter pares of amateur radio.
> >> >
> >> > Do you really believe that a 5-wpm exam constitutes "primus inter
pares?
> >I
> >> > sure don't.
> >>
> >> I think that many who have taken the code test would agree with you.
> >> But not all. I am one that disagrees. The code exam is probably the
> >> single biggest factor that keeps people moving on when they show an
> >> interest in amateur radio.
> >
> >Then it's just about the numbers? If a person is interested enough, I
assert
> >that he/she'll either begin with the Tech ticket and advance as their
> >interest grows.
> >
> >> And todays Technician license isn't much of a draw.
> >
> >50 MHz and up...at up to 1500 watts?!
>
> That part of the spectrum is ALSO allocated to Extras and
> Generals, plus the old Advanced class licensee, same
> power limit.

So much for inequality.

> >> I suppose they could become CBers instead
> >
> >vs. 40 ch. occupying 440 kHz of spectrum...
> >
> >, learning how to cuss and
> >> jam, and wire up a toilet flushing sound module to their microphone.

> >
> >I'm a CBer too, Brian...and I don't cuss OTA or use any of those silly
noise
> >toys. What are you implying?
>
> Calm yourself.

Ok, I'm calm. :-)

> You know very well what is CW (Conventional
> Wisdom) and PC (Politically Correct) to so many long-time
> amateur licensees. They regard Citizens Band Radio Service
> users as equivalent to swine, uncouth non-humans unfit to
> inhabit the "amateur" 11 meter band (that disappeared in 1958).

We both know that's incorrect, right?

> >> Then when they finally decide to overcome the code obstacle, they've
> >> already become molded into the kind of radio operator that we probably
> >> don't want.
> >
> >Do we really want to go there?
>
> That "there" has already been "gone to." You know very well
> the "CW and PC" mindset of some long-timers. Acknowledge
> what was publicly overt in here and move on.

Acknowledged and movin' on...

> >> I'd rather get them fresh.
> >
> >I'd rather get 'em interested.
>
> Then attend devotions at the Church of St. Hiram and Spread
> the Word.

Why is it that those who "advocate" (From my new acronym, PCTA. ;-)) Element
1 testing must be devotees of a holy CW church? I'm just a relative newbie
who wanted to get on HF, found out what needed to be done...and just did it.
Forget CW's virtues for a moment. Whether or not I planned on using CW or
not...it's far easier to just do it than whine about it. The truth is that
they don't sell a multi-choice Q & A pool for Element 1 and that frightens
the crap outta many folks. Witness this:

KN0WCW de WA2SI WA2SI, t_x fer c_ll BT ur _89 BT n_m_ i_ jo_n. ri_ i_
ken_o_d _ith 3 el_m_n_ _agi. qt_ is...and so on.

There's the monster. With a minimal amount of study and concentrating more
on the six required prosigns along with the numbers (They're patterned.
BTW.) simple common sense get's you through this grinning like a Cheshire
cat! Even if you muck up both callsigns, there's still a string of 69
characters in the example above. A little common sense will net you 25 in a
row very easily.

THIS is the target of an entire organization...on an international level?!
Puh-lease...entirely underwhelming.

> Emphasize getting newbies while teeners and
> ignore the tens of thousands of today's radio professionals
> above 18 and not yet licensed as amateurs.
>
> Professionals don't have the mindset of the devoted Believer
> in olde tyme hum radio, are not devoted to the Teachings of
> Morse, and know what the rest of the radio world is about.
> Some professionals have the temerity to express dissent
> about olde tyme hum radio and are not beloved of beeping.
> Can you "interest" them by constant denigration that they
> are "inferior" or will not show proper CW/PC obediance to
> The Correct Way in hamdom?

Give it some more thought. I thank god that my 5-yr. old is not old enough
to whine about anything other than an extra 1/2 hr. of Nickelodeon at night.
When we sit down for our 15 mins. of code after her homework, it never
occurs to her to whine about it. It just gets done.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

214. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 13:11:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303040511.5d2466bc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62400

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E642A42.F4854A9C@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Welp, if it works out that I can't get W0EX, I'll try for something
> > close like N0DIK.
>
>
>
> I'm certain you'd wear that one very comfortably since it fits you to a
> T!

Read what I said.

You're taking it out of context again.

215. Re: A GREAT Programfor CW Newbies!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 13:18:12 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <oI19a.9579$oY6.1911@nwrdny03.gnilink.net>
Source record: 62403

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b40mlf$qj5$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> You know what I did to improve my CW? I got on the air. Dang ... what a
> concept.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Right from the get-go, day one? ;-)

Just a handy tool, Dan. Not a substitute.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

> "Lloyd, N0VFP" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:3e63a964$1_4@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com...
> > Thanks for the heads up, i started using it myself, and I am 100%
> impressed!
> >
> > Lloyd, N0VFP
> >
> >
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:nQJ8a.7591$oY6.2994@nwrdny03.gnilink.net...
> > > This post is particularly aimed at any newbies (Myself, very much
> > included.)
> > > that might be reading the newsgroup. Here is the link to download
> G4FON's
> > > 'Koch Method CW Trainer' as well as KB2TQX's 'KochRX.'
> > >
> > > http://www.qsl.net/g4fon/CW%20Trainer.htm
> > >
> > > Lemme tell you, this makes learning and practicing CW really fun,
almost
> > > like a PC game. Download and install both into the same directory and
> then
> > > start off with two characters. KochRX allows you to enter the sent
Morse
> > > character on your keyboard and at the end of the session (You can vary
> the
> > > time and speed.) it'll compare actual sent vs. what you've typed and
> grade
> > > it.
> > >

> > > My 5-yr. old daughter and I usually practice with me sending on a code
> > > practice oscillator and her saying the character but now she competes
> > > against herself trying to get the "high score." I just set the pgm to
> send
> > > her E, T, A, N, I, & M (That's all she knows for now.) with an 'Actual
> > > Character Speed' of 15-wpm and 'Effective Code Speed' of 5-wpm....and
> > viola!
> > > Use KochRX to run the G4FON software so it'll be just like a game.
Give
> it
> > a
> > > shot, it's really quite fun. :-)
> > >
> > > --
> > > 73 de Bert
> > > WA2SI
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > ------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
> ==----------
> > http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> > -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
> =-----
>
>

216. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 13:21:12 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303040521.1ee94994@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62401

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E63B820.DC2954B1@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E60F380.8DC98F9@earthlink.net>...
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > >
> > > > In article <3E603824.DF80D6D2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > writes:
> > > >
> > > > >> We mustn't forget that FISTS claims that "Accuracy Transcends Speed."
> > > > >
> > > > >That's fine. If your top end is five words per minute, better slow it
> > > > >down to three, just in case.
> > > >
> > > > Poor baby, you really DID have a bad hair day today, didn't you?
> > > > [all three strands...]
> > > >
> > > > Tomorrow is another time for you in the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
> > > > Service.
> > > >
> > > > Beep, beep.
> > >
> > > Poor, sad Leonard. I use modes other than CW as I choose. You do what
> > > you can in amateur radio. I'll do what I want.
> > >
> > > Good luck in working your way up to that five word per minute plateau.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > It looks like your left hand is getting a workout.
>
> What is it that you're trying to say, Brian?

I tried to say, "It looks like your left hand is getting a workout."

Are you in disagreement
> with something I've written?

Nooo. Not me.

> Do you maintain that Len is already a ham?

I maintain a lawn and several vehicles. I have no time for
maintaining Len as a ham.

> Do you not think that five words per minute represents a plateau to
> him.

No. A plateau indicates that he has achieved 5WPM, and cannot go any higher. Instead, I think it represents a barrier to him.

> Do you think he has already achieved 5 wpm?

No.

> Dave K8MN

Dave, had you simply wished him luck in getting to 5WPM, that would have been a compliment. But you just had to continue on and call 5WPM a "plateau." That's being smug, and that's where you used your left hand again.

217. Re: A GREAT Programfor CW Newbies!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 13:27:53 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <tR19a.9604$oY6.3554@nwrdny03.gnilink.net>
Source record: 62404

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030303221142.23511.00000253@mb-mk.aol.com...
> >
> >From: "Bert Craig" wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM:
> >>My 5-yr. old daughter and I usually practice with me sending on a code
> >>practice oscillator and her saying the character but now she competes
> >>against herself trying to get the "high score." I just set the pgm to
send
> >>her E, T, A, N, I, & M (That's all she knows for now.)
> >
> >This means she can spell "M E A N T I M E"!
>
> Also, the word "A N I M A T E".

Since you brought it up. These are her current practice words.

IT, TEN, NET, TAN, TIM, NATE, TEAM, MEAT, MET, MITTEN (She always has
problems with this one though.), EAT, ATE, EATEN (Another problem word.),
and ET. (Like ET go home.)

What we do is practice for about 15 mins. after we work on her
reading/writing homework. It's long enough to stick and short enough not to
bore her...plus it's a game to her. She'll then have the option to forget
the code as opposed to having to learn it at a later date. I won't lie, it
helps me too as I have precious little time these days between two jobs. (A
recent development...but a good one.)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

218. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 13:35:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E64ABAD.8050300@psu.edu>
Source record: 62405

N2EY wrote:
> In article <20030303232723.09900.00001939@mb-fc.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
>
>>If you REALLY believe your statements about Kims callsign, then we better
>>
>>>see ya go after
>>
>
> (various suffixes)
>
>>>Ryan
>>
>>Ryan:
>>
>>Any radio amateur who selected a Vanity call sign with one of the
>>aforementioned suffixes, with the intention of provoking purient interest,
>>and then flaunting same in this newsgroup, would, indeed, be treated
>>as Kim's "equal."
>>
>
> Fun fact: The W6 version of Kim's call has been held by the same person since
> at least 1979.

And don't forget the W4 version of the call, who is almost certainly a
male, ironically named Larry.

> The holder's first name is Michael, which implies a male but
> doesn't prove it (remember actress Michael Learned?).

Learned what? 8^)

Life is too short to worry about Kim's callsign.

- Mike KB3EIA -

219. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 13:41:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303040541.442eb24a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62406

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E63B6D0.1F3F75@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDD72.DB32D50D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> > > > > Right-o. We mustn't confuse legitimate (yet very slooooooooow)
> > > > > communications and proficiency in use of a mode.
>
> > > > Why not? The desired communication took place, according to both of your comments.
> > > >
> > > Why not? Because the two are not one and the same. We'll never know if
> > > "desired" communications can take place at five words per minute unless
> > > the desire is to go v e r y s l o w l y.
> >
> > That sounds like the power requirement rules also. The OF's say they
> > "desire" a 40 over 9 signal report.
>
> Might sound like it to you. You're famous for trying to read something
> other than what is written.

And you're famous for being smugly -superior- in all of your posts.

Back to your silly assertion that the "desire is to go v e r y
s l o w l y."

Why is it important to you that all amateur communications go quickly?

We all don't communicate our information at double-time, do we?
Different people speak at different speeds, and different people beep
at different speeds. I'm sure you'd gladly slow down to 5wpm if it
were a band/county you needed.

If you have no desire to communicate, find a different hobby.

> > > Would you call a driver who can safely drive a car at speeds no higher
> > > than fifteen miles per hour a proficient driver?
> >
> > This is an amateur radio topic newsgroup. Would you mind containing
> > your comments to amateur radio?
>
> I thought perhaps you'd understand an analogy.

If you insist.

After reviewing the Ohio Revised Code I find that there are some roads
where there is a requirement to confine your rate of travel between a
minimum and maximum speed. Highways are such places. Additionally,
there is a requirement to affix an orange triangle to vehicles that
move at rates much slower than the posted maximum.

I see no minimum or maximum rate of Morse speed in Part 97 for
operations. In fact, Part 97 neither defines Morse Code, nor does it
indicate how the speed is computed. Ditto all of Title 34. Yet
something beeping must be examined at a rate of 5WPM, and 13-15WPM
exams are permissible.

Yours was not a particularly good analog.

> > Would you call someone
> > > who can play "Stardust" perfectly but only at half its normal tempo, a
> > > proficient pianist?
> >
> > This is an amateur radio topic newsgroup. Would you mind containing
> > your comments to amateur radio?
>
> Apparently you do understand an analogy but'd you'd like to dismiss it
> because it voids your construct.

I know nothing of music except what is on the broadcast radio. I do
not understand your analog.

> > > Someone who can send and receive morse at five words per minute is on
> > > the low end of mediocrity.
> >
> > Tell it to Riley.
>
> He already knows. You're the guy in the dark.

The FCC disagrees.

220. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 13:44:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303040544.2216000f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62407

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6426FA.7D7FAA63@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> >
> > I became interested in radio communication in the late 60's. Money
> > was an issue, and then there were competing interests. I became
> > licensed 1987. I often wonder had I been exposed to the pettiness of
> > some long time amateurs if I would have pursued it at all.
>
> With your attitude toward ham radio it's tempting to say, damn shame you weren't.

Then why not go ahead and say it? You've never held back out of
courtesy nor kindness.

No one
> posting here is more petty than you.

Perhaps I should be in NASCAR.

221. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 13:57:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303040557.612dd1b7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62408

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E63BA2C.E39B9368@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E60FB11.CA516235@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6002C5.DAE4639@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > Oh, I'm not involved in New Age Newspeak
> >
> > "Superiority" is not New Age Newspeak. It was extracted as one choice
> > from your Random House College Dictionary definition.
>
> The idea that no one is superior to another is New Age Newspeak. I
> don't believe in it.

Thus you fit the definition of smug for the reason of superiority.

> > > and I don't believe in
> > > political correctness, Brian. In everything I do, I am: superior to
> > > some, inferior to others, on an even footing with others. When I'm
> > > superior, I'm contentedly confident of my superiority.
> > >
> > > Maybe I she be more congnizant of the possibility that you'll get your
> > > feelings hurt if I'm seen to superior to you in something. I wouldn't
> > > want to hurt your self-esteem.
> > >
> > > Even Len has to be superior to me in at least one way....hmmmm...Oh, I
> > > have it! Len is much more patient than I am. I would not have the
> > > patience to wait for several decades to become a radio amateur after
> > > becoming "interested".
> >
> > I became interested in radio communication in the late 60's. Money
> > was an issue, and then there were competing interests. I became
> > licensed 1987.
>
> Money was an issue for me too. I didn't let that stop me. I earned
> some of it. I cajoled my parents for some of it. The sum total spent
> wasn't much at all, just a little over a hundred dollars.

That's an awful lot of money for a kid. I was lucky to get a bicycle.
My older brother and sister weren't as lucky. I did earn enough to
buy an alarm/clock radio which I used for night time broadcast band

dxing. Lots of fun. I even kept a log of stations heard, times, and
which way my radio was oriented when it sounded best. And I sold
flower seeds door to door, until the authorities put an end to that
(no soliciting), but not before I earned enough for a South Bend
fishing rod.

I had
> competing interests too. I found a way to pursue all of those.

Easy for you. You're superior.

> > I often wonder had I been exposed to the pettiness of
> > some long time amateurs if I would have pursued it at all.
>
> I never encountered too much in the way of petty radio amateurs. I've
> found the vast majority pleasant and helpful. Did you have that chip on
> your shoulder back when you made your decision or did it show up
> afterward?

My chip is on my motherboard, not my shoulder. I did see a commercial
where this guy put a battery on his shoulder and dared someone to
knock it off. I didn't get that one. And there was a sailor that had
a bird on his shoulder. That was pretty cool, too.

But this is an amateur radio newsgroup and we're straying off topic.

222. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 14:02:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303040602.7acfb8d0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62409

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E642DF9.752B88E9@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6003CB.9CCF7689@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDF27.7032976D@earthlink.net>...
> > > >
> > > > > Are you by chance attempting to ask a question (in which you attempt to
> > > > > put words in my mouth) and then supplying your own answer?
> > > > >
> > > > > I never did any of the things I've outlined above. I've certainly
> > > > > never:
> > > > >
> > > > > 1. announced here that I'd be doing something that I changed my mind
> > > > > and decided not to do.
> > > > >
> > > > > 2. announced here that I'd never do something then reversed myself.
> > > > >
> > > > > Nice try, Kim.
>
> > > > Dave, I certainly hope that you've changed your mind about working
> > > > Frenchmen on 6M out of band.
> > >
> > > I didn't have to change anything, Brian.
> >
> > We're speaking of your future course of action.
> >
> > Do you intend to work other "amateurs" that you know are out of band?
>
> I fully intend to operate where the FCC permits me to operate just as
> I've always done and as I have done overseas under the jurisdiction of
> foreign governments. I fully intend not to use a lookup table for each
> DX QSO or to check the FCC database for domestic QSOs.
>
> Other amateur stations need to worry about their own operations as they
> are responsible to their regulatory agencies.
>
> I believe you'll find that my view is essentially the same as it was
> before.
>
> Dave K8MN

Then you do intend to contact stations that you have a priori knowledge are operating out of band.

I thought so.

223. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 14:06:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303040606.3ba54a99@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62410

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E63BBA3.99F87C10@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E60F7CB.3C6E17B6@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > > > I can't document any such thing with a post here.
> > > >
> > > > So you lied?
> > >
> > > No, Brian, I did not. We have your word on the matter and we have it
> > > both ways---0-180-0-180-0-180-0. Is it starting to dawn on you why Ed
> > > Hare departed the group?
> >
> > If you cannot document it, how did you arrive at "0-180-0-180-0-180-0?"
>
> That'd be from your original statement that you left and your recent
> statement that you never left.

Yet you said that I never left, and complained about it.

> > Which is it?
>
> It's still both, Brian.

You're still being obtuse.

> > Did you say I left, or did you say I never left?
>
> The issue isn't what I said.

It is.

It is what you said then and what you tell
> us now.

I said then that I changed my mind.

> > Did Ed leave because I said I was leaving, or did Ed leave because I dind't leave?
>
> No, Ed left because he found your cutesty-stupid routine tedious.

That is your path, not mine. I'm merely trying to work with you here.

> > You've got a lot of 'splainin to do.
>
> <long silence follows while Brian waits>

>
> Dave K8MN

224. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 14:07:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303040607.1ec179ca@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62411

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030303195014.19927.00000944@mb-cj.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0303031002.277fd71@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> >Welp, Steve, I don't have to dance to that fiddle you're playing, and
> >> >I choose not to.
> >>
> >> Brian-to-English translation: I made a statement that I cannot or
> will
> >> not explain because even I do not understand what I said.
> >
> >Its also possible that you would not have the capacity to understand.
> >
> >> >Unable to think on your own and do a little deductive reasoning,
> >> >you'll just have to consider it one of life's unsolved mysteries
> >>
> >> Brain-to-English translation: I am too cowardly to explain what I
> said
> >> because after reading what I wrote I realize an answer might make me look
> even
> >> MORE foolish.
> >
> >I'm reminded of the Far-Side cartoon where the boy is at the door of
> >the "School For The Gifted." He's pushing, and the sign on the door
> >says, "Pull."
> >
> >> >Best of luck to you, though.
> >>
> >> No luck needed, Brain. Got you figured out pretty good, I think.
> >
> >I've got you nailed.
>
> I wish he would cross his feet...we are running low on nails...

I'll FEDEX a keg.

225. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 14:10:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303040610.1109f50@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62412

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030303192659.23360.00000682@mb-da.aol.com>...
>
> >I've got you nailed.
>
> Not today.
>
>
> Steven J Robeson, LPN

Everyday you post, you verify previously observed obsessive/compulsive behavior.

226. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 16:19:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E64D265.2B9895C4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62413

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E63B820.DC2954B1@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E60F380.8DC98F9@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > In article <3E603824.DF80D6D2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > > writes:
> > > > >
> > > > > >> We mustn't forget that FISTS claims that "Accuracy Transcends Speed."
> > > > > >
> > > > > >That's fine. If your top end is five words per minute, better slow it
> > > > > >down to three, just in case.
> > > > >
> > > > > Poor baby, you really DID have a bad hair day today, didn't you?
> > > > > [all three strands...]
> > > > >
> > > > > Tomorrow is another time for you in the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
> > > > > Service.
> > > > >
> > > > > Beep, beep.
> > > >
> > > > Poor, sad Leonard. I use modes other than CW as I choose. You do what
> > > > you can in amateur radio. I'll do what I want.
> > > >
> > > > Good luck in working your way up to that five word per minute plateau.

> > > It looks like your left hand is getting a workout.
> > >
> > What is it that you're trying to say, Brian?
> >
> I tried to say, "It looks like your left hand is getting a workout."

I send cw with my left hand.

> Are you in disagreement
> > with something I've written?
> >
> Nooo. Not me.
>
> > Do you maintain that Len is already a ham?

>
> I maintain a lawn and several vehicles. I have no time for
> maintaining Len as a ham.

Your attempt at cuteness falls short. Read the part "that Len is
already". It is the one which dooms your effort at word play.

> > Do you not think that five words per minute represents a plateau to
> > him.
>
> No. A plateau indicates that he has achieved 5WPM, and cannot go any
> higher. Instead, I think it represents a barrier to him.

We have no way of knowing if it is a barrier to him. He has never even
attempted a license exam which includes a 5 wpm morse test.

> > Do you think he has already achieved 5 wpm?
>
> No.

I don't think he has either. But he told us that he "knows" morse code.

> Dave, had you simply wished him luck in getting to 5WPM, that would
> have been a compliment. But you just had to continue on and call 5WPM
> a "plateau." That's being smug, and that's where you used your left
> hand again.

Oh, smugness is a left-handed thing is it? I did not intend to
compliment Len.

Dave K8MN

227. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 16:21:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E64D2FC.C0F76D6C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62414

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <20030303232723.09900.00001939@mb-fc.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> > (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> >
> >
> > >>If you REALLY believe your statements about Kims callsign, then we better
> > >>
> > >>>see ya go after
> > >>
> > >
> > > (various suffixes)
> > >
> > >>>Ryan
> > >>
> > >>Ryan:
> > >>
> > >>Any radio amateur who selected a Vanity call sign with one of the
> > >>aforementioned suffixes, with the intention of provoking purient interest,
> > >>and then flaunting same in this newsgroup, would, indeed, be treated
> > >>as Kim's "equal."
> > >>
> > >
> > > Fun fact: The W6 version of Kim's call has been held by the same person since
> > > at least 1979.
>
> And don't forget the W4 version of the call, who is almost certainly a
> male, ironically named Larry.
>
> > The holder's first name is Michael, which implies a male but
> > doesn't prove it (remember actress Michael Learned?).
>
> Learned what? 8^)
>
> Life is too short to worry about Kim's callsign.

I, for one, have never worried about Kim's callsign. I just point out
that her choice was tacky and in poor taste.

Dave K8MN

228. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 16:34:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E64D5FB.90E008DD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62415

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E63B6D0.1F3F75@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDD72.DB32D50D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > > > > > Right-o. We mustn't confuse legitimate (yet very slooooooooow)
> > > > > > > communications and proficiency in use of a mode.
> > >
> > > > > > Why not? The desired communication took place, according to both of your
comments.
> > > > >
> > > > > Why not? Because the two are not one and the same. We'll never know if
> > > > > "desired" communications can take place at five words per minute unless
> > > > > the desire is to go v e r y s l o w l y.
> > > >
> > > > That sounds like the power requirement rules also. The OF's say they
> > > > "desire" a 40 over 9 signal report.
> > >
> > > Might sound like it to you. You're famous for trying to read something
> > > other than what is written.
>
> And you're famous for being smugly -superior- in all of your posts.
>
> Back to your silly assertion that the "desire is to go v e r y
> s l o w l y."

I didn't have an assertion that there was a desire to go very slowly.
You must have missed the word "unless".

> Why is it important to you that all amateur communications go quickly?

It isn't important to me at all. We were talking about proficiency of
one whose top sending and receiving speed is five words per minute.

> We all don't communicate our information at double-time, do we?
> Different people speak at different speeds, and different people beep
> at different speeds. I'm sure you'd gladly slow down to 5wpm if it
> were a band/county you needed.

I'm sure I'd slow down too but my maximum speed isn't five words per
minute.
I'd be happy to listen to your definition of "double time" as it applies
to communications. Would you have us believe that morse communication
at ten words per minute is double time?

> If you have no desire to communicate, find a different hobby.

I'm communicating fine, Brian. As the term applies to amateur radio, I
have all of the available bands and band segments along with a number of
modes open to me. My comfortable morse speed is at least seven times
five words per minute.

> > > > Would you call a driver who can safely drive a car at speeds no higher
> > > > than fifteen miles per hour a proficient driver?
> > >
> > > This is an amateur radio topic newsgroup. Would you mind containing
> > > your comments to amateur radio?
> >
> > I thought perhaps you'd understand an analogy.
>
> If you insist.
>
> After reviewing the Ohio Revised Code I find that there are some roads
> where there is a requirement to confine your rate of travel between a
> minimum and maximum speed. Highways are such places. Additionally,
> there is a requirement to affix an orange triangle to vehicles that
> move at rates much slower than the posted maximum.

That's all eyewash. It does not apply to the analogy I stated. You
didn't answer the question. Would you call such a driver "proficient".

> I see no minimum or maximum rate of Morse speed in Part 97 for
> operations. In fact, Part 97 neither defines Morse Code, nor does it
> indicate how the speed is computed. Ditto all of Title 34. Yet
> something beeping must be examined at a rate of 5WPM, and 13-15WPM
> exams are permissible.

I don't think you'll find "something beeping" in Part 97. Your
statement is additional irrelevant fluff since none of that addresses
proficiency.

> Yours was not a particularly good analog.

I think you mean that you didn't like it because you can't counter it.
Care to provide an answer?

> > > Would you call someone
> > > > who can play "Stardust" perfectly but only at half its normal tempo, a
> > > > proficient pianist?
> > >
> > > This is an amateur radio topic newsgroup. Would you mind containing
> > > your comments to amateur radio?
> >
> > Apparently you do understand an analogy but'd you'd like to dismiss it
> > because it voids your construct.
>
> I know nothing of music except what is on the broadcast radio. I do
> not understand your analog.

I believe you.

> > > > Someone who can send and receive morse at five words per minute is on
> > > > the low end of mediocrity.
> > >
> > > Tell it to Riley.
> >
> > He already knows. You're the guy in the dark.
>
> The FCC disagrees.

The FCC doesn't think you're in the dark or the FCC thinks Riley doesn't
know?

Dave K8MN

229. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 16:48:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E64D91D.240DE889@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62416

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E63BA2C.E39B9368@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E60FB11.CA516235@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6002C5.DAE4639@earthlink.net>...

> > > I became interested in radio communication in the late 60's. Money
> > > was an issue, and then there were competing interests. I became
> > > licensed 1987.
> > >
> > Money was an issue for me too. I didn't let that stop me. I earned
> > some of it. I cajoled my parents for some of it. The sum total spent
> > wasn't much at all, just a little over a hundred dollars.
>
> That's an awful lot of money for a kid.

Sure it was. I got up at 4:30 every morning to deliver newspapers for a
time. I made about ten bucks a week doing so. I later wrote two sports
columns per week (at age fifteen) for the local paper and worked a
couple of days after school (and on Saturdays) at a hobby shop. I didn't
make great money but I made money. Some of it was spent on amateur
radio equipment.

> I was lucky to get a bicycle.
> My older brother and sister weren't as lucky. I did earn enough to
> buy an alarm/clock radio which I used for night time broadcast band
> dxing. Lots of fun. I even kept a log of stations heard, times, and
> which way my radio was oriented when it sounded best. And I sold
> flower seeds door to door, until the authorities put an end to that
> (no soliciting), but not before I earned enough for a South Bend
> fishing rod.

> > I had
> > competing interests too. I found a way to pursue all of those.

> Easy for you. You're superior.

It wasn't because I was superior. It was because I was interested and
didn't take the "I can't" route.

> > > I often wonder had I been exposed to the pettiness of
> > > some long time amateurs if I would have pursued it at all.
> >
> > I never encountered too much in the way of petty radio amateurs. I've
> > found the vast majority pleasant and helpful. Did you have that chip on
> > your shoulder back when you made your decision or did it show up
> > afterward?
>
> My chip is on my motherboard, not my shoulder. I did see a commercial
> where this guy put a battery on his shoulder and dared someone to
> knock it off. I didn't get that one. And there was a sailor that had
> a bird on his shoulder. That was pretty cool, too.
>
> But this is an amateur radio newsgroup and we're straying off topic.

Maybe guys will come along and attempt knocking the bird off your
shoulder.

Dave K8MN

230. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 16:51:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E64D9DD.3FB97257@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62417

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E642DF9.752B88E9@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6003CB.9CCF7689@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDF27.7032976D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > >
> > > > > > Are you by chance attempting to ask a question (in which you attempt to
> > > > > > put words in my mouth) and then supplying your own answer?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I never did any of the things I've outlined above. I've certainly
> > > > > > never:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > 1. announced here that I'd be doing something that I changed my mind
> > > > > > and decided not to do.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > 2. announced here that I'd never do something then reversed myself.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Nice try, Kim.
> > >
> > > > > Dave, I certainly hope that you've changed your mind about working
> > > > > Frenchmen on 6M out of band.
> > > > >
> > > > I didn't have to change anything, Brian.
> > > >
> > > We're speaking of your future course of action.
> > > >
> > > Do you intend to work other "amateurs" that you know are out of band?
> > >
> > I fully intend to operate where the FCC permits me to operate just as
> > I've always done and as I have done overseas under the jurisdiction of
> > foreign governments. I fully intend not to use a lookup table for each
> > DX QSO or to check the FCC database for domestic QSOs.
> >
> > Other amateur stations need to worry about their own operations as they
> > are responsible to their regulatory agencies.
> >
> > I believe you'll find that my view is essentially the same as it was
```

> > before.

> Then you do intend to contact stations that you have a priori
> knowledge are operating out of band.
>
> I thought so.

You're guilty of answering your own question. I wrote nothing which
would indicate that I'd do any such thing.

Dave K8MN

231. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 17:00:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E64DBAC.1BB3E413@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62418

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E63BBA3.99F87C10@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E60F7CB.3C6E17B6@earthlink.net>...

> > > > No, Brian, I did not. We have your word on the matter and we have it
> > > > both ways---0-180-0-180-0-180-0. Is it starting to dawn on you why Ed
> > > > Hare departed the group?
> > >
> > > If you cannot document it, how did you arrive at "0-180-0-180-0-180-0?"
> >
> > That'd be from your original statement that you left and your recent
> > statement that you never left.
>
> Yet you said that I never left, and complained about it.

Excuse me? You did a reversal and told us you never left.

> > > Which is it?
> >
> > It's still both, Brian.
>
> You're still being obtuse.

That isn't obtuse, Brian. It is that which you've stated. You stated
you were leaving. You stated you never left.

> > > Did you say I left, or did you say I never left?
> >
> > The issue isn't what I said.
>
> It is.

Sorry, that isn't correct.

> > It is what you said then and what you tell
> > us now.
>
> I said then that I changed my mind.

...and now you say you never left. 0-180-0-180-0. You're fluttering in
the breeze.

> > > Did Ed leave because I said I was leaving, or did Ed leave because I dind't leave?
> >
> > No, Ed left because he found your cutesty-stupid routine tedious.

> That is your path, not mine.

Your statement isn't borne out by your actions.

> I'm merely trying to work with you here.

You're doing more of the same which resulted in Ed's departure.

Dave K8MN

232. Re: Hey twithed...where's that page again??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 17:00:59 UTC
From: akcpagebusters@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <f5d8e07d.0303040900.6558939@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62419
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.swap,alt.usenet.kooks,alt.flame

Fatty Arbuckle <no@example.com> wrote in message
news:<44c50ef61060cf20fe5faaa2e7fd7c51@news.teranews.com>...
> Sissy twithed's Owner <akcpagebusters@yahoo.com> was all:
>
> > I think it sustained an injury....it was fatal too...yup...that
> > sukka's flatlined...hehehe...the geocities mortuary will handle the
> > arrangements.
>

I think its soo damn funny when twistedhed disguises himself as Fatty
Arbuckle and puts up pages about people. Do it some more
twistedhed@webtv.net.

It just shows how effective the anti-boys are! twistedhed@webtv.net is
ENRAGED, but he is too big of a sissy to do anything except from
behind an anonymous post. That's cool though. The very virulence of
the attack shows how totally ENRAGED his pink muffin boy self is.

The anti boys own rec.radio.cb

233. IDIOT SOUFFLE'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 18:48:09 UTC
From: The Sweedish chef <chef@food.com>
Message-ID: <3e64f138$1_4@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 62420
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Recipe For Pastor Gab's Ham Scam with Mixed Nuts, or; How to Earn a Meagre living from your Radio Hobby

-Combine equal parts of ARnewsline, RAIN, and ARRL News
-Add a stupid children's story
-Add one stolen voice ID
-Lie to interviewees about your own importance
-Add one conspiracy theory regarding spectrum theft
-Finely craft conspiracy theory to include FCC Corruption
-Add one hint that ARRL is becoming obsolete
-Add one or two PC causes (to attract liberal donors)
-Add phony concern about off-color language
-Pretend you did something worthwhile at one time
-Pretend you own the frequency you transmit on
-Season liberally with defamation and false accusations
-Garnish with oblique references to ARRL Directors

Variations:
-Paranoid Hate Speech
-Felony Affadavit Complaints
-Pyramid schemes involving membership sales

Combine ingredients. Set Radio Shack timer for 128 hours. Serve to naive listeners on 80 and 20 meters over a weak and distorted 30 year old transmitter.

Send leftovers to foreign militias (preferably brutal and anti-democratic) They need to eat too!

Probably delicious over Shortwave, but use caution as license revocation will result if served over Amateur Radio.

NB: Don't try this at home! Any resemblance to currently licensed Amateurs is entirely coincidental.

Satire:
1: a literary work holding up human vices and follies to ridicule or scorn
2: trenchant wit, irony, or sarcasm used to expose and discredit vice or folly

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

234. Re: A GREAT Programfor CW Newbies!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 20:24:42 UTC
From: The Sweedish chef <chef@food.com>
Message-ID: <3e6507dd_4@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 62421

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b40mlf$qj5$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> You know what I did to improve my CW? I got on the air. Dang ... what a
> concept.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

I welcome your comments Dan.

Lloyd

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

235. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 23:11:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303041511.33c9db99@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62422

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E64DBAC.1BB3E413@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E63BBA3.99F87C10@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E60F7CB.3C6E17B6@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > > No, Brian, I did not. We have your word on the matter and we have it
> > > > > both ways---0-180-0-180-0-180-0. Is it starting to dawn on you why Ed
> > > > > Hare departed the group?
> > > >
> > > > If you cannot document it, how did you arrive at "0-180-0-180-0-180-0?"
> > >
> > > That'd be from your original statement that you left and your recent
> > > statement that you never left.
> >
> > Yet you said that I never left, and complained about it.
>
> Excuse me?

You did.

> You did a reversal and told us you never left.

I told you I had changed my mind.

> > > > Which is it?
> > >
> > > It's still both, Brian.
> >
> > You're still being obtuse.
>
> That isn't obtuse, Brian. It is that which you've stated. You stated
> you were leaving. You stated you never left.

What did you state?

> > > > Did you say I left, or did you say I never left?
> > >
> > > The issue isn't what I said.
> >
> > It is.
>

> Sorry, that isn't correct.

But it is.

> > > It is what you said then and what you tell
> > > us now.
> >
> > I said then that I changed my mind.
>
> ...and now you say you never left. 0-180-0-180-0. You're fluttering in
> the breeze.

At least I have something to flutter.

> > > > Did Ed leave because I said I was leaving, or did Ed leave because I dind't leave?
> > >
> > > No, Ed left because he found your cutesty-stupid routine tedious.
>
> > That is your path, not mine.
>
> Your statement isn't borne out by your actions.

And this is round 17 of your stupidity.

> > I'm merely trying to work with you here.
>
> You're doing more of the same which resulted in Ed's departure.

Hmmm.

When do you intend to do something as intelligent?

236. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 23:16:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303041516.28333da0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62423

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E64D9DD.3FB97257@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E642DF9.752B88E9@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6003CB.9CCF7689@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDF27.7032976D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Are you by chance attempting to ask a question (in which you attempt to
> > > > > > > put words in my mouth) and then supplying your own answer?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > I never did any of the things I've outlined above. I've certainly
> > > > > > > never:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > 1. announced here that I'd be doing something that I changed my mind
> > > > > > > and decided not to do.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > 2. announced here that I'd never do something then reversed myself.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Nice try, Kim.
> > > > >
> > > > > > Dave, I certainly hope that you've changed your mind about working
> > > > > > Frenchmen on 6M out of band.
> > > > >
> > > > > I didn't have to change anything, Brian.
> > > >
> > > We're speaking of your future course of action.
> > >
> > > Do you intend to work other "amateurs" that you know are out of band?
> >
> I fully intend to operate where the FCC permits me to operate just as
> I've always done and as I have done overseas under the jurisdiction of
> foreign governments. I fully intend not to use a lookup table for each
> DX QSO or to check the FCC database for domestic QSOs.
>
> Other amateur stations need to worry about their own operations as they
> are responsible to their regulatory agencies.
>

> > > I believe you'll find that my view is essentially the same as it was
> > > before.
>
> > Then you do intend to contact stations that you have a priori
> > knowledge are operating out of band.
> >
> > I thought so.
>
> You're guilty of answering your own question. I wrote nothing which
> would indicate that I'd do any such thing.

David, but that is the question that has been asked. Are you prepared
to to answer it this time, or do we go to the next level of your
stupidity?

237. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 23:25:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303041525.4c14f22d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62424

```
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E64D5FB.90E008DD@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E63B6D0.1F3F75@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDD72.DB32D50D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> > > > > > > > > Right-o. We mustn't confuse legitimate (yet very slooooooooow)
> > > > > > > > > communications and proficiency in use of a mode.
>
> > > > > > > > Why not? The desired communication took place, according to both of your
comments.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Why not? Because the two are not one and the same. We'll never know if
> > > > > > > "desired" communications can take place at five words per minute unless
> > > > > > > the desire is to go v e r y s l o w l y.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That sounds like the power requirement rules also. The OF's say they
> > > > > > "desire" a 40 over 9 signal report.
> > > > >
> > > > > Might sound like it to you. You're famous for trying to read something
> > > > > other than what is written.
> > >
> > > And you're famous for being smugly -superior- in all of your posts.
> >
> > Back to your silly assertion that the "desire is to go v e r y
> > s l o w l y."
>
> I didn't have an assertion that there was a desire to go very slowly.
> You must have missed the word "unless".
```

I didn't miss the word "useless" which is what every post of yours ends up being.

Get back to me if you have anything useful.

238. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 23:30:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303041530.705880d2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62425

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E64D265.2B9895C4@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E63B820.DC2954B1@earthlink.net>...

> > > Do you not think that five words per minute represents a plateau to
> > > him.
> >
> > No. A plateau indicates that he has achieved 5WPM, and cannot go any
> > higher. Instead, I think it represents a barrier to him.
>
> We have no way of knowing if it is a barrier to him. He has never even
> attempted a license exam which includes a 5 wpm morse test.

Then you agree that you don't know what a plateau is? Or at least you
didn't until I explained it to you?

239. Re: A GREAT Programfor CW Newbies!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 23:35:39 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <fLa9a.358790$be.331981@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 62426

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030303220400.23511.00000252@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: "Bert Craig" wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM:
> >My 5-yr. old daughter and I usually practice with me sending on a code
> >practice oscillator and her saying the character but now she competes
> >against herself trying to get the "high score." I just set the pgm to
send
> >her E, T, A, N, I, & M (That's all she knows for now.)
>
> This means she can spell "M E A N T I M E"!
>
> From Dan/W4NTI:
> >You know what I did to improve my CW? I got on the air. Dang ... what
a
> >concept.
>
> Practice something and you will get better at it. Thats clever?
>

Repetico Mater Studiorum ...according to my 1964 Latin class. The Romans knew is 2 thousand plus years ago. It is a system that works .... or are you still putting you hand into the charcoal grill ...??

73 God Bless Tom KI3R nr Pittsburgh

240. Great new book for tinkerers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-04 23:53:30 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <_%a9a.2874$gF3.305813@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 62427
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Just got a copy of the new league book "Experimental Methods in RF Design" ($49.95). Already found 3 new ideas for a receiver project I'm doing!

Anyone even a little interested in doing their own design work should pick up a copy.

&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; 73, de Hans, K0HB
--
SOC #291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

241. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 00:32:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304193207.19550.00000022@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 62428

>Subject: Re: Callsign etiquette?
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 3/3/03 9:53 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E642334.2070006@adelphia.net>

>Heh, heh, good one, Leonard! When I saw the first post I thought maybe
>you pushed the send button too soon, but after the fifth one I was
>howling. Touche'!

I think the part that says "...excessive emoticons and general infantile
behavior." pretty much summed it up. The first one might have made a point.
The rest was spam.

Steve, K4YZ

242. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 00:35:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304193535.29447.00000599@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 62432

In article <3E64D5FB.90E008DD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E63B6D0.1F3F75@earthlink.net>...
>> > Brian wrote:
>> > >
>> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>...
>> > > > Brian wrote:
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E5EDD72.DB32D50D@earthlink.net>...
>> > > > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > N2EY wrote:
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > > In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
>> > > > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> >
>> > > > > > Right-o. We mustn't confuse legitimate (yet very slooooooooow)
>> > > > > > communications and proficiency in use of a mode.
>> >
>> > > > > Why not? The desired communication took place, according to both
>of your comments.
>> > > >
>> > > > Why not? Because the two are not one and the same. We'll never know
>if
>> > > > "desired" communications can take place at five words per minute
>unless
>> > > > the desire is to go v e r y s l o w l y.
>> > >
>> > > That sounds like the power requirement rules also. The OF's say they
>> > > "desire" a 40 over 9 signal report.
>> >
>> Might sound like it to you. You're famous for trying to read something
>> other than what is written.
>>
>> And you're famous for being smugly -superior- in all of your posts.
>>
>> Back to your silly assertion that the "desire is to go v e r y
>> s l o w l y."

>
>I didn't have an assertion that there was a desire to go very slowly.
>You must have missed the word "unless".
>
>> Why is it important to you that all amateur communications go quickly?
>
>It isn't important to me at all. We were talking about proficiency of
>one whose top sending and receiving speed is five words per minute.

Proficiency at any rate is measured by accuracy.

The very recent (see Newsline) 136 KHz distance v. power
record was set with a dot period of 60 seconds.

>> We all don't communicate our information at double-time, do we?
>> Different people speak at different speeds, and different people beep
>> at different speeds. I'm sure you'd gladly slow down to 5wpm if it
>> were a band/county you needed.
>
>I'm sure I'd slow down too but my maximum speed isn't five words per
>minute.

Obviously...you've defined 5 WPM as "mediocre." Since you
are self-defined as "superior," your rate must be much higher.

>I'd be happy to listen to your definition of "double time" as it applies
>to communications. Would you have us believe that morse communication
>at ten words per minute is double time?

Amateur radio is defined as a radio activity without pecuniary
interest. "Double time" is the phrase for overtime payment at
twice the normal hourly rate.

>> If you have no desire to communicate, find a different hobby.
>
>I'm communicating fine, Brian. As the term applies to amateur radio, I
>have all of the available bands and band segments along with a number of
>modes open to me. My comfortable morse speed is at least seven times
>five words per minute.

With that proficiency you will be in great demand in the
commercial world should an emergency require additional
skilled morsemen to operate the many OOK CW radio
circuits worldwide.

>That's all eyewash. It does not apply to the analogy I stated. You
>didn't answer the question. Would you call such a driver "proficient".

Herr Robust, no one in here is required to answer Your questions
on vehicle traffic safety or the Ohio state highway system.
Please confine your smuggness to amateur radio policy topics.

>> I see no minimum or maximum rate of Morse speed in Part 97 for
>> operations. In fact, Part 97 neither defines Morse Code, nor does it

>> indicate how the speed is computed. Ditto all of Title 34. Yet
>> something beeping must be examined at a rate of 5WPM, and 13-15WPM
>> exams are permissible.
>
>I don't think you'll find "something beeping" in Part 97. Your
>statement is additional irrelevant fluff since none of that addresses
>proficiency.

The reference is to equivalent morse code rate. As presently
defined by the FCC, there is no real explicit definition for morse
rate used on US amateur radio license tests. There was a
separate statement by the FCC that allows VEs to use 15 WPM
character rate at a 5 WPM word rate (so-called "Farnsworth"
method) yet there is no specific, explicit definition of word rate
using International Morse Code.

That was all debated in here some time ago. Move on. Do not
dwell on your virtual injuries received here years ago. Heal.

>> Yours was not a particularly good analog.
>
>I think you mean that you didn't like it because you can't counter it.
>Care to provide an answer?

Herr Robust does not provide good analogies. Witness the
"ball game" and "checkers" analogies recently...and several
other fluffy analogies archived in you-know-where.

>> > > Would you call someone
>> > > > who can play "Stardust" perfectly but only at half its normal tempo,
>a
>> > > > proficient pianist?
>> > >
>> > > This is an amateur radio topic newsgroup. Would you mind containing
>> > > your comments to amateur radio?
>> >
>> > Apparently you do understand an analogy but'd you'd like to dismiss it
>> > because it voids your construct.
>>
>> I know nothing of music except what is on the broadcast radio. I do
>> not understand your analog.
>
>I believe you.

Then you admit your analogies are not proficient.

I do know music but this newsgroup is not for the demi-semi-
(tractors) quavering in the dissonance of inappropriate analogies.

>> > > > Someone who can send and receive morse at five words per minute is on
>> > > > the low end of mediocrity.
>> > >
>> > > Tell it to Riley.

>> >
>> > He already knows. You're the guy in the dark.
>>
>> The FCC disagrees.
>
>The FCC doesn't think you're in the dark or the FCC thinks Riley doesn't
>know?

Riley Hollingsworth is a "special counsel" to the FCC. That title
refers to what is essentially a temporary hire or a "consultancy"
equivalent. He is not in the regular Wireless Bureau staff list
(what you may think of as a "key list").

The FCC has stated in 1990 (see 90-53) and 1999 (see 99-412)
that morse code testing is of no value to them in determining if
an applicant should be granted a US amateur radio license.
That public statement is found at the FCC, not Google.

Try to stay focussed.

243. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 00:35:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304193536.29447.00000601@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 62429

In article <3E64D265.2B9895C4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Oh, smugness is a left-handed thing is it? I did not intend to
>compliment Len.

I doubt you could ever bring yourself to do such a thing... :-)

That requires great powers of self-control and diplomacy.

State Department is said to practice diplomacy.

Nothing rubbed off in all that time? :-)

244. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 00:35:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304193536.29447.00000600@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 62430

In article <3E64D2FC.C0F76D6C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Life is too short to worry about Kim's callsign.
>
>I, for one, have never worried about Kim's callsign. I just point out
>that her choice was tacky and in poor taste.

...and several other attributes, all archived you-know-where.

Who called who "Tugboat Annie" many times, hmmm?

245. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 00:35:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304193539.29447.00000602@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 62433

In article <f45722ac.0303040521.1ee94994@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E63B820.DC2954B1@earthlink.net>...
>> Brian wrote:
>> >
>> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E60F380.8DC98F9@earthlink.net>...
>> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > > In article <3E603824.DF80D6D2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> > > > writes:
>> > > >
>> > > > >> We mustn't forget that FISTS claims that "Accuracy Transcends
>Speed."
>> > > > >
>> > > > >That's fine. If your top end is five words per minute, better slow
>it
>> > > > >down to three, just in case.
>> > > >
>> > > > Poor baby, you really DID have a bad hair day today, didn't you?
>> > > > [all three strands...]
>> > > >
>> > > > Tomorrow is another time for you in the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
>> > > > Service.
>> > > >
>> > > > Beep, beep.
>> > >
>> > > Poor, sad Leonard. I use modes other than CW as I choose. You do what
>> > > you can in amateur radio. I'll do what I want.
>> > >
>> > > Good luck in working your way up to that five word per minute plateau.
>> > >
>> > > Dave K8MN
>> >
>> > It looks like your left hand is getting a workout.
>>
>> What is it that you're trying to say, Brian?
>
>I tried to say, "It looks like your left hand is getting a workout."

Sounds clear enough for me... :-)

> Are you in disagreement
>> with something I've written?
>
>Nooo. Not me.

I don't think he allows disagreement with anything he has
written. :-)

>
>> Do you maintain that Len is already a ham?
>
>I maintain a lawn and several vehicles. I have no time for
>maintaining Len as a ham.

Well, our freezer isn't big enough to "maintain" a whole ham.
:-)

>> Do you not think that five words per minute represents a plateau to
>> him.
>
>No. A plateau indicates that he has achieved 5WPM, and cannot go any
>higher. Instead, I think it represents a barrier to him.

It represents an unneccessary requirement for a US amateur
radio license, any class. The FCC agrees with that viewpoint.

>> Do you think he has already achieved 5 wpm?
>
>No.

Actually, yes, roughly 8 WPM equivalent rate...long ago. :-)
It evaporated with lack of use, interest, and necessity.

The high-collared colonel keeps confusing "interest in radio"
with "getting an amateur license." He constantly maintains
that one absolutely must have an amateur radio license to
just talk about amateur radio...not realizing that the FCC
does not require such a license to make regulations about
US amateur radio.

The colonel keeps flashing his twin lightning bolts (ornaments
on that high collar) insisting and insisting on certain
"requirements" which are really those he was able to achieve.
By association, those achievements are held up as some
kind of role models for others to reach...to be as good as He.
In simpler words, whatever the colonel did is what others
must do...by his standards of excellence. <shrug>

>> Dave K8MN
>
>Dave, had you simply wished him luck in getting to 5WPM, that would
>have been a compliment. But you just had to continue on and call 5WPM
>a "plateau." That's being smug, and that's where you used your left
>hand again.

As the old saying goes, "different strokes..." :-)

246. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 00:35:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304193540.29447.00000603@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 62434

In article <20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>>news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>>> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>> writes:
>>
>>> >Someone who can send and receive morse at five words per minute is on
>>> >the low end of mediocrity.
>>>
>>> I disagree!
>>>
>>> Someone who can send and receive morse at no more than five words per
>>> minute
>>> has some basic Morse code skills. Such a person is not proficient - yet.
>>
>>Even if sending and receiving are 100% accurate, and the desired
>>message gets through, you would classify the operator as less than
>>proficient?
>
>If 5 wpm is the maximum Morse speed a person can do, regardless of
>circumstances, I would not call that person "proficient".

You are supposed to call such individuals "mediocre." Haven't
you read the "sneer-macht" official bulletin board outside the
ARS Hq? Das oberst wrote the orders.

>Was that not clear from what I wrote?

You haven't been fully Googled yet.

>It's not a put-down to describe such skills as entry-level.

A "put-down" is a "put-down."

>The Morse test only requires either one solid minute out of five or correct
>answers to seven of ten fill-in-the-blank questions. Nowhere near perfect
>copy is required to pass.

Well, that pretty much "nails" an opinion of yours that
morsemanship is an absolute essential for US amateur
radio licensing, doesn't it?

[thanks for the keg of nails, Brian, came on the plane today...]

>>> And the sending test disappeared in the USA about 20 years ago.
>>
>>For all Morse exams regardless of speed, not just the 5wpm exam.
>
>Was that not clear from what I wrote?

No. It was not accompanied by the appropriate gut-and-paste
from Google.

>>> The stated goal was elimination of the Morse proficiency test. That's been
>>> accomplished in the USA, because the remaining test is a basic skill test,
>>> not a proficiency test.
>>
>>Really?
>
>Yes, really.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, the constant statement of NCTAs in here was the
elimination of the morse code test for any US amateur radio
license examination. The sudden introduction of alleged
"proficiency" was due to the over-heated imagination of some
PCTAs.

>>Is that in Part 97? All of Title 34?
>
>You tell me where the term "Morse proficiency" appears in those documents.

You must show everyone through the appropriate Googling.

>>The rules don't even define what Morse Code is, let alone what are
>>basic skills or proficiency.
>
>Because such definitions are so self-evident as to be unnecessary.

Oh, dear, allusions to book-burning since dictionaries are no
longer needed. Phil can toss his "Black's" for an example.

We can all forget about other requirements, particular technical
requirements because most of those are "so self-evident as to
be unnecessary?" Apparently, yes in your mind, since you
go into the usual "self-evident" song-and-dance on the basis of
your personal concept of amateur radio. Tsk, tsk, tsk, not good
law and Part 97 is not a Declaration of Independence and you
are not a Thomas Jefferson.

The FACTS of the FCC's definitions of morse code and word
rate have ALREADY been discussed in here and found faulty.
The resident newsgroup counsel pro (Bono/U2) stated that it
"wasn't worth the hassle" to contact the FCC for a correction
of Part 97. Please quit trying all the necro-equine flaggelation
on morsemanship definitions and do your Googling.

247. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 00:35:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304193541.29447.00000604@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 62431

In article <f45722ac.0303040558.27dc026d@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E6423B8.5DA1FF8C@att.net>...
>> >
>> >
>> > Steve - ever think the whole point of his postings might be to "brown you
>off"?
>> >
>>
>>
>>
>> Why, I thought we all knew that Lame Lennie aka AVeryFineSpeciMan is here
>for the
>> express purpose of
>> "browning off" ham radio and everyone remotely involved in it. Ccept his
>little
>> butty Brain "Mogodishu Slim"
>> BurkeTurkey. He's already embarassingly red (and brown) enough.
>
>Dick/W0EX, you better spit out that bile before it chokes you.

He feeds on it.

248. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 00:35:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304193544.29447.00000605@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 62435

In article <_A19a.9558$oY6.4542@nwrdny03.gnilink.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030303195007.19927.00000935@mb-cj.aol.com...
>> In article <y2N8a.7928$oY6.78@nwrdny03.gnilink.net>, "Bert Craig"
>> <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:
>>
>> >"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>> >news:f45722ac.0303030938.966d866@posting.google.com...
>> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>> >news:<Ymx8a.656744$HG.123127573@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
>> >> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:20030302152900.04150.00000150@mb-bk.aol.com...
>> >> > > More modern folks are just not impressed by "proficiency
>> >> > > in morse code as the primus inter pares of amateur radio.
>> >> >
>> >> > Do you really believe that a 5-wpm exam constitutes "primus inter
>pares?
>> >I
>> >> > sure don't.
>> >>
>> >> I think that many who have taken the code test would agree with you.
>> >> But not all. I am one that disagrees. The code exam is probably the
>> >> single biggest factor that keeps people moving on when they show an
>> >> interest in amateur radio.
>> >
>> >Then it's just about the numbers? If a person is interested enough, I
>assert
>> >that he/she'll either begin with the Tech ticket and advance as their
>> >interest grows.
>> >
>> >> And todays Technician license isn't much of a draw.
>> >
>> >50 MHz and up...at up to 1500 watts?!
>>
>> That part of the spectrum is ALSO allocated to Extras and
>> Generals, plus the old Advanced class licensee, same
>> power limit.
>
>So much for inequality.

? Do you wish a "separate-but-equal" status?

Are non-morsemen supposed to ride in the back of the EM bus?

>
>> >> I suppose they could become CBers instead
>> >
>> >vs. 40 ch. occupying 440 kHz of spectrum...
>> >
>> >, learning how to cuss and
>> >> jam, and wire up a toilet flushing sound module to their microphone.
>> >
>> >I'm a CBer too, Brian...and I don't cuss OTA or use any of those silly
>noise
>> >toys. What are you implying?
>>
>> Calm yourself.
>
>Ok, I'm calm. :-)

...before the storm? :-)

>> You know very well what is CW (Conventional
>> Wisdom) and PC (Politically Correct) to so many long-time
>> amateur licensees. They regard Citizens Band Radio Service
>> users as equivalent to swine, uncouth non-humans unfit to
>> inhabit the "amateur" 11 meter band (that disappeared in 1958).
>
>We both know that's incorrect, right?

No. I've heard the CW-PC shouting and hollering from amateur
licensees for 45 years. Their QRM pervades discussion to this
day. By observation all those eptitheti indicate that the spray-
bottle crowd believe their bigotry is divine and unchangeable.

>> >> Then when they finally decide to overcome the code obstacle, they've
>> >> already become molded into the kind of radio operator that we probably
>> >> don't want.
>> >
>> >Do we really want to go there?
>>
>> That "there" has already been "gone to." You know very well
>> the "CW and PC" mindset of some long-timers. Acknowledge
>> what was publicly overt in here and move on.
>
>Acknowledged and movin' on...

We will see...please do not be optimistic since someone in
here is about to go ballistic.

>> Then attend devotions at the Church of St. Hiram and Spread
>> the Word.
>
>Why is it that those who "advocate" (From my new acronym, PCTA. ;-)) Element
>1 testing must be devotees of a holy CW church? I'm just a relative newbie
>who wanted to get on HF, found out what needed to be done...and just did it.
>Forget CW's virtues for a moment. Whether or not I planned on using CW or

>not...it's far easier to just do it than whine about it. The truth is that
>they don't sell a multi-choice Q & A pool for Element 1 and that frightens
>the crap outta many folks. Witness this:
>
>KN0WCW de WA2SI WA2SI, t_x fer c_ll BT ur _89 BT n_m_ i_ jo_n. ri_ i_
>ken_o_d _ith 3 el_m_n_ _agi. qt_ is...and so on.
>
>There's the monster. With a minimal amount of study and concentrating more
>on the six required prosigns along with the numbers (They're patterned.
>BTW.) simple common sense get's you through this grinning like a Cheshire
>cat! Even if you muck up both callsigns, there's still a string of 69
>characters in the example above. A little common sense will net you 25 in a
>row very easily.
>
>THIS is the target of an entire organization...on an international level?!
>Puh-lease...entirely underwhelming.

Absolutely...and NOT "underwhelming." There's been NO
logical need for morsemanship in amateur radio for years,
only the insistence of old-timers that such skills MUST be
achieved...to fit the old-timers' quaint ideas that amateur
radio skills of long decades ago MUST be preserved in a
sort of living museum of the airwaves.

Have you seen what the FCC stated publicly in 1990 and
in 1999 on their need for morse code testing? I can pull
those without once Googling if you need an update.

>> Emphasize getting newbies while teeners and
>> ignore the tens of thousands of today's radio professionals
>> above 18 and not yet licensed as amateurs.
>>
>> Professionals don't have the mindset of the devoted Believer
>> in olde tyme hum radio, are not devoted to the Teachings of
>> Morse, and know what the rest of the radio world is about.
>> Some professionals have the temerity to express dissent
>> about olde tyme hum radio and are not beloved of beeping.
>> Can you "interest" them by constant denigration that they
>> are "inferior" or will not show proper CW/PC obediance to
>> The Correct Way in hamdom?
>
>Give it some more thought.

No. The subject of morse code testing has been considered
here for over 50 years...which included actual operation on HF
in communications (as well as other EM places forbidden to
US amateurs).

The "necessity" for a morse code test boils down to a simple
turf thing of old-timers having to test for morsemanship,
therefore everyone else must do the same. Illogical, personal,
emotional reasoning. Stubbornness. Turf things because

they made it and now claim ownership over who can do what
or who can discuss laws.

The FCC determines who gets an amateur license and the
attendant "title" of a callsign that hams love to write behind
(or in lieu of) their name.

>I thank god that my 5-yr. old is not old enough
>to whine about anything other than an extra 1/2 hr. of Nickelodeon at night.

That's nice...you now equate newsgroup opponents as
children?

The so-called record of the world's youngest ham was made
in 1998 by a four-year-old who passed a Novice class license.
If you wanted to get all snarly, I would remind you that age 5
is a year late compared to that male black child of the record.
But I don't like to get folks all lathered up about recent
events, so I won't do such reminding.

Do you need information on Nickelodeon? They are on Olive
street in Burbank, just across from Community Chevrolet.
Very distinctive front of their main building. I am acquainted
with two adults who work there.

>When we sit down for our 15 mins. of code after her homework, it never
>occurs to her to whine about it. It just gets done.

That's nice. Quality time with your children. Instill the Proper
Virtues and the progressive Amateur Way that morsemanship
is the epitome of all amateur skills.

You are welcome to call all opponents of your viewpoints
"children" and dismiss them as unworthy by describing
their opposition as "whining." You can even falsely extend
your complaints received later as "an insult to your kids"
in a snide misdirection. That is commonplace in computer-
modem communications...but still misdirection.

You have an alternate to later replies to your "childish whining"
charge - You know better. [always a popular choice] This
states that opponents are truly unworthy of your magnificent
statements of clarity and logical thought.

There are any number of misdirections and statements of
superiority through tenure, class, callsign, etc. which can be
used in your replies. See what others use. [Google away]

Do not expect all the charges of childish whining to be received
in good humor...

249. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 00:42:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304194244.19550.00000023@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 62436

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/3/03 6:50 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030303195010.19927.00000937@mb-cj.aol.com>

>Of course, and all the no-code-test Technicians must ride in
> the back of the privilege bus, not drink from the HF fountain,
> and be the subject of ridicule shoveled on them by long-time
> amateurs due to their "inferiority."

All of the No Code Technicians are in the back of that bus due to treaties signed by the United States, ratified byt the Congress of the United States, and NOT subject to unilateral interpretation by the FCC, and agency subordinate to the Congress of the United States...

NOT individual FCC licensees, regardless of what Lennie tries to make it appear.

> Those two acronyms have been in use for at least four years in
> here. You are just now asking what it means?!?!?

Bert's not been a part of this forum for those years, Your Scumminess...Not everyone eats, drinks and lives to be a part of the tit-for-tat herein. Just becasue YOU think it's important doesn't mean it has the same priority in other people's ADL's. (*)

Steve, K4YZ

(*)...Oooops did I use an acronym Lennie doesn't know...?!?! I use it every day, Lennie, why don't YOU know it...?!?!

250. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 00:45:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304194526.19550.00000024@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 62437

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/4/03 8:10 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303040610.1109f50@posting.google.com>

>Everyday you post, you verify previously observed obsessive/compulsive
>behavior.

I see.....

And YOUR excuse is...WHAT...?!?!

Steve

251. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 01:06:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304200615.19550.00000025@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 62438

>Subject: Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/3/03 6:50 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030303195006.19927.00000934@mb-cj.aol.com>

>I grew up in northern Illinois, far from NYC's "radio row" and
> the sole "electronics store" in Rockford was H&H Electronics
> partnered by a couple of radio amateurs that started up about
> 1947 (Gene Hubbell, SK, ex-W9ERU, W7DI later, one H&H
> partner). Rockford had about 85,000 population then. No
> "coffee pot in the back (or front) at H&H." No "Elmers (in or
> out of elmer suits)" hanging around to help middle-schoolers.
> Emphasis in "radio" then was FM broadcasting, "Hi-Fi" music
> systems with magnetic tape recording (new at that time), and
> broadcast television received via elaborate antennas in the
> fringe area of Chicago TV reception 90 miles from there.

So?

I DID grow up near Cleveland, OH. AES in Wickliffe and Fair Radio out in
Lima DID have coffee pots and there were, from time to time, "tenured" Amateurs
who were willing to "help the kid".

Sorry your experience wasn't as satisfying.

>I recall only one "ham club" in the home town but there were
> no "Elmers," rather some OFs and WW2 veterans who had
> a like of strong drink..."beer can vertical" parties were a big
> "six-pack" adult thing that never resulted in stable or viable
> antennas.

Of course the obligatory suggestion that Amateurs are drunkards and
incompetent. Wouldn't be a LennieRant unless there was one, I guess.

>>During those years it was easy for a person to get
>>interested in being an amateur, to shop around for the best
>>deal on equipment, and to meet an Elmer. We were visible to
>>the public, and well regarded.
>
> That seems to have been a geographic localized thing.
> In the late 1940s "small towns" of 80K population had firm,
> fair-trade prices on ready-built equipment or one ordered
> out of the Allied or Newark catalogs.

It was a late 1960's and 1970's thing too. I remember quite a few days
spent at Metropolatin Atlanta Amateur stores. One was "ZZZ" Electronics near
85 and Buford Highway. Spent a lot of days around the coffee pot there.

>The only "coffee pot" in a ham store I've encountered is the
> local HRO...a Mr. Coffee appliance apparently made during
> store opening time and never cleaned/refreshed afterwards.
> "Across the hill" to the south in L.A., Jun's or Henry Radio
> never had such, nor did Electronic City in Burbank. Retail
> stores seem (oddly?) bent on SELLING, not acting as
> "Elmers" or club surrogates.

Whew. More BS. I spent a lot of time drinking coffee at Henry's both in teh LA store and the old one in Anaheim. Dated one of the Henry's daughters (Mary) in 81 or 82. Spent time with Stuart, KB6GS at the LA store where, upon request, a cup of coffee was had by all.

Only went to Jun's once or twice...Never went to "Electronic City".

>Of course, I'm a relative newcomer, you understand, moving to
> L.A. area in 1956 and owning this present house for 40 years.
> I've been to NYC's fabled "radio row" in 1952 and found it not
> quite as spectacular as legend would have it.

We are SOOOOOOOO impressed. (not!)

>It will hurt much more to recognize that the electronics world
> has CHANGED...

Too bad you're not an active part of it, Eh, Putzy One?

> When seniors to teenagers have color TV...(SNIP TO...)

>....they aren't all that impressed by "working DX with CW on HF."

Lennie, YOU are the only one who keeps making that reference. Please cite your source for this assertion. None of the "old timers" here have made such a statement.

>That hoary old paradigm from the 1930s of "working DX with
> CW on HF" is out of date, obsolete.

Then why do YOU keep reciting it, Sir Scummy?

>There's absolutely no need
> of any amateur "National Traffic System" to cheat on Western
> Union's telegram charges when they can get on-line with the
> Internet and Instant Message someone or send e-mail.

...IN YOUR OPINION.

>Pardon me for messing up your corn flakes but isn't much of
> all this ham operating just the same thing as CB with a license?

How would you know, Lennie? You are neither a licensee nor participant.

>There be no new paradigms there, senior.

Nor in anything you've offered herein. Same usual denigrating stuff. Verbose, lacking substance or meaning. basically, TRASH.

252. Re: Great new book for tinkerers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 01:18:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304201840.09289.00002641@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 62439

In article <_%a9a.2874$gF3.305813@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>Just got a copy of the new league book "Experimental Methods in RF Design"
>($49.95). Already found 3 new ideas for a receiver project I'm doing!

That's nice. Did you order from amazon.com and get free
shipping at the same price? :-)

>Anyone even a little interested in doing their own design work should pick
>up a copy.

Why the imperative of "should?" What is in that $49.95 book
that compels its purchase (which is equivalent to two pairs
of FRS handhelds or a nice night on the town for two)?

I'm still interested in design work even after four decades of
doing that for a living. Still doing it for myself. Why the
promotional blurbing when ARRL has plenty of advertising
already out there?

You post has appeared simultaneously in this newsgroup,
rec.radio.amateur.misc and rec.radio.amateur.homebrew.
There are several other rec.radio.amateur newsgroups.

Will that book enable four-year-old licensees to build their
own RF thingies all by themselves? Will everyone reading
the book learn how to whittle their own ICs out of wood?

What is IN the book? Use generalities if you can't use
specifics. Humor us. Does it have projects using Amish
rake portable antennas? The Amish wish to know!

253. Re: Great new book for tinkerers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 01:46:13 UTC
From: john <johnkrac@ja.com>
Message-ID: <FFc9a.391592$Yo4.12941717@news1.calgary.shaw.ca>
Source record: 62440

Wow...

Someone call the local proctology school, quick!! I think of of their test subjects have escaped!!

Len, do you realize that rather than spending time typing out that message, you couldn't have gone to ARRL or amazon and checked the book for yourself?!?!

You put the "OUCH" in Anal!

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030304201840.09289.00002641@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <_%a9a.2874$gF3.305813@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "KHB"
> <khb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>
> >Just got a copy of the new league book "Experimental Methods in RF Design"
> >($49.95). Already found 3 new ideas for a receiver project I'm doing!
>
> That's nice. Did you order from amazon.com and get free
> shipping at the same price? :-)
>
> >Anyone even a little interested in doing their own design work should pick
> >up a copy.
>
> Why the imperative of "should?" What is in that $49.95 book
> that compels its purchase (which is equivalent to two pairs
> of FRS handhelds or a nice night on the town for two)?
>
> I'm still interested in design work even after four decades of
> doing that for a living. Still doing it for myself. Why the
> promotional blurbing when ARRL has plenty of advertising
> already out there?
>
> You post has appeared simultaneously in this newsgroup,
> rec.radio.amateur.misc and rec.radio.amateur.homebrew.
> There are several other rec.radio.amateur newsgroups.
>
> Will that book enable four-year-old licensees to build their
> own RF thingies all by themselves? Will everyone reading
> the book learn how to whittle their own ICs out of wood?
>

> What is IN the book? Use generalities if you can't use
> specifics. Humor us. Does it have projects using Amish
> rake portable antennas? The Amish wish to know!
>
>

254. Re: Great new book for tinkerers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 01:48:47 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v6am3so1p6v872@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62441

Hmmm ... Len, you might humor us by letting us know what you have done in the way of either 1) serving your country or 2) providing emergency communications. I already am familiar with Hans' work as I was at the other end of it when I was on Guam Island.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

--

Make Unlimited phone calls from your PC to ANY phone in the World!
http://www.eboom.com/free/
"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030304201840.09289.00002641@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <_%a9a.2874$gF3.305813@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"K HB"
> <khb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>
> >Just got a copy of the new league book "Experimental Methods in RF
Design"
> >($49.95). Already found 3 new ideas for a receiver project I'm doing!
>
> That's nice. Did you order from amazon.com and get free
> shipping at the same price? :-)
>
> >Anyone even a little interested in doing their own design work should
pick
> >up a copy.
>
> Why the imperative of "should?" What is in that $49.95 book
> that compels its purchase (which is equivalent to two pairs
> of FRS handhelds or a nice night on the town for two)?
>
> I'm still interested in design work even after four decades of
> doing that for a living. Still doing it for myself. Why the
> promotional blurbing when ARRL has plenty of advertising
> already out there?
>
> You post has appeared simultaneously in this newsgroup,
> rec.radio.amateur.misc and rec.radio.amateur.homebrew.
> There are several other rec.radio.amateur newsgroups.
>
> Will that book enable four-year-old licensees to build their

> own RF thingies all by themselves? Will everyone reading
> the book learn how to whittle their own ICs out of wood?
>
> What is IN the book? Use generalities if you can't use
> specifics. Humor us. Does it have projects using Amish
> rake portable antennas? The Amish wish to know!
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.458 / Virus Database: 257 - Release Date: 2/24/03

255. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 01:54:03 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <%Mc9a.360435$be.333782@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 62442

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E63B77C.CF61C719@earthlink.net...

> Just in case your accuracy is thrown off at the breakneck speed of five
> words per minute, of course. Five words per minute doesn't demonstrate
> proficiency.

Thank you, Captain Obvious.

Here's a question: what makes anyone critical of current AR testing standards (either the written and/or code requirements) think that the 5 WPM code requirement for HF privileges is going to keep those interested in the mode from ever being proficient at a higher speed? Do they really think that anyone that's interested in doing CW, and is actively pursuing communication using this mode, will be forever stuck at 5 WPM, just because that's where they started out? Doesn't that sound stupid? Well, of course it does. Keep hammering on that nail-- if all's you carry is a hammer, everything begins to look like a nail.

Generally speaking (speaking from the point of a new General licensee, that is) five words per minute only demonstrates that one is a beginner, like me. I don't claim proficiency at any speed above 8 WPM. But, proficiency is not a matter of speed, unless one does not care to have a code QSO with some slow beginner like me. I am proficient in code at around 8 WPM-- *because I'm a beginner*. If I keep doing CW and having conversations using the mode, then I'll get faster and better at it.

DUH!! That principle goes for just about everything, does it not?

How many times does this need to be pointed out to the OF's? Let me restate it for those who're slow on the uptake because their thought processes are constipated by prejudice against new ops and forever soured by the "lowering of standards" (i.e., "any less tough than I had it"): people who do slow CW are generally BEGINNERS, or they could be someone who hasn't been into CW for awhile and who is now rediscovering the mode.

Attitudes such as the one displayed above-- "Just in case your accuracy is thrown off at the breakneck speed of five words per minute, of course. Five words per minute doesn't demonstrate proficiency" -- do not help anyone, and as such only serve to foster resentment and perpetuate a negative attitude towards not only the mode, but also towards those who really like to use it. I used to think to myself, good lord, what sort of communication mode could possibly cause so many people to have such freaking blue-in-the-face hissy fits and cause so much strife among licensed AR operators?

I have concluded that it's much, much less about the communication mode of CW itself and much more about the piss-poor attitudes of those who feel that

utter proficiency in CW makes for the best operators, or that testing in mode should be done away with because of the "outdatedness" of CW. With this sort of vehemence coming rapid-fire from both ends, the innocent (read: AR newbies) tend to be caught in the path of fire. Older ops are disgusted by the "lowering of standards" (which newbies had no control over); anti-code types are absolutely frothed at the mouth over having ANY code tests. New ops become ticked off by the collective attitude problems of both sides, and they end up deciding that it *must be CW itself that is the problem*. Pity, that. This ongoing argument continually divides, slices and dices this community over and over and over again.

Those getting into AR when they do have to deal with the standards of their times. I only knew that the code speed was 5 WPM to pass when I was tested. I just did what was required of me to get my foot in the door of the HF bands, and upward I go from here.

I will maintain that even if the tests were so much harder "back then" and the code test so much faster, it's irrelevant to us newbies. People can complain till they are out of breath about how the standards have slipped and how new operators are lacking in proficiency, but these complainers were all beginners at one point too. Perhaps time has dulled their memories. It's 2003, folks. The times, they are a-changing, in the words of one famous singer/songwriter. If you don't like change, then stick with what you know and like, and quit chewing on the rest of our collective butts for not liking the same things you do. Meanwhile, EVERYONE who has a voice in the code/no-code matter should make their feelings known to the powers that be, because I believe that the fate of the code test will eventually be decided by the majority.

As far as proficiency in CW goes, it's simple. If someone wants to be good at something, they will put forth the time and the effort and, as such, practice will eventually make them a lot better.

Jackie
KC0ODY

256. Re: A GREAT Programfor CW Newbies!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 02:09:31 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <v%c9a.360589$be.333593@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 62443

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:nQJ8a.7591$oY6.2994@nwrdny03.gnilink.net...
> This post is particularly aimed at any newbies (Myself, very much
included.)
> that might be reading the newsgroup. Here is the link to download G4FON's
> 'Koch Method CW Trainer' as well as KB2TQX's 'KochRX.'

I used this program along with the ARRL's introduction to code CDs to help
me practice random code characters- highly recommended and very
customizable. G4FON is to be commended for making this program available to
everyone for the download.

Jackie KC0ODY

257. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 03:16:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304221644.07556.00000139@mb-fq.aol.com>
Source record: 62444

In article <f45722ac.0303040607.1ec179ca@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> >I've got you nailed.
>>
>> I wish he would cross his feet...we are running low on nails...
>
>I'll FEDEX a keg.

Thanks, got it! Gosh, a lot of hammers in here thinking
everything else is a nail... :-)

258. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 03:16:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304221646.07556.00000140@mb-fq.aol.com>
Source record: 62445

In article <20030304200615.19550.00000025@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>I grew up in northern Illinois, far from NYC's "radio row" and
>> the sole "electronics store" in Rockford was H&H Electronics
>> partnered by a couple of radio amateurs that started up about
>> 1947 (Gene Hubbell, SK, ex-W9ERU, W7DI later, one H&H
>> partner). Rockford had about 85,000 population then. No
>> "coffee pot in the back (or front) at H&H." No "Elmers (in or
>> out of elmer suits)" hanging around to help middle-schoolers.
>> Emphasis in "radio" then was FM broadcasting, "Hi-Fi" music
>> systems with magnetic tape recording (new at that time), and
>> broadcast television received via elaborate antennas in the
>> fringe area of Chicago TV reception 90 miles from there.
>
> So?
>
> I DID grow up near Cleveland, OH. AES in Wickliffe and Fair Radio out in
>Lima DID have coffee pots and there were, from time to time, "tenured"
Amateurs
>who were willing to "help the kid".

Of course you did...why those businesses did nothing else but
sit around the pot-bellied stove in the back, slurping coffee,
and impressing the kids with tales of radio derring-do and
other do-do. Oh, my!

> Sorry your experience wasn't as satisfying.

Noooo...you are NOT sorry one bit, Forest Grump. :-)

> Of course the obligatory suggestion that Amateurs are drunkards and
>incompetent. Wouldn't be a LennieRant unless there was one, I guess.

Oh, my, outrage by Sgt Yaputz! Tsk, tsk, tsk.

> It was a late 1960's and 1970's thing too. I remember quite a few days
>spent at Metropolatin Atlanta Amateur stores. One was "ZZZ" Electronics near
>85 and Buford Highway. Spent a lot of days around the coffee pot there.

Of course you did, Forest Grump.

"Life's lak a can o' coffee...ya don't know what's in da bean."

> Whew. More BS. I spent a lot of time drinking coffee at Henry's both in
>teh LA store and the old one in Anaheim. Dated one of the Henry's daughters
>(Mary) in 81 or 82. Spent time with Stuart, KB6GS at the LA store where,

>upon request, a cup of coffee was had by all.

Of course you did! If you wrote it in here it must be true,
right, Forest Grump?

Was "Mary" impressed by your mighty monopole "antenna?"
Was it olive-green in color and marked "USMC?"
Was that between wives or during a marriage?
Was "Mary" impressed by your tales of Hostile Action
Heroism?

How about that...most folks think that Henry Radio was started
by someone whose surname was "Henry." In that case, the
words "Henry's daughters" is incorrect. Hard to tell with
mixing of given and surnames.

But, I'll bet you knew Monterey Jack personally, eh?

> Only went to Jun's once or twice...Never went to "Electronic City".

Oh, my, not one mention of visiting the Burbank HRO! Tsk, tsk,
tsk. You DID visit that one (with their over-cooked carafe), didn't
you? It wasn't far at all to Electronic City from that HRO. You
missed the vast parking lot at Electronic City? How could you
fail to notice?

>>It will hurt much more to recognize that the electronics world
>> has CHANGED...
>
> Too bad you're not an active part of it, Eh, Putzy One?

Tsk, tsk, tsk, Forest Grump, I am still an active part of the
electronics industry in the southland. I'm just not working
the regular hours of the "employed." Contractural work is
like that. :-)

>>That hoary old paradigm from the 1930s of "working DX with
>> CW on HF" is out of date, obsolete.
>
> Then why do YOU keep reciting it, Sir Scummy?

Poor Forest Grump, didn't find a coffee bean to your satisfaction?

All you hoary old-timers seem to think of nothing but HF as
"the ham bands" and expressing this devotion to DXing and
CW. See Roll, Heil, Miccolis, Carroll, et al., in here.

>>Pardon me for messing up your corn flakes but isn't much of
>> all this ham operating just the same thing as CB with a license?
>
> How would you know, Lennie? You are neither a licensee nor participant.

Haven't used either one of my CB transceivers in at least a
couple of years. :-) If I bother to listen to the "11m band" with

the Icom, most of what I hear is wall-to-wall heterodynes. If I bother to listen to the HF ham bands with the Icom, most of what I hear is the same sort of nattering that existed 9 years ago, 19 years ago, 29 years ago, 39 years ago when I listend from this same location. :-)

Well, to be honest...the use of "599" for ham signal reports has gotten more numerous with the years...barely discernable signals close to noise levels, too! :-)

>>There be no new paradigms there, senior.
>
> Nor in anything you've offered herein. Same usual denigrating stuff.
>Verbose, lacking substance or meaning. basically, TRASH.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, denial of the shifting target market in consumer electronics retailing! I thought ex-purchasing agents knew of the electronics market? No? Didn't learn anything at that modem and set-top-box factory for the short time you were there?

Business trends in electronics isn't "TRASH," little man Grump. It is reality. The "substance" of the shifting focus is found in the business sections of the larger newspapers, not in the magazines and website of ARRL. One projection for year 2005 total semi-conductor world market sales is a mere $210 Billion...not a lot of that targeted for amateur radio... [source Microwave Journal, next month's issue]

Ah, but don't let this stop you, Forest Grump. Run on down to your local Best Buy, CompUSA, Target, K-Mart, Good Guys, Sears, Kragen Auto Parts or Circuit City store and spend hours gassing in caffienated nirvana about all the ham radio equipment they have for sale. Don't forget to take your Amish rake with you. Have fun!

259. Re: NAMBLA Member Douglas W. Adair N8WWM sings us a song!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 03:25:35 UTC
From: cheesecutter@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <fef386d5.0303041925.60fc68d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62446
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap,alt.flame,alt.usenet.kooks

Fatty Arbuckle <no@example.com> wrote in message
news:<cc91132c66bb1a0dcb3945fff8ce6917@news.teranews.com>...
> Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net> wrote:
>
> > Why twisty, resorting to changing your nic now? No one else would defend
> > you to that level.....
>
> Dave, are you really that stupid, or are you just trying to help Douglas W.
> Adair N8WWM live down his own violations on the Rain Report so he can get
> back to crying about CB rule violations, posting gay porn binaries, pedophile
> fantasies, running BI>20 spew attacks on rec.radio.cb and forging Twistedhed
> to all groups in the rec.radio hierarchy with fellow net-abuser and outcast
> Leland C. Scott KC8LDO?
>
> In any case, instead of defending Twistedhed, I merely pointed out that
> Douglas W. Adair N8WWM appears to enjoy writing original pieces featuring
> children, specifically boys, and gay sex. It's not like this is the first or
> even the second time Adair N8WWM has written original pedophilia songs.
>
> Why are you, Dave Hall, so eager to defend Douglas W. Adair N8WWM from having
> his pedophile fantasies exposed and disseminated? Are you sympathetic to
> pedophile fantasy writers, assuming N8WWM hasn't -yet- raped children? Are
> you frightened that Adair will call you a "traitor to amateur radio", as he
> did the late Richard McCollum Nï¿½BK, if you don't support his insane, abusive behavior?
Does
> Twistedhed drive you crazy enough to support Doug Adair N8WWM who regularly
> uses the kind of "gutter language" you've spoken so vehemently against, Dave?
>
> Your hypocrisy is positively shocking, Dave Hall N3CVJ.
>
> The most likely explanation for your brainless follow-up is that you're just
> one anti-twistedhed k00k defending another. Appropriate groups added. When
> malicious clowns like you are involved, Dave N3CVJ, it's hard to tell, but
> I'm willing to explore it at length with you.
>
> Regarding your baseless assertion that I am "twisty" under another "nic", one
> needs only to be able to read to realize that his posting style and mine are
> quite different. You obviously consider yourself quite intelligent,
> regardless of the fact that you're actually a blinkered, intellectually
> myopic hypocrite. Can't you at least read well enough to see the difference,
> Dave?
>
> I've restored the post in question below my comments. Read it closely and

> decide whether your bitterness over being clobbered in debate after debate is
> worth defending a federal outlaw, homosexual stalker, racist and pedophile
> fantasy writer like Douglas W. Adair N8WWM just because he, too, is obsessed
> with "twisty".
>
> Here are a few quotes from the ignorant, hypocritical racist pedophile fellow
> no-code ham radio hobbyist you're backing, Dave:
>
>
> "Live like a nigger, die like a nigger."
> <8f86ecaf.0111291029.6f6e6106@posting.google.com>
>
> "I was sucking when I was 10..."
> <20020307120558.91433.qmail@web20409.mail.yahoo.com>
>
> "WHAT MATTERS IS YOU ARE A FAGGOT ASS COCK
> SUCKER WITH A FUCKING UGLY ASS KID. YOU PROBABLY BUTT HUMP YOUR OWN
> KID."
> <3f8d1439.0206110732.34a362d4@posting.google.com>
>
> "After
> dark my FUGGLY kid made gas money for us by blowing 2 drivers in the
> TA parking lot. He came back and kissed me passionately so I could
> taste what he got to swallow. Yum Yum!
> <7684f123.0212070023.34227f00@posting.google.com>
>
> "Cuz, you see, my dad used to take me for rides on his bone
> But I guess that's all over now since my daddy's gone."
> <cf47b7c7.0111101134.78f41d44@posting.google.com>
>
> "Your time to be reckoned with by the government is coming. Make no
> mistake, you will be in for a shock cuz ya dont believe it. You are a
> criminal and a traitor to amateur radio."
> <e5604a02.0108081330.4e86961b@posting.google.com>
>
>
>
> BEGIN RESTORE of <bb7b6da633242f03075b1ea99f3710b8@news.teranews.com>
>
> --
>
>
> >We OWN FAGGOT TWISTY <weowntwistyfag@yahoo.com>, who is really Douglas W.
> >Adair N8WWM, a federal criminal from Toledo Ohio, was featured in the Rain
> >Report recently for violating Federal Communications Law. This would
> normally
> >be just another example of an unpleasant, obese social retard with a ham
> >license, but Douglas W. Adair N8WWM had, for a number of years prior to his
> >violations, harassed and forged others, complained about eBay auctions and
> >abused usenet regularly to combat FCC rule violations as an "antikeyclown".

> >
> >Details and audio at http://www.geocities.com/chiprshredr
> >
> >Thus, Douglas W. Adair is a ridiculous hypocrite (with the tiniest,
> daintiest
> >little hands ever seen on a grown man). Fortunately, he doesn't have the
> good
> >sense to lay low and continues to post his uniquely imbecilic rants, somehow
> >hoping his hypocrisy will be forgotten. This presents a great opportunity
> for
> >those of us who enjoy verbally clubbing Douglas W. Adair N8WWM like a
> >helpless, fag-laming baby seal.
> >
> >With that in mind, here is evidence that not only is Douglas W. Adair N8WWM
> a
> >federal criminal (see link above), but that he is also a homosexual and a
> >pedophile due to his writing of a long and creepy song (deleted for brevity)
> >featuring the following references to gay sex and children, specifically
> >young boys :
> >
> >suck
> >gay sex
> >drop his pants
> >pooper reamed out
> >Sucking cock
> >
> >BOYS<--------------
> >
> >dick glop
> >fag
> >suck
> >gay
> >faggot
> >dick
> >jizz
> >
> >BOYS<--------------
> >
> >sucks
> >sucks
> >gay sex
> >anal hole
> >jizz
> >suck
> >dick
> >lick
> >goo
> >fag
> >gay
> >

> >BOY<----------------
> >
> >suck
> >gay
> >faggot
> >dick
> >jizz
> >
> >BOYS<---------------
> >
> >sucks
> >fag
> >sucks
> >cock
> >sucked
> >fag
> >fag
> >dicks
> >ass
> >gay
> >faggot
> >dick
> >jizz
> >
> >BOYS<----------------
> >
> >cock
> >dick
> >boner
> >ass
> >jizz
> >gay
> >faggot
> >dick
> >jizz
> >
> >BOYS<----------------
> >
> >fags
> >dick
> >jizz
> >fag
> >faggot
> >gay
> >faggot
> >dick
> >jizz
> >
> >BOYS<----------------
> >

> >Gay
> >gay
> >queer
> >
> >CHILDREN<-----------
> >
> >sucked
> >gay
> >faggot
> >dick
> >jizz
> >
> >BOYS<---------------
>
> END RESTORE
> --

fatty, you da man,......you da man.....

260. Re: Great new book for tinkerers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 04:00:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304230003.04150.00000183@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 62448

In article <v6am3so1p6v872@corp.supernews.com>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Hmmm ... Len, you might humor us by letting us know what you have done in
>the way of either 1) serving your country or 2) providing emergency
>communications. I already am familiar with Hans' work as I was at the other
>end of it when I was on Guam Island.

"Humor?!?" :-) Ooooo...what a great lead-in...

If I repeat how and what I served my country in here, a
number of hostile action heroes (some of which never
served in any military branch) will grab their capes and
fly into action whining about "CVs," spritzing epithets
right and left. :-)

That particular book title is NOT about either "serving one's
country" or "providing emergency communications." Read
the message again in any of the three newsgroups it is
posted. Can you sense spam advertising for beloved ARRL
products? I can.

You want some honest answers about hobby design and
construction? Go to rec.radio.amateur.homebrew. So far
it is a mild place arguing not about "papers" or
"qualifications" but of actual design and construction.

ARRL has its own product advertising on its website and
publications. Hard to miss the ads for products there. As
far as I know, direct orders to Newington for products still
get a large extra shipping cost added to billing. Amazon.com
doesn't add shipping charges over total sell prices greater
than $25...including resale of ARRL products at no change
to ARRL-direct prices.

261. Re: Great new book for tinkerers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 04:00:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304230004.04150.00000184@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 62447

In article <FFc9a.391592$Yo4.12941717@news1.calgary.shaw.ca>, "john"
<johnkrac@ja.com> writes:

>Wow...
>
>Someone call the local proctology school, quick!! I think of of their test
>subjects have escaped!!

No, little man, your sanitarium didn't buckle all your jacket straps.

>Len, do you realize that rather than spending time typing out that message,
>you couldn't have gone to ARRL or amazon and checked the book for
>yourself?!?!

Oh, my, a non-descriptive chastisement from John Krac (whoever
that is)! Am I supposed to be "wounded?" Are you also a
hostile action hero?

A true ARRL lover would have launched into a description of contents
or at least a synopsis of contents in the best Madison Avenue style.
That wasn't done.

>You put the "OUCH" in Anal!

Calm down. Buckle up and drive someone else to distraction, boy.

262. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 04:00:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030304230005.04150.00000185@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 62449

In article <20030304194244.19550.00000023@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Of course, and all the no-code-test Technicians must ride in
>> the back of the privilege bus, not drink from the HF fountain,
>> and be the subject of ridicule shoveled on them by long-time
>> amateurs due to their "inferiority."
>
> All of the No Code Technicians are in the back of that bus due to treaties
>signed by the United States, ratified byt the Congress of the United States,
>and NOT subject to unilateral interpretation by the FCC, and agency subordinate
>to the Congress of the United States...

Oh, my, were you admitted to a bar this afternoon and thought you had become a legal beagle? Arf, arf?

Strange words. According to the FCC, not to mention a couple of Acts of Congress (one in 1934, another in 1996), only the FCC created the class of the (no-code-test) Technician license. Not the US Congress. Not the ITU.

Since the FCC is chartered (by law) to regulate US civil radio, it MAKES the US civil radio regulations. Neither is the FCC "subordinate to Congress." FCC is not part of the Legislative branch of the US government. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Better review US civics and government, Forest Grump.

> NOT individual FCC licensees, regardless of what Lennie tries to make it
>appear.

"Makes it appear?!?" :-) Have you been watching reruns of Rocky the Flying Squirrel on TV and think I am Bullwinkle? ["watch me pull a rabbit out of the hat!"] Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

>> Those two acronyms have been in use for at least four years in
>> here. You are just now asking what it means?!?!?
>
> Bert's not been a part of this forum for those years, Your
>Scumminess...Not everyone eats, drinks and lives to be a part of the
>tit-for-tat herein.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Bert answered for himself in here. Has he been "absent for years?" Go thee and Google, hostile action hero.

Try to let others answer for themselves, Forest Grump.

263. Re: Twithed 'selective disregard' myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 04:09:45 UTC
From: "Muhbalz Izhairy"
Message-ID: <BnmdnTK4AboM5fijXTWcpQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 62450

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:v629qac41oga89@corp.supernews.com...
> And this has what to do with amateur radio policy?
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

Catch ya Back on the CB NG jim, thats where you belong. Your not a real ham.

> --
>
>
> ----------
> Make Unlimited phone calls from your PC to ANY phone in the World!
> http://www.eboom.com/free/
> "Mr. X" <. ..-. ..-@..-. .com> wrote in message
> news:zGKdneN51ZceYcKjXTWcrg@comcast.com...
> > From: (twistedhed@webtv.net) Twistedhed
> > Subject: Re: They all fall down
> > Date: Fri, Feb 28, 2003
> > >my selective rule disregard of DX and freeband
> >
> > From: Twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
> > Subject: Re: Hey Jer, ask Riley...
> > Date: Mon, 7 Oct 2002
> > >We selectively disregard certain rules.
> >
> > From: Twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
> > Subject: Re: The FAME of N8WWM!!!
> > Date: 2003-02-27
> > >I respect all the FCC rules and selectively
> > >disregard two...period.
> >
> > From: Twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
> > Subject: Re: Interesting happenings above 30 Mhz
> > Date: 2002-10-29
> > >I respect all radio law except for a few minor laws I
> >
> > >selectively disregard, such as
> > >DX and freebanding on 555 and a few others.
> >
> > From: Twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
> > Subject: Re: Hams on the wrong NG
> > Date: 2002-06-24
> > >I will selectively disregard any law/rule

> > >I do not agree with..always have, always will.
> >
> > From: Twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
> > Subject: Re: Do Truckers use 10 meters ?
> > Date: 2002-11-04
> > >How many times you want me to say I selectively
> > >disregard certain rules such as dx and freebanding?
> >
> >
> > UNLICENSED RADIO OPERATION or operation of radio
> > transmitting equipment without a license (outside the
> > frequency limits of the citizens band) is a violation
> > of Section 301 of the Communications Act of 1934, as
> > amended, 47 U.S.C. Section 301. Such operation will
> > subject you to fine or imprisonment, as well as an in
> > rem seizure of radio transmitting equipment, in
> > cooperation with the United States Attorney for your
> > jurisdiction. Fines normally range from $7,500 to
> > $10,000.
> >
> > Therefore your "freebanding" is not a selective
> > disregard for certain rules, it is a violation of the
> > Communications Act of 1934.
> >
> >
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.458 / Virus Database: 257 - Release Date: 2/24/03
>
>

264. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 04:18:12 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <8Ue9a.362394$vm2.275829@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 62451

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030304193540.29447.00000603@mb-cd.aol.com...

> >If 5 wpm is the maximum Morse speed a person can do, regardless of
> >circumstances, I would not call that person "proficient".
>
> You are supposed to call such individuals "mediocre."

Most likely (as this thread is confined to the definition of someone who is proficient at 5 WPM in CW) such a person would be more accurately referred to as a "beginner".

Dave Heil, would you withhold your slapdash judgments long enough to allow for a beginner to have studied and learned the code well enough in about 5 hours over a four-week period to pass the mandated CW test? Hint: there are no extra "points" or higher license privileges awarded to beginners nowadays who can pass the code test at a higher proficiency speed, so it doesn't matter anyway.

Mediocrity is defined by Webster as: "of moderate or low quality, value, ability, or performance", which may well apply to beginners as judged by those who have had more practice in CW to become proficient. But I know of no one who starts out utterly excellent at any skill. The relevance of Mr. Heil's point here, if any, is utterly escaping me.

When I first came to this group, I thought I should read a good cross-section of the threads because I felt that I could probably get a sense of the key hot-button issues that hams were discussing in a relatively unrestricted environment. But seeing the two names of "Len Over 21" and "Dave Heil" prattling endlessly over certain threads on r.r.a.p. reminds me of some big-top billing of two midgets mud-wresting in some tawdry circus act... in other words, stupid, offensive, degrading and utterly pointless. Bye now, you two have fun.

Jackie

265. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 04:40:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E657FF4.2012E6A2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62452

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E64DBAC.1BB3E413@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E63BBA3.99F87C10@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E60F7CB.3C6E17B6@earthlink.net>...

> > > Yet you said that I never left, and complained about it.
> > >
> > Excuse me?
>
> You did.

You're beginning to get tangled in your own story.

> > You did a reversal and told us you never left.
>
> I told you I had changed my mind.

You said, Brian, that you never left.

> > That isn't obtuse, Brian. It is that which you've stated. You stated
> > you were leaving. You stated you never left.
>
> What did you state?

That's irrelevant. I wasn't Brian Burke who announced to the newsgroup
that he was leaving and who recently announced that he never really
left.

> > ...and now you say you never left. 0-180-0-180-0. You're fluttering in
> > the breeze.
>
> At least I have something to flutter.

You certainly do: Your credibility.

> > > I'm merely trying to work with you here.
> > >
> > You're doing more of the same which resulted in Ed's departure.
>

> Hmmm.
>
> When do you intend to do something as intelligent?

You mean as you did/didn't?

Dave K8MN

266. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 04:42:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E65808E.3D42D926@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62453

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E64D9DD.3FB97257@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E642DF9.752B88E9@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6003CB.9CCF7689@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDF27.7032976D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Are you by chance attempting to ask a question (in which you attempt to
> > > > > > > > put words in my mouth) and then supplying your own answer?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I never did any of the things I've outlined above. I've certainly
> > > > > > > > never:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > 1. announced here that I'd be doing something that I changed my mind
> > > > > > > > and decided not to do.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > 2. announced here that I'd never do something then reversed myself.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Nice try, Kim.
> > >
> > > > > > > > Dave, I certainly hope that you've changed your mind about working
> > > > > > > > Frenchmen on 6M out of band.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I didn't have to change anything, Brian.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > We're speaking of your future course of action.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Do you intend to work other "amateurs" that you know are out of band?
> > > > >
> > > > I fully intend to operate where the FCC permits me to operate just as
> > > > I've always done and as I have done overseas under the jurisdiction of
> > > > foreign governments. I fully intend not to use a lookup table for each
> > > > DX QSO or to check the FCC database for domestic QSOs.
> > > >
```

> > > > Other amateur stations need to worry about their own operations as they
> > > > are responsible to their regulatory agencies.
> > > >
> > > > I believe you'll find that my view is essentially the same as it was
> > > > before.
> >
> > > Then you do intend to contact stations that you have a priori
> > > knowledge are operating out of band.
> > >
> > > I thought so.
> >
> > You're guilty of answering your own question. I wrote nothing which
> > would indicate that I'd do any such thing.
>
> David, but that is the question that has been asked. Are you prepared
> to to answer it this time, or do we go to the next level of your
> stupidity?

I'll think about answering your question when you show some civility and
when you answer the questions N2EY and I have both asked about your
Somali "operations".

What was that line you used with Steve? Something about not dancing to
his fiddling...

Dave K8MN

267. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 04:43:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6580E1.83D5D4B3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62454

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E64D5FB.90E008DD@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E63B6D0.1F3F75@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDD72.DB32D50D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > > > > > > > Right-o. We mustn't confuse legitimate (yet very slooooooooow)
> > > > > > > > > communications and proficiency in use of a mode.
> > >
> > > > > > > > Why not? The desired communication took place, according to both of your
comments.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Why not? Because the two are not one and the same. We'll never know if
> > > > > > > > "desired" communications can take place at five words per minute unless
> > > > > > > > the desire is to go v e r y s l o w l y.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > That sounds like the power requirement rules also. The OF's say they
> > > > > > > "desire" a 40 over 9 signal report.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Might sound like it to you. You're famous for trying to read something
> > > > > > other than what is written.
> > > > >
> > > > > And you're famous for being smugly -superior- in all of your posts.
> > > > >
> > > > > Back to your silly assertion that the "desire is to go v e r y
> > > > > s l o w l y."
> > >
```

> > I didn't have an assertion that there was a desire to go very slowly.
> > You must have missed the word "unless".
>
> I didn't miss the word "useless" which is what every post of yours ends up being.
>
> Get back to me if you have anything useful.

How would you recognize it? Your failure to read carefully has you
dangling once again.

Dave K8MN

268. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 04:47:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6581A9.2EE4110C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62455

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E64D265.2B9895C4@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E63B820.DC2954B1@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > Do you not think that five words per minute represents a plateau to
> > > > him.
> > >
> > > No. A plateau indicates that he has achieved 5WPM, and cannot go any
> > > higher. Instead, I think it represents a barrier to him.
> >
> > We have no way of knowing if it is a barrier to him. He has never even
> > attempted a license exam which includes a 5 wpm morse test.
>
> Then you agree that you don't know what a plateau is? Or at least you
> didn't until I explained it to you?

Did I write that I agreed that I didn't know what a plateau is? I don't
see it here and I don't recall it. If or when Leonard H. hits that 5
wpm plateau, he can rest for a while and think about tackling the exam
which would give him an amateur license with HF access.

Dave K8MN

269. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 05:03:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E658558.72819DA5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62456

```
Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E64D5FB.90E008DD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E63B6D0.1F3F75@earthlink.net>...
> >> > Brian wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>...
> >> > > > Brian wrote:
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E5EDD72.DB32D50D@earthlink.net>...
> >> > > > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >> > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > N2EY wrote:
> >> > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > > In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
> >> > > > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >> > >
> >> > > > > > Right-o. We mustn't confuse legitimate (yet very slooooooooow)
> >> > > > > > communications and proficiency in use of a mode.
> >> > >
> >> > > > > Why not? The desired communication took place, according to both
> >of your comments.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Why not? Because the two are not one and the same. We'll never know
> >if
> >> > > > "desired" communications can take place at five words per minute
> >unless
> >> > > > the desire is to go v e r y s l o w l y.
> >> > >
> >> > > That sounds like the power requirement rules also. The OF's say they
> >> > > "desire" a 40 over 9 signal report.
> >> >
> >> > Might sound like it to you. You're famous for trying to read something
> >> > other than what is written.
> >>
> >> And you're famous for being smugly -superior- in all of your posts.
> >>
```

> >> Back to your silly assertion that the "desire is to go v e r y
> >> s l o w l y."
> >
> >I didn't have an assertion that there was a desire to go very slowly.
> >You must have missed the word "unless".
> >
> >> Why is it important to you that all amateur communications go quickly?
> >
> >It isn't important to me at all. We were talking about proficiency of
> >one whose top sending and receiving speed is five words per minute.
>
> Proficiency at any rate is measured by accuracy.

No kidding. Someone who is accurate only up to five wpm is not as
proficient as one who is accurate to 35 wpm. Tell us something new.

> The very recent (see Newsline) 136 KHz distance v. power
> record was set with a dot period of 60 seconds.

Of necessity.

> >> We all don't communicate our information at double-time, do we?
> >> Different people speak at different speeds, and different people beep
> >> at different speeds. I'm sure you'd gladly slow down to 5wpm if it
> >> were a band/county you needed.
> >
> >I'm sure I'd slow down too but my maximum speed isn't five words per
> >minute.
>
> Obviously...you've defined 5 WPM as "mediocre." Since you
> are self-defined as "superior," your rate must be much higher.

You've not understood what was written. I'm superior in some things.
I'm inferior in some things. I've defined 5 wpm as "less than
mediocre".
Yes, my rate is much higher. I am more proficient than one who can
receive at only 5 wpm.

> >I'd be happy to listen to your definition of "double time" as it applies
> >to communications. Would you have us believe that morse communication
> >at ten words per minute is double time?
>
> Amateur radio is defined as a radio activity without pecuniary
> interest. "Double time" is the phrase for overtime payment at
> twice the normal hourly rate.

Not even close to an answer and not even close to cute.

>
> >> If you have no desire to communicate, find a different hobby.
> >
> >I'm communicating fine, Brian. As the term applies to amateur radio, I
> >have all of the available bands and band segments along with a number of

> >modes open to me. My comfortable morse speed is at least seven times
> >five words per minute.
>
> With that proficiency you will be in great demand in the
> commercial world should an emergency require additional
> skilled morsemen to operate the many OOK CW radio
> circuits worldwide.

I'm not at all concerned with what the commercial world is doing. I'm
active as a radio amateur. Morse is in wide use in amateur radio.

> >That's all eyewash. It does not apply to the analogy I stated. You
> >didn't answer the question. Would you call such a driver "proficient".
>
> Herr Robust, no one in here is required to answer Your questions
> on vehicle traffic safety or the Ohio state highway system.
> Please confine your smuggness to amateur radio policy topics.

I didn't have a question on vehicle safety nor did I mention Ohio
anything.
You now what follows your use of "Herr Robust" don't you?

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >> I see no minimum or maximum rate of Morse speed in Part 97 for
> >> operations. In fact, Part 97 neither defines Morse Code, nor does it
> >> indicate how the speed is computed. Ditto all of Title 34. Yet
> >> something beeping must be examined at a rate of 5WPM, and 13-15WPM
> >> exams are permissible.

> >I don't think you'll find "something beeping" in Part 97. Your
> >statement is additional irrelevant fluff since none of that addresses
> >proficiency.
>
> The reference is to equivalent morse code rate. As presently
> defined by the FCC, there is no real explicit definition for morse
> rate used on US amateur radio license tests. There was a
> separate statement by the FCC that allows VEs to use 15 WPM
> character rate at a 5 WPM word rate (so-called "Farnsworth"
> method) yet there is no specific, explicit definition of word rate
> using International Morse Code.

Sorry, Leonard. That isn't the matter under discussion. We were
writing of morse proficiency.

> That was all debated in here some time ago. Move on. Do not
> dwell on your virtual injuries received here years ago. Heal.

That's quite a "virtual drama" you have running inside your cranium.

> >> Yours was not a particularly good analog.
> >
> >I think you mean that you didn't like it because you can't counter it.
> >Care to provide an answer?
>
> Herr Robust does not provide good analogies. Witness the
> "ball game" and "checkers" analogies recently...and several
> other fluffy analogies archived in you-know-where.

You fall into the category as Brian. You don't like them because you
have no answer for them.

>
> >> > > Would you call someone
> >> > > > who can play "Stardust" perfectly but only at half its normal tempo,
> >a
> >> > > > proficient pianist?
> >> > >
> >> > > This is an amateur radio topic newsgroup. Would you mind containing
> >> > > your comments to amateur radio?
> >> >
> >> > Apparently you do understand an analogy but'd you'd like to dismiss it
> >> > because it voids your construct.
> >>
> >> I know nothing of music except what is on the broadcast radio. I do
> >> not understand your analog.
> >
> >I believe you.
>
> Then you admit your analogies are not proficient.

No, I believe that Brian doesn't undertand it.

> I do know music but this newsgroup is not for the demi-semi-
> (tractors) quavering in the dissonance of inappropriate analogies.

You know music? Good! Maybe you'd like to answer the question posed.

> >> > > > Someone who can send and receive morse at five words per minute is on
> >> > > > the low end of mediocrity.
> >> > >
> >> > > Tell it to Riley.
> >> >
> >> > He already knows. You're the guy in the dark.
> >>
> >> The FCC disagrees.
> >
> >The FCC doesn't think you're in the dark or the FCC thinks Riley doesn't
> >know?
>
> Riley Hollingsworth is a "special counsel" to the FCC. That title

> refers to what is essentially a temporary hire or a "consultancy"
> equivalent. He is not in the regular Wireless Bureau staff list
> (what you may think of as a "key list").

Riley is a temp? You know this because...

> The FCC has stated in 1990 (see 90-53) and 1999 (see 99-412)
> that morse code testing is of no value to them in determining if
> an applicant should be granted a US amateur radio license.
> That public statement is found at the FCC, not Google.
>
> Try to stay focussed.

Here are a couple of points for you to stew on: 1) There is an ongoing discussion of morse proficiency 2) there is still a 5 wpm morse exam for amateur radio HF access.

Dave K8MN

270. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 05:04:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6585BD.324BDC8E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62457

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E64D265.2B9895C4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Oh, smugness is a left-handed thing is it? I did not intend to
> >compliment Len.
>
> I doubt you could ever bring yourself to do such a thing... :-)

You've never given me a reason for wanting to compliment you.
>
> That requires great powers of self-control and diplomacy.
>
> State Department is said to practice diplomacy.
>
> Nothing rubbed off in all that time? :-)

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

271. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 05:09:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6586C0.3AC2253@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62458

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E64D2FC.C0F76D6C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Life is too short to worry about Kim's callsign.
> > >
> > >I, for one, have never worried about Kim's callsign. I just point out
> > >that her choice was tacky and in poor taste.
> >
> > ...and several other attributes, all archived you-know-where.
> >
> > Who called who "Tugboat Annie" many times, hmmm?

I refer to her as "Tugboat Annie" whenever her vulgarity begins.

I refer to you as "Foghorn" when you crank up your use of cutesty German
names or start the "poor baby" stuff.

But you knew all that.

Dave K8MN

272. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 05:21:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E65893A.1E50EAC3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62459

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0303040521.1ee94994@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E63B820.DC2954B1@earthlink.net>...
> >> Brian wrote:
> >> >
> >> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E60F380.8DC98F9@earthlink.net>...
> >> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> > > >
> >> > > > In article <3E603824.DF80D6D2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> > > > writes:

> >No. A plateau indicates that he has achieved 5WPM, and cannot go any
> >higher. Instead, I think it represents a barrier to him.
>
> It represents an unneccessary requirement for a US amateur
> radio license, any class. The FCC agrees with that viewpoint.
>
> >> Do you think he has already achieved 5 wpm?
> >
> >No.
>
> Actually, yes, roughly 8 WPM equivalent rate...long ago. :-)
> It evaporated with lack of use, interest, and necessity.

So Len has actually rolled over the edge of his plateau.

> The high-collared colonel keeps confusing "interest in radio"
> with "getting an amateur license." He constantly maintains
> that one absolutely must have an amateur radio license to
> just talk about amateur radio...not realizing that the FCC
> does not require such a license to make regulations about
> US amateur radio.

You've talked but you've not done. You've been raving about morse
testing here for at least seven years. In seven years, you aren't one
step closer to an amateur radio license than when you started posting.
There's been no "Extra right out of the box". There hasn't even been a
no-code exam.

> The colonel keeps flashing his twin lightning bolts (ornaments
> on that high collar) insisting and insisting on certain
> "requirements" which are really those he was able to achieve.
> By association, those achievements are held up as some
> kind of role models for others to reach...to be as good as He.
> In simpler words, whatever the colonel did is what others
> must do...by his standards of excellence. <shrug>

Otheres can't do as I've done. There certainly is no 20 wpm morse test--just a measly f i v e w o r d p e r m i n u t e s for HF access. You've now said that you once could copy 8 wpm. There is nothing to indicate that you could not do so again. As I've written before, the only thing stopping you is YOU. I have no sympathy for you at all.

Just in case you think I forgot the "colonel" and "lightining bolts" stuff:

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

273. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 05:43:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E658ECE.8C1F8DB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62460

Jackie wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E63B77C.CF61C719@earthlink.net...
>
> > Just in case your accuracy is thrown off at the breakneck speed of five
> > words per minute, of course. Five words per minute doesn't demonstrate
> > proficiency.
>
> Thank you, Captain Obvious.
>
> Here's a question: what makes anyone critical of current AR testing
> standards (either the written and/or code requirements) think that the 5 WPM
> code requirement for HF privileges is going to keep those interested in the
> mode from ever being proficient at a higher speed?

I've not been nor am I being critical of current amateur radio testing
standards. I do not believe it is likely that those interested in using
morse will stay long at the 5 wpm level. Maybe you've not been reading
the thread.

> Do they really think that
> anyone that's interested in doing CW, and is actively pursuing communication
> using this mode, will be forever stuck at 5 WPM, just because that's where
> they started out? Doesn't that sound stupid? Well, of course it does.

So far, nobody has written anything like that.

> Keep
> hammering on that nail-- if all's you carry is a hammer, everything begins
> to look like a nail.

This one is starting to become overworked and it doesn't apply.

> Generally speaking (speaking from the point of a new General licensee, that
> is) five words per minute only demonstrates that one is a beginner, like me.
> I don't claim proficiency at any speed above 8 WPM. But, proficiency is not
> a matter of speed, unless one does not care to have a code QSO with some
> slow beginner like me. I am proficient in code at around 8 WPM-- *because
> I'm a beginner*. If I keep doing CW and having conversations using the
> mode, then I'll get faster and better at it.

Yes, Jackie, proficiency is a matter of speed and accuracy. Nothing
bars someone who is really proficient in morse from slowing down for a
QSO with a beginner. You're reading a whole lot more into this than was
being discussed.

> DUH!! That principle goes for just about everything, does it not?

Some people play the hell out of the guitar. Some folks practice for
years and never get beyond chording "Country Roads". Some people pick
up darts and are winning tournaments. Some play and play and play and
never get much better.
THAT principle goes for just about anything.

> How many times does this need to be pointed out to the OF's? Let me restate
> it for those who're slow on the uptake because their thought processes are
> constipated by prejudice against new ops and forever soured by the "lowering
> of standards" (i.e., "any less tough than I had it"): people who do slow CW
> are generally BEGINNERS, or they could be someone who hasn't been into CW
> for awhile and who is now rediscovering the mode.

When you start referring to those who've been licensed for a number of
years as "OF's" and begin "pointing out" things to them, I'm sure
you'll have to repeat it a number of times since it won't be long before
no one is paying any attention to you. It'll really help if you throw
in things like "constipated by prejudice".

> Attitudes such as the one displayed above-- "Just in case your accuracy is
> thrown off at the breakneck speed of five words per minute, of course. Five
> words per minute doesn't demonstrate proficiency" -- do not help anyone, and
> as such only serve to foster resentment and perpetuate a negative attitude
> towards not only the mode, but also towards those who really like to use it.

Let's test your ideas. Do you consider five word per minute code to be
fast code? Do you think that anyone whose highest speed is 5 wpm is
proficient at morse?

Dave K8MN

274. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 06:03:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E659390.B337934A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62461

Jackie wrote:
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030304193540.29447.00000603@mb-cd.aol.com...
>
> > >If 5 wpm is the maximum Morse speed a person can do, regardless of
> > >circumstances, I would not call that person "proficient".
> >
> > You are supposed to call such individuals "mediocre."
>
> Most likely (as this thread is confined to the definition of someone who is
> proficient at 5 WPM in CW) such a person would be more accurately referred
> to as a "beginner".

Not one time have I used the term "beginner". There are those who never progress beyond five words per minute. Some of them are inept and some of them never use the mode after passing an exam. Check out the Novice segments of 80 or 40 meters some evening. You'll find quite a number of stations conversing at or near five words per minute. These folks are not beginners.

> Dave Heil, would you withhold your slapdash judgments long enough to allow
> for a beginner to have studied and learned the code well enough in about 5
> hours over a four-week period to pass the mandated CW test? Hint: there are
> no extra "points" or higher license privileges awarded to beginners nowadays
> who can pass the code test at a higher proficiency speed, so it doesn't
> matter anyway.

Jackie, it looks like you've made a slapdash judgement about what was written and why. At no time did I set out to take a swipe at beginners. I stated that if your maximum morse speed is at five words per minute, you are not proficient in the use of morse. I could be politically correct and write that there is no difference in one who can handle twenty wpm and one who can handle five wpm as long as we are both trying our best--but I won't.

> Mediocrity is defined by Webster as: "of moderate or low quality, value,
> ability, or performance", which may well apply to beginners as judged by
> those who have had more practice in CW to become proficient. But I know of
> no one who starts out utterly excellent at any skill. The relevance of Mr.
> Heil's point here, if any, is utterly escaping me.

It certainly looks to me as if I've chosen my words well. "Mediocre" seems to fill the bill nicely. Why are you offended if someone says that the ability or performance of one who can copy morse at only five wpm is low? Where did I write that anyone starts at "excellent" or

"utterly excellent"?

> When I first came to this group, I thought I should read a good
> cross-section of the threads because I felt that I could probably get a
> sense of the key hot-button issues that hams were discussing in a relatively
> unrestricted environment. But seeing the two names of "Len Over 21" and
> "Dave Heil" prattling endlessly over certain threads on r.r.a.p. reminds me
> of some big-top billing of two midgets mud-wresting in some tawdry circus
> act... in other words, stupid, offensive, degrading and utterly pointless.
> Bye now, you two have fun.

Jackie, I welcomed you here and I congratulated you on getting your
station set up. I submit that you've read things into my recent posts on
morse proficiency which were not there. If you don't like what I write,
please feel free to not read it.

Dave K8MN

275. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 06:21:30 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA8B019A.11F41%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62462

"N2EY" wrote:

> But what is a reasonable dropout rate, (snip) Sadly, some
> of them are no longer with us.

The least possible (I'd like to see all remain with us).

> Also, how does the dropout rate correlate to license class?

Beyond my original comments, perhaps not at all.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

276. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 06:26:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E659883.9D750C8F@att.net>
Source record: 62463

N2EY wrote:

> erm "Morse proficiency" appears in those documents.
> >
> >The rules don't even define what Morse Code is, let alone what are
> >basic skills or proficiency.
>
> Because such definitions are so self-evident as to be unnecessary.

....to virtually everyone on the planet, except Slim.

277. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 06:29:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E659938.CDD7B974@att.net>
Source record: 62464

Bert Craig wrote:

> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030303195010.19927.00000937@mb-cj.aol.com...
> > In article <Ymx8a.656744$HG.123127573@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert
> Craig"
> > <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:
> >
> > >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20030302152900.04150.00000150@mb-bk.aol.com...
> > >> More modern folks are just not impressed by "proficiency
> > >> in morse code as the primus inter pares of amateur radio.
> > >
> > >Do you really believe that a 5-wpm exam constitutes "primus inter pares?"
> I
> > >sure don't.
> >
> > "Proficiency" in morse code has been defined by long-time
> > amateurs as what They tested to...namely greater than
> > 20 WPM rate.
>
> "Long-time," Len? I've only been licensed for two years...
>
> > "First among equals" (literal translatin of Latin phrase) refers
> > to all the long-timer amateurs who keep telling everyone that
> > they are "first" when not telling everyone they are "superior."
>
> "Last among lazy." No translation required.

WHOA! Hammer, meet nail!

278. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 06:34:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E659A78.861C802B@att.net>
Source record: 62465

N2EY wrote:

>
>
> Show us some numbers, Len.....

snip

All Len will *ever* show is his bare backside.

AVeryFineSpeciMan indeed.

279. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 06:39:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E659B94.5E88A67F@att.net>
Source record: 62466

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E642A42.F4854A9C@att.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > Welp, if it works out that I can't get W0EX, I'll try for something
> > > close like N0DIK.
> >
> >
> >
> > I'm certain you'd wear that one very comfortably since it fits you to a
> > T!
>
> Read what I said.
>
> You're taking it out of context again.

Not at all, same context as that of your soulmate W5TiT's. Birds of a feather etc.

280. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 06:42:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E659C2D.E9CF09DD@att.net>
Source record: 62467

Brian wrote:

> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E63B820.DC2954B1@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E60F380.8DC98F9@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > In article <3E603824.DF80D6D2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > > writes:
> > > > >
> > > > > >> We mustn't forget that FISTS claims that "Accuracy Transcends Speed."
> > > > > >
> > > > > >That's fine. If your top end is five words per minute, better slow it
> > > > > >down to three, just in case.
> > > > >
> > > > > Poor baby, you really DID have a bad hair day today, didn't you?
> > > > > [all three strands...]
> > > > >
> > > > > Tomorrow is another time for you in the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
> > > > > Service.
> > > > >
> > > > > Beep, beep.
> > > >
> > > > Poor, sad Leonard. I use modes other than CW as I choose. You do what
> > > > you can in amateur radio. I'll do what I want.
> > > >
> > > > Good luck in working your way up to that five word per minute plateau.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > It looks like your left hand is getting a workout.
> >
> > What is it that you're trying to say, Brian?
>
> I tried to say, "It looks like your left hand is getting a workout."
>
> Are you in disagreement
> > with something I've written?
>
> Nooo. Not me.
>

> > Do you maintain that Len is already a ham?
>
> I maintain a lawn and several vehicles. I have no time for
> maintaining Len as a ham.
>
> > Do you not think that five words per minute represents a plateau to
> > him.
>
> No. A plateau indicates that he has achieved 5WPM, and cannot go any
> higher. Instead, I think it represents a barrier to him.
>
> > Do you think he has already achieved 5 wpm?
>
> No.
>

Seems clear to all interested observers (the few that there are) that Slim doesn't ever bother
to think at all.

281. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 06:44:41 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b459av11klj@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 62478

Well then Larry, to prove that you are not a hypocrite, let's see ya go after all of the other "naughty" callsigns (in your mind at least) be them vanity or not. I will even buy ya a ream of printer paper for the letters to write to the FCC to complain.

Ryan

> Ryan:
>
> Any radio amateur who selected a Vanity call sign with one of the
> aforementioned suffixes, with the intention of provoking purient interest,
> and then flaunting same in this newsgroup, would, indeed, be treated
> as Kim's "equal."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

282. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 06:45:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E659CDC.846A0D6D@att.net>
Source record: 62468

Mike Coslo wrote:

>
> Life is too short to worry about Kim's callsign.

But certainly not too short to express your disgust at her flaunting it and then move on while she
lamely attempts to defend/justify/explain.

283. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 06:46:23 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b459b821klj@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 62479

Jim.... I guess any avid bird watcher that is also a ham should apply for the suffix of TIT. That should drive Larry nuts..... :)

Ryan

Any radio amateur who selected a Vanity call sign with one of the
> >aforementioned suffixes, with the intention of provoking purient interest,
> >and then flaunting same in this newsgroup, would, indeed, be treated
> >as Kim's "equal."
> >
> Fun fact: The W6 version of Kim's call has been held by the same person since
> at least 1979. The holder's first name is Michael, which implies a male but
> doesn't prove it (remember actress Michael Learned?).
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

284. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 06:50:08 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b459bh31klj@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 62480

Bingo Mike,
Life is definitely too short to waste time on things we cannot change, or to worry about the negative stuff. If efforts were spent more on changing the things we can change, to make amateur radio a better place as well as the world in general, we would all be better off. It's soooo easy to be an "olde farte" (in relation to mentality not necessarily an age reference) and sit around and complain, but it takes a better person to effect positive change.

Ryan

>
> Life is too short to worry about Kim's callsign.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

285. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 06:51:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E659E71.9B04EDF2@att.net>
Source record: 62469

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6423B8.5DA1FF8C@att.net>...
> > >
> > >
> > > Steve - ever think the whole point of his postings might be to "brown you off"?
> > >
> >
> >
> >
> > Why, I thought we all knew that Lame Lennie aka AVeryFineSpeciMan is here for the
> > express purpose of
> > "browning off" ham radio and everyone remotely involved in it. Ccept his little
> > butty Brain "Mogodishu Slim"
> > BurkeTurkey. He's already embarassingly red (and brown) enough.
>
> Dick/W0EX, you better spit out that bile before it chokes you.

The bile is all yours, Slim. Enjoy. Oh, you've been enjoying for years. Right.

286. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 06:56:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E659F91.EBF914C9@att.net>
Source record: 62470

Brian wrote:

> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E642DF9.752B88E9@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6003CB.9CCF7689@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5EDF27.7032976D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Are you by chance attempting to ask a question (in which you attempt to
> > > > > > put words in my mouth) and then supplying your own answer?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I never did any of the things I've outlined above. I've certainly
> > > > > > never:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > 1. announced here that I'd be doing something that I changed my mind
> > > > > > and decided not to do.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > 2. announced here that I'd never do something then reversed myself.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Nice try, Kim.
> > >
> > > > > Dave, I certainly hope that you've changed your mind about working
> > > > > Frenchmen on 6M out of band.
> > > > >
> > > > I didn't have to change anything, Brian.
> > > >
> > > We're speaking of your future course of action.
> > >
> > > Do you intend to work other "amateurs" that you know are out of band?
> >
> > I fully intend to operate where the FCC permits me to operate just as
> > I've always done and as I have done overseas under the jurisdiction of
> > foreign governments. I fully intend not to use a lookup table for each
> > DX QSO or to check the FCC database for domestic QSOs.
> >
> > Other amateur stations need to worry about their own operations as they
> > are responsible to their regulatory agencies.
> >
> > I believe you'll find that my view is essentially the same as it was

> > before.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Then you do intend to contact stations that you have a priori
> knowledge are operating out of band.
>
> I thought so.

Would you kindly quote in Part 97 where it says a US ham is responsible for knowing other countries
allocations and keeping current on them and their updates?

I know, someone else came on frequency saying they were out. An authority? How would you know?
I guess everyone is supposed to accept what someone says as gospel? Yep, you would.

287. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 07:12:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E65A353.CDE30AB@att.net>
Source record: 62471

>
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>
> >There's absolutely no need
> > of any amateur "National Traffic System" to cheat on Western
> > Union's telegram charges when they can get on-line with the
> > Internet and Instant Message someone or send e-mail.
>
>

This from the same dunce who insists there was no nationwide Police
Ratiotelegraph Net until the early
1970's. If he doesn't want to know about it he simply refuses to admit it exists.

What an idiot!

288. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 11:49:03 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Pul9a.1259$gf7.554854@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 62472

```
"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0303041534.f42f72@posting.google.com...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<y2N8a.7928$oY6.78@nwrdny03.gnilink.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0303030938.966d866@posting.google.com...
> > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:<Ymx8a.656744$HG.123127573@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> > > > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20030302152900.04150.00000150@mb-bk.aol.com...
> > > > > More modern folks are just not impressed by "proficiency
> > > > > in morse code as the primus inter pares of amateur radio.
> > > >
> > > > Do you really believe that a 5-wpm exam constitutes "primus inter
pares?
> > I
> > > > > sure don't.
> > > >
> > > I think that many who have taken the code test would agree with you.
> > > But not all. I am one that disagrees. The code exam is probably the
> > > single biggest factor that keeps people moving on when they show an
> > > interest in amateur radio.
> > >
> > Then it's just about the numbers? If a person is interested enough, I
assert
> > that he/she'll either begin with the Tech ticket and advance as their
> > interest grows.
>
> How do you advance when the code represents a barrier?

Stop thinking of the code as a barrier. You advance by passing Element 1,
that's how.

"Think you can or think you can't...either way, you're right."

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI
```

289. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 11:52:10 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Kxl9a.1265$gf7.560330@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 62473

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3E659938.CDD7B974@att.net...
>
>
> Bert Craig wrote:
>
> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030303195010.19927.00000937@mb-cj.aol.com...
> > > In article <Ymx8a.656744$HG.123127573@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert
> > Craig"
> > > <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:
> > >
> > > >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > >news:20030302152900.04150.00000150@mb-bk.aol.com...
> > > >> More modern folks are just not impressed by "proficiency
> > > >> in morse code as the primus inter pares of amateur radio.
> > > >
> > > >Do you really believe that a 5-wpm exam constitutes "primus inter
pares?"
> > I
> > > >sure don't.
> > >
> > > "Proficiency" in morse code has been defined by long-time
> > > amateurs as what They tested to...namely greater than
> > > 20 WPM rate.
> >
> > "Long-time," Len? I've only been licensed for two years...
> >
> > > "First among equals" (literal translatin of Latin phrase) refers
> > > to all the long-timer amateurs who keep telling everyone that
> > > they are "first" when not telling everyone they are "superior."
> >
> > "Last among lazy." No translation required.
>
>
>
> WHOA! Hammer, meet nail!

Was it something I said? 0;-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

290. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 13:10:02 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <KGm9a.367272$be.341150@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 62474

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E658ECE.8C1F8DB@earthlink.net...

> I've not been nor am I being critical of current amateur radio testing
> standards. I do not believe it is likely that those interested in using
> morse will stay long at the 5 wpm level. Maybe you've not been reading
> the thread.

I am reading the thread and the question was not specifically directed at you, but anyone who wanted to answer. I should have wrote, "here's a question for anyone..." I just don't understand why people are so critical of slow coders who happen to be beginners.

> Some people play the hell out of the guitar. Some folks practice for
> years and never get beyond chording "Country Roads". Some people pick
> up darts and are winning tournaments. Some play and play and play and
> never get much better.
> THAT principle goes for just about anything.

Doing Morse is not really like playing the hell out of guitar. I have played guitar and it's a lot harder to learn guitar than it was to learn Morse. While some people can be remarkably proficient at something in less time than others (call it talent) Morse is not that hard to get better and faster at if one has the desire to learn correctly and practice.

> When you start referring to those who've been licensed for a number of
> years as "OF's" and begin "pointing out" things to them, I'm sure
> you'll have to repeat it a number of times since it won't be long before
> no one is paying any attention to you. It'll really help if you throw
> in things like "constipated by prejudice".

Uh, how am I criticizing or talking down in any way to people who have been in the hobby for awhile? I couldn't possibly teach anything to anyone who's been in this hobby for years- I know far less than they do. To me, OF's are simply people with bad attitudes- and it has nothing to do with age. I know of a couple OFs who're in their 30's. Some people DO have constipated thinking if they can't reconcile change and cut some slack to those who deal with the results of it. I'm not pointing fingers at any one in particular, I'm not pretending to know more than the oldtimers in the hobby, I'm just pointing out that some people should be aware of when their attitudes are turning off newcomers and prospective amateurs. Being a newcomer to the hobby, I happen to care that our numbers don't go down. Problematic and misdirected attitudes could result in fewer people wanting to be a part of the hobby, through no fault of their own.

> Let's test your ideas. Do you consider five word per minute code to be
> fast code?

Never claimed it was, no. Who would? I don't know any beginners who are fast coders.

> Do you think that anyone whose highest speed is 5 wpm is
> proficient at morse?

If they are accurate, consistent and understandable, then sure, they are proficient- at 5 WPM. I'd say that "proficient" is first defined by accuracy. Perhaps our definitions are different, but to me, proficiency means you know how to do something and speed is of lesser importance, since one will likely get faster in time with practice.

Jackie

291. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 14:32:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E660A64.5090006@psu.edu>
Source record: 62475

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>> Life is too short to worry about Kim's callsign.
>
>
> But certainly not too short to express your disgust at her flaunting it and then
> move on while she
> lamely attempts to defend/justify/explain.
>

True enough, Dick. But there are some here who have what might appear to be a fixation on it. It was a big issue when I first showed up here, and it's still an issue, and I'll bet it will still be an issue for years to come.

And if as some say, she is doing it for the attention, the ploy is working well.

- Mike KB3EIA -

292. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 15:24:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E6616C7.9040601@psu.edu>
Source record: 62476

Jackie wrote:
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E658ECE.8C1F8DB@earthlink.net...
>
>
>> I've not been nor am I being critical of current amateur radio
>> testing standards. I do not believe it is likely that those
>> interested in using morse will stay long at the 5 wpm level. Maybe
>> you've not been reading the thread.
>
>
> I am reading the thread and the question was not specifically
> directed at you, but anyone who wanted to answer. I should have
> wrote, "here's a question for anyone..." I just don't understand why
> people are so critical of slow coders who happen to be beginners.

The answer IMO, is that there are couple reasons:

1. creeping codgerism, where a person has come a long way since they got on board the ARS. Many people do not have much time for newbies when they are not newbies themselves. Fortunately there are others who welcome new people. I have been fortunate to have met many people of this caliber who have been happy to put up with me. The old "no kids, no lids, and no space cadets" outlook still exists in varying degrees.

2. Exclusivity. The darkside of knowing Morse is that with humans being a competive sort, and with Morse being someting that can be easily quantified by the speed with which a person can send and recieve, and you have a hierarchy system if people want one.

>> Some people play the hell out of the guitar. Some folks practice
>> for years and never get beyond chording "Country Roads". Some
>> people pick up darts and are winning tournaments. Some play and
>> play and play and never get much better. THAT principle goes for
>> just about anything.
>
>
> Doing Morse is not really like playing the hell out of guitar. I have
> played guitar and it's a lot harder to learn guitar than it was to
> learn Morse. While some people can be remarkably proficient at
> something in less time than others (call it talent) Morse is not that
> hard to get better and faster at if one has the desire to learn
> correctly and practice.

Whoa Jackie! don't fall into a generalization trap. In my own case I experinced the exact opposite of what you describe. I play guitar, and I

was playing (semi) proficiently in a couple hours - at least you could identify the song. 8^) in the case of learning Morse code, it took me six *months* of daily practice - around an hour or more a day. I had an intense desire to learn, as a person doesn't spend that much time unless they really *want* to.

I think that Morse ability is something that some people either have or they don't. There are varying degrees in between. I think I fall somewhere in the lower part of the "have it" group. Am I stupid? possibly, but not because I can't do Morse well. i know some people who picked up Morse code almost immediately, yet flunked the written test several times.

Who is the better ham? one who can send and recieve Morse at 30wpm and has forgotten half of the technical knowledge or one who struggles along at 5wpm yet has a wealth of knowledge. Note I am speaking really hypothetically here - the argument has been trimmed to show the point of it. A Hams technical ability is not the major measure of a Ham either.

>> When you start referring to those who've been licensed for a number
>> of years as "OF's" and begin "pointing out" things to them, I'm
>> sure you'll have to repeat it a number of times since it won't be
>> long before no one is paying any attention to you. It'll really
>> help if you throw in things like "constipated by prejudice".
>
>
> Uh, how am I criticizing or talking down in any way to people who
> have been in the hobby for awhile? I couldn't possibly teach anything
> to anyone who's been in this hobby for years- I know far less than
> they do.

Wrong. I always try to learn something from everyone I meet. And I pump all the Hams I associate with for knowledge, and offer the same whenever I can. Lots of more experienced hams don't know things I do, and of course I don't know so much of what they do.

> To me, OF's are simply people with bad attitudes- and it has
> nothing to do with age. I know of a couple OFs who're in their 30's.

I think it's just a microcosm of life. There are not-so-nice people everywhere. It's a 50-50 thing.

- Mike KB3EIA

293. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 15:51:25 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <12p9a.39560$x.775@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 62477

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030304193544.29447.00000605@mb-cd.aol.com...
> In article <_A19a.9558$oY6.4542@nwrdny03.gnilink.net>, "Bert Craig"
> <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030303195007.19927.00000935@mb-cj.aol.com...
> >> In article <y2N8a.7928$oY6.78@nwrdny03.gnilink.net>, "Bert Craig"
> >> <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:
> >>
> >> >"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:f45722ac.0303030938.966d866@posting.google.com...
> >> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> >> >news:<Ymx8a.656744$HG.123127573@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> >> >> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >> > news:20030302152900.04150.00000150@mb-bk.aol.com...
> >> >> > > More modern folks are just not impressed by "proficiency
> >> >> > > in morse code as the primus inter pares of amateur radio.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Do you really believe that a 5-wpm exam constitutes "primus inter
> >pares?
> >> >I
> >> >> > sure don't.
> >> >>
> >> >> I think that many who have taken the code test would agree with you.
> >> >> But not all. I am one that disagrees. The code exam is probably
the
> >> >> single biggest factor that keeps people moving on when they show an
> >> >> interest in amateur radio.
> >> >
> >> >Then it's just about the numbers? If a person is interested enough, I
> >assert
> >> >that he/she'll either begin with the Tech ticket and advance as their
> >> >interest grows.
> >> >
> >> >> And todays Technician license isn't much of a draw.
> >> >
> >> >50 MHz and up...at up to 1500 watts?!
> >>
> >> That part of the spectrum is ALSO allocated to Extras and
> >> Generals, plus the old Advanced class licensee, same
> >> power limit.
> >
> >So much for inequality.

>
> ? Do you wish a "separate-but-equal" status?

Who said that all amateurs are equal, Len? Not I. Those holding a Tech"+",
General, Advanced, or Extra have "earned" (There's that evil little word
again.) privileges than their no-code Tech counterparts.

> Are non-morsemen supposed to ride in the back of the EM bus?

Of course not, just pass Element 1 and move up to the front.

> >> >> I suppose they could become CBers instead
> >> >
> >> >vs. 40 ch. occupying 440 kHz of spectrum...
> >> >
> >> >, learning how to cuss and
> >> >> jam, and wire up a toilet flushing sound module to their microphone.
> >> >
> >> >I'm a CBer too, Brian...and I don't cuss OTA or use any of those silly
> >noise
> >> >toys. What are you implying?
> >>
> >> Calm yourself.
> >
> >Ok, I'm calm. :-)
>
> ...before the storm? :-)

Good one. :-)

> >> You know very well what is CW (Conventional
> >> Wisdom) and PC (Politically Correct) to so many long-time
> >> amateur licensees. They regard Citizens Band Radio Service
> >> users as equivalent to swine, uncouth non-humans unfit to
> >> inhabit the "amateur" 11 meter band (that disappeared in 1958).
> >
> >We both know that's incorrect, right?
>
> No. I've heard the CW-PC shouting and hollering from amateur
> licensees for 45 years. Their QRM pervades discussion to this
> day. By observation all those eptitheti indicate that the spray-
> bottle crowd believe their bigotry is divine and unchangeable.

I was agreeing with you, Len. "Calm youself."

> >> >> Then when they finally decide to overcome the code obstacle, they've
> >> >> already become molded into the kind of radio operator that we
probably
> >> >> don't want.
> >> >
> >> >Do we really want to go there?
> >>
> >> That "there" has already been "gone to." You know very well

> >> the "CW and PC" mindset of some long-timers. Acknowledge
> >> what was publicly overt in here and move on.
> >
> >Acknowledged and movin' on...
>
> We will see...please do not be optimistic since someone in
> here is about to go ballistic.

Again, Not I.

> >> Then attend devotions at the Church of St. Hiram and Spread
> >> the Word.
> >
> >Why is it that those who "advocate" (From my new acronym, PCTA. ;-))
Element
> >1 testing must be devotees of a holy CW church? I'm just a relative
newbie
> >who wanted to get on HF, found out what needed to be done...and just did
it.
> >Forget CW's virtues for a moment. Whether or not I planned on using CW or
> >not...it's far easier to just do it than whine about it. The truth is
that
> >they don't sell a multi-choice Q & A pool for Element 1 and that
frightens
> >the crap outta many folks. Witness this:
> >
> >KN0WCW de WA2SI WA2SI, t_x fer c_ll BT ur _89 BT n_m_ i_ jo_n. ri_ i_
> >ken_o_d _ith 3 el_m_n_ _agi. qt_ is...and so on.
> >
> >There's the monster. With a minimal amount of study and concentrating
more
> >on the six required prosigns along with the numbers (They're patterned.
> >BTW.) simple common sense get's you through this grinning like a Cheshire
> >cat! Even if you muck up both callsigns, there's still a string of 69
> >characters in the example above. A little common sense will net you 25 in
a
> >row very easily.
> >
> >THIS is the target of an entire organization...on an international
level?!
> >Puh-lease...entirely underwhelming.
>
> Absolutely...and NOT "underwhelming." There's been NO
> logical need for morsemanship in amateur radio for years

Sure there is, Len. All the bands contain CW sub-bands and 30m is CW only.
(...and all are quite busy.)

> ,
> only the insistence of old-timers that such skills MUST be
> achieved...to fit the old-timers' quaint ideas that amateur

> radio skills of long decades ago MUST be preserved in a
> sort of living museum of the airwaves.

"Living" Museum, Len? "It's alive!" ("That's Fronk-en-steen.")

> Have you seen what the FCC stated publicly in 1990 and
> in 1999 on their need for morse code testing? I can pull
> those without once Googling if you need an update.
>
> >> Emphasize getting newbies while teeners and
> >> ignore the tens of thousands of today's radio professionals
> >> above 18 and not yet licensed as amateurs.
> >>
> >> Professionals don't have the mindset of the devoted Believer
> >> in olde tyme hum radio, are not devoted to the Teachings of
> >> Morse, and know what the rest of the radio world is about.
> >> Some professionals have the temerity to express dissent
> >> about olde tyme hum radio and are not beloved of beeping.
> >> Can you "interest" them by constant denigration that they
> >> are "inferior" or will not show proper CW/PC obediance to
> >> The Correct Way in hamdom?

Huh? "I say, I say, I say...you're ramblin' son. (Foghorn Leghorn)

> >Give it some more thought.
>
> No. The subject of morse code testing has been considered
> here for over 50 years...which included actual operation on HF
> in communications (as well as other EM places forbidden to
> US amateurs).
>
> The "necessity" for a morse code test boils down to a simple
> turf thing of old-timers having to test for morsemanship,
> therefore everyone else must do the same. Illogical, personal,
> emotional reasoning. Stubbornness. Turf things because
> they made it and now claim ownership over who can do what
> or who can discuss laws.
>
> The FCC determines who gets an amateur license and the
> attendant "title" of a callsign that hams love to write behind
> (or in lieu of) their name.

Uh huh.

> >I thank god that my 5-yr. old is not old enough
> >to whine about anything other than an extra 1/2 hr. of Nickelodeon at
night.
>
> That's nice...you now equate newsgroup opponents as
> children?

Some, yes. In a few cases the children a a tad more sensible. <hihi> Oops, sorry...I meant <g>

> The so-called record of the world's youngest ham was made
> in 1998 by a four-year-old who passed a Novice class license.
> If you wanted to get all snarly, I would remind you that age 5
> is a year late compared to that male black child of the record.
> But I don't like to get folks all lathered up about recent
> events, so I won't do such reminding.
>
> Do you need information on Nickelodeon? They are on Olive
> street in Burbank, just across from Community Chevrolet.
> Very distinctive front of their main building. I am acquainted
> with two adults who work there.
>
> >When we sit down for our 15 mins. of code after her homework, it never
> >occurs to her to whine about it. It just gets done.
>
> That's nice. Quality time with your children. Instill the Proper
> Virtues and the progressive Amateur Way that morsemanship
> is the epitome of all amateur skills.

Nope, she's just at that stage where she literally "soaks" up stuff. Why not give her the gift of being able to forget the code rather than learn it if she decides to become "radio-active," later in life? Notice I didn't say "to pass Element 1." Plus, it's a game to her. Gee, doesn't that mean 5-wpm is...ready, Len...here it comes..."childsplay." Haw! Actually, her characters are not set at 5-wpm...they're at 15-wpm!

> You are welcome to call all opponents of your viewpoints
> "children"

The statement doesn't fit...so you must acquit. Sorry, Len...I didn't call anybody a child.

> and dismiss them as unworthy by describing
> their opposition as "whining." You can even falsely extend
> your complaints received later as "an insult to your kids"
> in a snide misdirection. That is commonplace in computer-
> modem communications...but still misdirection.
>
> You have an alternate to later replies to your "childish whining"
> charge - You know better. [always a popular choice] This
> states that opponents are truly unworthy of your magnificent
> statements of clarity and logical thought.
>
> There are any number of misdirections and statements of
> superiority through tenure, class, callsign, etc. which can be
> used in your replies. See what others use. [Google away]
>
> Do not expect all the charges of childish whining to be received
> in good humor...

Alrighty then, whew! You take care, Len.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

294. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 17:09:10 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303050909.659aa95c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62481

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E659A78.861C802B@att.net>...
> N2EY wrote:

> > Show us some numbers, Len.....
>
> snip
>
> All Len will *ever* show is his bare backside.
>
> AVeryFineSpeciMan indeed.

Dick,

Why so negative? Perhaps Len has some useful information about ARS license numbers that he hasn't shared yet. For example, if he has old Callbooks or CD-ROMs, he could generate a listing of license class totals over various time periods and share it with the newsgroup.

Such data could either support or work against his claims. Without such data, those claims are just wild speculation presented as facts.

73 de Jim, N2EY

295. Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 17:28:36 UTC
From: XYZ <XYZ@microsoft.com>
Message-ID: <8tq9a.32115$5l.9072723@twister.midsouth.rr.com>
Source record: 62482

I have a question I can't seem to get a good answer for.

Can a Volunteer Fireman/EMT who has a ham ticket use ham frequencies to conduct operations with another Fireman/EMT ham while on duty?

Technically he is conducting "business", but he is also doing Public Service. Seems a little gray, but hopefully someone can clearify this for me.

Comments?

296. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 17:35:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030305123547.14968.00000037@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62483

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/4/03 9:16 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030304221644.07556.00000139@mb-fq.aol.com>
>
>In article <f45722ac.0303040607.1ec179ca@posting.google.com>,
>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>>> >I've got you nailed.
>>>
>>> I wish he would cross his feet...we are running low on nails...
>>
>>I'll FEDEX a keg.
>
> Thanks, got it! Gosh, a lot of hammers in here thinking
> everything else is a nail... :-)

Let's see....My feet are crossed and you're doing the nailing...?!?!

Guess who is who here...?!?!

297. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 17:58:17 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <ZUq9a.39687$x.7767@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 62484

"XYZ" <XYZ@microsoft.com> wrote in message
news:8tq9a.32115$5l.9072723@twister.midsouth.rr.com...
> I have a question I can't seem to get a good answer for.
>
> Can a Volunteer Fireman/EMT who has a ham ticket use ham frequencies to
> conduct operations with another Fireman/EMT ham while on duty?

I'm going to take a shot at this. If they are conducting "routine"
operations, then no. However, in an emergency, all bets are off and they are
now be considered emergency traffic. (It'd better be an emergency though.)

> Technically he is conducting "business", but he is also doing Public
> Service. Seems a little gray, but hopefully someone can clearify this for
> me.
>
> Comments?

Hope that helped. :-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

298. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 17:58:27 UTC
From: Aspiring Elmer <elmer@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <7Vq9a.527$v26.355@news1.west.cox.net>
Source record: 62485

Any answer you get here will be an opinion or someone's interpretation of
the rules. I would suggest you contact the FCC -- several ways to do this is
at URL:
http://www.fcc.gov/contacts.html

--
Caveat Lector - Ya All
I Doubt, Therefore I Might Be
73 From AC6V, who is QBF most of the time !!
Rod In Oceanside, CA
Home Page http://ac6v.com
DX Book http://ac6v.com/DXSAMPLE.htm

"XYZ" <XYZ@microsoft.com> wrote in message
news:8tq9a.32115$5l.9072723@twister.midsouth.rr.com...
> I have a question I can't seem to get a good answer for.
>
> Can a Volunteer Fireman/EMT who has a ham ticket use ham frequencies to
> conduct operations with another Fireman/EMT ham while on duty?
>
> Technically he is conducting "business", but he is also doing Public
> Service. Seems a little gray, but hopefully someone can clearify this for
> me.
>
> Comments?
>
>

299. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 18:13:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E663E37.E46669BE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62486

Jackie wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E658ECE.8C1F8DB@earthlink.net...
>
> > I've not been nor am I being critical of current amateur radio testing
> > standards. I do not believe it is likely that those interested in using
> > morse will stay long at the 5 wpm level. Maybe you've not been reading
> > the thread.
>
> I am reading the thread and the question was not specifically directed at
> you, but anyone who wanted to answer. I should have wrote, "here's a
> question for anyone..." I just don't understand why people are so critical
> of slow coders who happen to be beginners.

You used my name a couple of times so I sensed that it was directed to
me.
I don't see much evidence of people being so critical of slow coders who
are beginners. Where do you see it?

> > Some people play the hell out of the guitar. Some folks practice for
> > years and never get beyond chording "Country Roads". Some people pick
> > up darts and are winning tournaments. Some play and play and play and
> > never get much better.
> > THAT principle goes for just about anything.
>
> Doing Morse is not really like playing the hell out of guitar. I have played
> guitar and it's a lot harder to learn guitar than it was to learn Morse.

The guitar was easy for me. Whether something is easy or hard seems to
be quite subjective. Learning three or four chords on a guitar is quite
easy for most people. Learning morse at 5 wpm is quite easy for most
people.
Becoming proficient isn't always as easy.

> While some people can be remarkably proficient at something in less time
> than others (call it talent) Morse is not that hard to get better and faster
> at if one has the desire to learn correctly and practice.

I'd agree.

> > When you start referring to those who've been licensed for a number of
> > years as "OF's" and begin "pointing out" things to them, I'm sure
> > you'll have to repeat it a number of times since it won't be long before
> > no one is paying any attention to you. It'll really help if you throw
> > in things like "constipated by prejudice".

>
> Uh, how am I criticizing or talking down in any way to people who have been
> in the hobby for awhile?

That is evident by the words you used when you posted you comment.

> I couldn't possibly teach anything to anyone who's
> been in this hobby for years- I know far less than they do.

Agreed.

> To me, OF's are
> simply people with bad attitudes- and it has nothing to do with age. I know
> of a couple OFs who're in their 30's. Some people DO have constipated
> thinking if they can't reconcile change and cut some slack to those who deal
> with the results of it. I'm not pointing fingers at any one in particular,
> I'm not pretending to know more than the oldtimers in the hobby, I'm just
> pointing out that some people should be aware of when their attitudes are
> turning off newcomers and prospective amateurs. Being a newcomer to the
> hobby, I happen to care that our numbers don't go down. Problematic and
> misdirected attitudes could result in fewer people wanting to be a part of
> the hobby, through no fault of their own.

You'll understand that the attitudes of newcomers and those who have yet
to become newcomers can create negative reactions from some who have
long been licensed amateurs. Our numbers are not going down. Rather
they are moving steadily upward.

> > Let's test your ideas. Do you consider five word per minute code to be
> > fast code?
>
> Never claimed it was, no. Who would? I don't know any beginners who are fast
> coders.

I agree. I don't think that 10 wpm is fast either. If you keep using
morse, there'll come a day when you think 10 wpm is downright slow.

> > Do you think that anyone whose highest speed is 5 wpm is
> > proficient at morse?
>
> If they are accurate, consistent and understandable, then sure, they are
> proficient- at 5 WPM.

I didn't ask if they were proficient at 5 wpm. I asked if they were
proficient at morse. Is someone whose speed, consistency and accuracy
is 30 word per minute proficient at morse?

> I'd say that "proficient" is first defined by
> accuracy. Perhaps our definitions are different, but to me, proficiency
> means you know how to do something and speed is of lesser importance, since
> one will likely get faster in time with practice.

When I write about someone whose maximum speed is 5 wpm, I mean someone
whose accurate speed is 5 wpm. If you say that your speed is 5 wpm but

you can't really copy what is sent, your speed isn't 5 wpm. Proficiency doesn't deal with what one is likely to do in the future. The word proficient means (according to the Random House College Dictionary) 1. well-advanced or expert; skilled. 2. an expert. Someone whose maximum morse speed is 5 wpm is not proficient. That isn't an insult to newcomers.

Dave K8MN

300. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 19:26:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hbaac32.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 62487

On Wed, 05 Mar 2003 05:03:07 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:

>> >The FCC doesn't think you're in the dark or the FCC thinks Riley doesn't
>> >know?
>>
>> Riley Hollingsworth is a "special counsel" to the FCC. That title
>> refers to what is essentially a temporary hire or a "consultancy"
>> equivalent. He is not in the regular Wireless Bureau staff list
>> (what you may think of as a "key list").
>
>Riley is a temp? You know this because...

Quick, pass the Pepto-Bismol.

The "Special Counsel" title is a fancy way of saying that he has a specific area of assignment (Amateur Radio issues). No, he's not a "temp" - he's career Civil Service. I know this because I know him face-to-face for many years.

Yes, he is not on the Wireless Telecomm Bureau staff list because he is not part of that Bureau and hasn't been for years. He is part of the Enforcement Bureau, where he sits (figureatively) at the right hand of God (Joe Casey, Chief of the Technical and Public Safety Division which is the remnant of what used to be the Field Operations Bureau before the Enforcement Bureau was created a couple of years ago).

Lucky Riley, he gets to sit (literally) two states away from the Headache Palace and do what a lot of us wanted the Wireless Bureau and its predecessor(s) to do for all the years until the function was reassigned to the (now) Enforcement Bureau.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

301. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 19:28:37 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hbab304.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 62488

On Wed, 05 Mar 2003 17:28:36 GMT, XYZ wrote:

>I have a question I can't seem to get a good answer for.
>
>Can a Volunteer Fireman/EMT who has a ham ticket use ham frequencies to
>conduct operations with another Fireman/EMT ham while on duty?
>
>Technically he is conducting "business", but he is also doing Public
>Service. Seems a little gray, but hopefully someone can clearify this for
>me.

Absolutely not. He would be conducting "the business" of the
fire department rather than amateur public service.

This specific question came up about 20 years ago with regard to
the Sacramento (CA) Sheriff's Reserve Patrols, and the clear answer
"NO" came from the FCC.

The only exception would be if RACES was activated and then the
operators would have to be RACES members and their operations
conducted according to a RACES plan under the control of the
appropriate Emergency Manager.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

302. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 19:43:40 UTC
From: Moron Casey <Anon@nobodyhasit.com>
Message-ID: <b45k04$qa6$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 62489

Joe Casey ?????

HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA
HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA
HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA
HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA
HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA
HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA
HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA
HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA
HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA !!!!!!!!!!!!!

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message

> Yes, he is not on the Wireless Telecomm Bureau staff list because
> he is not part of that Bureau and hasn't been for years. He is
> part of the Enforcement Bureau, where he sits (figureatively) at
> the right hand of God (Joe Casey, Chief of the Technical and Public
> Safety Division which is the remnant of what used to be the Field
> Operations Bureau before the Enforcement Bureau was created a
> couple of years ago).
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

303. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 19:52:22 UTC
From: Mike Bartowlini <Fireman@HaveBIGballs.net>
Message-ID: <b45kgerjb0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 62490

Nope! It is perfectly legal for a volunteer fireman to do
this. It is done all over Tennessee. The FCC stuck their
nose in the matter a few years back and got it chopped off
by the entire Congressional delegation of Tennessee plus
both U.S. Senators. Both our U.S. Senators said the FCC
would have their budget cut if they ever stuck their nose in
volunteer firemen's business in Tennessee again.

Mike Bartowline
Volunteer Firefighter
Engine 16

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hbab304.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Wed, 05 Mar 2003 17:28:36 GMT, XYZ wrote:
>
> >I have a question I can't seem to get a good answer for.
> >
> >Can a Volunteer Fireman/EMT who has a ham ticket use ham frequencies to
> >conduct operations with another Fireman/EMT ham while on duty?
> >
> >Technically he is conducting "business", but he is also doing Public
> >Service. Seems a little gray, but hopefully someone can clearify this
for
> >me.
>
> Absolutely not. He would be conducting "the business" of the
> fire department rather than amateur public service.
>
> This specific question came up about 20 years ago with regard to
> the Sacramento (CA) Sheriff's Reserve Patrols, and the clear answer
> "NO" came from the FCC.
>
> The only exception would be if RACES was activated and then the
> operators would have to be RACES members and their operations
> conducted according to a RACES plan under the control of the
> appropriate Emergency Manager.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> ARRL Volunteer Counsel
>
>
>
>

>

304. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 22:30:33 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303051430.643e1c3c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62491

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BA8B019A.11F41%stewart@say.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
>
> > But what is a reasonable dropout rate, (snip) Sadly, some
> > of them are no longer with us.
>
> The least possible (I'd like to see all remain with us).

Agreed!!

A better question would be "what's the minimum realistic dropout
rate?".

If the 'average' ham is licensed 50 years (!) the dropout rate
averages out to 2% per year. With 680,000 hams, that's 13,600 per
year.
>
> > Also, how does the dropout rate correlate to license class?
>
> Beyond my original comments, perhaps not at all.
>
One way to calculate it from the AH0A data:

1) Add up all the cancellations and expirations for a given time
period (say, calendar year 2002). Call this total 'raw dropouts'

2) Add up all the renewals and renewals-in-the-grace-period for the
same time period. Call this total 'all renewals'

3) Subtract 'all renewals' from 'raw dropouts' to get 'adjusted
dropouts'.

For the Technician case, both Techs and Tech Pluses must be considered
together because Tech Pluses are renewed as Techs. If this is not
done, the Tech dropout rate will appear to be lower than it really is,
due to Tech Plus renewals offsetting true Tech dropouts.

If anyone actually does this calculation, I predict the dropout rate
will not be much different for the various license classes.

73 de Jim, N2EY

305. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 23:55:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030305185555.06165.00000012@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62494

In article <3E65893A.1E50EAC3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

306. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 23:55:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030305185555.06165.00000011@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62496

In article <3E65A353.CDE30AB@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

> This from the same dunce who insists there was no nationwide Police
>Ratiotelegraph Net until the early
>1970's. If he doesn't want to know about it he simply refuses to admit it
>exists.
>
>What an idiot!

Gosh, olde farte, you are welcome to come to Los Angeles and
tell the LAPD that it existed. Some nice LAPD folks at the
North Hollywood Division told me all about a teleprinter net that
was working away since before WW2, connected into a national
net of TTY just after WW2. That was confirmed by telephone
with the Piper Technical Center in downtown L.A.

Did you use the telephone number I supplied in here some years
back? No?

Well...we'll just chalk it up to yourself being unable to
differentiate "telegraphy" equipment. Teleprinters (trade name
Teletype) are classified as telegraph equipment. I guess some
terms in the state of Missouri are different... :-)

307. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 23:55:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030305185556.06165.00000014@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62492

In article <3E6585BD.324BDC8E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

308. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 23:55:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030305185556.06165.00000015@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62493

In article <3E6585BD.324BDC8E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

309. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 23:55:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030305185556.06165.00000013@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62495

In article <3E6586C0.3AC2253@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E64D2FC.C0F76D6C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >> Life is too short to worry about Kim's callsign.
>> >
>> >I, for one, have never worried about Kim's callsign. I just point out
>> >that her choice was tacky and in poor taste.
>>
>> ...and several other attributes, all archived you-know-where.
>>
>> Who called who "Tugboat Annie" many times, hmmm?
>
>I refer to her as "Tugboat Annie" whenever her vulgarity begins.

"Vulgarity" defined as speaking out against your personal
opinions? :-)

>I refer to you as "Foghorn" when you crank up your use of cutesty German
>names or start the "poor baby" stuff.

Awwww....

>But you knew all that.

I did? :-)

310. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 23:55:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030305185558.06165.00000016@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62497

In article <3E658558.72819DA5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E64D5FB.90E008DD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Brian wrote:
>> >>
>> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<3E63B6D0.1F3F75@earthlink.net>...
>> >> > Brian wrote:
>> >> > >
>> >> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>...
>> >> > > > Brian wrote:
>> >> > > > > >
>> >> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<3E5EDD72.DB32D50D@earthlink.net>...
>> >> > > > > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
>> >> > > > > > > > >
>> >> > > > > > > > N2EY wrote:
>> >> > > > > > > > >
>> >> > > > > > > > > In article
><f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
>> >> > > > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> >> > >
>> >> > > > > > > > Right-o. We mustn't confuse legitimate (yet very slooooooooow)
>> >> > > > > > > > communications and proficiency in use of a mode.
>> >> >
>> >> > > > > > Why not? The desired communication took place, according to
>both
>> >of your comments.
>> >> > > >
>> >> > > > > > Why not? Because the two are not one and the same. We'll never
>know
>> >if
>> >> > > > > "desired" communications can take place at five words per minute
>> >unless
>> >> > > > > the desire is to go v e r y s l o w l y.
>> >> > >
>> >> > > That sounds like the power requirement rules also. The OF's say

>they
>> >> > > "desire" a 40 over 9 signal report.
>> >> >
>> >> > Might sound like it to you. You're famous for trying to read
>something
>> >> > other than what is written.
>> >>
>> >> And you're famous for being smugly -superior- in all of your posts.
>> >>
>> >> Back to your silly assertion that the "desire is to go v e r y
>> >> s l o w l y."
>> >
>> >I didn't have an assertion that there was a desire to go very slowly.
>> >You must have missed the word "unless".
>> >
>> >> Why is it important to you that all amateur communications go quickly?
>> >
>> >It isn't important to me at all. We were talking about proficiency of
>> >one whose top sending and receiving speed is five words per minute.
>>
>> Proficiency at any rate is measured by accuracy.
>
>No kidding. Someone who is accurate only up to five wpm is not as
>proficient as one who is accurate to 35 wpm. Tell us something new.

Looking out the window yesterday, I could see it was raining.
:-)

>> The very recent (see Newsline) 136 KHz distance v. power
>> record was set with a dot period of 60 seconds.
>
>Of necessity.

Oh? Not of rapid-rate "proficiency?" :-)

>> >> We all don't communicate our information at double-time, do we?
>> >> Different people speak at different speeds, and different people beep
>> >> at different speeds. I'm sure you'd gladly slow down to 5wpm if it
>> >> were a band/county you needed.
>> >
>> >I'm sure I'd slow down too but my maximum speed isn't five words per
>> >minute.
>>
>> Obviously...you've defined 5 WPM as "mediocre." Since you
>> are self-defined as "superior," your rate must be much higher.
>
>You've not understood what was written. I'm superior in some things.
>I'm inferior in some things.

Good grief...actually "inferior in some things?!?" Who would have
thought...?!

>I've defined 5 wpm as "less than mediocre".

Well, "there we have it!"

>Yes, my rate is much higher. I am more proficient than one who can
>receive at only 5 wpm.

Yes, yes, we've all heard of your superiority.

Are you also able to leap tall pile-ups in a single bound? Faster
than a speeding bulletin?

>Not even close to an answer and not even close to cute.

Awwww. Did your corn flakes taste unusual this morning?

>> With that proficiency you will be in great demand in the
>> commercial world should an emergency require additional
>> skilled morsemen to operate the many OOK CW radio
>> circuits worldwide.
>
>I'm not at all concerned with what the commercial world is doing. I'm
>active as a radio amateur. Morse is in wide use in amateur radio.

...and so morse it be...

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>Sorry, Leonard. That isn't the matter under discussion. We were
>writing of morse proficiency.

...and you are the absolute moderator-judge-jury...yes, everyone
knows that.

>> That was all debated in here some time ago. Move on. Do not
>> dwell on your virtual injuries received here years ago. Heal.
>
>That's quite a "virtual drama" you have running inside your cranium.

No. It's all in Google. :-)

>> Herr Robust does not provide good analogies. Witness the
>> "ball game" and "checkers" analogies recently...and several
>> other fluffy analogies archived in you-know-where.
>
>You fall into the category as Brian. You don't like them because you
>have no answer for them.

Poor baby...he got answers he didn't like! Awwww....

>> Then you admit your analogies are not proficient.
>
>No, I believe that Brian doesn't undertand it.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...not everyone understands Field Orders.

Have you tried a course in remedial conversational English?

>You know music? Good! Maybe you'd like to answer the question posed.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...this isn't a newsgroup about music, maestro.

>> Riley Hollingsworth is a "special counsel" to the FCC. That title
>> refers to what is essentially a temporary hire or a "consultancy"
>> equivalent. He is not in the regular Wireless Bureau staff list
>> (what you may think of as a "key list").
>
>Riley is a temp? You know this because...

The FCC publicly stated its Bureau staff listings.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, you mis-use the word "temp." Riley Hollingsworth
is not a temporary office worker. He is contracted to be special
counsel to the FCC on amateur radio matters.

>> Try to stay focussed.
>
>Here are a couple of points for you to stew on: 1) There is an ongoing
>discussion of morse proficiency 2) there is still a 5 wpm morse exam for
>amateur radio HF access.

No "stew," Morse Mulligan. :-)

This isn't a food newsgroup even if you are a virtual Emeril
LaGASse. <pow!> :-)

311. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 23:55:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030305185559.06165.00000017@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62499

In article <8Ue9a.362394$vm2.275829@rwcrnsc54>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030304193540.29447.00000603@mb-cd.aol.com...
>
>> >If 5 wpm is the maximum Morse speed a person can do, regardless of
>> >circumstances, I would not call that person "proficient".
>>
>> You are supposed to call such individuals "mediocre."
>
>Most likely (as this thread is confined to the definition of someone who is
>proficient at 5 WPM in CW) such a person would be more accurately referred
>to as a "beginner".

There are de facto AND de jure conditions at work in this venue.
:-)

Certain individuals (who shall be nameless) insist on degrees of
"superiority" and "inferiority" according to their personal desires.

>Dave Heil, would you withhold your slapdash judgments long enough to allow
>for a beginner to have studied and learned the code well enough in about 5
>hours over a four-week period to pass the mandated CW test? Hint: there are
>no extra "points" or higher license privileges awarded to beginners nowadays
>who can pass the code test at a higher proficiency speed, so it doesn't
>matter anyway.
>
>Mediocrity is defined by Webster as: "of moderate or low quality, value,
>ability, or performance", which may well apply to beginners as judged by
>those who have had more practice in CW to become proficient. But I know of
>no one who starts out utterly excellent at any skill. The relevance of Mr.
>Heil's point here, if any, is utterly escaping me.

It becomes more evident over a period of time. :-)

Say about a five year period (give or take) and a comment
about a government radio circuit in a cashew-crunching little
African country and everything that followed... :-)

>When I first came to this group, I thought I should read a good
>cross-section of the threads because I felt that I could probably get a
>sense of the key hot-button issues that hams were discussing in a relatively
>unrestricted environment. But seeing the two names of "Len Over 21" and
>"Dave Heil" prattling endlessly over certain threads on r.r.a.p. reminds me
>of some big-top billing of two midgets mud-wresting in some tawdry circus

>act... in other words, stupid, offensive, degrading and utterly pointless.

Welcome to the world of computer-modem communications! :-)

Sigh...the tawdry mud-wrestling has been going on since ARPANET
in the 1970s. It may never cease until the last keyboard is pried
from a cold, dead hand. :-)

>Bye now, you two have fun.

I am. He ain't. See ya...

312. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 23:56:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030305185603.06165.00000018@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62498

```
In article <12p9a.39560$x.775@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030304193544.29447.00000605@mb-cd.aol.com...
>> In article <_A19a.9558$oY6.4542@nwrdny03.gnilink.net>, "Bert Craig"
>> <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:
>>
>> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20030303195007.19927.00000935@mb-cj.aol.com...
>> >> In article <y2N8a.7928$oY6.78@nwrdny03.gnilink.net>, "Bert Craig"
>> >> <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>> >> >news:f45722ac.0303030938.966d866@posting.google.com...
>> >> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>> >> >news:<Ymx8a.656744$HG.123127573@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
>> >> >> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >> >> > news:20030302152900.04150.00000150@mb-bk.aol.com...
>> >> >> > > More modern folks are just not impressed by "proficiency
>> >> >> > > in morse code as the primus inter pares of amateur radio.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > Do you really believe that a 5-wpm exam constitutes "primus inter
>> >pares?
>> >> >I
>> >> >> > sure don't.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> I think that many who have taken the code test would agree with you.
>> >> >> But not all. I am one that disagrees. The code exam is probably
>the
>> >> >> single biggest factor that keeps people moving on when they show an
>> >> >> interest in amateur radio.
>> >> >
>> >> >Then it's just about the numbers? If a person is interested enough, I
>> >assert
>> >> >that he/she'll either begin with the Tech ticket and advance as their
>> >> >interest grows.
>> >> >
>> >> >> And todays Technician license isn't much of a draw.
>> >> >
>> >> >50 MHz and up...at up to 1500 watts?!
>> >>
>> >> That part of the spectrum is ALSO allocated to Extras and
>> >> Generals, plus the old Advanced class licensee, same
```

>> >> power limit.
>> >
>> >So much for inequality.
>>
>> ? Do you wish a "separate-but-equal" status?
>
>Who said that all amateurs are equal, Len? Not I. Those holding a Tech"+",
>General, Advanced, or Extra have "earned" (There's that evil little word
>again.) privileges than their no-code Tech counterparts.

Ah, but this sub-thread evolved out of the Latin phrase "primus inter pares," an oxymoron in a dead language...literally translated as "first among equals."

That Latin phrase was used by RCA commercial avionics group out of the RCA Electromagnetic and Aviation Systems Division back in the 1970s. Cute, but it was ripe for some kidding in the avionics industry...:-)

As used in amateur radio, it is meaningless in the sum total of political correctness and "CW" (Conventional Wisdom, a phrase used by Newsweek magazine) hamspeak. US amateur radio has been stratified for decades by a Class Distinction, reaching a peak with the 6 different classes of amateur licenses. Those still exist, by the way, 99-412 didn't take it away entirely, just stopped issuing new amateur license grants to 3 of the 6 classes. The 6 classes still exist legally and factually.

The olde farte mindset is absolutely grounded in Class Distinction in here...the olde fartes being condescendingly smug/arrogant in looking down noses at the "inferiors." Since they insist on a curious sort of "equality" of their "ham community" through an amateur license they nonetheless rate themselves "first" (if not "superior"). That "firstness" is evidently extremely important to themselves although of marginal value to anyone else. :-)

>> Are non-morsemen supposed to ride in the back of the EM bus?
>
>Of course not, just pass Element 1 and move up to the front.

Odd, a half century ago and during four periods subsequent, I've operated over much of the HF spectrum without any morsemanship necessary or needed.

Ah, you are referring to AMATEUR radio where a number of amateurs consider morsemanship to be of the paramount skill accomplishment...and therefore being a "qualifier" for permission to operate in small slices of the HF spectrum.

That's still curious...other radio services do not have this "qualifier" yet the amateur still considers it a necessity. It seems to be the only radio service requiring that qualifier. Do you sense any illogic there? Or isn't it just an emotional mindset based on

some odd territorial imperative held by those wonderful olde fartes?

>> >We both know that's incorrect, right?
>>
>> No. I've heard the CW-PC shouting and hollering from amateur
>> licensees for 45 years. Their QRM pervades discussion to this
>> day. By observation all those eptitheti indicate that the spray-
>> bottle crowd believe their bigotry is divine and unchangeable.
>
>I was agreeing with you, Len. "Calm youself."

No problem. Bigotry exists in human society in many guises.
I've seen enough of it in seven decades of existance...actually
quite enough by the third decade. Does your comment mean
that you condone bigotry by self-styled supremacists?

I don't condone it, nor appreciate it, nor accept it. You may have
noticed some of that in here... :-)

>> >Acknowledged and movin' on...
>>
>> We will see...please do not be optimistic since someone in
>> here is about to go ballistic.
>
>Again, Not I.

I do not expect it from you, Bert. In this medium there are a
surprising number of readers who never post but a small group
of olde farte regulars who insist on nailing their personal view-
points, prejudices, preferences, and persimmon-puckered
ascerbicity upon some "infereior" elements as if those sub-
humans required some kind of ethnic cleansing. :-)

>> Absolutely...and NOT "underwhelming." There's been NO
>> logical need for morsemanship in amateur radio for years
>
>Sure there is, Len. All the bands contain CW sub-bands and 30m is CW only.
>(...and all are quite busy.)

Sorry, but all those sub-bands are there to satisfy the needs of
some olde fartes, a sort of spectral clubroom away from the
main hall of the lodge, isolated so as to not upset the narrow-
banders seeking refuge from the turbulence of the mainstream.
There they can exercise their special skills, give each other
virtual high-fives about being the best of all radio operators...as
they imagine the rest of the radio world smiling down in
appreciation of their magnificent morse accomplishments.

Note: "All the bands" refers only to amateur HF and two small
slivers of each of two VHF bands. There are NO exclusive
CW-only sub-bands on the 99+% of US amateur allocations
which are above 2 meters. Note also that US amateur HF
allocations are not that exclusive for OOK CW; only the two

VHF slivers are CW-only.

>> only the insistence of old-timers that such skills MUST be
>> achieved...to fit the old-timers' quaint ideas that amateur
>> radio skills of long decades ago MUST be preserved in a
>> sort of living museum of the airwaves.
>
>"Living" Museum, Len? "It's alive!" ("That's Fronk-en-steen.")

Mary Shelley should have had a talk with Ada Lovelace.
Neither produced anything but fiction. [those not knowing
literary history will not understand the above...]

ARRL caters to the olde farte mentality, the traditionalists,
the certificatists, those wishing (sometimes desperately) of a
lifestyle away from reality so that they achieve some sense of
self-importance. Since ARRL has a virtual monopoly on US
radio amateur publications, ARRL can exercise influence on
the "amateur community." Perhaps ARRL has deluded itself
since three-quarters of all licensed US radio amateurs are NOT
members. ARRL still does not understand that and may not
until there is a full turnover of all its managers and directors.

>Huh? "I say, I say, I say...you're ramblin' son. (Foghorn Leghorn)

Don't be a cartoon. The original was "Senator Claghorn" (voice
of Kenny Delmar) on the Fred Allen radio show's "Allen's
Alley" regular skit, along with "Mrs. Nussbaum," "Titus Moody"
and some others.

>> That's nice...you now equate newsgroup opponents as
>> children?
>
>Some, yes. In a few cases the children a a tad more sensible. <hihi> Oops,
>sorry...I meant <g>

Careful OM, don't use BF. 599 on the "translations" but not
needed as a ROTFLMAO will do nicely in this mode. :-)

BF = "Bad Form" a quaint olde English expression rather out
of date, even by Brits nowadays. At one time that was
supposed to be one of the accepted abbreviations in hamspeak,
pushed by certain Anglophiles in the New England area.

>Nope, she's just at that stage where she literally "soaks" up stuff. Why not
>give her the gift of being able to forget the code rather than learn it if
>she decides to become "radio-active," later in life? Notice I didn't say "to
>pass Element 1." Plus, it's a game to her. Gee, doesn't that mean 5-wpm
>is...ready, Len...here it comes..."childsplay." Haw! Actually, her
>characters are not set at 5-wpm...they're at 15-wpm!

Of course...and by extension, all of the ham operating "skills"
are then based on childhood pursuits or are childlike? Are

all the olde farte mentalities grounded on some childish game
of "king of the hill?" Perhaps so.

A previous message merry-go-round in here involved the FCC's
rather lax definition of morse code word rate...itself based on an
obsolete CCITT document which had been revised and updated
by ITU-T...but the FCC had not corrected itself in 99-412 or a
subsequent addendum on restructuring.

Regardless of the accomplishments of your very own child, not
all children are supplied with an unlimited number of aptitudes,
able to "soak up" anything equally. That applies to languages,
artistic skills, reasoning skills, physical skills and similar
attributes...including arrhythmic monotonic pattern cognition
(on-off codes as heard over radios). Federal regulations on radio
are not based around individual-example children but on all US
citizens of all ages. Regulations on mitigation of interference
are there for responsible humans requiring some degree of
maturity.

Now, I'm not criticizing you or your daughter, Bert, but parents
are seldom able to evaluate their children objectively, regardless
of their claims. Children aren't the issue. Regulations affecting
the entire citizenry of a country are the issue.

>> You are welcome to call all opponents of your viewpoints
>> "children"
>
>The statement doesn't fit...so you must acquit. Sorry, Len...I didn't call
>anybody a child.

You are not a Johnnie Cochrane nor an O. J. Simpson, are
not on public TV in here. You may have robes but aren't a
"Dancing Ito" led by a Marcia Clark.

The "Haw, childsplay" commentary you've used implies that.

>> Do not expect all the charges of childish whining to be received
>> in good humor...
>
>Alrighty then, whew! You take care, Len.

See ya...

313. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-05 23:56:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030305185641.18155.00000057@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 62500

>Subject: Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/4/03 9:16 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030304221646.07556.00000140@mb-fq.aol.com>

>> Sorry your experience wasn't as satisfying.
>
> Noooo...you are NOT sorry one bit, Forest Grump

Yet another name to be called...Of course LENNIE doesn't DO that kinda thing...HE'S a "PROFESSIONAL".

Yes, Lennie, I >>AM<< sorry. For if you'd had a better experience, you'd be a "ham" today instead of acting like a pig.

>>Of course the obligatory suggestion that Amateurs are drunkards and
>>incompetent. Wouldn't be a LennieRant unless there was one, I guess.
>
>Oh, my, outrage by Sgt Yaputz!

Outrage? Naaaaw. That passed a long time ago. Just once again pointing out how you REALLY consider Amateur Radio.

>Was "Mary" impressed by your mighty monopole "antenna?"
> Was it olive-green in color and marked "USMC?"
> Was that between wives or during a marriage?
> Was "Mary" impressed by your tales of Hostile Action
> Heroism?

Nope. Just friends. I'd go into the definition of what "friends" are, Lennie, but since you don't have a common frame of reference with mere mortals, why waste any bandwidth...?!?!

>All you hoary old-timers seem to think of nothing but HF as
> "the ham bands" and expressing this devotion to DXing and
> CW. See Roll, Heil, Miccolis, Carroll, et al., in here.

Sorry, Lennie. Almost everyone in here has expressed use/prerence in ALL Amateur bands, not just HF.

You are, again, lying.

Leonard H. Anderson...ex-rear area radio clerk widget with a bad attitude about what he can't have...Friends and fun.

Too bad for Lennie.

314. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 00:02:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030305190222.18155.00000058@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 62501

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/4/03 10:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030304230005.04150.00000185@mb-bk.aol.com>

>> All of the No Code Technicians are in the back of that bus due to
>treaties
>>signed by the United States, ratified byt the Congress of the United States,
>>and NOT subject to unilateral interpretation by the FCC, and agency
>subordinate
>>to the Congress of the United States...
>
> Oh, my, were you admitted to a bar this afternoon and thought
> you had become a legal beagle? Arf, arf?
>
> Strange words. According to the FCC, not to mention a couple
> of Acts of Congress (one in 1934, another in 1996), only the
> FCC created the class of the (no-code-test) Technician license.
> Not the US Congress. Not the ITU.

S25 limits Amateur Radio licensure to operators with no demonstrated Morse
Code proficiency to frequencies above 30 megahertz.

Nothing strange about that...it's been that way for decades.

>Since the FCC is chartered (by law) to regulate US civil radio,
> it MAKES the US civil radio regulations. Neither is the FCC
> "subordinate to Congress." FCC is not part of the Legislative
> branch of the US government

The FCC is NOT subordinate to the Congress of the United States...?!?!

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! !

WHAT A FREAKIN' IDIOT!

If you say so, Lennie...if you say so! ! ! ! ! !

>Better review US civics and government, Forest Grump

Take your own advice, Sir Scumbag LaTwit.

>Try to let others answer for themselves, Forest Grump

Try to get YOUR answers correct, Lennie!

Sheesh! WHAT an IDIOT! ! ! !

315. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 00:28:47 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E66963E.6571AB46@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 62502

Jackie wrote:

> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E63B77C.CF61C719@earthlink.net...
>
> > Just in case your accuracy is thrown off at the breakneck speed of five
> > words per minute, of course. Five words per minute doesn't demonstrate
> > proficiency.
>
> Thank you, Captain Obvious.
>
> Here's a question: what makes anyone critical of current AR testing
> standards (either the written and/or code requirements) think that the 5 WPM
> code requirement for HF privileges is going to keep those interested in the
> mode from ever being proficient at a higher speed? Do they really think that
> anyone that's interested in doing CW, and is actively pursuing communication
> using this mode, will be forever stuck at 5 WPM, just because that's where
> they started out? Doesn't that sound stupid? Well, of course it does. Keep
> hammering on that nail-- if all's you carry is a hammer, everything begins
> to look like a nail.

I understand that the code test is done "Farnsworth" style, i.e., higher speed
characters (13wpm?) spaced at 5wpm. So you have to learn what the
characters sound like farnsworth style. Presumably, once you get your license
and operate CW, your speed will quickly pick up. Back in the old days,
when you had to go to a FCC field office for all the tests, the 5wpm test
had characters at 5 w p m. Daaaah daaaah diiiit daaaaaah.
You'd have to reeducate yourself from that to get good at CW.

316. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 00:34:06 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E66977E.460BB4FB@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 62503

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Wed, 05 Mar 2003 17:28:36 GMT, XYZ wrote:
>
> >I have a question I can't seem to get a good answer for.
> >
> >Can a Volunteer Fireman/EMT who has a ham ticket use ham frequencies to
> >conduct operations with another Fireman/EMT ham while on duty?
> >
> >Technically he is conducting "business", but he is also doing Public
> >Service. Seems a little gray, but hopefully someone can clearify this for
> >me.
>
> Absolutely not. He would be conducting "the business" of the
> fire department rather than amateur public service.
>
> This specific question came up about 20 years ago with regard to
> the Sacramento (CA) Sheriff's Reserve Patrols, and the clear answer
> "NO" came from the FCC.
>
> The only exception would be if RACES was activated and then the
> operators would have to be RACES members and their operations
> conducted according to a RACES plan under the control of the
> appropriate Emergency Manager.
>

I suppose *if* the regular fire frequencies got overloaded or their
equipment went down during an otherwise routine emergency, then
the use of ham freqs would be okay. But not for routine activities.

317. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 02:09:19 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v6dbgsmjq58m45@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62504

Glad to know that money talks; then again, if it truly does, we may loose all VHF and above amateur allocations. Then again, with a drug manufacturer threatening to cut off Canadian wholesalers if the drug (cheaper in Canada) is sold to Americans, I am really beginning to wonder. Hmmm ... I heard the US wants to fine 'em $1,000,000.00 ... I think they should bring the racketeering laws to bear and throw the CEO in the slammer for about 25 years (10 years for the immediate reports to the CEO).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.459 / Virus Database: 258 - Release Date: 2/25/03

318. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 02:12:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030305211256.09289.00002703@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 62505

In article <3E64ABAD.8050300@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>
> And don't forget the W4 version of the call, who is almost certainly a
>male, ironically named Larry.
>
>
>> The holder's first name is Michael, which implies a male but
>> doesn't prove it (remember actress Michael Learned?).
>
>Learned what? 8^)

I guess Michael Learned what it was like to live on Walton's Mountain!

> Life is too short to worry about Kim's callsign.

The only person in this newsgroup who could possibly be "worried" about Kim's callsign is Kim herself. However, since she has consistently stated that she's happy with it, obviously she doesn't have a conscience about things like bringing the ARS "...one step closer to extinction."

73 de Larry, K3LT

319. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 02:38:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030305213805.09289.00002704@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 62506

In article <b459av11klj@enews4.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>Well then Larry, to prove that you are not a hypocrite, let's see ya go
>after all of the other "naughty" callsigns (in your mind at least) be them
>vanity or not. I will even buy ya a ream of printer paper for the letters
>to write to the FCC to complain.
>
>Ryan

Ryan:

No need to kill a lot of trees on my account. Kim showed up in this
newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign, and
literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
she asked for. Any other moron who shows up in this newsgroup with
a call sign capable of taking the ARS "...one step closer to extinction"
will be dealt with accordingly. No letters to the FCC are necessary;
they already know that they issued these call signs, and will merely
defend their having done so as the call sign holder's "right" under
freedom of speech. That is not the issue, nor is it the solution. The
responsibility for the demeaning of the image of all radio amateurs
lies solely with those who chose call signs intended to incite prurient
interest.

73 de Larry, K3LT

320. Re: internet ILINK repeater linking project dead?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 03:11:14 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v6df4vnscben27@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62507
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I tried Google and came up with this:
http://w3.execnet.com/ilink/
Looks like they're up to something else.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.459 / Virus Database: 258 - Release Date: 2/25/03

321. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 04:46:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E66D285.8D857234@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62508

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Wed, 05 Mar 2003 05:03:07 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >> >The FCC doesn't think you're in the dark or the FCC thinks Riley doesn't
> >> >know?
> >>
> >> Riley Hollingsworth is a "special counsel" to the FCC. That title
> >> refers to what is essentially a temporary hire or a "consultancy"
> >> equivalent. He is not in the regular Wireless Bureau staff list
> >> (what you may think of as a "key list").
> >
> >Riley is a temp? You know this because...
>
> Quick, pass the Pepto-Bismol.
>
> The "Special Counsel" title is a fancy way of saying that he has a
> specific area of assignment (Amateur Radio issues). No, he's not a
> "temp" - he's career Civil Service. I know this because I know him
> face-to-face for many years.
>
> Yes, he is not on the Wireless Telecomm Bureau staff list because
> he is not part of that Bureau and hasn't been for years. He is
> part of the Enforcement Bureau, where he sits (figureatively) at
> the right hand of God (Joe Casey, Chief of the Technical and Public
> Safety Division which is the remnant of what used to be the Field
> Operations Bureau before the Enforcement Bureau was created a
> couple of years ago).
>
> Lucky Riley, he gets to sit (literally) two states away from the
> Headache Palace and do what a lot of us wanted the Wireless Bureau
> and its predecessor(s) to do for all the years until the function
> was reassigned to the (now) Enforcement Bureau.

I guessed it was another thing Len got wrong--sort of like that DOS Key
Officers listing.

Dave K8MN

322. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 04:52:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E66D3F2.F068FFE4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62509

```
Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E6586C0.3AC2253@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E64D2FC.C0F76D6C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >> Life is too short to worry about Kim's callsign.
> >> >
> >> >I, for one, have never worried about Kim's callsign. I just point out
> >> >that her choice was tacky and in poor taste.
> >>
> >> ...and several other attributes, all archived you-know-where.
> >>
> >> Who called who "Tugboat Annie" many times, hmmm?
> >>
> >I refer to her as "Tugboat Annie" whenever her vulgarity begins.
>
> "Vulgarity" defined as speaking out against your personal
> opinions? :-)

No, vulgarity as in she could make a sailor blush.

Dave K8MN
```

323. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 05:02:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E66D653.8A47C6AE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62510

```
Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E658558.72819DA5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E64D5FB.90E008DD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Brian wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >> >news:<3E63B6D0.1F3F75@earthlink.net>...
> >> >> > Brian wrote:
> >> >> > >
> >> >> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >> >news:<3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>...
> >> >> > > > Brian wrote:
> >> >> > > > >
> >> >> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >> >news:<3E5EDD72.DB32D50D@earthlink.net>...
> >> >> > > > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >> >> > > > > > >
> >> >> > > > > > > N2EY wrote:
> >> >> > > > > > >
> >> >> > > > > > > In article
> ><f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
> >> >> > > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

> >> Herr Robust does not provide good analogies. Witness the
> >> "ball game" and "checkers" analogies recently...and several
> >> other fluffy analogies archived in you-know-where.
> >>
> >> >You fall into the category as Brian. You don't like them because you
> >> >have no answer for them.
> >>
> >> Poor baby...he got answers he didn't like! Awwww....

No, I got no answers from you or Brian, just tap dancing.

> >> Then you admit your analogies are not proficient.
> >>
> >> >No, I believe that Brian doesn't undertand it.
```

>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...not everyone understands Field Orders.

Which order would that be, Len?

> Have you tried a course in remedial conversational English?
>
> >You know music? Good! Maybe you'd like to answer the question posed.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...this isn't a newsgroup about music, maestro.

So you don't like the answer that reality would force on you?

> >> Riley Hollingsworth is a "special counsel" to the FCC. That title
> >> refers to what is essentially a temporary hire or a "consultancy"
> >> equivalent. He is not in the regular Wireless Bureau staff list
> >> (what you may think of as a "key list").
> >
> >Riley is a temp? You know this because...
>
> The FCC publicly stated its Bureau staff listings.

...and you misunderstood them.

> Tsk, tsk, tsk, you mis-use the word "temp." Riley Hollingsworth
> is not a temporary office worker. He is contracted to be special
> counsel to the FCC on amateur radio matters.

Looks like you misused the word "temp". Why'd you snip just that part
of your Riley tale? Looks like you also misunderstood Riley's function.
It looks like a rerun of your DOS Key Officers gaffe.

> >Here are a couple of points for you to stew on: 1) There is an ongoing
> >discussion of morse proficiency 2) there is still a 5 wpm morse exam for
> >amateur radio HF access.
>
> No "stew," Morse Mulligan. :-)
>
> This isn't a food newsgroup even if you are a virtual Emeril
> LaGASse. <pow!> :-)

"Critics are like Eunuchs. They know what to do but they can't do it".
<pow!>

Dave K8MN

324. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 06:59:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030306015920.29820.00000939@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 62511

In article <20030305190222.18155.00000058@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>> All of the No Code Technicians are in the back of that bus due to
>>treaties
>>>signed by the United States, ratified byt the Congress of the United
>States,
>>>and NOT subject to unilateral interpretation by the FCC, and agency
>>subordinate
>>>to the Congress of the United States...
>>
>> Oh, my, were you admitted to a bar this afternoon and thought
>> you had become a legal beagle? Arf, arf?
>>
>> Strange words. According to the FCC, not to mention a couple
>> of Acts of Congress (one in 1934, another in 1996), only the
>> FCC created the class of the (no-code-test) Technician license.
>> Not the US Congress. Not the ITU.
>
> S25 limits Amateur Radio licensure to operators with no demonstrated
>Morse Code proficiency to frequencies above 30 megahertz.

Tsk, tsk, tsk..."S25" refers to the entire set of ITU-R Recommendations for amateur radio.

S25.5 is the specific Recommendation in regards to administrations giving International Morse Code testing for any amateur radio license having privileges below 30 MHz.

S25.5 does not "limit" anyone, since it merely indicates a frequency below which licensees should (not shall) demonstrate the ability to receive International Morse Code by ear and send by hand. Note that ITU-R Recommendations are just recommendations, not commands or regulations to be obeyed.

In the USA, the "send by hand" portion of S25.5 is an optional waive for all examinations. Administration members of ITU-R are not obliged to precisely obey all recommendations.

Japan has waived Recommendation S25.5 for a certain class of their amateur license which does have HF privileges.

Administrations are free to impose morse code testing for all amateur licensees if they so wish, or partial morse code testing for privileges above 30 MHz. It is all up to each nation's

administrations.

> Nothing strange about that...it's been that way for decades.

That it was "always so" is not a valid criterion for an ITU-R
Recommendation.

>>Since the FCC is chartered (by law) to regulate US civil radio,
>> it MAKES the US civil radio regulations. Neither is the FCC
>> "subordinate to Congress." FCC is not part of the Legislative
>> branch of the US government
>
> The FCC is NOT subordinate to the Congress of the United States...?!?!
>
>BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! !
>
> WHAT A FREAKIN' IDIOT!
>
> If you say so, Lennie...if you say so! ! ! ! ! !

No, the US government says so. The Federal Communications
Commission is an independent agency. It was formerly under
Department of Commerce, a secretariat.

There are three branches of the United States government:
Administrative, Legislative, Judicial. Congress is the
Legislative branch. The presidency and secretaries are the
administration branch. The Supreme Court is the Judicial.

>>Better review US civics and government, Forest Grump
>
> Take your own advice, Sir Scumbag LaTwit.

"Laugh" all you want, use all the epithets you want...you will not
change the US government that way, nor the Constitution of the
United States of America.

>>Try to let others answer for themselves, Forest Grump
>
> Try to get YOUR answers correct, Lennie!
>
> Sheesh! WHAT an IDIOT! ! ! !

325. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 08:08:49 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA8C6C40.12028%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62512

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> If the 'average' ham is licensed 50 years (!) (snip)

Wow, and you questioned my assumptions. Actually, I like the numbers though. If true, that means I have about 46 more years to go - which will make me about 90+ years old in the end. At that point, I guess I'll drop out of ham radio and go into deep sea diving or something. :)

And, yes, I do know what you're trying to say. I'm just trying to lighten up the conversation a little (see below).

> If anyone actually does this calculation, I predict
> the dropout rate will not be much different for the
> various license classes.

I'll take your word for it, Jim. My original comments were just a knee-jerk reaction to my first impression of the numbers. Because of that, I'm certainly not going to defend them through an in-depth study using the steps you've outlined.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

326. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 09:22:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA8C7D90.1202A%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62513

"Mike Bartowlini" wrote:

> Nope! It is perfectly legal for a volunteer
> fireman to do this. It is done all over
> Tennessee. The FCC stuck their nose in the
> matter a few years back and got it chopped
> off by the entire Congressional delegation
> of Tennessee plus both U.S. Senators. Both
> our U.S. Senators said the FCC would have
> their budget cut if they ever stuck their
> nose in volunteer firemen's business in
> Tennessee again.

I agree with what the other fellow said - he should check with the FCC for a specific determination first. I seriously doubt such use is acceptable.

As for your comments, it is not "perfectly" legal. It is most likely a direct violation of FCC rules governing ham radio. If so, any person caught using those frequencies for such activities could be subject to enforcement.

Actually, firefighters (volunteer or otherwise) have no business using the ham radio frequencies - or the frequencies of any other radio service not specifically allocated for that use. The FCC's ultimate position will most likely be that firefighters should use the frequencies already set aside for public safety agencies and their personnel. Since there is no shortage of those frequencies, there is no mandate to use other frequencies.

Furthermore, ham radio frequencies are not the best choice for firefighters to use. Unless it is a true emergency (and I'm not certain all fire calls would be defined as such under the rules governing ham radio), firefighters would have to share those frequencies with other ham operators. For example, firefighters would have no recourse if the conversations of other hams interfered with their operations.

Finally, your story about the members of Congress from Tennessee has the ring of fanciful local folklore. Few members of Congress would be that concerned over the volunteer activities of a local ham operator, especially as it relates to his use of his privately owned radio.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

327. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 12:52:38 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@14313netaction.net>
Message-ID: <b47g9sikr0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 62514

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA8C7D90.1202A%stewart@say.net...
> "Mike Bartowlini" wrote:
>
> > Nope! It is perfectly legal for a volunteer
> > fireman to do this. It is done all over
> > Tennessee. The FCC stuck their nose in the
> > matter a few years back and got it chopped
> > off by the entire Congressional delegation
> > of Tennessee plus both U.S. Senators. Both
> > our U.S. Senators said the FCC would have
> > their budget cut if they ever stuck their
> > nose in volunteer firemen's business in
> > Tennessee again.
>
>
> I agree with what the other fellow said - he should check with the FCC
for
> a specific determination first. I seriously doubt such use is acceptable.
>
> As for your comments, it is not "perfectly" legal. It is most likely a
> direct violation of FCC rules governing ham radio. If so, any person
caught
> using those frequencies for such activities could be subject to
enforcement.
>
> Actually, firefighters (volunteer or otherwise) have no business using
the
> ham radio frequencies - or the frequencies of any other radio service not
> specifically allocated for that use. The FCC's ultimate position will most
> likely be that firefighters should use the frequencies already set aside
for
> public safety agencies and their personnel. Since there is no shortage of
> those frequencies, there is no mandate to use other frequencies.
>
> Furthermore, ham radio frequencies are not the best choice for
> firefighters to use. Unless it is a true emergency (and I'm not certain
all
> fire calls would be defined as such under the rules governing ham radio),
> firefighters would have to share those frequencies with other ham
operators.
> For example, firefighters would have no recourse if the conversations of
> other hams interfered with their operations.
>

> Finally, your story about the members of Congress from Tennessee has the
> ring of fanciful local folklore. Few members of Congress would be that
> concerned over the volunteer activities of a local ham operator,
especially
> as it relates to his use of his privately owned radio.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Sure. Go tell your fairy tale of how "protected" amateur radio freqs.
are
to any military commander. The U.S. military makes use of any amater
frequency anytime and for how often and how long it pleases. Hams
have an overinflated view of themselves as to their self-importance in the
larger scheme of things. Duhhhhhhh.

Lloyd

328. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 17:54:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303060543.4b29c85e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62515

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E6580E1.83D5D4B3@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > Get back to me if you have anything useful.
>
> How would you recognize it? Your failure to read carefully has you
> dangling once again.

I said, "Get back to me if you have anything useful."

329. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 17:54:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303060546.4a02a1b8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62516

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E6581A9.2EE4110C@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E64D265.2B9895C4@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E63B820.DC2954B1@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > > Do you not think that five words per minute represents a plateau to
> > > > > him.
> > > >
> > > > No. A plateau indicates that he has achieved 5WPM, and cannot go any
> > > > higher. Instead, I think it represents a barrier to him.
> > >
> > > We have no way of knowing if it is a barrier to him. He has never even
> > > attempted a license exam which includes a 5 wpm morse test.
> >
> > Then you agree that you don't know what a plateau is? Or at least you
> > didn't until I explained it to you?
>
> Did I write that I agreed that I didn't know what a plateau is? I don't
> see it here and I don't recall it.

Taken in context, your lack of knowledge is a given.

If or when Leonard H. hits that 5
> wpm plateau, he can rest for a while and think about tackling the exam
> which would give him an amateur license with HF access.

That he could.

330. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 17:54:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303060547.6c37227a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62517

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E6581A9.2EE4110C@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E64D265.2B9895C4@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E63B820.DC2954B1@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > > Do you not think that five words per minute represents a plateau to
> > > > > him.
> > > >
> > > > No. A plateau indicates that he has achieved 5WPM, and cannot go any
> > > > higher. Instead, I think it represents a barrier to him.
> > >
> > > We have no way of knowing if it is a barrier to him. He has never even
> > > attempted a license exam which includes a 5 wpm morse test.
> >
> > Then you agree that you don't know what a plateau is? Or at least you
> > didn't until I explained it to you?
>
> Did I write that I agreed that I didn't know what a plateau is? I don't
> see it here and I don't recall it.

Taken in context, your lack of knowledge is a given.

If or when Leonard H. hits that 5
> wpm plateau, he can rest for a while and think about tackling the exam
> which would give him an amateur license with HF access.

That he could.

331. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 17:55:40 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303060555.1550ecf2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62518

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E659F91.EBF914C9@att.net>...

> Would you kindly quote in Part 97 where it says a US ham is responsible for knowing other countries
> allocations and keeping current on them and their updates?

But if you happened to know that the other "amateur" is operating out
of band, why would you participate in a QSO with them?

332. Re: Great new book for tinkerers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 18:09:41 UTC
From: oneangryman@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <8c61e9d6.0303060746.4e2f1bbe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62519
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030304201840.09289.00002641@mb-ch.aol.com...
>
>In article <_%a9a.2874$gF3.305813@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"Kï¿½HB"
><kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>>Just got a copy of the new league book "Experimental Methods in RF
Design"
>>($49.95). Already found 3 new ideas for a receiver project I'm
doing!
>
> That's nice. Did you order from amazon.com and get free
> shipping at the same price? :-)
>
>>Anyone even a little interested in doing their own design work
should pick
>>up a copy.
>
> Why the imperative of "should?" What is in that $49.95 book
> that compels its purchase (which is equivalent to two pairs
> of FRS handhelds or a nice night on the town for two)?
>
> I'm still interested in design work even after four decades of
> doing that for a living. Still doing it for myself. Why the
> promotional blurbing when ARRL has plenty of advertising
> already out there?
>
> You post has appeared simultaneously in this newsgroup,
> rec.radio.amateur.misc and rec.radio.amateur.homebrew.
> There are several other rec.radio.amateur newsgroups.
>
> Will that book enable four-year-old licensees to build their
> own RF thingies all by themselves? Will everyone reading
> the book learn how to whittle their own ICs out of wood?
>
> What is IN the book? Use generalities if you can't use
> specifics. Humor us. Does it have projects using Amish
> rake portable antennas? The Amish wish to know!
>
>

Dear Len way the hell over 21,
Why don't you go visit this page at Amish Rakefight.com since

you seem to want to bring the Amish into this (and piss them
off as well as the rest of our little group)
http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy/

Now go climb back under that rock you slithered out from!
You should rename your self from Len over 21 to Len's IQ less than 21!

Never argue with an idiot. They drag you down to their level then beat
you with experience. -- Dilbert

One Angry Man
oneangryman@hotmail.com

333. Re: internet ILINK repeater linking project dead?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-06 21:06:40 UTC
From: Dave Schmidt <n9nlu@NO_SPAM_charter.net>
Message-ID: <v6fe5vpa90flb0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62520
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dont for get about the Yaesu/Vertex WiRES II system. That system has been running in Japan for a year or so, and was just introduced in the USA about 6 months ago. Europe and a few other locations have also started WiRES II ops so it seems to be picking up a little bit of popularity.

Dave
N9NLU

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message news:309163756.362525F238@taranews.net...
> Has iLink come to a sudden end? I know that the iLink servers had a
> lot fewer users logged in than echolink after the iLink guy split them
> off because he was jealous of echolink. It looks like he killed his
> own brain child.
>
> All of the iLink pages at http://www.aacnet.net have been taken down
> without any warning. Radio linking pages around the web still contain
> that dead URL, and a download of the iLink software can't be done.
> Even Google still comes up with the old iLink pages when you go to
> look for a download.
>
> So now it is IRLP and echolink and maybe eQSO which are left, and
> pretty soon echolink will win over everybudy. Watch for my *ALABAMA*
> conference server to start up on echolink in a few more days and be
> even bigger than the *GEORGIA* conference.

334. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 00:20:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E67E61C.94666CB6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62521

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6580E1.83D5D4B3@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > Get back to me if you have anything useful.
> >
> > How would you recognize it? Your failure to read carefully has you
> > dangling once again.
>
> I said, "Get back to me if you have anything useful."

...and I asked how you'd recognize something useful. I have all kinds
of useful information. Get back to me when you've found a way to
process it.

Dave K8MN

335. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 00:21:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E67E688.EA27CB62@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62522

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6581A9.2EE4110C@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E64D265.2B9895C4@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E63B820.DC2954B1@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > > > > Do you not think that five words per minute represents a plateau to
> > > > > > > him.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > No. A plateau indicates that he has achieved 5WPM, and cannot go any
> > > > > > higher. Instead, I think it represents a barrier to him.
> > > > >
> > > > > We have no way of knowing if it is a barrier to him. He has never even
> > > > > attempted a license exam which includes a 5 wpm morse test.
> > > >
> > > > Then you agree that you don't know what a plateau is? Or at least you
> > > > didn't until I explained it to you?
> > >
> > Did I write that I agreed that I didn't know what a plateau is? I don't
> > see it here and I don't recall it.
>
> Taken in context, your lack of knowledge is a given.

Against the backdrop of your previous input through a number of threads,
your response is predictable.

> If or when Leonard H. hits that 5
> > wpm plateau, he can rest for a while and think about tackling the exam
> > which would give him an amateur license with HF access.
>
> That he could.

...but he won't.

Dave K8MN

336. Re: Great new book for tinkerers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 00:44:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030306194402.06818.00000149@mb-cl.aol.com>
Source record: 62523

In article <8c61e9d6.0303060746.4e2f1bbe@posting.google.com>,
oneangryman@hotmail.com (One Angry Man so angry she
dare not give her mainden name) writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030304201840.09289.00002641@mb-ch.aol.com...
>>
>>In article <_%a9a.2874$gF3.305813@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
>"Kï¿½HB"
>><kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>
>>>Just got a copy of the new league book "Experimental Methods in RF
>Design"
>>>($49.95). Already found 3 new ideas for a receiver project I'm
>doing!
>>
>> That's nice. Did you order from amazon.com and get free
>> shipping at the same price? :-)
>>
>>>Anyone even a little interested in doing their own design work
>should pick
>>>up a copy.
>>
>> Why the imperative of "should?" What is in that $49.95 book
>> that compels its purchase (which is equivalent to two pairs
>> of FRS handhelds or a nice night on the town for two)?
>>
>> I'm still interested in design work even after four decades of
>> doing that for a living. Still doing it for myself. Why the
>> promotional blurbing when ARRL has plenty of advertising
>> already out there?
>>
>> You post has appeared simultaneously in this newsgroup,
>> rec.radio.amateur.misc and rec.radio.amateur.homebrew.
>> There are several other rec.radio.amateur newsgroups.
>>
>> Will that book enable four-year-old licensees to build their
>> own RF thingies all by themselves? Will everyone reading
>> the book learn how to whittle their own ICs out of wood?
>>
>> What is IN the book? Use generalities if you can't use
>> specifics. Humor us. Does it have projects using Amish
>> rake portable antennas? The Amish wish to know!
>

>Dear Len way the hell over 21,
>Why don't you go visit this page at Amish Rakefight.com since
>you seem to want to bring the Amish into this (and piss them
>off as well as the rest of our little group)
>http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy/

Poor baby...doing a bad imitation of the late Peter Finch who
starred in the film "Network?" Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Anonymous, too. Shows great non-courage... :-)

Lots of mighty "amish" in here, hiding behind their dark cloaks
of anonymity, waving their mighty wooden weapons of a
century or more of the past, charging blasphemy and heresy
against their idolatry. They are a wonder to behold, legends
in their own minds.

>Now go climb back under that rock you slithered out from!

Oooooo! I'll bet you want to meet me after school to beat
me up in the schoolyard, too!!! :-)

>You should rename your self from Len over 21 to Len's IQ less than 21!

That's only a screen name, you poor angry person you.

My real name and full mailing address has been printed many
times in past issues of Ham Radio Magazine...as well as a
few other magazines and one BYTE Book. For confirmation
of that, see old issues or buy a full set of articles from all 22
years of Ham Radio on 3 CDs, available from CQ or ARRL
for $150 (shipping charges extra cost).

You might want to see your personal physician. Extreme
anger over minor things is often a sign of mental disorder.
Many modern pharmaceuticals are available to treat such
conditions and restore some normalcy.

337. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 00:44:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030306194404.06818.00000150@mb-cl.aol.com>
Source record: 62524

In article <c2356669.0303050909.659aa95c@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E659A78.861C802B@att.net>...
>> N2EY wrote:
>
>> > Show us some numbers, Len.....
>>
>> snip
>>
>> All Len will *ever* show is his bare backside.
>>
>> AVeryFineSpeciMan indeed.
>
>Dick,
>
>Why so negative? Perhaps Len has some useful information about ARS
>license numbers that he hasn't shared yet.

I've "shared" information 5 years ago on the FCC's own database (available then, as now, free to the public). Got arguments and charges of "lying" about it...:-)

>For example, if he has old
>Callbooks or CD-ROMs, he could generate a listing of license class
>totals over various time periods and share it with the newsgroup.

FCC grants US amateur radio licenses, not the Callbook or CD-ROMs. :-)

Ever since the restructuring period, the AH0A stat pages have lumped the two Technician totals into one pseudo-class. That was clever for Speroni, an avowed PCTA...especially when the no-code-test Technicians can't be readily extracted to show the actual growth of non-morse hobbyists in the USA. The rationales for them "being essentially the same" abound. :-)

One CAN get somewhat-old data from the Speroni stat site for a relatively short period before restructuring. Mr. N2EY has never accepted such arguments since he too is an avowed PCTA and insists on the morse code test not being any sort of valid reason. :-)

>Such data could either support or work against his claims.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. In previous numbers games in here, Mr. N2EY
has been steadfast in rationalizing his viewpoints and using
sources and presentations from those sources which are
biased towards his own viewpoints (that of an avowed PCTA).

ALL of those exchanges are in Google. :-)

The FCC makes the entire US amateur radio license database
available to the public, updated each week. That is the source
of "Callbook data" and "CD-ROM data" except that downloaders
often do further sorting for their own purposes. Such sorting and
tabulation is NOT government approved, just based on
government data. Mr. N2EY is free to download the FCC data-
base and sort his own directly.

>Without
>such data, those claims are just wild speculation presented as facts.

Tsk, tsk, tsk! "Wild speculation!" :-)

PCTAs in here seem to be imbued with morsemen's wild hair
on even the least negative attitude towards morse code's
macho magnificence. [see Mr.N2EY, Dickiebird, the colonel,
the flipped-out hostile action hero, and some other bus riders,
see also Dick and Jane plus Archie from ARRL in old ham
comic book strips]

There's very selective non-acceptance of "facts" in here by the
PCTA regulars if such facts do not exemplify, honor, and
revere mighty morse. QED. "It is as demonstrated."

Since my two Callbooks (same year, different sorting) from the
mid 1970s long since went to the recycling can...so did my
three IEEE membership directories (from different years), old
telephone directories, old industry periodicals and old catalogs...
stating the personal presence of such data sources is not
strictly "factual." Factual implies that a data source is available
for anyone to peruse, reference, or check...and remains un-
changed in content. Anyone.

Deliberate biasing of true factual data is bogus, the "wild
speculation" of Mr. N2EY's charge. An example is the bundling
together of the Speroni stats for Technician and Technician-Plus
so as to mask those that were code tested versus those that
were not code tested for their licenses.

Mr. N2EY should busy himself with downloading the weekly FCC
free databases and sorting them out himself...instead of using
others' databases? Or prepare another Sermon on the Antenna
Mount evangelizing the Right Attitude on the worship and
reverence of morsemanship.

beep, beep

338. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 01:02:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303061702.413bec90@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62525

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E65808E.3D42D926@earthlink.net>...

> I'll think about answering your question when you show some civility and
> when you answer the questions N2EY and I have both asked about your
> Somali "operations".
>
> What was that line you used with Steve? Something about not dancing to
> his fiddling...
>
> Dave K8MN

Suit yourself. We have nothing more to talk about.

339. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 03:01:05 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v6g2u4lbc3gl39@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62526

Lloyd, it isn't so much the amateur's 'importance', in many instances it is a case of international agreements. Of course, I might be in error on this one - but if the military decided to put a big mux signal on your favorite tv station, I'd wager that you would be raising a stink with your congressperson. In any event, the military does answer to someone (*not* the FCC - maybe more like the president ... er, commander-in-chief) and he/she along with congress answers to big business ... er, the people .... That aside, I am very interested in what international agreements are going to do (not directed against you - I am curious about this Iraq thing ... the greenhouse gas thing ... and a lot of other things). It would seem that agreements are important so long as we like the particular agreement (or am I missing something?).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim
ps - I still recall the blast from the CNO about operating in the 75 meter amateur band. To protect the guilty, I won't mention the guy's callsign, but as I recall, the guy who sent a telegram to the FCC had his 1st class radiotelephone ticket, commercial telegraph ticket, and amateur extra class ticket and had mentioned how many channels of that multiplex were being keyed, the signal strength, frequency, and equipment it was monitored on. No mention was made of the military. Probably the signal strength indicated that the problem was local. The number of channels and spacing (gee, was it 16 channels? I forget) indicated it was military. Apparently, someone in Washington dropped someone else a note ;)
I also recall that the person in question was loading up his skivvies for a couple of weeks hoping to heck that no one found out who raised the complaint!
--

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@14313netaction.net> wrote in message
news:b47g9sikr0@pita.alt.net...
>
> Sure. Go tell your fairy tale of how "protected" amateur radio
freqs.
> are
> to any military commander. The U.S. military makes use of any amater
> frequency anytime and for how often and how long it pleases. Hams
> have an overinflated view of themselves as to their self-importance in the
> larger scheme of things. Duhhhhhhh.
>
> Lloyd
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.459 / Virus Database: 258 - Release Date: 2/25/03

340. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 05:27:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA8D9807.120B7%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62527

"Lloyd" wrote:
>
>> "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote
>>
>> I agree with what the other (snip)
>
>
> Sure. Go tell your fairy tale of how "protected"
> amateur radio freqs. Are to any military commander.
> The U.S. military makes use of any amater frequency
> anytime and for how often and how long it pleases.
> Hams have an overinflated view of themselves as to
> their self-importance in the larger scheme of
> things. Duhhhhhhh.

Perhaps your impression of hams having "an over-inflated view of themselves as to their self-importance" comes from an apparent inability to comprehend what you read. I said nothing whatsoever about "protected" amateur radio frequencies or the military.

We were talking about a ham operator, also a volunteer firefighter, using his privately owned ham radio equipment to conduct fire department operations related communications on the amateur radio frequencies. Since he is a ham operator, he is subject to the rules governing ham radio. My previous comments addressed that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

341. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 05:46:11 UTC
From: Hillary Hodunk <Gomerez@gogomerezup.org>
Message-ID: <b49bln$t3r$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 62528

Only thing more entertaining than reading ham radio
operators bicker over unimportant matters of no consequence
is going to a hamfest and actually seeing hundreds of
societal rejects and human debris wandering around
aimlessly.

Go go gomerieeze

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA8D9807.120B7%stewart@say.net...
> "Lloyd" wrote:
> >
> >> "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote
> >>
> >> I agree with what the other (snip)
> >>
> >>
> > Sure. Go tell your fairy tale of how "protected"
> > amateur radio freqs. Are to any military commander.
> > The U.S. military makes use of any amater frequency
> > anytime and for how often and how long it pleases.
> > Hams have an overinflated view of themselves as to
> > their self-importance in the larger scheme of
> > things. Duhhhhhhh.
>
>
> Perhaps your impression of hams having "an over-inflated view of
> themselves as to their self-importance" comes from an apparent inability
to
> comprehend what you read. I said nothing whatsoever about "protected"
> amateur radio frequencies or the military.
>
> We were talking about a ham operator, also a volunteer firefighter,
using
> his privately owned ham radio equipment to conduct fire department
> operations related communications on the amateur radio frequencies. Since
he
> is a ham operator, he is subject to the rules governing ham radio. My
> previous comments addressed that.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

>
>
> ------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

342. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 06:27:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E683BBC.D6C96C90@att.net>
Source record: 62529

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Jackie wrote:
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3E658ECE.8C1F8DB@earthlink.net...
> >
> >
> >> I've not been nor am I being critical of current amateur radio
> >> testing standards. I do not believe it is likely that those
> >> interested in using morse will stay long at the 5 wpm level. Maybe
> >> you've not been reading the thread.
> >
> >
> > I am reading the thread and the question was not specifically
> > directed at you, but anyone who wanted to answer. I should have
> > wrote, "here's a question for anyone..." I just don't understand why
> > people are so critical of slow coders who happen to be beginners.
>
> The answer IMO, is that there are couple reasons:
>
> 1. creeping codgerism, where a person has come a long way since they
> got on board the ARS. Many people do not have much time for newbies when
> they are not newbies themselves. Fortunately there are others who
> welcome new people. I have been fortunate to have met many people of
> this caliber who have been happy to put up with me. The old "no kids, no
> lids, and no space cadets" outlook still exists in varying degrees.
>
> 2. Exclusivity. The darkside of knowing Morse is that with humans being
> a competive sort, and with Morse being someting that can be easily
> quantified by the speed with which a person can send and recieve, and
> you have a hierarchy system if people want one.

I don't think either of you understand what's happened here. No one has criticized nor "put down" anyone
because they're a 5wpm beginner, so far as I can tell. The problem is with the few like Burke and Anderson
who have an ingrained animosity toward Morse code and all who've been around ham radio any serious length of time who don't share their views. Morse is nothing more or less than an affront to them personally. They don't like it and never have, so it follows they don't have any use for anyone who considers it idiotic to regard it as some ethereal "barrier". Maybe for some tiny segment of all those who really want to become ham radio operators it might indeed be an obstacle. So it was for most of us who learned it the hard way long before there were such things as cassette recorders and computer programs. We learned it by memorizing the characters on the chart and listening for them on the air with really primitive

receivers, by comparison with
anything in use today. Turned out that was a real benefit in the long run since it trained us to use our brains for
QRM filters. To this day I am able to pick a single CW signal out of a crowded band with no help from a narrow filter at reasonable speed.

Please understand- When Larry Roll rants about all the "dumbed down" Extra lites that says nothing about his attitude toward newcomers, even those who happen to be Extra lites. It's the dumbed down system he/we decry, and he *does* have a point. We all know that you had nothing to do with it and were we in your circumstances we'd do exactly as you have/are. The criticism is toward not newcomers but some of the
older procrastinating complainers who, instead of just quietly taking advantage of the looser standards and easier testing, find it so necessary to attempt to abuse those who, without comment nor complaint just did it
and met the requirements.

Dick

343. Re: Great new book for tinkerers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 06:38:09 UTC
From: oneangryman@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <8c61e9d6.0303062238.1086d744@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62530

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030306194402.06818.00000149@mb-cl.aol.com>...
> In article <8c61e9d6.0303060746.4e2f1bbe@posting.google.com>,
> oneangryman@hotmail.com (One Angry Man so angry she
> dare not give her mainden name) writes:

I'm more of a woman than you are,
and more of a man than you'll ever be!

>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030304201840.09289.00002641@mb-ch.aol.com...
> >>
> >>In article <_%a9a.2874$gF3.305813@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
> "Kï¿½HB"
> >><kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>
> >>>Just got a copy of the new league book "Experimental Methods in RF
> Design"
> >>>($49.95). Already found 3 new ideas for a receiver project I'm
> doing!
> >>
> >> That's nice. Did you order from amazon.com and get free
> >> shipping at the same price? :-)
> >>
> >>>Anyone even a little interested in doing their own design work
> should pick
> >>>up a copy.
> >>
> >> Why the imperative of "should?" What is in that $49.95 book
> >> that compels its purchase (which is equivalent to two pairs
> >> of FRS handhelds or a nice night on the town for two)?
> >>
> >> I'm still interested in design work even after four decades of
> >> doing that for a living. Still doing it for myself. Why the
> >> promotional blurbing when ARRL has plenty of advertising
> >> already out there?
> >>
> >> You post has appeared simultaneously in this newsgroup,
> >> rec.radio.amateur.misc and rec.radio.amateur.homebrew.
> >> There are several other rec.radio.amateur newsgroups.
> >>
> >> Will that book enable four-year-old licensees to build their
> >> own RF thingies all by themselves? Will everyone reading
> >> the book learn how to whittle their own ICs out of wood?

> >>
> >> What is IN the book? Use generalities if you can't use
> >> specifics. Humor us. Does it have projects using Amish
> >> rake portable antennas? The Amish wish to know!
> >
> >Dear Len way the hell over 21,
> >Why don't you go visit this page at Amish Rakefight.com since
> >you seem to want to bring the Amish into this (and piss them
> >off as well as the rest of our little group)
> >http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy/
>
> Poor baby...doing a bad imitation of the late Peter Finch who
> starred in the film "Network?" Tsk, tsk, tsk.

You do a poor imitation of someone with brains!

>
> Anonymous, too.

Just to you oh great high and mighter whiner!

> Shows great non-courage... :-)

I don't remember anyone calling you Lenny the Lionhearted!
Lenny the Lier, Lenny the Louse, Putz, those names I see a lot!

>
> Lots of mighty "amish" in here, hiding behind their dark cloaks
> of anonymity, waving their mighty wooden weapons of a
> century or more of the past, charging blasphemy and heresy
> against their idolatry. They are a wonder to behold, legends
> in their own minds.

No, just charging you with stupidity, do yourself a favor and
plead guilty and throw yourself on the mercy of the court!

>
> >Now go climb back under that rock you slithered out from!
>
> Oooooo! I'll bet you want to meet me after school to beat
> me up in the schoolyard, too!!! :-)

Nope, I don't get any thrill out of beating the crap out of
dried up old farts like you. Besides your so full of crap no
one could beat it ALL out of you!

BTW just how old a fart are you? 70/75 or older? What ever
your age is your old enough to know better that to spread
crap the way you do.

>
> >You should rename your self from Len over 21 to Len's IQ less than 21!
>
> That's only a screen name, you poor angry person you.

Who cares?!?!

>
> My real name and full mailing address has been printed many
> times in past issues of Ham Radio Magazine...as well as a
> few other magazines and one BYTE Book.

You looking for a medal or a chest to pin it on?

> For confirmation
> of that, see old issues or buy a full set of articles from all 22
> years of Ham Radio on 3 CDs, available from CQ or ARRL
> for $150 (shipping charges extra cost).
>

Why would I care to know who you really are. I see enough
of you here to make me puke now!

> You might want to see your personal physician.

She's nice you should make an appointment for yourself.

> Extreme
> anger over minor things is often a sign of mental disorder.

You should know all about mental disorders.

> Many modern pharmaceuticals are available to treat such
> conditions and restore some normalcy.

I see it hasn't helped you yet!

Poor Len of 21 IQ, so full of crap it just keeps
oozing out all over his postings and this newsgroup.

To quote Lynyrd Skynyrd
"Ooooh that smell
Can't you smell that smell"

"Ooooh that smell"
The smell of Len of low IQ!

This page is for you Lennie
http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy/

344. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 06:52:02 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b4b4up11d7n@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 62539

>
> No need to kill a lot of trees on my account. Kim showed up in this
> newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign, and
> literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
> she asked for. Any other moron who shows up in this newsgroup with
> a call sign capable of taking the ARS "...one step closer to extinction"
> will be dealt with accordingly.

I never guessed you as fatalist, just a pessimist. I am quite sure (an opinion) that Kim's callsign is not going to bring the hobby to extinction, but there are many other reasons much greater that will.

No letters to the FCC are necessary;
> they already know that they issued these call signs, and will merely
> defend their having done so as the call sign holder's "right" under
> freedom of speech. That is not the issue, nor is it the solution. The
> responsibility for the demeaning of the image of all radio amateurs
> lies solely with those who chose call signs intended to incite prurient
> interest.

Well, there are other callsigns, apparently based on your criteria, vanity or not, that are offensive then..... I am betting that even the suffix of POO and PEE are going to "bring the a.r.s. one step closer to extinction" also eh?

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

345. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 07:28:00 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b4b4us21d7n@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 62538

My guess is that if it were a true (and would have to be clearly proven as such) emergency where loss of life or considerable property risk were involved AND other forms of communication equipment were not able to contact someone for emergency help, then I guess use of the ham frequencies would be okay in that regard. But CLEARLY the 2 points would have to be clearly demostrated, life/property risk, as well as the comm's issue. Possible defense of this argueing point *may* be at the bottom of this post....

If the firefighter is also a RACES person, that may be another issue as well. I am in that type of situation myself.....

If the firefighters are using the ham equipt./frequencies for routine business activities such as using it while on a call, or at a training excercise, my guess is that would clearly not be acceptable.

Now here's an issue, say if you had a department with a half a dozen firefighters that are hams, and you talked with another on the way to the station, depending on what you talk about, that *may* be construed as business. Also, what if not on a call, meeting or training but a group of firefighters get on a discussion about something related to the fire department, not while on duty but on their own free time?

The only close situation I ran into while being a ham, as well as a firefighter was about a year or so ago, and me and other firefighter were on a medical call at a biker rally and it reached a point where we were concerned for our safety and could not easily back out. Upon trying our department HT's and cell-phones, neither of them could reach the fire repeater nor cell tower for the area we were in. The only other means of communication was utilizing the ham repeater which I could hit, and called 911 through the autopatch to request law enforcement assistance. Being that there were no other means of rendering assistance, I can only assume that I made the right decision in this case. It is funny to note that there are quite a few areas in my county where the stupid cell phones have dead spots and the ham radio repeater works better than the county fire repeater system. The ham repeater is about 30 watts at about 90-100 feet and the fire repeater is at 275 feet at about 100 watts. 5 watt ham HT's seem to have twice (or more) the coverage area than our stinkin' fire HT's while working simplex or repeater frequencies!!!!! Go figure.....

Another point I am wondering, if it is a volunteer agency (we are not, we are paid on my dept.) are they conducting business, business meaning providing a service and rendering a profit? Is a true volunteer department the same as other volunteer/non-profit/community-public service activities? (comparing to working for the various bike races/walks/10k runs etc.)

Just some thoughts...
Ryan, KC8PMX
Firefighter/Medical First Responder (soon to be an EMT-B, then on to EMT-P)
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"XYZ" <XYZ@microsoft.com> wrote in message
news:8tq9a.32115$5l.9072723@twister.midsouth.rr.com...
> I have a question I can't seem to get a good answer for.
>
> Can a Volunteer Fireman/EMT who has a ham ticket use ham frequencies to
> conduct operations with another Fireman/EMT ham while on duty?
>
> Technically he is conducting "business", but he is also doing Public
> Service. Seems a little gray, but hopefully someone can clearify this for
> me.
>
> Comments?
>
>

Sec. 97.401 Operation during a disaster.

(a) When normal communication systems are overloaded, damaged or disrupted because a disaster has occurred, or is likely to occur, in an area where the amateur service is regulated by the FCC, an amateur station may make transmissions necessary to meet essential communication needs and facilitate relief actions.
(b) When normal communication systems are overloaded, damaged or disrupted because a natural disaster has occurred, or is likely to occur, in an area where the amateur service is not regulated by the FCC, a station assisting in meeting essential communication needs and facilitating relief actions may do so only in accord with ITU Resolution No. 640 (Geneva, 1979). The 80 m, 75 m, 40 m, 30 m, 20 m, 17 m, 15 m, 12 m, and 2 m bands may be used for these purposes.
(c) When a disaster disrupts normal communication systems in a particular area, the FCC may declare a temporary state of communication emergency. The declaration will set forth any special conditions and special rules to be observed by stations during the communication emergency. A request for a declaration of a temporary state of emergency should be directed to the EIC in the area concerned.
(d) A station in, or within 92.6 km of, Alaska may transmit emissions J3E and R3E on the channel at 5.1675 Mhz for emergency communications. The channel must be shared with stations licensed in the Alaska-private fixed service. The transmitter power must not exceed 150 W.

Sec. 97.403 Safety of life and protection of property.

No provision of these rules prevents the use by an amateur station of any means of radiocommunication at its disposal to provide essential communication needs in connection with the immediate safety of human life and immediate protection of property when normal communication

systems are not available.

Sec. 97.405 Station in distress.

(a) No provision of these rules prevents the use by an amateur station in distress of any means at its disposal to attract attention, make known its condition and location, and obtain assistance.
(b) No provision of these rules prevents the use by a station, in the exceptional circumstances described in paragraph (a) of this section, of any means of radiocommunications at its disposal to assist a station in distress.

Sec. 97.407 Radio amateur civil emergency service.

(a) No station may transmit in RACES unless it is an FCC-licensed primary, club, or military recreation station and it is certified by a civil defense organization as registered with that organization, or it is an FCC-licensed RACES station. No person may be the control operator of a RACES station, or may be the control operator of an amateur station transmitting in RACES unless that person holds a FCC-issued amateur operator license and is certified by a civil defense organization as enrolled in that organization.
(b) The frequency bands and segments and emissions authorized to the control operator are available to stations transmitting communications in RACES on a shared basis with the amateur service. In the event of an emergency which necessitates the invoking of the President's War Emergency Powers under the provisions of Section 706 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 606, RACES stations and amateur stations participating in RACES may only transmit on the following frequency segments:
(1) The 1800-1825 kHz, 1975-2000 kHz, 3.50-3.55 MHz, 3.93-3.98 MHz, 3.984-4.000 MHz, 7.079-7.125 MHz, 7.245-7.255 MHz, 10.10-10.15 MHz, 14.047-14.053 MHz, 14.22-14.23 MHz, 14.331-14.350 MHz, 21.047-21.053 MHz, 21.228-21.267 MHz, 28.55-28.75 MHz, 29.237-29.273 MHz, 29.45-29.65 MHz, 50.35-50.75 MHz, 52-54 MHz, 144.50-145.71 MHz, 146-148 MHz, 2390-2450 MHz segments;
(2) The 1.25 m, 70 cm and 23 cm bands; and
(3) The channels at 3.997 MHz and 53.30 MHz may be used in emergency areas when required to make initial contact with a military unit and for communications with military stations on matters requiring coordination.
(c) A RACES station may only communicate with:
(1) Another RACES station;
(2) An amateur station registered with a civil defense organization;
(3) A United States Government station authorized by the responsible agency to communicate with RACES stations;
(4) A station in a service regulated by the FCC whenever such communication is authorized by the FCC.
(d) An amateur station registered with a civil defense organization may only communicate with:
(1) A RACES station licensed to the civil defense organization with which the amateur station is registered;

(2) The following stations upon authorization of the responsible civil defense official for the organization with which the amateur station is registered:
(i) A RACES station licensed to another civil defense organization;
(ii) An amateur station registered with the same or another civil defense organization;
(iii) A United States Government station authorized by the responsible agency to communicate with RACES stations; and
(iv) A station in a service regulated by the FCC whenever such communication is authorized by the FCC.
(e) All communications transmitted in RACES must be specifically authorized by the civil defense organization for the area served. Only civil defense communications of the following types may be transmitted:
(1) Messages concerning impending or actual conditions jeopardizing the public safety, or affecting the national defense or security during periods of local, regional, or national civil emergencies;
(2) Messages directly concerning the immediate safety of life of individuals, the immediate protection of property, maintenance of law and order, alleviation of human suffering and need, and the combating of armed attack or sabotage;
(3) Messages directly concerning the accumulation and dissemination of public information or instructions to the civilian population essential to the activities of the civil defense organization or other authorized governmental or relief agencies; and
(4) Communications for RACES training drills and tests necessary to ensure the establishment and maintenance of orderly and efficient operation of the RACES as ordered by the responsible civil defense organization served. Such drills and tests may not exceed a total time of 1 hour per week. With the approval of the chief officer for emergency planning in the applicable State, Commonwealth, District or territory, however, such tests and drills may be conducted for a period not to exceed 72 hours no more than twice in any calendar year.

346. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 12:24:23 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@citlink.net>
Message-ID: <v6h3rpkil9vf25@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62531

"Hillary Hodunk" <Gomerez@gogomerezup.org> wrote in message
news:b49bln$t3r$0@pita.alt.net...
| Only thing more entertaining than reading ham radio
| operators bicker over unimportant matters of no consequence
| is going to a hamfest and actually seeing hundreds of
| societal rejects and human debris wandering around
| aimlessly.
|
| Go go gomerieeze
|

like computer shows ???

347. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-07-07 13:25:32 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@38945nightlynet.net>
Message-ID: <b4a6j2$ao8$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 62532

```
"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3E683BBC.D6C96C90@att.net...
>
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> > Jackie wrote:
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3E658ECE.8C1F8DB@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > >
> > >> I've not been nor am I being critical of current amateur radio
> > >> testing standards. I do not believe it is likely that those
> > >> interested in using morse will stay long at the 5 wpm level. Maybe
> > >> you've not been reading the thread.
> > >
> > >
> > > I am reading the thread and the question was not specifically
> > > directed at you, but anyone who wanted to answer. I should have
> > > wrote, "here's a question for anyone..." I just don't understand why
> > > people are so critical of slow coders who happen to be beginners.
> >
> > The answer IMO, is that there are couple reasons:
> >
> > 1. creeping codgerism, where a person has come a long way since
they
> > got on board the ARS. Many people do not have much time for newbies when
> > they are not newbies themselves. Fortunately there are others who
> > welcome new people. I have been fortunate to have met many people of
> > this caliber who have been happy to put up with me. The old "no kids, no
> > lids, and no space cadets" outlook still exists in varying degrees.
> >
> > 2. Exclusivity. The darkside of knowing Morse is that with
humans being
> > a competive sort, and with Morse being someting that can be easily
> > quantified by the speed with which a person can send and recieve, and
> > you have a hierarchy system if people want one.
>
>
>
> I don't think either of you understand what's happened here. No one has
criticized
> nor "put down" anyone
> because they're a 5wpm beginner, so far as I can tell. The problem is with
```

the few
> like Burke and Anderson
> who have an ingrained animosity toward Morse code and all who've been
around ham
> radio any serious length of time who don't share their views. Morse is
nothing more
> or less than an affront to them personally. They don't like it and never
have, so
> it follows they don't have any use for anyone who considers it idiotic to
regard
> it as some ethereal "barrier". Maybe for some tiny segment of all those
who really
> want to become ham radio operators it might indeed be an obstacle. So it
was for
> most of us who learned it the hard way long before there were such things
as
> cassette recorders and computer programs. We learned it by memorizing the
> characters on the chart and listening for them on the air with really
primitive
> receivers, by comparison with
> anything in use today. Turned out that was a real benefit in the long run
since it
> trained us to use our brains for
> QRM filters. To this day I am able to pick a single CW signal out of a
crowded
> band with no help from a narrow filter at reasonable speed.
>
> Please understand- When Larry Roll rants about all the "dumbed down"
Extra lites
> that says nothing about his attitude toward newcomers, even those who
happen to be
> Extra lites. It's the dumbed down system he/we decry, and he *does* have a
point.
> We all know that you had nothing to do with it and were we in your
> circumstances we'd do exactly as you have/are. The criticism is toward not
> newcomers but some of the
> older procrastinating complainers who, instead of just quietly taking
advantage of
> the looser standards and easier testing, find it so necessary to attempt
to abuse
> those who, without comment nor complaint just did it
> and met the requirements.
>
> Dick
>

BWAAHHHHH BWAHHHHH

348. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 16:49:49 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4aijo$6j5$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62533

The give away here is 'Hillary'. Think about it.

Dan/W4NTI

"Steve Fleckenstein" <spfleck@citlink.net> wrote in message
news:v6h3rpkil9vf25@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Hillary Hodunk" <Gomerez@gogomerezup.org> wrote in message
> news:b49bln$t3r$0@pita.alt.net...
> | Only thing more entertaining than reading ham radio
> | operators bicker over unimportant matters of no consequence
> | is going to a hamfest and actually seeing hundreds of
> | societal rejects and human debris wandering around
> | aimlessly.
> |
> | Go go gomerieeze
> |
>
> like computer shows ???
>
>

349. Here's your chance

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 17:21:20 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <ky4aa.7210$wJ1.707135@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 62534

The Question Pool Committee of the National Conference of Volunteer Examiner Coordinators has released a draft syllabus for the Element 3 (General) Amateur Radio examination. This syllabus will be used to develop a new General class question pool that will become effective July 1, 2004. The QPC is inviting comments on the document as well as suggested questions for the General-class question pool.

The draft is located at http://www.arrl.org/arrlvec/gp-syllabus-2004.html

Your suggestions and comments may be sent to qpc@arrl.org.

&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; 73, de Hans, K0HB
--
Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
http://www.mnyarc.org
http://www.k0bsa.org

350. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 17:21:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303070642.b86a128@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62535

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E683BBC.D6C96C90@att.net>...

> Please understand- When Larry Roll rants about all the "dumbed down" Extra lites
> that says nothing about his attitude toward newcomers, even those who happen to be
> Extra lites. It's the dumbed down system he/we decry,

Then why the incessant personal attacks?

351. Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 19:21:37 UTC
From: N3THJ <n3thj2000nospam@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <01c2e4de$e56884a0$82878685@clip>
Source record: 62536

A friend of mine is looking at upgrading to General, and
was inquiring about the elimination of the code requirement.
I really didn't have an answer, other than they were supposedly
taking it up this month at the big meeting. Has anyone in here
heard anything in regards to what may happen or when?
This is an honest question and I am looking for honest
answers. Please reply to the NG, as I don't need my mailbox filled
with flames.
Thanks, Bill

352. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 19:39:30 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4asgqkqt1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62537

The next WARC conference (this year I think) will possibly consider that issue. If they vote to not require CW any longer then the FCC will likely do the same. But don't get in a rush. It ain't gonna happen tomorrow.

And for goodness sakes ... how hard is 5 words per minute.

Dan/W4NTI

"N3THJ" <n3thj2000nospam@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:01c2e4de$e56884a0$82878685@clip...
> A friend of mine is looking at upgrading to General, and
> was inquiring about the elimination of the code requirement.
> I really didn't have an answer, other than they were supposedly
> taking it up this month at the big meeting. Has anyone in here
> heard anything in regards to what may happen or when?
> This is an honest question and I am looking for honest
> answers. Please reply to the NG, as I don't need my mailbox filled
> with flames.
> Thanks, Bill

353. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 23:40:00 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v6ibeapma7c7ac@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62540

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b4asgqkqt1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> The next WARC conference (this year I think) will possibly consider that
> issue. If they vote to not require CW any longer then the FCC will likely
> do the same. But don't get in a rush. It ain't gonna happen tomorrow.
>
> And for goodness sakes ... how hard is 5 words per minute.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

For me it was the hardest test I ever had to take,
but I did it anyway and passed. I hope they don't
get rid of the 5WPM test. Now I'm glad I had to
do it! I learned something I otherwise never would
have tried to learn.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

354. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-07 23:59:11 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <jnaaa.123$Ad2.85419@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 62541

Bill,

The "World Radiocommunications Conference" (WRC-03) will take place
from early June through early July this year in Geneva, Switzerland. (I
expect
to be there as part of the US Delegation.)

The regional positions prepared so far, as well as the national positions
that
are known, all indicate that the elimination of the Morse proficiency test
requirement
from the ITU ("International Telecommunications Union") Radio Regulations
will
be a "slam dunk."

After the international (treaty) requirement is removed from the radio
regulations,
administrations will be free to remove corresponding Morse test requirements
from their national regulations for licence classes that allow access to the
frequencies
below 30 MHz.

73,

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
Grid Square FN20fm
<mailto:wk3c@wk3c.com> (general personal e-mail and NCI e-mail)
<mailto:wk3cqth@wk3c.com> (QSO, QSL, skeds, only, please)

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, QCWA (31424)
Member, ARRL
Member, TAPR
Member, The SETI League

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

"N3THJ" <n3thj2000nospam@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:01c2e4de$e56884a0$82878685@clip...
> A friend of mine is looking at upgrading to General, and

> was inquiring about the elimination of the code requirement.
> I really didn't have an answer, other than they were supposedly
> taking it up this month at the big meeting. Has anyone in here
> heard anything in regards to what may happen or when?
> This is an honest question and I am looking for honest
> answers. Please reply to the NG, as I don't need my mailbox filled
> with flames.
> Thanks, Bill

355. Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 04:01:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303072001.136673ec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62543

From the ARRL Letter, Vol 22 No 10:

==>UK TO AK ON 136 kHz

Reaching Alaska from the United Kingdom using just 1 W ERP is quite a feat for any band, but the Radio Society of Great Britain reports that Laurie Mayhead, G3AQC, was heard in Alaska on 136 kHz. In the early hours of February 15, he transmitted to Laurence Howell, GM4DMA/KL1X in Anchorage, and just before UK dawn at 0615 his call sign was clearly identified using software to read the signal.

G3AQC was using QRSS--very slow CW--with a 60-second-long dit. The 7278-km distance is a transmission record for 1 W ERP on 136 kHz.

Two years ago, Mayhead and Larry Kayser, VA3LK, made ham radio history when they completed the first two-way transatlantic exchange on 136 kHz, also using very slow speed CW. Last year G3AQC became the first person to span the Atlantic on 73 kHz.

Howell expressed surprise that the path involved in the latest accomplishment is "notoriously poor" between southeastern Alaska, on the east coast of the Pacific, and Europe. "The signal would theoretically go on a Great Circle route to nearly 80 degrees north, over the northern Canadian Arctic, northern Greenland, east of Iceland, Glasgow, then over the UK to the South Coast--across and through the auroral oval."

He said there's speculation that the actual path might been around or even under the auroral zone, since there was no auroral Doppler seen on the received signal. Howell and Mayhead credited research and preparation carried out by G3NYK, G3LDO, W3EEE and W4DEX, for helping to set the new LF record.--RSGB

Imagine if Laurie had used Dick's "banana boat swing" to evade machine copy.

Trivia Time:

If the dit was 60 seconds long, how long is the dash?

How long is the inter-character space?

How long is the inter-word space?

Could Farnsworth have been substituted for Morse Code, and worked as effectively?

Are these UK amateurs considered proficient?

356. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 04:03:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030307230345.19751.00003185@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 62544

In article <01c2e4de$e56884a0$82878685@clip>, "N3THJ"
<n3thj2000nospam@hotmail.com> writes:

>A friend of mine is looking at upgrading to General, and
>was inquiring about the elimination of the code requirement.
>I really didn't have an answer, other than they were supposedly
>taking it up this month at the big meeting. Has anyone in here
>heard anything in regards to what may happen or when?
>This is an honest question and I am looking for honest
>answers. Please reply to the NG, as I don't need my mailbox filled
>with flames.
>Thanks, Bill

Bill:

The remaining 5 WPM Morse code testing requirement will most likely
be eliminated after the World Radiocommunication Conference (WRC-03)
happening this June in Geneva. This is when the ITU radio regulation
S25.5 will be presumably voted out of existence, making it possible for
the separate national radio regulatory agencies (like the FCC in the United
States) to eliminate code testing as a requirement for an amateur radio
license with full HF privileges. I have no doubt that this will, indeed,
occur. It will NOT be a good thing for the ARS. (That is my opinion,
not a "flame.")

73 de Larry, K3LT

357. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 04:03:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030307230345.19751.00003186@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 62545

In article <3E683BBC.D6C96C90@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>
> Please understand- When Larry Roll rants about all the "dumbed down" Extra
>lites
>that says nothing about his attitude toward newcomers, even those who happen
>to be
>Extra lites. It's the dumbed down system he/we decry, and he *does* have a
>point.
>We all know that you had nothing to do with it and were we in your
>circumstances we'd do exactly as you have/are. The criticism is toward not
>newcomers but some of the
>older procrastinating complainers who, instead of just quietly taking
>advantage of
>the looser standards and easier testing, find it so necessary to attempt to
>abuse
>those who, without comment nor complaint just did it
>and met the requirements.
>
>Dick

Dick:

You've nailed it. I personally know many amateur radio "newcomers" who happen to be General- or Extra-Lites, and they, for the most part, have not dared to presume to be anything other than the lesser trained and experienced amateur radio operators that they are. I am more than willing to show them the way to "earn" their place in ham radio, and a few have responded positively. The ones who haven't either drop out or consign themselves to the repeaters. In any case, it is THEIR attitude, not mine, that shapes their future as hams.

73 de Larry, K3LT

358. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 04:03:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030307230346.19751.00003187@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 62546

In article <f45722ac.0303070642.b86a128@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E683BBC.D6C96C90@att.net>...
>
>> Please understand- When Larry Roll rants about all the "dumbed down" Extra
>lites
>> that says nothing about his attitude toward newcomers, even those who
>happen to be
>> Extra lites. It's the dumbed down system he/we decry,
>
>Then why the incessant personal attacks?

Brian:

I will not presume to speak for Dick, but my alleged "attacks" are not intended to be "personal" unless and until the person to whom I am responding makes it so. Usually, this takes the form of some newcomer Extra-Lite demanding instant acceptance as a full-fledged Amateur Extra-class operator in spite of never having been exposed to anything close to the technical knowledge or operating experience required by his Pre-Restructuring counterparts in order to attain that status. The new Extra-Lites are the unfortunate victims of reduced standards which now set them apart as being inferior to their presumed "peers." The same will be true of the dumbed-down college graduates who have been passed through the colleges and universities of our country by Affirmative Action programs and a curriculum which is heavy on politically-correct social indoctrination and increasingly lacking in the basics of the sciences, arts, and humanities.

I truly fear for the future of the world. I'm sure that eventually, Socialism will
be tried here in the United States, and, as it has everywhere else, it will expose it's subjects to generations of misery before it eventually fails.

73 de Larry, K3LT

359. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 04:05:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303072005.365b0731@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62547

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030305213805.09289.00002704@mb-ch.aol.com>...

> Kim showed up in this
> newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign, and
> literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
> she asked for.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, that's rapist mentality.

360. Re: Here's your chance

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 04:12:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303072012.171ae2ab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62548

"Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<ky4aa.7210$wJ1.707135@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> The Question Pool Committee of the National Conference of Volunteer Examiner
> Coordinators has released a draft syllabus for the Element 3 (General)
> Amateur Radio examination. This syllabus will be used to develop a new
> General class question pool that will become effective July 1, 2004. The QPC
> is inviting comments on the document as well as suggested questions for the
> General-class question pool.
>
> The draft is located at http://www.arrl.org/arrlvec/gp-syllabus-2004.html
>
> Your suggestions and comments may be sent to qpc@arrl.org.
>
> ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ 73, de Hans, K0HB

Suggestions such as "Don't publish the questions pools?"

361. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 04:13:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030307231300.10456.00001066@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 62549

In article <01c2e4de$e56884a0$82878685@clip>, "N3THJ"
<n3thj2000nospam@hotmail.com> writes:

>A friend of mine is looking at upgrading to General, and
>was inquiring about the elimination of the code requirement.
>I really didn't have an answer, other than they were supposedly
>taking it up this month at the big meeting. Has anyone in here
>heard anything in regards to what may happen or when?
>This is an honest question and I am looking for honest
>answers. Please reply to the NG, as I don't need my mailbox filled
>with flames.

One of the many topics to be discussed, perhaps voted on,
at WRC-03 (World Radio Conference 2003) in Geneva,
Switzerland, mid June into beginning July, is a revision
of all S25 Recommendations for interenational amateur
radio. That includes S25.5, the one Recommendation that
addresses International Morse Code testing for all amateur
radio licenses having below-30-MHz privileges.

Only administrations may vote on Recommendations at a
WRC. The United States administration is represented by
members of the Department of State, Federal Communications
Commission, and National Telecommunications and
Information Agency (NTIA). There are several "observers" and
"advisors" invited to be with the USA administration party but
they have no voting power.

WRCs (formerly World Administrative Radio Conferences or
WARCs) are held approximately biannually. All come under
the ITU-R or International Telecommunications Union radio
section. The ITU is a United Nations body. ITU establishes
Recommendations on spectrum allocations and regulatory
rules. These Recommendations are not binding but are held
by administrations under an honor system, pledges to support
the decisions made under the ITU.

A great many topics are scheduled to be covered at WRC-03.
A list of those to be addressed only by the US administration
is found on the FCC website: Click on "International" under
Bureaus on the FCC home page, then click on "WRC" at the
International Bureau main page. There are several downloadable
documents at the FCC WRC page. Amateur radio action item
numbers are 1.7.1 through 1.7.3., those previously discussed
by IWG-6 (Informal Working Group 6). One of those documents
should be a copy of the IARU (International Amateur Radio

Union) position on revision of all within S25; that may also be found at the IARU website, www.iaru.org.

The FCC has stated in 1990 under FCC 90-53 (establishment of the no-code-test Technician class) and in 1999 under 99-412 (Report and Order on US amateur radio restructuring) that a morse code test is not considered useful to the FCC in their determination of granting an amateur radio license. They also stated that the code test must be kept to honor the obligation of membership in the ITU. As a further note, FCC regulations were changed some years back to make a morse code sending test optional to examiners...despite ITU-R Recommendation clearly stating that the morse code examination test must include "reception by ear and transmission by hand."

ITU-R Recommendation S25.5 does not establish any International Morse Code word rate. That examination rate is optional to each member country's administration. IARU suggestions include a complete rewrite of all S25 articles.

There is no accurate opinion at this time as to whether any amateur radio recommendations will be voted on at WRC-03. The list of action items slated for that Conference is quite long and numerous. Most of the action items involve spectral allocations and technical Recommendations for international communications carriers and the commercial/governmental radio services. The 40 meter SWBC versus amateur frequency occupancy issue has not reached a solution since 1979 when it was brought up at WARC-79.

ARRL has taken a passive stance on the examination morse code test, neither for retention nor elimination. IARU has taken a position of revision of most articles in S25, including an elimination of the International Morse Code test for a license. The USA administration preliminary position paper supports the IARU suggestions according to the FCC WRC page. NTIA has taken a position two years ago that it favors elimination of the morse code test. NTIA is the agency under the Commerce Department that regulates and coordinates all USA government radio use; FCC (an independent agency) regulates only US civil radio use.

There are a variety of opinions among other nations administrations' radio regulatory agencies on amateur radio matters at WRC-03. Some favor elimination of the code test while others favor retention of the code test. Everyone will have to wait for what transpires in Geneva at WRC.

Len Anderson
retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

362. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 04:26:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030307232654.10901.00001651@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 62550

In article <f45722ac.0303072001.136673ec@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>
>Trivia Time:
>
>If the dit was 60 seconds long, how long is the dash?

Brian:

Presumably, three times longer than the "dit," or 180 seconds.

>How long is the inter-character space?

Good question; obviously that would depend on the software used. My
guess is it would be at least the length of a "dah," or 180 seconds.

>How long is the inter-word space?

Should be at least three inter-character spaces in length, or 540 seconds.
Again, it would depend on the software in use. At these slow speeds,
standard inter-chracter and inter-word spacing would not necessarily
apply. The exaggerated spacing would likely not be necessary in spite of
the increased length of the actual "on" time of the separate dits and dahs.
I'm sure they were visually monitoring each others signals on a computer
screen display that resembled an oscilloscope with a greatly expanded
time base. However, I doubt that they were sending any "words" longer
than each other's call signs. I'd sure like to read about the receivers
in use. They must have been dealing with signal strengths in the nano-
volt level.

>Could Farnsworth have been substituted for Morse Code, and worked as
>effectively?

I dunno. Since when is Farnsworth a "substitute" for Morse code? I
always thought it was just another method of sending Morse code.

>Are these UK amateurs considered proficient?

I'd say they were.

73 de Larry, K3LT

363. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 04:29:32 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Mkeaa.4548$se1.2614504@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62542

"N3THJ" <n3thj2000nospam@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:01c2e4de$e56884a0$82878685@clip...
> A friend of mine is looking at upgrading to General, and
> was inquiring about the elimination of the code requirement.
> I really didn't have an answer, other than they were supposedly
> taking it up this month at the big meeting. Has anyone in here
> heard anything in regards to what may happen or when?
> This is an honest question and I am looking for honest
> answers. Please reply to the NG, as I don't need my mailbox filled
> with flames.
> Thanks, Bill

While there are people working to do this, there is no way to be certain if or when it will happen. Even though it may be considered at this summers conference, there's no guarantee that it will be voted on and there's no guarantee what direction such a vote would take. In addition, even if the ITU drops the requirement, each country will still have the freedom to keep it if they so use. Here in the US, it would take many months. First of all the FCC would put out a Notice of Proposed Rule Making. Then there would be time allowed for comments. And finally the FCC might or might not change it. This entire process would take quite a long time.

In the time that it would take for this change to happen, IF it happens, a person could learn the code and be on the air for months. It is pointless to wait. Especially since the sunspot cycle is on the declining side of the cycle. The average person can learn the 5wpm in approximately 30 hours of study and practice using modern study methods. Two fifteen minute sessions per day every day and you've got it in only two months.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

364. Re: Here's your chance

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 04:34:44 UTC
From: K�HB <k�hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <Epeaa.8431$wJ1.806037@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 62551

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in

:
: Suggestions such as "Don't publish the questions pools?"
:

I don't know of any limitations on the suggestions, so you'd certainly be free to suggest that. Unfortunately the QPC would not be in a position to implement it however, since it would be in direct conflict with §97.523 of the Commissions rules.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

365. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 04:53:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E697740.457A8D17@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62552

Brian wrote:
>
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030305213805.09289.00002704@mb-ch.aol.com>...
>
> > Kim showed up in this
> > newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign, and
> > literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
> > she asked for.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Larry, that's rapist mentality.

That'd be one of your less intelligent responses. I don't know of any rapists who do nothing other than give their "victim" a talking to or a lecture on their lack of good taste.

Dave K8MN

366. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 05:01:12 UTC
From: Lloyd <Stumpjumper@Stumpjumper38945.net>
Message-ID: <b4btd7auq0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 62553

"Hillary Hodunk" <Gomerez@gogomerezup.org> wrote in message
news:b49bln$t3r$0@pita.alt.net...
> Only thing more entertaining than reading ham radio
> operators bicker over unimportant matters of no consequence
> is going to a hamfest and actually seeing hundreds of
> societal rejects and human debris wandering around
> aimlessly.
>
> Go go gomerieeze

Jerry Springer should set up a booth for interviews at Hamfests. He would have an endless supply of guests for his shows. It was once said that Hamfests are in reality an endless parade of human debris.

Lloyd

367. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 05:53:44 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v6j1b2s1cjv4fe@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62554

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030307232654.10901.00001651@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <f45722ac.0303072001.136673ec@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >
> >Trivia Time:
> >
> >If the dit was 60 seconds long, how long is the dash?
>
> Brian:
>
> Presumably, three times longer than the "dit," or 180 seconds.
>
> >How long is the inter-character space?
>
> Good question; obviously that would depend on the software used. My
> guess is it would be at least the length of a "dah," or 180 seconds.
>
> >How long is the inter-word space?
>
> Should be at least three inter-character spaces in length, or 540 seconds.
> Again, it would depend on the software in use. At these slow speeds,
> standard inter-chracter and inter-word spacing would not necessarily
> apply. The exaggerated spacing would likely not be necessary in spite of
> the increased length of the actual "on" time of the separate dits and
dahs.
> I'm sure they were visually monitoring each others signals on a computer
> screen display that resembled an oscilloscope with a greatly expanded
> time base. However, I doubt that they were sending any "words" longer
> than each other's call signs. I'd sure like to read about the receivers
> in use. They must have been dealing with signal strengths in the nano-
> volt level.
>
> >Could Farnsworth have been substituted for Morse Code, and worked as
> >effectively?
>
> I dunno. Since when is Farnsworth a "substitute" for Morse code? I
> always thought it was just another method of sending Morse code.
>
> >Are these UK amateurs considered proficient?
>
> I'd say they were.
>

> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry
Since they have set a record that means they must be
on the cutting edge of Amateur Radio. And they are
using good old Morse's Code to accomplish it!
So much for it being a "dead mode" of little use.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

368. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 06:26:04 UTC
From: Neb Revod <spammers@biteme.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.18d32cda2ff2e519896c8@pdx.news.speakeasy.net>
Source record: 62555

In article <v6j1b2s1cjv4fe@corp.supernews.com>, kb9tmp@juno.com says...
>
>
> Larry
> Since they have set a record that means they must be
> on the cutting edge of Amateur Radio. And they are
> using good old Morse's Code to accomplish it!
> So much for it being a "dead mode" of little use.

Not quite right. Cutting edge? Arguably yes, but it was NOT "good old
Morse's Code" in any sense other than the actual encoding of characters.
Any arbitrary scheme of distinguishable periods of modulation, used to
encode the characters could have been used. Moreover, the feat required
the use of software (computers) at both ends. It could NOT have been
accomplished by two CW'ers putting fist to key.

369. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 06:49:20 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93381287D20ABelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 62556

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
news:20030307231300.10456.00001066@mb-ma.aol.com:

> In article <01c2e4de$e56884a0$82878685@clip>, "N3THJ"
> <n3thj2000nospam@hotmail.com> writes:
>
>>A friend of mine is looking at upgrading to General, and
>>was inquiring about the elimination of the code requirement.
>>I really didn't have an answer, other than they were supposedly
>>taking it up this month at the big meeting. Has anyone in here
>>heard anything in regards to what may happen or when?
>>This is an honest question and I am looking for honest
>>answers. Please reply to the NG, as I don't need my mailbox filled with
>>flames.
>
> One of the many topics to be discussed, perhaps voted on,
> at WRC-03 (World Radio Conference 2003) in Geneva,
> Switzerland, mid June into beginning July, is a revision
> of all S25 Recommendations for interenational amateur
> radio. That includes S25.5, the one Recommendation that
> addresses International Morse Code testing for all amateur
> radio licenses having below-30-MHz privileges.
>
> Only administrations may vote on Recommendations at a
> WRC. The United States administration is represented by
> members of the Department of State, Federal Communications
> Commission, and National Telecommunications and
> Information Agency (NTIA). There are several "observers" and
> "advisors" invited to be with the USA administration party but
> they have no voting power.
>
> WRCs (formerly World Administrative Radio Conferences or
> WARCs) are held approximately biannually. All come under
> the ITU-R or International Telecommunications Union radio
> section. The ITU is a United Nations body. ITU establishes
> Recommendations on spectrum allocations and regulatory
> rules. These Recommendations are not binding but are held
> by administrations under an honor system, pledges to support
> the decisions made under the ITU.
>
> A great many topics are scheduled to be covered at WRC-03.
> A list of those to be addressed only by the US administration
> is found on the FCC website: Click on "International" under
> Bureaus on the FCC home page, then click on "WRC" at the

> International Bureau main page. There are several downloadable
> documents at the FCC WRC page. Amateur radio action item
> numbers are 1.7.1 through 1.7.3., those previously discussed
> by IWG-6 (Informal Working Group 6). One of those documents
> should be a copy of the IARU (International Amateur Radio
> Union) position on revision of all within S25; that may also be
> found at the IARU website, www.iaru.org.
>
> The FCC has stated in 1990 under FCC 90-53 (establishment
> of the no-code-test Technician class) and in 1999 under 99-412
> (Report and Order on US amateur radio restructuring) that a
> morse code test is not considered useful to the FCC in their
> determination of granting an amateur radio license. They also
> stated that the code test must be kept to honor the obligation
> of membership in the ITU. As a further note, FCC regulations
> were changed some years back to make a morse code sending
> test optional to examiners...despite ITU-R Recommendation
> clearly stating that the morse code examination test must
> include "reception by ear and transmission by hand."
>
> ITU-R Recommendation S25.5 does not establish any
> International Morse Code word rate. That examination rate
> is optional to each member country's administration. IARU
> suggestions include a complete rewrite of all S25 articles.
>
> There is no accurate opinion at this time as to whether any
> amateur radio recommendations will be voted on at WRC-03.
> The list of action items slated for that Conference is quite long
> and numerous. Most of the action items involve spectral
> allocations and technical Recommendations for international
> communications carriers and the commercial/governmental
> radio services. The 40 meter SWBC versus amateur frequency
> occupancy issue has not reached a solution since 1979 when
> it was brought up at WARC-79.
>
> ARRL has taken a passive stance on the examination morse
> code test, neither for retention nor elimination. IARU has taken
> a position of revision of most articles in S25, including an
> elimination of the International Morse Code test for a license.
> The USA administration preliminary position paper supports the
> IARU suggestions according to the FCC WRC page. NTIA has
> taken a position two years ago that it favors elimination of the
> morse code test. NTIA is the agency under the Commerce
> Department that regulates and coordinates all USA government
> radio use; FCC (an independent agency) regulates only US civil
> radio use.
>
> There are a variety of opinions among other nations
> administrations' radio regulatory agencies on amateur radio
> matters at WRC-03. Some favor elimination of the code test

> while others favor retention of the code test. Everyone will have
> to wait for what transpires in Geneva at WRC.
>
> Len Anderson
> retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person
>

Lots of interesting posts. There has been no doubt for many years which way the vote will go, despite what some would have you beleive. Once it can be brought to a vote, the Morse test requirement will be abolished by the ITU. The only trick, however, is geting it to a vote. In fact, the vote should have taken place on, I think, three previous occasions since 1995, but either didn't make the final agenda or else the whole conference was postponed. Frankly, it would have been carried by a few votes back in 1995, and would be a landslide now, largely because maritime use of CW ended in the meantime. There is little likelihood that it will not be voted on this time, however, as I think (or at least hope) that the ITU realise that the credibility of the ITU itself and their whole decision-making process is at stake if they continue to delay voting on any single issue to this extent, no matter what that issue is. I confess I wrote them a letter saying just that, but got no reply.

The domestic process is another matter. The FCC decision-making process is long and complicated, which is actually done to protect the public. Some think that it could take even as long as two years to get through the FCC, although that's about the longest estimate. Some other countries are already planning to ditch the Morse test immediately after WRC 03, notably the UK, but the FCC are unable to do that, as they have to consult on any changes they make. 'Immediate', by civil service standards, means a few months, so in the US I wouldn't necessarily expect it to happen before 2004, as it won't be 'immediate'! But it will happen. My XYL is waiting for element 1 to be abolished before she upgrades to General, but she is in no hurry. She will get there eventually.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

370. Automated Transmissions from a Computer / Reapeter Station

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 07:34:45 UTC
From: lszumel@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <94a4e3a5.0303072334.4296131@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62557

Hi all,

I've done my best to research this in past usenet postings, but I haven't come across any answers to this question. Hopefully I'm not asking a common or dumb question.

I'm relatively new to amateur radio, just have a no-code tech license.

I'd really like to experiment with a computer/ham interfacing project. I don't have a specific goal, but the basic premise is to have a transceiver hooked up to my PC and be able to remotely access the PC via repeater-like operation.

AFAIK, automated/unattended transmission is not allowed by the FCC on amateur bands. However, repeaters are allowed. So, would such a set-up be acceptable as long as the PC was only responding to my commands? I'm envisioning a DTMF code or something.

Of course, data would be lots of fun too, but I'd like to start with a simple DTMF interface. A nice starter project would be to ask the computer "do I have any email" and if I did it would tell me how many messages and from whom.

Thanks for any ideas or comments,

-Leo
KD5SZT

371. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 09:34:19 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA8F234B.12961%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62558

"N3THJ" wrote:

> A friend of mine is looking at upgrading to
> General, and was inquiring about the elimination
> of the code requirement. I really didn't have
> an answer, (snip)

I agree with the others, Bill. S25.5 will likely be voted out if it ever comes up for a vote. No delegation today has taken a public position opposing this. The question is whether it will come up for a vote. The conference has a full agenda, covering many subjects. Because of that, S25.5 may never make it to the table. In other words, it is possible, but I'm not convinced it is a done deal at this conference.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

372. Re: Automated Transmissions from a Computer / Reapeter Station

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 09:49:00 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0303080939510.262@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 62559

On Sat, 7 Mar 2003, Leo wrote:
> I've done my best to research this in past usenet postings, but I
> haven't come across any answers to this question. Hopefully I'm not
> asking a common or dumb question.
>
> I'm relatively new to amateur radio, just have a no-code tech license.
>
> I'd really like to experiment with a computer/ham interfacing project.
> I don't have a specific goal, but the basic premise is to have a
> transceiver hooked up to my PC and be able to remotely access the PC
> via repeater-like operation.
>
> AFAIK, automated/unattended transmission is not allowed by the FCC on

Incorrect. See "Auxiliary station" which (under certain circumstances) may be automatically controlled (47 CFR 97.201(d)). See also .109(d).

> amateur bands. However, repeaters are allowed. So, would such a set-up
> be acceptable as long as the PC was only responding to my commands?
> I'm envisioning a DTMF code or something.

See 47 CFR 97.109(c) and 97.213.

> Of course, data would be lots of fun too, but I'd like to start with a
> simple DTMF interface. A nice starter project would be to ask the
> computer "do I have any email" and if I did it would tell me how many
> messages and from whom.

373. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 10:16:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA8F2D16.12965%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62560

"Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com" wrote:
>
> Check out some of his ramblings as Aaron Voobner.
>
> http://tinyurl.com/716b

Okay, my friend, I'm going to repeat this one more time - stop accusing me of being Aaron Voobner. I am not Aaron Voobner. I have never posted a single message as Aaron Voobner. This accusation was first started by a bunch of CB'ers and I'm getting really tired of it. Up to now, I was willing to just ignore it, but it is becoming increasingly clear that I'm not going to be able to do so. This accusation has persisted for almost a year, and is now, thanks to you, following me to other areas of my life. This harassment will not continue.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

374. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 13:33:25 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Fimaa.4604$se1.2699970@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62561

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030307230345.19751.00003185@mb-cu.aol.com...
> The remaining 5 WPM Morse code testing requirement will most likely
> be eliminated after the World Radiocommunication Conference (WRC-03)
> happening this June in Geneva. This is when the ITU radio regulation
> S25.5 will be presumably voted out of existence, making it possible for
> the separate national radio regulatory agencies (like the FCC in the
United
> States) to eliminate code testing as a requirement for an amateur radio
> license with full HF privileges. I have no doubt that this will, indeed,
> occur. It will NOT be a good thing for the ARS. (That is my opinion,
> not a "flame.")
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

One cannot be sure. They tried to get a vote at the last WRC and failed.
So a person really should not count on it but instead proceed as if it were
going to stay.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

375. Re: Here's your chance

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 14:28:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E69FE2B.6030800@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62562

Brian wrote:

> "Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<ky4aa.7210$wJ1.707135@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
>
>>The Question Pool Committee of the National Conference of Volunteer Examiner
>>Coordinators has released a draft syllabus for the Element 3 (General)
>>Amateur Radio examination. This syllabus will be used to develop a new
>>General class question pool that will become effective July 1, 2004. The QPC
>>is inviting comments on the document as well as suggested questions for the
>>General-class question pool.
>>
>>The draft is located at http://www.arrl.org/arrlvec/gp-syllabus-2004.html
>>
>>Your suggestions and comments may be sent to qpc@arrl.org.
>>
>>ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ 73, de Hans, K0HB
>>
>
> Suggestions such as "Don't publish the questions pools?"
>

How about making sure that the answers are not gleanable from any source
at all? That would make it a little tougher!

- Mike KB3EIA -

376. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 15:22:42 UTC
From: Radio Funtimes <stinkyhamops444@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e6a0ac8@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 62563

Bill, I know 4 good Electrical Engineers who would
get their ham ticket tomorrow if they did not have
to learn the stupid arcane archaic code. These people
would be an asset to the hobby, yet the code is a
hinderance. (what Engineer who puts in 9+ hour
workdays and has a family has the time to learn code?)
The only reason I did is I was single whe I got my
ticket back in '76. You would thisnk ARRL would
put code to bed once and for all. Finally, to anyone
who thinks code is a "screwball barrier" take a listen
to 14.313 14.275 and parts of 75 at night.
So much for that hollow-argument!! Oy Vey.... :)

"N3THJ" <n3thj2000nospam@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:01c2e4de$e56884a0$82878685@clip...
> A friend of mine is looking at upgrading to General, and
> was inquiring about the elimination of the code requirement.
> I really didn't have an answer, other than they were supposedly
> taking it up this month at the big meeting. Has anyone in here
> heard anything in regards to what may happen or when?
> This is an honest question and I am looking for honest
> answers. Please reply to the NG, as I don't need my mailbox filled
> with flames.
> Thanks, Bill

377. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 17:11:48 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <037E33C543827D5D.B9999C7F1D8F7F8F.A89A92274721CC45@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62567

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030303232723.09900.00001939@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <b3viu765rt@enews4.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Jeessh..... Looks like you better go out and bust those people with the
> >following callsign (call area irrelavent in this case!)
> >
> >KC#UNT
> >
> >I know that either that callsign has been issued or is getting pretty
damned
> >close to becoming issued in the 8 callsign district!
> >
> >If you REALLY believe your statements about Kims callsign, then we better
> >see ya go after the suffix of ASS, SEX, FUK, DIK, MUF, NUT, and
probably
> >others that you can think of..... and get these people busted or nagg
them
> >equally. Otherwise it is mere hypocrisy.
> >
> >Ryan
>
> Ryan:
>
> Any radio amateur who selected a Vanity call sign with one of the
> aforementioned suffixes, with the intention of provoking purient interest,
> and then flaunting same in this newsgroup, would, indeed, be treated
> as Kim's "equal."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Oh? And what "treatment" would that be, Larry? I'm not sure that you mean
"treatment" as in nice or mean treatment. I've never noticed one way or the
other. Perhaps you can define...

Kim W5TIT

378. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 17:16:51 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4d8hbbdt1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62564

Exactly my point...thanks for the comment.

Dan/W4NTI

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:v6ibeapma7c7ac@corp.supernews.com...

> For me it was the hardest test I ever had to take,
> but I did it anyway and passed. I hope they don't
> get rid of the 5WPM test. Now I'm glad I had to
> do it! I learned something I otherwise never would
> have tried to learn.
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP
> "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> -Groucho Marx
>
>
>
>

379. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 17:18:46 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030308121846.19625.00000139@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 62565

>the code is a
>hinderance. (what Engineer who puts in 9+ hour
>workdays and has a family has the time to learn code?)

If they dont have enough time to learn the code, then how will they have enough time to operate?

380. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 17:21:52 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <BD1B1F809AE129E8.6540F0A68B1F0A22.497B1521E0289524@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62568

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E6586C0.3AC2253@earthlink.net...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3E64D2FC.C0F76D6C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
<k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >> Life is too short to worry about Kim's callsign.
> > >
> > >I, for one, have never worried about Kim's callsign. I just point out
> > >that her choice was tacky and in poor taste.
> >
> > ...and several other attributes, all archived you-know-where.
> >
> > Who called who "Tugboat Annie" many times, hmmm?
>
> I refer to her as "Tugboat Annie" whenever her vulgarity begins.
>
> I refer to you as "Foghorn" when you crank up your use of cutesty German
> names or start the "poor baby" stuff.
>
> But you knew all that.
>
> Dave K8MN

And you had to say it anyway, didn't you Dave? Sticking your foot in your
mouth again?

Kim W5TIT

381. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 17:31:03 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <DBD4544523A92058.2FC40646754F7C99.94D547A554836204@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62569

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030305213805.09289.00002704@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <b459av11klj@enews4.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Well then Larry, to prove that you are not a hypocrite, let's see ya go
> >after all of the other "naughty" callsigns (in your mind at least) be
them
> >vanity or not. I will even buy ya a ream of printer paper for the
letters
> >to write to the FCC to complain.
> >
> >Ryan
>
> Ryan:
>
> No need to kill a lot of trees on my account. Kim showed up in this
> newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign, and
> literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
> she asked for. Any other moron who shows up in this newsgroup with
> a call sign capable of taking the ARS "...one step closer to extinction"
> will be dealt with accordingly. No letters to the FCC are necessary;
> they already know that they issued these call signs, and will merely
> defend their having done so as the call sign holder's "right" under
> freedom of speech. That is not the issue, nor is it the solution. The
> responsibility for the demeaning of the image of all radio amateurs
> lies solely with those who chose call signs intended to incite prurient
> interest.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Plus, it's the only way Larry can be a minority...

Kim W5TIT

382. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 17:37:27 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <7C8509FB6DF83A2A.4B374A381CE82281.BA29A0415AEE833B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62570

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0303072005.365b0731@posting.google.com...
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030305213805.09289.00002704@mb-ch.aol.com>...
>
> > Kim showed up in this
> > newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign, and
> > literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
> > she asked for.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Larry, that's rapist mentality.

I told him that long ago...trouble is: he knows.

Kim W5TIT

383. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 18:06:00 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <4ACBF9D3F88E4E0A.6D82B132EBE9EB9B.4685EECA2E104334@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62572

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA8C7D90.1202A%stewart@say.net...
> "Mike Bartowlini" wrote:
>
> > Nope! It is perfectly legal for a volunteer
> > fireman to do this. It is done all over
> > Tennessee. The FCC stuck their nose in the
> > matter a few years back and got it chopped
> > off by the entire Congressional delegation
> > of Tennessee plus both U.S. Senators. Both
> > our U.S. Senators said the FCC would have
> > their budget cut if they ever stuck their
> > nose in volunteer firemen's business in
> > Tennessee again.
>
>
> I agree with what the other fellow said - he should check with the FCC
for
> a specific determination first. I seriously doubt such use is acceptable.
>

I would think that both are correct, with guidelines. It seems to me that
an emergency service organization (police, fire, ambulance, fire & rescue,
etc.) would be able to avail themselves of amateur radio frequencies *IF* it
were in an emergency (not just routine use). The reason I would interpret
it this way is because of the rule for communication on any available radio
frequency during an emergency. While "emergency" is left to interpretation,
it is further defined as any threat to life or property, correct?

>
> As for your comments, it is not "perfectly" legal. It is most likely a
> direct violation of FCC rules governing ham radio. If so, any person
caught
> using those frequencies for such activities could be subject to
enforcement.
>

I'd agree that would be the case, if the use were for routine purposes.

>
> Actually, firefighters (volunteer or otherwise) have no business using
the
> ham radio frequencies - or the frequencies of any other radio service not
> specifically allocated for that use.
>

Unfortunately, it is being learned that the frequencies of fire, police, ambulance, etc., are inadequate--due to the fact that they cannot communicate with each other. After all, that is one of the many fundamental reasons for the amateur radio emergency communication network of services: the abiltiy of emergency organizations to communicate with each other. That is why I would support the purchase of ham radio equipment by emergency organizations--and its use if the situation warrants.

>
> The FCC's ultimate position will most
> likely be that firefighters should use the frequencies already set aside
for
> public safety agencies and their personnel. Since there is no shortage of
> those frequencies, there is no mandate to use other frequencies.
>

I think the existing rules would specifically argue that. Remember, I am talking about the use of amateur radio frequencies by emergency organizations (or anyone, for that matter) in an emergency situation. While it's been a long, long time since I've read different parts of the Communications Act, it does seem to me that I saw provisions that would allow any available radio to be used by anyone in an emergency. I've also heard this very topic debated many times on the air. It always leads to some great exchanges of ideas.

>
> Furthermore, ham radio frequencies are not the best choice for
> firefighters to use. Unless it is a true emergency (and I'm not certain
all
> fire calls would be defined as such under the rules governing ham radio),
>

The rules governing ham radio would be that an emergency is defined as any threat to life or *property*. Fire is a huge threat to property, correct?

>
> firefighters would have to share those frequencies with other ham
operators.
> For example, firefighters would have no recourse if the conversations of
> other hams interfered with their operations.
>

OK, right or wrong for the firefighters to be using the frequencies--any human (amateur radio operator or not) would be other than nice if they were to interfere or to refuse to relinquish a frequency for an emergency service. I say this even if they (the firefighters) were using the frequencies for normal routine use. The place for challenge is with the FCC on this, not for us to refuse to allow fire personnel onto the frequency if they think they have the right.

>
> Finally, your story about the members of Congress from Tennessee has the
> ring of fanciful local folklore. Few members of Congress would be that

> concerned over the volunteer activities of a local ham operator,
especially
> as it relates to his use of his privately owned radio.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Well, I would tend to agree on that!

Kim W5TIT

384. Re: N5QXX/R: The New Orleans linked repeater that isn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 18:06:04 UTC
From: Radio Funtimes <stinkyhamops444@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e6a310c@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 62571
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

They need to see this: http://www.markfiore.com/animation/dictator.html

"Stu Parker" <sparkr@pavillage.net> wrote in message
news:577654515751.1356729F38A@pavillage.net...
> Down there in New Orleans, they brag about N5QXX as the longest echo
> linked repeater. The real truth is that it isn't.
>
> Oh yes, if you take a look in the repeater section of Echolink, you'll
> find N5QXX all right, but you won't be able to link to it. Instead,
> you'll get an "access denied" message, because only a small number of
> people are allowed to use it.
>
> So why is it on Echolink at all? Your guess is as good as mine,
> although I tend to lean toward the explanation that the club wants
> bragging rights without having to actually perform as do other linked
> repeaters.
>
> What a bunch of morons. They should be cut off from Echolink.

385. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 18:35:14 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <CJqaa.4705$se1.2766165@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62566

"Radio Funtimes" <stinkyhamops444@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3e6a0ac8@snipnews.snip.net...
> Bill, I know 4 good Electrical Engineers who would
> get their ham ticket tomorrow if they did not have
> to learn the stupid arcane archaic code. These people
> would be an asset to the hobby, yet the code is a
> hinderance. (what Engineer who puts in 9+ hour
> workdays and has a family has the time to learn code?)
> The only reason I did is I was single whe I got my
> ticket back in '76. You would thisnk ARRL would
> put code to bed once and for all. Finally, to anyone
> who thinks code is a "screwball barrier" take a listen
> to 14.313 14.275 and parts of 75 at night.
> So much for that hollow-argument!! Oy Vey.... :)

If they don't have time to study the code, then they don't have time to
study for the written tests either. Afterall a good percentage of the tests
are rules, regs, operating practices, propagation, etc. You can't pass it
on electronics theory alone.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

386. Re: Automated Transmissions from a Computer / Reapeter Station

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 19:01:46 UTC
From: lszumel@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <94a4e3a5.0303081101.430f8a2e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62573

This a bit long. Here's a summary (please correct if I'm wrong):

(1) Any station can be remotely controlled (47CFR97.109C) and use any frequency on which the operator is licensed

(2) Any auxiliary station can be automatically controlled (47CFR97.201A) on 1.25m or shorter, but the station must be part of a system

(3) Any station may be automatically controlled (47CFR97.221) for sending data on any frequency to which the operator is licensed, provided no more than 500Hz of bandwidth is used.

> Incorrect. See "Auxiliary station" which (under certain circumstances) may be
> automatically controlled (47 CFR 97.201(d)). See also .109(d).
>
> See 47 CFR 97.109(c) and 97.213.
>

Thanks for the pointers. This looks like good news for me. However, I am still not clear on the difference between automatic transmissions and transmissions from an auxiliary station.

47 CFR 97.201(d) clearly states that an auxiliary station may be automatically controlled. However, it's not clear to me what an auxiliary station is. 47 CFR 97.201(a) says any station licensed to a Tech or higher can be an auxiliary station--but do I need to do anything besides buy equipment? I can't find mention of how to license a station.

Also, The FCC defines Auxiliary Station to be:

"Auxiliary station. An amateur station, other than in a message forwarding system, that is transmitting communications point-to-point within a system of cooperating amateur stations."

Does that mean I can't have automatic control unless I'm part of a system of some sort?

Also, 47 CFR 97.109(c) says that any station may be remotely controlled, but only stations "stations specifically designated elsewhere in this part" may be automatically controlled. Is that referring just to auxiliary stations or to something else?

For my first application, I think 47 CFR 97.109(c) is all I need to move forward. But I'm interested in automatic control as well, and that might get me into auxiliary station rules.

Question: when it comes to data, would 47 CFR 97.221 be more
appropriate? That refers to automatic transmission of data on
non-auxiliary stations. Since any protocol like TCP/IP requests
packets that were sent, this would seem to satisfy the stipulation
that the automatic transmission must be responding to interrogation by
a station under
local or remote control" (47 CFR 97.221(c)(1)).

Also, I note that aux. stations may only transmit on 1.25m and
shorter. That's a bummer, since it increases my equipment cost for
this experiment.

Ok, sorry for such a long message!

Thanks again,

-Leo

387. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 19:09:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6A3FEB.B2F793E4@att.net>
Source record: 62574

Lloyd wrote:

>
> BWAAHHHHH BWAHHHHH

Ah. Your total vocabulary. We see.

388. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 19:09:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6A3FF6.14843F5C@att.net>
Source record: 62575

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E683BBC.D6C96C90@att.net>...
>
> > Please understand- When Larry Roll rants about all the "dumbed down" Extra lites
> > that says nothing about his attitude toward newcomers, even those who happen to be
> > Extra lites. It's the dumbed down system he/we decry,
>
> Then why the incessant personal attacks?

You ARE looking in the mirror when you say that, I'm sure.

389. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 19:16:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030308141644.06165.00000092@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62577

In article <v6j1b2s1cjv4fe@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
writes:

>Larry
>Since they have set a record that means they must be
>on the cutting edge of Amateur Radio. And they are
>using good old Morse's Code to accomplish it!

That 136 KHz record was NOT set by "receiving by ear
and sending by hand."

There are several dozen other codes with error-correction
capability that could have been used (see the MIT "Red
Book" by Petersen and Weldon) and have been used for
decades. VERY weak-signal reception (to the point of
of signals BELOW the noise floor) has been done
academically and professionally for at least three decades.

That morse code was used at all is a tradition thing and
possibly bounded by regulations in the transmitting end's
home administration. Aperiodic, monotonic codings are
NOT optimum for very low signal communications.

Compute the equivalent WPM rate for a dot period of 60
seconds. Use any method. "Farnsworth" method would,
if patterned on the US optional test rate, have a WPM rate
based on 3 times the basic dot period. As such, the single
word PARIS (of 70 dot periods in length) would require
4,200 seconds to complete (70 minutes total) and the word
per minute rate would then be 1 per 3.5 hours. Is that in
the "proficient" category?

>So much for it being a "dead mode" of little use.

So much for illogical associations...

390. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 19:16:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030308141645.06165.00000093@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 62576

In article <CJqaa.4705$se1.2766165@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>If they don't have time to study the code, then they don't have time to
>study for the written tests either.

Sorry, but that's an illogical and irrelevant statement.

The code test exists as a separate element. A code test has always been a US amateur license test regulation. That does NOT mean it must always be there.

The argument is whether or not the code test is relevant to the granting of a US amateur radio license. The FCC is on record (since 1990) of stating it is NOT relevant. See FCC 90-53. See FCC 99-412.

>You can't pass it on electronics theory alone.

That was never an issue.

Perhaps the QPC syllabus should have questions on a right attitude? Belief in olde tyme hammus superioris? Strict adherence to tradition, jargon, methods, standards and practices? Marching in ranks to the same drumbeat?

If morsemanship is the Premier skill of amateur radio, such a strict requirement (of some in the "ham community") then, by all means, change the hobby activity to the Amateur Radiotelegraphy Service. Or possibly the Archaic Radio-telegraphy Service since there is a dwindling number of professional morsemen in the international radio world.

Study hard, work hard, exaggerate the license test into a PhD-equivalent academic test and anyone could be as great and wonderful as the olde tyme hammes.

391. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 19:20:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6A4279.68C2A28E@att.net>
Source record: 62578

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <3E65A353.CDE30AB@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:
>
> > This from the same dunce who insists there was no nationwide Police
> >Ratiotelegraph Net until the early
> >1970's. If he doesn't want to know about it he simply refuses to admit it
> >exists.
> >
> >What an idiot!
>
> Gosh, olde farte, you are welcome to come to Los Angeles and
> tell the LAPD that it existed.

I would be able to do exactly that, and also to PROVE it, you trolling
ignoramous.

I'm quite well aware that you aren't the only ignorant, arrogant
asshole residing in the Los Angeles Basin, hey I was there in person
myself only last week and observed a few, but one must ponder the
lucidity of anyone who remains there past the barest necessity.

I'll be glad to inform anyone there at LAPD of their former CW callsign
if you can dig up anyone with *any* interest, or even a mild curiousity.

I won't wait up for you or them. I'm fully aware that none of the new
generation of APCO types is at all informed on any serious amount of
their history and couldn't care less.

Oh- you wouldn't know that the quickest way to get a message from the
Midwest direct to LAPD was on CW. Via the relay at Flagstaff AZ under
most propagation conditions. It it went the convential route it would
have to be relayed to CHP Sacremento via CW, them typed into the
state's wireline teletype system. By the time it ever got that far, LAPD
would be acting on the
direct CW message and the teletype message will still be in someone's
hopper!

Yeah, I know, that frosts your bare backside, and chaps your cheeks,
buuuuttttttttt--
that's the way it was!

392. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 19:20:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6A4298.F48704@att.net>
Source record: 62579

N2EY wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E659A78.861C802B@att.net>...
> > N2EY wrote:
>
> > > Show us some numbers, Len.....
> >
> > snip
> >
> > All Len will *ever* show is his bare backside.
> >
> > AVeryFineSpeciMan indeed.
>
> Dick,
>
> Why so negative?

Wellllll..., Jim, you know the rules--- two negatives make one positive!

He's positively the original Putz.

> Perhaps Len has some useful information about ARS
> license numbers that he hasn't shared yet.

I'm sure you said that in jest.... the one thing he's never showed us
is real
information re ham radio. And never will.

> For example, if he has old
> Callbooks or CD-ROMs, he could generate a listing of license class
> totals over various time periods and share it with the newsgroup.

Yeah, Right! as if.

>
> Such data could either support or work against his claims. Without
> such data, those claims are just wild speculation presented as facts.
>

That's all he has ever had, all he ever will.

393. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 19:21:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6A42AA.BF87F867@att.net>
Source record: 62580

Brian wrote:

> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6580E1.83D5D4B3@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > Get back to me if you have anything useful.
> >
> > How would you recognize it? Your failure to read carefully has you
> > dangling once again.
>
> I said, "Get back to me if you have anything useful."

Useful? most of us thought that a full-access ham radio license would be
useful, despite
being required to actually DO something to get it. Evidently you
wouldn't recognize "useful".

394. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 19:21:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6A42CE.282F148B@att.net>
Source record: 62581

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E659E71.9B04EDF2@att.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6423B8.5DA1FF8C@att.net>...
> > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Steve - ever think the whole point of his postings might be to "brown you off"?
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Why, I thought we all knew that Lame Lennie aka AVeryFineSpeciMan is here for the
> > > > > express purpose of
> > > > > "browning off" ham radio and everyone remotely involved in it. Ccept his little
> > > > > butty Brain "Mogodishu Slim"
> > > > > BurkeTurkey. He's already embarassingly red (and brown) enough.
> > > >
> > > Dick/W0EX, you better spit out that bile before it chokes you.
> > >
> > The bile is all yours, Slim. Enjoy. Oh, you've been enjoying for years. Right.
> >
> I just don't want your callsign becoming available prematurely. Live
> long and prosper.

That has long been the plan and still is. How're your plans going? Do
you think that someday you might find it in yourself to grow up, wise up
and move on
with your life? Or just sit it all out?

395. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 19:22:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6A42E3.2E9DEFC@att.net>
Source record: 62582

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Wed, 05 Mar 2003 05:03:07 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >> >The FCC doesn't think you're in the dark or the FCC thinks Riley doesn't
> >> >know?
> >>
> >> Riley Hollingsworth is a "special counsel" to the FCC. That title
> >> refers to what is essentially a temporary hire or a "consultancy"
> >> equivalent. He is not in the regular Wireless Bureau staff list
> >> (what you may think of as a "key list").
> >
> >Riley is a temp? You know this because...
>
> Quick, pass the Pepto-Bismol.
>
> The "Special Counsel" title is a fancy way of saying that he has a
> specific area of assignment (Amateur Radio issues). No, he's not a
> "temp" - he's career Civil Service. I know this because I know him
> face-to-face for many years.
>
> Yes, he is not on the Wireless Telecomm Bureau staff list because
> he is not part of that Bureau and hasn't been for years. He is
> part of the Enforcement Bureau, where he sits (figureatively) at
> the right hand of God (Joe Casey, Chief of the Technical and Public
> Safety Division which is the remnant of what used to be the Field
> Operations Bureau before the Enforcement Bureau was created a
> couple of years ago).
>
> Lucky Riley, he gets to sit (literally) two states away from the
> Headache Palace and do what a lot of us wanted the Wireless Bureau
> and its predecessor(s) to do for all the years until the function
> was reassigned to the (now) Enforcement Bureau.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Yep, looks like Our Boy leaped at another conclusion - and missed.
Again. 'Nother headache.

He'll never rival Tarzan.

396. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 19:22:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6A42FD.D6854B05@att.net>
Source record: 62583

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E659F91.EBF914C9@att.net>...
>
> > Would you kindly quote in Part 97 where it says a US ham is responsible for knowing other countries
> > allocations and keeping current on them and their updates?
>
> But if you happened to know that the other "amateur" is operating out
> of band, why would you participate in a QSO with them

Given your track record I doubt many readers will be inclined to
accept anything you "know" at face value.

If I was in QSO with a foreign ham and some clod came on the frequency
and informed me that I shouldn't be talking to that guy because that guy
was out of his allotted band I'd likely say "Buzz off Slim/Brian. You're
in no position to 'know'". And besides it's none of YOUR business, just
as it's none of your business how Dave handles his on the air contacts.

397. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 19:22:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6A4307.8C236F9A@att.net>
Source record: 62584

Brian wrote:

> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E65808E.3D42D926@earthlink.net>...
>
> > I'll think about answering your question when you show some civility and
> > when you answer the questions N2EY and I have both asked about your
> > Somali "operations".
> >
> > What was that line you used with Steve? Something about not dancing to
> > his fiddling...
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Suit yourself. We have nothing more to talk about.

Far as I can see you never did.

398. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 19:53:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030308145301.24103.00000073@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62585

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/5/03 5:56 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030305185603.06165.00000018@mb-cj.aol.com>

>Odd, a half century ago and during four periods subsequent, I've
> operated over much of the HF spectrum without any morseman-
> ship necessary or needed.

You have not "operated" on HF, Lennie. You were involved in the emissions of RF at frequencies in the HF range, but in the context of Amateur Radio, you have zero point zero hours of experience.

This IS an AMATEUR RADIO forum, afterall....

>Ah, you are referring to AMATEUR radio where a number of
> amateurs consider morsemanship to be of the paramount skill
> accomplishment...and therefore being a "qualifier" for permission
> to operate in small slices of the HF spectrum.

Nope. The Code Test is only 1/4th of the examination criteria, and that dictated by the United States' compliance with treaties to which it is signatory.

That YOU don't consider it relevent is laughable and in itself IRrelevent. Persons with actual communications law experience have disproven your rants already. Take a hint.

>That's still curious...other radio services do not have this
> "qualifier" yet the amateur still considers it a necessity.

Other "radio services" are not covered by S25. ONLY Amateur Radio.

>It seems
> to be the only radio service requiring that qualifier

Duh...ya think?

>Do you sense any illogic there?

Only since the law that still requires it is an international one, and is up for review THIS year.

>Or isn't it just an emotional mindset based on
> some odd territorial imperative held by those wonderful olde fartes?

Nope. Just the law. You DO believe that a peaceful society must have laws which are changed by peaceful means and majority rule, don't you, Lennie? Or are you an anarchist...?!?!

>No problem. Bigotry exists in human society in many guises.
> I've seen enough of it in seven decades of existance...actually
> quite enough by the third decade. Does your comment mean
> that you condone bigotry by self-styled supremacists?

No one "condones" self-styled supremacists, Lennie, but we do TOLERATE
you.

>I don't condone it, nor appreciate it, nor accept it. You may have
> noticed some of that in here...

Yep...From "Lenof21", "Lenover21", "Averyfineman", "NoCWTest" and others
emanating from your keyboard....

>Sorry, but all those sub-bands are there to satisfy the needs of
> some olde fartes, a sort of spectral clubroom away from the
> main hall of the lodge, isolated so as to not upset the narrow-
> banders seeking refuge from the turbulence of the mainstream.

The FCC recognizes those "sub-bands" as necessary in order to allow equal
access and minimal interference between mode users. You milage varties, but
then you're on the wrong side of the road, too!

>ARRL caters to the olde farte mentality, the traditionalists,
> the certificatists, those wishing (sometimes desperately) of a
> lifestyle away from reality so that they achieve some sense of
> self-importance.

Oh...?!?! I see no restrictions on membership by license class.

>Since ARRL has a virtual monopoly on US
> radio amateur publications, ARRL can exercise influence on
> the "amateur community.

I see no exclusivity in the topic matter of any of thier publications,
either.

>ARRL still does not understand that and may not
> until there is a full turnover of all its managers and directors.

The ARRL seems to understand fine. From what informed position do you
make these observations? In what programs are you active? What ARRL field
organizations are you an elected member of?

>Of course...and by extension, all of the ham operating "skills"
> are then based on childhood pursuits or are childlike? Are
> all the olde farte mentalities grounded on some childish game
> of "king of the hill?" Perhaps so.

We see who would be "King Of The Hill", Lennie...

>Now, I'm not criticizing you or your daughter, Bert, but parents
> are seldom able to evaluate their children objectively, regardless
> of their claims.

I am still awaiting Lennie's revelations as to how many children he has sired and raised. He loves to insist that age limits be imposed on Amateur Radio, and frequently makes these assertions on how parents are unable to make objective assessments of thier kids skills, performance, etc.

>Children aren't the issue. Regulations affecting
> the entire citizenry of a country are the issue.

So far you have yet to demonstrate that there is ANY precedent for changing ANY regulation as a result of negative impact to ANY radio service, ESPECIALLY Amateur Radio, vis-a-vis licensure of adolescents.

Not one iota.

More unsubstantiated rants from someone with no qualifications from which to make them.

YA PUTZ!

Steve

Steven J Robeson, LPN

399. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 19:57:10 UTC
From: Radio Funtimes <stinkyhamops444@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e6a4b16@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 62586

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:CJqaa.4705$se1.2766165@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...

> If they don't have time to study the code, then they don't have time to
> study for the written tests either. Afterall a good percentage of the
tests
> are rules, regs, operating practices, propagation, etc. You can't pass it
> on electronics theory alone.
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE

Ain't it just funny how whenever the topic of
relaxation of the code requirements come along
it always merits a goofy response by the "true believers"

I mean these CW diehards are just as committed
and ready and goofy enuf to lay down their life for
the cause!

They remind me of the Pallie Suicide Bomber,
all-ready-to-go with his explosives belt securely
strapped on, waiting at the bus stop for the #43
to Hebron....

Or a kook Larouche plebe, ready to pounce on you
at the airport because you must know that the Queen
of England is REALLY a space-ailen from the planet remulac....

Or an ailen abductee from the Raelian cult who just
cloned your baby.....

How I love he convoluted logic of these CW mullett-heads!

You have to really wonder if those voices they claim to
be hearing from the "Space Brothers" on 7.2-- Mhz or
on Art Bell's radio show can be "cured" with a good
regimine of Prozac, diet and exercize....

Oy-Vey!

"Only two things are infinite, the
universe and human stupidity, and
I'm not sure about the former."
- Albert Einstein (1879-1955)

"I was frantically spinning my chair away from the screen and covering my
daughter's eyes with one hand while trying to click the picture away, but
as soon as I did MORE pictures popped up, and then more, covering the

screen with explicit images of people and animals and possibly, at one point, Elmo..... I finally had to turn my computer off to make it all go away."

- Dave Barry tries to find "Elmo" on the web for his daughter of two.

400. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 20:06:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030308150614.24103.00000074@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62587

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/6/03 12:59 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030306015920.29820.00000939@mb-fi.aol.com>

>Tsk, tsk, tsk..."S25" refers to the entire set of ITU-R
> Recommendations for amateur radio.

Which does not make my previous statement any less true.

>S25.5 does not "limit" anyone...(SNIP)

In this case it does, Lennie, as demonstrated to you by Counsellor Kane on several occassions before. The entire S25 package has been ratified by the Congress of the United States and is therefore part of American law.

It DOES limit a LOT of "someones"

>Japan has waived Recommendation S25.5 for a certain class of
> their amateur license which does have HF privileges.

Hurrah for Japan. What part of JAPANESE law am I obliged to observe when I am NOT in Japanese territorial control?

>>Nothing strange about that...it's been that way for decades.
>
> That it was "always so" is not a valid criterion for an ITU-R
> Recommendation.

You quoted me as saying "always so". That's not what I said. I said that it's been that way for decades...Certainly a long time, however NOT "always". Please stop misquoting people.

>Neither is the FCC
>>> "subordinate to Congress." FCC is not part of the Legislative
>>> branch of the US government
>>
>> The FCC is NOT subordinate to the Congress of the United States...?!?!

(My laughter snipped)

>> If you say so, Lennie...if you say so! ! ! ! ! !
>
> No, the US government says so. The Federal Communications
> Commission is an independent agency. It was formerly under
> Department of Commerce, a secretariat.

Again...if you say so, Lennie.

However everyone in this forum with Junior High School US Giovernment class behind them knows what an idiot you just made yourself in a public forum...Thanks!

(A government agency NOT subordinate to Congress...Someone had better tell the Congress! I think they'd like to know!~
BBBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!)

Fourteen years of night school wasted, Lennie.

>"Laugh" all you want, use all the epithets you want...you will not
> change the US government that way, nor the Constitution of the
> United States of America.

Lennie, you spastic idiot, YOU make it sooooooooooo easy to LAUGH at you!
The FCC....NOT subordinate to Congress...?!?! WAFIYA ! ! ! ! !

You make my "job" sooooooooooo easy! Thanks!

Steve

401. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 20:11:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E6A4E7D.1080505@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62588

Radio Funtimes wrote:

> Bill, I know 4 good Electrical Engineers who would
> get their ham ticket tomorrow if they did not have
> to learn the stupid arcane archaic code.

Good idea! Lets apply that to my own experience:

I'll probably never do satellite comms, so I want no questions about that on my test.

And they have a lot of nerve having questions about Maximum powers, because I don't ever plan to operate over a hundred watts. Get thos questions out!

I don't have enough space to put up a 160 meter antenna, so why should they ask me any questions about the band edges at that frequency?

> These people would be an asset to the hobby, yet the code is a
> hinderance.

That is a good excuse.<not> How are people who refuse to learn something because they don't have the initiative to learn something they might not like going to be an asset?

> (what Engineer who puts in 9+ hour
> workdays and has a family has the time to learn code?)

I work 50+ hours a week, am Captain of an ice hockey team that plays 2-3 games a week, and while I was studying for my ticket, I was ferrying my son around with his ice hockey team. I have other hobbies too. These must not be very energetic engineers!

402. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 20:12:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E6A4EC6.5030806@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62589

WA8ULX wrote:

>>the code is a
>>hinderance. (what Engineer who puts in 9+ hour
>>workdays and has a family has the time to learn code?)
>>
>
> If they dont have enough time to learn the code, then how will they have enough
> time to operate?

Game, set, and match!

- Mike KB3EIA -

403. Re: Here's your chance

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 20:30:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303081230.48532419@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62590

"Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<Epeaa.8431$wJ1.806037@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in
>
> :
> : Suggestions such as "Don't publish the questions pools?"
> :
>
> I don't know of any limitations on the suggestions, so you'd certainly be
> free to suggest that. Unfortunately the QPC would not be in a position to
> implement it however, since it would be in direct conflict with ï¿½97.523 of
> the Commissions rules.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

I wonder if that's anything like substituting a 13-15WPM Farnsworth
Exam for the REQUIRED 5WPM Morse Exam?

404. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 20:33:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303081233.7a32b209@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62591

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message news:<v6j1b2s1cjv4fe@corp.supernews.com>...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030307232654.10901.00001651@mb-dh.aol.com...
> > In article <f45722ac.0303072001.136673ec@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >
> > >Trivia Time:
> > >
> > >If the dit was 60 seconds long, how long is the dash?
> >
> > Brian:
> >
> > Presumably, three times longer than the "dit," or 180 seconds.
> >
> > >How long is the inter-character space?
> >
> > Good question; obviously that would depend on the software used. My
> > guess is it would be at least the length of a "dah," or 180 seconds.
> >
> > >How long is the inter-word space?
> >
> > Should be at least three inter-character spaces in length, or 540 seconds.
> > Again, it would depend on the software in use. At these slow speeds,
> > standard inter-chracter and inter-word spacing would not necessarily
> > apply. The exaggerated spacing would likely not be necessary in spite of
> > the increased length of the actual "on" time of the separate dits and
> dahs.
> > I'm sure they were visually monitoring each others signals on a computer
> > screen display that resembled an oscilloscope with a greatly expanded
> > time base. However, I doubt that they were sending any "words" longer
> > than each other's call signs. I'd sure like to read about the receivers
> > in use. They must have been dealing with signal strengths in the nano-
> > volt level.
> >
> > >Could Farnsworth have been substituted for Morse Code, and worked as
> > >effectively?
> >
> > I dunno. Since when is Farnsworth a "substitute" for Morse code? I
> > always thought it was just another method of sending Morse code.
> >
> > >Are these UK amateurs considered proficient?
> >
> > I'd say they were.

> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
>
> Larry
> Since they have set a record that means they must be
> on the cutting edge of Amateur Radio. And they are
> using good old Morse's Code to accomplish it!
> So much for it being a "dead mode" of little use.

At what speed did these proficient, cutting edge coders send their message?

Remember that a single dit was one minute long.

405. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 20:34:32 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303081234.29fe5d13@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62592

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030307232654.10901.00001651@mb-dh.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0303072001.136673ec@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >
> >Trivia Time:
> >
> >If the dit was 60 seconds long, how long is the dash?
>
> Brian:
>
> Presumably, three times longer than the "dit," or 180 seconds.
>
> >How long is the inter-character space?
>
> Good question; obviously that would depend on the software used. My
> guess is it would be at least the length of a "dah," or 180 seconds.
>
> >How long is the inter-word space?
>
> Should be at least three inter-character spaces in length, or 540 seconds.
> Again, it would depend on the software in use. At these slow speeds,
> standard inter-chracter and inter-word spacing would not necessarily
> apply. The exaggerated spacing would likely not be necessary in spite of
> the increased length of the actual "on" time of the separate dits and dahs.
> I'm sure they were visually monitoring each others signals on a computer
> screen display that resembled an oscilloscope with a greatly expanded
> time base. However, I doubt that they were sending any "words" longer
> than each other's call signs. I'd sure like to read about the receivers
> in use. They must have been dealing with signal strengths in the nano-
> volt level.
>
> >Could Farnsworth have been substituted for Morse Code, and worked as
> >effectively?
>
> I dunno. Since when is Farnsworth a "substitute" for Morse code? I
> always thought it was just another method of sending Morse code.
>
> >Are these UK amateurs considered proficient?
>
> I'd say they were.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

At what speed (in WPM) did they send their message?

406. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 20:37:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303081237.716163e2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62593

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E697740.457A8D17@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030305213805.09289.00002704@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> >
> > > Kim showed up in this
> > > newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign, and
> > > literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
> > > she asked for.
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> > Larry, that's rapist mentality.
>
> That'd be one of your less intelligent responses. I don't know of any
> rapists who do nothing other than give their "victim" a talking to or a
> lecture on their lack of good taste.
>
> Dave K8MN

How many do you know?

407. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 20:48:55 UTC
From: me <me@here.com>
Message-ID: <b4dkuuetg1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62594

At least, the engineers were smart enough to see the waste of time in
learning something that really don't want to do.

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3E6A4EC6.5030806@adelphia.net...
> WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >>the code is a
> >>hinderance. (what Engineer who puts in 9+ hour
> >>workdays and has a family has the time to learn code?)
> >>
> >
> > If they dont have enough time to learn the code, then how will they have
enough
> > time to operate?
>
>
> Game, set, and match!
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

408. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 20:51:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E6A57F1.7050900@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62595

me wrote:

> At least, the engineers were smart enough to see the waste of time in
> learning something that really don't want to do.
>

And since they don't have the time to learn, they don't have the time to
be an asset to the hobby.

- Mike KB3EIA -

409. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 20:59:41 UTC
From: me <me@here.com>
Message-ID: <b4dlj4muj1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62596

Let's see.. They have an electrical engineering degree. How hard would the theory be. Oh gee, they now have to read the rules and regulations. That should take an evening at worst case scenario.

The code would take how long? And no plans to use it.

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:3E6A57F1.7050900@adelphia.net...
> me wrote:
>
> > At least, the engineers were smart enough to see the waste of time in
> > learning something that really don't want to do.
> >
>
> And since they don't have the time to learn, they don't have the time to
> be an asset to the hobby.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

410. Re: Here's your chance

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 21:08:38 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v6kn14brqu8pa5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62597

Mike, my suggestion would be a test watered down to what most folks seem to want. Two questions, plus a bonus question.
1) What is your name (you may not pull out your driver's license - spelling counts)
2) What is your address (ditto spelling and driver's license)

passing is 50%

bonus question (in case you fail both the above questions) worth 50 points
If you have a picture of your radio, point out the power switch. If you don't, we have a light switch here in this room. It is currently turned 'on'. If you can turn it off, you score 50 bonus points

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

--

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.459 / Virus Database: 258 - Release Date: 2/25/03

411. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 21:14:33 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v6knc89s33r0ce@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62598

Umm ... WPM ... you mean 'words per month'? My guess on all of this is that
if you use very tiny bandwidths, you eliminate noise - and also limit your
data rate. Neither bad nor good, it becomes a trade-off.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

--

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0303081234.29fe5d13@posting.google.com...
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030307232654.10901.00001651@mb-dh.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0303072001.136673ec@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >
> > >Trivia Time:
> > >
> > >If the dit was 60 seconds long, how long is the dash?
> >
> > Brian:
> >
> > Presumably, three times longer than the "dit," or 180 seconds.
> >
> > >How long is the inter-character space?
> >
> > Good question; obviously that would depend on the software used. My
> > guess is it would be at least the length of a "dah," or 180 seconds.
> >
> > >How long is the inter-word space?
> >
> > Should be at least three inter-character spaces in length, or 540
seconds.
> > Again, it would depend on the software in use. At these slow speeds,
> > standard inter-chracter and inter-word spacing would not necessarily
> > apply. The exaggerated spacing would likely not be necessary in spite
of
> > the increased length of the actual "on" time of the separate dits and
dahs.
> > I'm sure they were visually monitoring each others signals on a computer
> > screen display that resembled an oscilloscope with a greatly expanded
> > time base. However, I doubt that they were sending any "words" longer
> > than each other's call signs. I'd sure like to read about the receivers
> > in use. They must have been dealing with signal strengths in the nano-

> > volt level.
> >
> > >Could Farnsworth have been substituted for Morse Code, and worked as
> > >effectively?
> >
> > I dunno. Since when is Farnsworth a "substitute" for Morse code? I
> > always thought it was just another method of sending Morse code.
> >
> > >Are these UK amateurs considered proficient?
> >
> > I'd say they were.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> At what speed (in WPM) did they send their message?

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.459 / Virus Database: 258 - Release Date: 2/25/03

412. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 21:47:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4dod8$4oj$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62599

The comments about 313 and 275 do not apply to MOST of the actual amateur licensees. If you take a listen you will find that the TRASH is coming from the NO CALLSIGN individuals.

This does not apply to KB1EVE, or WA9KJI.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message news:CJqaa.4705$se1.2766165@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Radio Funtimes" <stinkyhamops444@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:3e6a0ac8@snipnews.snip.net...
> > Bill, I know 4 good Electrical Engineers who would
> > get their ham ticket tomorrow if they did not have
> > to learn the stupid arcane archaic code. These people
> > would be an asset to the hobby, yet the code is a
> > hinderance. (what Engineer who puts in 9+ hour
> > workdays and has a family has the time to learn code?)
> > The only reason I did is I was single whe I got my
> > ticket back in '76. You would thisnk ARRL would
> > put code to bed once and for all. Finally, to anyone
> > who thinks code is a "screwball barrier" take a listen
> > to 14.313 14.275 and parts of 75 at night.
> > So much for that hollow-argument!! Oy Vey.... :)
>
>
> If they don't have time to study the code, then they don't have time to
> study for the written tests either. Afterall a good percentage of the tests
> are rules, regs, operating practices, propagation, etc. You can't pass it
> on electronics theory alone.
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
>

413. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 21:53:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E6A665D.4030509@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62600

me wrote:

> Let's see.. They have an electrical engineering degree. How hard would the
> theory be. Oh gee, they now have to read the rules and regulations. That
> should take an evening at worst case scenario.
>
> The code would take how long? And no plans to use it.

That's pretty much the case for me. Took me 6 months of around an hour a
day study. For most people it would take a fair amount less time. And
I'm 90 percent digital (computer) modes 10 percent contesting

The written test took around a week of brushing up, was no sweat
whatsoever. For some others it would be.

To me, it boils down to: If you want it, this is how you get it. I wanted
it, I learned Morse. These others just don't want it that much. Their loss.

- Mike KB3EIA -

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3E6A57F1.7050900@adelphia.net...
>
>>me wrote:
>>
>>
>>>At least, the engineers were smart enough to see the waste of time in
>>>learning something that really don't want to do.
>>>
>>>
>>And since they don't have the time to learn, they don't have the time to
>>be an asset to the hobby.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>
>

414. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 22:07:44 UTC
From: me <me@here.com>
Message-ID: <b4dpio$911$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62601

The real problem in this newsgroup is dealing with the reality that morse code is not even 50 percent of the average operators air time.

With the thinking that I have observed, everyone should have to learn how to ride a horse to get a drivers license.

415. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 22:46:35 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030308174635.09269.00000046@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 62605

From: "N3THJ" n3thj2000nospam@hotmail.com

>Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Too late. (See posts below).

From: "KB9TMP" kb9tmp@juno.com
>I hope they don't
>get rid of the 5WPM test. Now I'm glad I had to
>do it! I learned something I otherwise never would
>have tried to learn.

Do you often not like doing something and then enjoy it after you are pressured to?

From: "Radio Funtimes" stinkyhamops444@yahoo.com
>Bill, I know 4 good Electrical Engineers who would
>get their ham ticket tomorrow if they did not have
>to learn the stupid arcane archaic code. These people
>would be an asset to the hobby, yet the code is a
>hinderance. (what Engineer who puts in 9+ hour
>workdays and has a family has the time to learn code?)

Good point.

You can get a technician class license and not have to learn code. However, its also the Ham culture of Q codes, rituals, appliance operator oriented, not technical (except antennas - to outfit radios) hobby that scare away EEs.

Despite the hype of it being a technical hobby, most Hams are uninterested in this aspect. Since most Hams do not share their interests EEs don't want to join.

From WA8ULX:
>If they dont have enough time to learn the code, then how will they have
>enough
>time to operate?

Why should they learn an irrelevant skill at all? Why make time for something of no interest? Also, when it is in line with their field, it is easier to justify and make time for.

From Dee Flint, N8UZE
>If they don't have time to study the code, then they don't have time to
>study for the written tests either. Afterall a good percentage of the tests
>are rules, regs, operating practices, propagation, etc. You can't pass it
>on electronics theory alone.

Like I said above, the written material is related with their field, so it is easier to study for this than the code.

From Mike Coslo:
>I'll probably never do satellite comms, so I want no questions about that
>on my test.
>
> And they have a lot of nerve having questions about Maximum powers,
>because I don't ever plan to operate over a hundred watts. Get thos
>questions out!
>
> I don't have enough space to put up a 160 meter antenna, so why should
>they ask me any questions about the band edges at that frequency?

You may never plan to do those things, but you may end up doing them anyway. For example, at Field Day. Therefore you should be tested on this. You will never use Morse, so you should not be tested for it.

Also, its also wrong to link Morse code to the higher license class. Its not just a matter of not being tested on it. Its linking it to an unrelated (technical) license class test.

>That is a good excuse.<not> How are people who refuse to learn something
>because they don't have the initiative to learn something they might not
>like going to be an asset?

How about the Ham culture that says you must learn Morse code, and not those other things? You don't seem to be against Hams not learning those other skills.

From: lenover21:
> Perhaps the QPC syllabus should have questions on a right
> attitude? Belief in olde tyme hammus superioris? Strict
> adherence to tradition, jargon, methods, standards and
> practices? Marching in ranks to the same drumbeat?

Ham radio is a cult. If one observed Hams at some club meeting and Hamfest one would see this. You must believe and follow the traditions if you are to be a Ham.

416. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 22:58:23 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030308175823.09269.00000047@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 62607

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>If they
>don't have time to study one element, they don't have time to study the
>others nor will they have time to operate. Therefore "lack of time" is an
>irrelevant argument.

They would know <most of the> written material, so this would take alot less time. On the other hand, it would take alot longer to learn the code. So, they would have time to learn the material, but not the code.

>It's like saying you are not going to join a club or
>lodge simply because you don't like one of the members.

Not exactly. Even though many aspects could be possible, the Ham culture is heavily sided towards contesting, operating, Morse, and antennas.

417. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 22:58:50 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <KAuaa.9584$wJ1.922492@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 62606

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote

:
: Ham radio is a cult.
:

Well then I guess that makes you a cult member. Welcome.

73, de Hans, K0HB
Most Exhalted Liberator of the Electric Smoke

418. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 23:09:19 UTC
From: me <me@here.com>
Message-ID: <b4dt67$v3j$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62608

The orginial point was why should the engineers even have to learn the code.

Would an electrial engineer be an addition to a hobby that is interested in electronics?

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message news:s2vaa.5430$se1.2840183@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "me" <me@here.com> wrote in message
> news:b4dlj4muj1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> > Let's see.. They have an electrical engineering degree. How hard would the
> > theory be. Oh gee, they now have to read the rules and regulations. That
> > should take an evening at worst case scenario.
> >
> > The code would take how long? And no plans to use it.
> >
>
> You have to MEMORIZE not just read the rules, regs, operating procedures,
> etc. That takes time. Very few engineers have a photographic memory. Even
> with an electrical engineering degree, it will take probably 30 hours to
> learn all the stuff for the tech test and another 30 for the general. Now
> there are exceptions but the guy who read the book one night and passed the
> test the next is NOT representative.
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
>
> >
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3E6A57F1.7050900@adelphia.net...
> > > me wrote:
> > >
> > > > At least, the engineers were smart enough to see the waste of time in
> > > > learning something that really don't want to do.
> > > >
> > >
> > > And since they don't have the time to learn, they don't have the time to
> > > be an asset to the hobby.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -

> > >
> >
> >
>
>

419. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 23:14:54 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <OPuaa.5428$se1.2836550@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62602

You have jumped to conclusions that I neither stated nor implied. My statement was simple. That is if they don't have time to study one part of the material, they don't have time to study the rest of it either as the written portions will also take time and effort. I did not imply nor state that any particular item was better or worse than another or had any particular virtue.

However, I will not be drawn into further discussion on this topic with you as I have already seen on this newsgroup how you extract conclusions not stated or even implied in the postings to which you respond.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030308141645.06165.00000093@mb-cj.aol.com...
> In article <CJqaa.4705$se1.2766165@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >If they don't have time to study the code, then they don't have time to
> >study for the written tests either.
>
> Sorry, but that's an illogical and irrelevant statement.
>
> The code test exists as a separate element. A code test has
> always been a US amateur license test regulation. That does
> NOT mean it must always be there.
>
> The argument is whether or not the code test is relevant to the
> granting of a US amateur radio license. The FCC is on record
> (since 1990) of stating it is NOT relevant. See FCC 90-53.
> See FCC 99-412.
>
>
>
>
> >You can't pass it on electronics theory alone.
>
> That was never an issue.
>
> Perhaps the QPC syllabus should have questions on a right
> attitude? Belief in olde tyme hammus superioris? Strict
> adherence to tradition, jargon, methods, standards and
> practices? Marching in ranks to the same drumbeat?
>

> If morsemanship is the Premier skill of amateur radio, such a
> strict requirement (of some in the "ham community") then,
> by all means, change the hobby activity to the Amateur
> Radiotelegraphy Service. Or possibly the Archaic Radio-
> telegraphy Service since there is a dwindling number of
> professional morsemen in the international radio world.
>
> Study hard, work hard, exaggerate the license test into a
> PhD-equivalent academic test and anyone could be as
> great and wonderful as the olde tyme hammes.

420. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 23:18:17 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030308181817.09269.00000048@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 62609

From Dee Flint, N8UZE:
>You have to MEMORIZE not just read the rules, regs, operating procedures,
>etc. That takes time. Very few engineers have a photographic memory. Even
>with an electrical engineering degree, it will take probably 30 hours to
>learn all the stuff for the tech test and another 30 for the general. Now
>there are exceptions but the guy who read the book one night and passed the
>test the next is NOT representative.

The general and Extra tests are just as easy as the technician class test. The test can be learned in 8 hours, WITHOUT an EE degree. Are you saying, one 8 hour session on a weekend is too much time? These are 8 hour "license in a day" classes, where the test is given right after these classes. At least 75% of those pass on the first try.

421. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 23:23:41 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4du13asv1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62610

Does this cult require 'human sacrafice' ?? If so I have some
recomendations.

Dan/W4NTI

"K&#65533;HB" <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:KAuaa.9584$wJ1.922492@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote
>
> :
> : Ham radio is a cult.
> :
>
> Well then I guess that makes you a cult member. Welcome.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> Most Exhalted Liberator of the Electric Smoke
>
>
>
>
>
>

422. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 23:27:17 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <p%uaa.5429$se1.2839468@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62603

"Radio Funtimes" <stinkyhamops444@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3e6a4b16@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:CJqaa.4705$se1.2766165@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> > If they don't have time to study the code, then they don't have time to
> > study for the written tests either. Afterall a good percentage of the
> tests
> > are rules, regs, operating practices, propagation, etc. You can't pass
it
> > on electronics theory alone.
> >
> > Dee Flint, N8UZE
>

Your conclusions below are illogical. I have not stated that there is any particular virtue in any particular test element in this thread. If they don't have time to study one element, they don't have time to study the others nor will they have time to operate. Therefore "lack of time" is an irrelevant argument. For example, if someone said "well I can learn Morse code quick but don't have time to study the written," I would consider that just as much of a "lame excuse" and not a reason to change the written requirements. The requirements are stated, we don't have the power to change them unilaterally. Anyone who lets something like this hold them back is being silly. It's like saying you are not going to join a club or lodge simply because you don't like one of the members.

> Ain't it just funny how whenever the topic of
> relaxation of the code requirements come along
> it always merits a goofy response by the "true believers"
>
> I mean these CW diehards are just as committed
> and ready and goofy enuf to lay down their life for
> the cause!
>
> They remind me of the Pallie Suicide Bomber,
> all-ready-to-go with his explosives belt securely
> strapped on, waiting at the bus stop for the #43
> to Hebron....
>
> Or a kook Larouche plebe, ready to pounce on you
> at the airport because you must know that the Queen
> of England is REALLY a space-ailen from the planet remulac....
>

> Or an ailen abductee from the Raelian cult who just
> cloned your baby.....
>
> How I love he convoluted logic of these CW mullett-heads!
>
> You have to really wonder if those voices they claim to
> be hearing from the "Space Brothers" on 7.2-- Mhz or
> on Art Bell's radio show can be "cured" with a good
> regimine of Prozac, diet and exercize....
>
> Oy-Vey!
>
> "Only two things are infinite, the
> universe and human stupidity, and
> I'm not sure about the former."
> - Albert Einstein (1879-1955)
>
> "I was frantically spinning my chair away from the screen and covering my
> daughter's eyes with one hand while trying to click the picture away, but
> as soon as I did MORE pictures popped up, and then more, covering the
> screen with explicit images of people and animals and possibly, at one
> point, Elmo..... I finally had to turn my computer off to make it all go
> away."
>
> - Dave Barry tries to find "Elmo" on the web for his daughter of two.
>
>

423. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-08 23:30:32 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <s2vaa.5430$se1.2840183@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62604

```
"me" <me@here.com> wrote in message
news:b4dlj4$muj$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> Let's see.. They have an electrical engineering degree. How hard would the
> theory be. Oh gee, they now have to read the rules and regulations. That
> should take an evening at worst case scenario.
>
> The code would take how long? And no plans to use it.
>

You have to MEMORIZE not just read the rules, regs, operating procedures,
etc. That takes time. Very few engineers have a photographic memory. Even
with an electrical engineering degree, it will take probably 30 hours to
learn all the stuff for the tech test and another 30 for the general. Now
there are exceptions but the guy who read the book one night and passed the
test the next is NOT representative.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3E6A57F1.7050900@adelphia.net...
> > me wrote:
> >
> > > At least, the engineers were smart enough to see the waste of time in
> > > learning something that really don't want to do.
> > >
> >
> > And since they don't have the time to learn, they don't have the time to
> > be an asset to the hobby.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
>
```

424. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 00:02:38 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <b4e0au$1jb0$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 62613

Brian <brianburke@juno.com> wrote:
>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>news:<20030307232654.10901.00001651@mb-dh.aol.com>...
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> >Trivia Time:
>> >
>> >If the dit was 60 seconds long, how long is the dash?
>>
>> Brian:
>>
>> Presumably, three times longer than the "dit," or 180 seconds.
[...]
>At what speed (in WPM) did they send their message?

Based on the word PARIS, which is a 50 "dit" time word, 50 minutes
per word, or 0.02 WPM.

Dennis Ferguson

425. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 00:57:00 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <wjwaa.5444$se1.2862049@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62611

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030308175823.09269.00000047@mb-fr.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
> >If they
> >don't have time to study one element, they don't have time to study the
> >others nor will they have time to operate. Therefore "lack of time" is
an
> >irrelevant argument.
>
> They would know <most of the> written material, so this would take alot
less
> time. On the other hand, it would take alot longer to learn the code. So,
they
> would have time to learn the material, but not the code.

No an electrical engineer would NOT know "most" of the material. The bulk of the material is rules, regs, operating procedures, propagation, station setup, digital modes, etc. The electronics is only a small portion of the testing.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

426. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 00:57:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4e3h4$c4l$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62614

Sorry to tell you Dee....but the short term ham license appears to be the 'standard'. Folks dont know what PEP is, or how to measure it for the various modes. They don't know the basic 468/Fmhz formula for a 1/2 wave in free space dipole.

Etc. Etc.

But they are dang good at screaming 'contact', and such as that.

Can someone help me here? What is a signal report of 7 by 9 mean and what the heck is Seventy Thirds?

Dan/W4NTI

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message news:eqwaa.5450$se1.2863713@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030308181817.09269.00000048@mb-fr.aol.com...
> > The general and Extra tests are just as easy as the technician class test.
> The
> > test can be learned in 8 hours, WITHOUT an EE degree. Are you saying, one
> 8
> > hour session on a weekend is too much time? These are 8 hour "license in a
> day"
> > classes, where the test is given right after these classes. At least 75%
> of
> > those pass on the first try.
> >
> >
>
> Have you taken the General and Extra. They are not as easy as you imply.
> As far as these "license in a day" classes, they are a serious disservice to
> the prospective amateurs who take them. The material goes into the
> individual's short term memory only rather than in the long term memory.
> The objective should be to get this into long term memory so that you can
> access it when you need it. Thus a few days after the test the person has
> forgotten most of the material that he/she has studied. So now you have a
> person who has passed the test and yet has almost no more knowledge than an
> unlicensed individual since they will not retain it more than a few days.

>
> The "license in a day" classes would be good as a test preparation for
some
> one who has taken the time to learn the material before the class.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>
>
>

427. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 01:04:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <eqwaa.5450$se1.2863713@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62612

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030308181817.09269.00000048@mb-fr.aol.com...
> The general and Extra tests are just as easy as the technician class test.
The
> test can be learned in 8 hours, WITHOUT an EE degree. Are you saying, one
8
> hour session on a weekend is too much time? These are 8 hour "license in a
day"
> classes, where the test is given right after these classes. At least 75%
of
> those pass on the first try.
>
>

Have you taken the General and Extra. They are not as easy as you imply.
As far as these "license in a day" classes, they are a serious disservice to
the prospective amateurs who take them. The material goes into the
individual's short term memory only rather than in the long term memory.
The objective should be to get this into long term memory so that you can
access it when you need it. Thus a few days after the test the person has
forgotten most of the material that he/she has studied. So now you have a
person who has passed the test and yet has almost no more knowledge than an
unlicensed individual since they will not retain it more than a few days.

The "license in a day" classes would be good as a test preparation for some
one who has taken the time to learn the material before the class.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

428. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 02:06:04 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E6AA18C.2794A0D0@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 62615

KC8PMX wrote:

>
> The only close situation I ran into while being a ham, as well as a
> firefighter was about a year or so ago, and me and other firefighter were on
> a medical call at a biker rally and it reached a point where we were
> concerned for our safety and could not easily back out. Upon trying our
> department HT's and cell-phones, neither of them could reach the fire
> repeater nor cell tower for the area we were in. The only other means of
> communication was utilizing the ham repeater which I could hit, and called
> 911 through the autopatch to request law enforcement assistance. Being that
> there were no other means of rendering assistance, I can only assume that I
> made the right decision in this case. It is funny to note that there
> are quite a few areas in my county where the stupid cell phones have dead
> spots and the ham radio repeater works better than the county fire repeater
> system. The ham repeater is about 30 watts at about 90-100 feet and the
> fire repeater is at 275 feet at about 100 watts.

Sounds like your fire repeater has a deaf receiver (partially fried front end)
that greatly reduces sensitivity without killing it completely. Or bad coax
(water got in?) And that the
people responsible for its maintenance are not doing their jobs.

> 5 watt ham HT's seem to
> have twice (or more) the coverage area than our stinkin' fire HT's while
> working simplex or repeater frequencies!!!!! Go figure.....

Around here, in NNJ, the local power company is called "Public
Service". And if their powerlines are creating RFI, well that could
be another thread with the same title "Public Service and Ham" :-)

429. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 02:13:08 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <b4e7vk$1tti$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 62617

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> writes:
>
>>Larry
>>Since they have set a record that means they must be
>>on the cutting edge of Amateur Radio. And they are
>>using good old Morse's Code to accomplish it!
[...]
> That morse code was used at all is a tradition thing and
> possibly bounded by regulations in the transmitting end's
> home administration. Aperiodic, monotonic codings are
> NOT optimum for very low signal communications.

I don't quite understand why you think Morse is necessarily "aperiodic" (that's a function of how it is sent, it can be sent with very precise timing), but "optimum" is a quality whose evaluation is highly dependent on the system and the attributes of the system which you value. It is true that if maximum instantaneous power is limited then fully-voiced binary FSK and PSK modulations have an inherent 3 dB advantage over amplitude keying at the same information rate, but it requires significant additional transmitter and receiver complexity to implement these, particularly in the presence of ionospheric paths causing phase and frequency flutter, so what is "optimum" depends on one's evaluation of whether the additional system complexity is justified to achieve a 3 dB advantage. Note that production services running at similar frequencies often come down on the same side of this tradeoff. Of the time services I know of I think WWVB and MSF both use amplitude keying (though "off" isn't all the way off, but rather 10 dB down from "on") while I think DCF77 uses PSK. Loran C uses pulse modulation, but this is only advantageous if you have no bandwidth or instantaneous power limitations and solely need to optimize the cost of your power bill.

Once you've decided on amplude keying, however, Morse coding isn't identifiably inferior to anything else. Its duty cycle doesn't often drop much below from 50% independent of what is being sent, and it provides a measure of compression for plain texts. Note that FEC doesn't automatically buy you anything much, it requires a coding-gain-versus-information-rate tradeoff which you need a lot of system knowledge to judge. I understand that the hobbyists doing LF experimentation under Part 15 have tended to use either slow Morse or slow BPSK using PSK31 coding and FEC, and while I think the latter is considered to give better results I don't think it is a whole lot better.

> Compute the equivalent WPM rate for a dot period of 60
> seconds. Use any method. "Farnsworth" method would,
> if patterned on the US optional test rate, have a WPM rate
> based on 3 times the basic dot period. As such, the single
> word PARIS (of 70 dot periods in length) would require
> 4,200 seconds to complete (70 minutes total) and the word
> per minute rate would then be 1 per 3.5 hours. Is that in
> the "proficient" category?

Bad math, I think. PARIS is 50 dot periods, or 1 word every 50 minutes,
so the word per minute rate is 1 per 0.833 hours, or 0.02 WPM. Still
not too fast, though.

Dennis Ferguson

430. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 02:27:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303081827.274d3702@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62616

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030308121846.19625.00000139@mb-bd.aol.com>...
> >the code is a
> >hinderance. (what Engineer who puts in 9+ hour
> >workdays and has a family has the time to learn code?)
>
> If they dont have enough time to learn the code, then how will they have enough
> time to operate?

Learning the code was a huge sink of time. Trying to use it was
another "less than useful" sink of time.

I see that you never spent enough time at it to become "proficient"
(proficient in the words of Larry, Dick, Dave, et al).

431. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 02:32:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303081832.d8c2c1e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62618

Responding from the TOP,

"Very Tiny Bandwidth" is a bad thing?

"Limited Data Rate" is a bad thing?

Perhaps by "words per month" you are implying that these world record setters are NOT proficient?

Brian

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message news:<v6knc89s33r0ce@corp.supernews.com>...
> Umm ... WPM ... you mean 'words per month'? My guess on all of this is that
> if you use very tiny bandwidths, you eliminate noise - and also limit your
> data rate. Neither bad nor good, it becomes a trade-off.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

> > At what speed (in WPM) did they send their message?

432. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 02:35:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303081835.107414f1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62619

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030308141644.06165.00000092@mb-cj.aol.com>...
> In article <v6j1b2s1cjv4fe@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
> writes:
>
> >Larry
> >Since they have set a record that means they must be
> >on the cutting edge of Amateur Radio. And they are
> >using good old Morse's Code to accomplish it!
>
> That 136 KHz record was NOT set by "receiving by ear
> and sending by hand."

Oooh! Ouch!

> There are several dozen other codes with error-correction
> capability that could have been used (see the MIT "Red
> Book" by Petersen and Weldon) and have been used for
> decades. VERY weak-signal reception (to the point of
> of signals BELOW the noise floor) has been done
> academically and professionally for at least three decades.

Oooh! Ouch!

> That morse code was used at all is a tradition thing and
> possibly bounded by regulations in the transmitting end's
> home administration. Aperiodic, monotonic codings are
> NOT optimum for very low signal communications.

Oooh! Ouch!

> Compute the equivalent WPM rate for a dot period of 60
> seconds. Use any method. "Farnsworth" method would,
> if patterned on the US optional test rate, have a WPM rate
> based on 3 times the basic dot period. As such, the single
> word PARIS (of 70 dot periods in length) would require
> 4,200 seconds to complete (70 minutes total) and the word
> per minute rate would then be 1 per 3.5 hours. Is that in
> the "proficient" category?

Not according to our esteemed DXPert!

> >So much for it being a "dead mode" of little use.
>
> So much for illogical associations...

Oooh! Ouch!

433. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 02:37:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303081837.4ae4e95c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62620

Neb Revod <spammers@biteme.com> wrote in message
news:<MPG.18d32cda2ff2e519896c8@pdx.news.speakeasy.net>...
> In article <v6j1b2s1cjv4fe@corp.supernews.com>, kb9tmp@juno.com says...
> >
> >
> > Larry
> > Since they have set a record that means they must be
> > on the cutting edge of Amateur Radio. And they are
> > using good old Morse's Code to accomplish it!
> > So much for it being a "dead mode" of little use.
>
> Not quite right. Cutting edge? Arguably yes, but it was NOT "good old
> Morse's Code" in any sense other than the actual encoding of characters.
> Any arbitrary scheme of distinguishable periods of modulation, used to
> encode the characters could have been used. Moreover, the feat required
> the use of software (computers) at both ends. It could NOT have been
> accomplished by two CW'ers putting fist to key.

Extra Dick/W0EX knows how to thwart 'puter copy.

Ask him about it.

Wear your "bile" shield when you do, though.

434. Re: Here's your chance

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 02:39:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303081839.16c13c4d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62621

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3E69FE2B.6030800@adelphia.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<ky4aa.7210$wJ1.707135@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> >
> >>The Question Pool Committee of the National Conference of Volunteer Examiner
> >>Coordinators has released a draft syllabus for the Element 3 (General)
> >>Amateur Radio examination. This syllabus will be used to develop a new
> >>General class question pool that will become effective July 1, 2004. The QPC
> >>is inviting comments on the document as well as suggested questions for the
> >>General-class question pool.
> >>
> >>The draft is located at http://www.arrl.org/arrlvec/gp-syllabus-2004.html
> >>
> >>Your suggestions and comments may be sent to qpc@arrl.org.
> >>
> >>ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >>
> >
> > Suggestions such as "Don't publish the questions pools?"
> >
>
> How about making sure that the answers are not gleanable from any source
> at all? That would make it a little tougher!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

But that might put the ARRL out of biddness.

435. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 02:41:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303081841.1644574a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62622

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<7C8509FB6DF83A2A.4B374A381CE82281.BA29A0415AEE833B@lp.airnews.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0303072005.365b0731@posting.google.com...
> > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
> news:<20030305213805.09289.00002704@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> >
> > > Kim showed up in this
> > > newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign, and
> > > literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
> > > she asked for.
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> > Larry, that's rapist mentality.
>
> I told him that long ago...trouble is: he knows.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Apparently, it's also dave mentality.

436. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 02:51:51 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303081851.220d31ea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62623

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6A4307.8C236F9A@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E65808E.3D42D926@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > I'll think about answering your question when you show some civility and
> > > when you answer the questions N2EY and I have both asked about your
> > > Somali "operations".
> > >
> > > What was that line you used with Steve? Something about not dancing to
> > > his fiddling...
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Suit yourself. We have nothing more to talk about.
>
> Far as I can see you never did.

Yep. Kim had it figured out long ago. Dave was just trying to jerk us off.

437. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 02:57:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303081857.71a7dddc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62624

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6A42FD.D6854B05@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E659F91.EBF914C9@att.net>...
> >
> > > Would you kindly quote in Part 97 where it says a US ham is responsible for knowing other countries
> > > allocations and keeping current on them and their updates?
> >
> > But if you happened to know that the other "amateur" is operating out
> > of band, why would you participate in a QSO with them

>
> Given your track record I doubt many readers will be inclined to
> accept anything you "know" at face value.

I'd be disinclined to believe that. For example, you and Dave didn't know that a Commander had the authority to grant amateur operations in Somalia.

You and Dave would knowingly work out of band Frenchmen on 6M.

You cannot figure out how to operate amateur radio away from the power mains.

That's just some recent stuff. I don't have any more time to devote to your ineptness.

> If I was in QSO with a foreign ham and some clod came on the frequency
> and informed me that I shouldn't be talking to that guy because that guy
> was out of his allotted band I'd likely say "Buzz off Slim/Brian. You're
> in no position to 'know'". And besides it's none of YOUR business, just
> as it's none of your business how Dave handles his on the air contacts.

Who's talking about "some clod???"

I said you already knew the French allocation on 6M, yet you intend to go ahead and work them out of band.

You don't disagree. The poops on your face.

438. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 04:18:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6AC066.3A6E46F8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62625

Brian wrote:
>
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message

> > >Are these UK amateurs considered proficient?

> > I'd say they were.

> > 73 de Larry, K3LT

> At what speed (in WPM) did they send their message?

You'd have us believe that the speed used on 136 KHz was their maximum
or are you, like Leonard H. confusing profiency with efficiency?

Dave K8MN

439. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 04:21:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6AC11D.408DD595@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62626

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E697740.457A8D17@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030305213805.09289.00002704@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> > >
> > > > Kim showed up in this
> > > > newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign, and
> > > > literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
> > > > she asked for.
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> > > Larry, that's rapist mentality.
> >
> > That'd be one of your less intelligent responses. I don't know of any
> > rapists who do nothing other than give their "victim" a talking to or a
> > lecture on their lack of good taste.

> How many do you know?

You keep screwing up that reading part. You missed the word "of" which
follows "know". Keep practicing.

Dave K8MN

440. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 04:28:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6AC2D7.11FE2D4E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62627

Brian wrote:
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<7C8509FB6DF83A2A.4B374A381CE82281.BA29A0415AEE833B@lp.airnews.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0303072005.365b0731@posting.google.com...
> > > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
> > news:<20030305213805.09289.00002704@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> > >
> > > > Kim showed up in this
> > > > newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign, and
> > > > literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
> > > > she asked for.
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> > > Larry, that's rapist mentality.
> >
> > I told him that long ago...trouble is: he knows.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Apparently, it's also dave mentality.

dave no believe you.

Dave K8MN

441. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 04:33:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6AC46B.27CA6E34@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62628

Brian wrote:
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message

> > Stop thinking of the code as a barrier. You advance by passing Element 1,
> > that's how.
>
> Yes, yes, that's how I didit. But what of element two? And what of
> people who cannot pass element one?

They fail the exam. They may attempt it again--as many times as is
necessary.

> Dave thinks he's the World's Greatest DXer and is?

Brian, are you attempting to emulate Len or are you a simpleton?
You and only you have used the term "World's Greatest DXer" and
attempted to apply it to me. I've not only never used it to refer to
myself, I've previously corrected you when you've used it. Are you
beyond honesty?

Dave K8MN

442. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 04:57:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030308235733.08747.00002409@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 62631

In article <v6j1b2s1cjv4fe@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
writes:

>Larry
>Since they have set a record that means they must be
>on the cutting edge of Amateur Radio. And they are
>using good old Morse's Code to accomplish it!
>So much for it being a "dead mode" of little use.

Bill:

Unfortunately, I don't think us Morse Code supporters can look to
this story as proving anything too significant about the Morse code.
I'm sure it was employed mainly as a matter of convenience, as
opposed to formulating some other encoding system specifically
for this VLF project. I just wonder if something like Hellschreiber
would have worked?

Let's face it -- I'm not interested in a CW QSO in which I need to
use a stopwatch in order to copy what the other station is sending!

73 de Larry, K3LT

443. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 04:57:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030308235734.08747.00002411@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 62630

In article <f45722ac.0303081234.29fe5d13@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> I dunno. Since when is Farnsworth a "substitute" for Morse code? I
>> always thought it was just another method of sending Morse code.
>>
>> >Are these UK amateurs considered proficient?
>>
>> I'd say they were.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>At what speed (in WPM) did they send their message?

Brian:

According to Dennis Ferguson, 0.02 WPM. Unfortunately, Jim Hampton
beat me to "words per month" -- but it is a riot, nevertheless!

Considering the soporific data-rate imposed by the 136 kHz band, I don't think
I'm going to be giving it a try any time soon. I can hardly stay awake during
a
5 WPM QSO as it is.

73 de Larry, K3LT

444. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 04:57:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030308235734.08747.00002410@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 62635

In article <MPG.18d32cda2ff2e519896c8@pdx.news.speakeasy.net>, Neb Revod
<spammers@biteme.com> writes:

>n article <v6j1b2s1cjv4fe@corp.supernews.com>, kb9tmp@juno.com says...
>>
>>
>> Larry
>> Since they have set a record that means they must be
>> on the cutting edge of Amateur Radio. And they are
>> using good old Morse's Code to accomplish it!
>> So much for it being a "dead mode" of little use.
>
>Not quite right. Cutting edge? Arguably yes, but it was NOT "good old
>Morse's Code" in any sense other than the actual encoding of characters.
>Any arbitrary scheme of distinguishable periods of modulation, used to
>encode the characters could have been used. Moreover, the feat required
>the use of software (computers) at both ends. It could NOT have been
>accomplished by two CW'ers putting fist to key.

Neb:

Not unless they used their "fists" to place a brick on the key to hold it
down for the eternal duration of their dits and dahs! All joking aside, I'm
sure the "keying" was done by a relay controlled by the software they
used to receive and analyze their signals.

I don't consider this to be a valid code/no-code issue. As Len
Anderson already pointed out, many other coding schemes could
have been employed -- I'll just assume that Morse was more
convenient for technical reasons. This is obviously not a method
of data communication of practical use to professional or amateur
radiocommunicators unless it can, somehow, be speeded up to a
productive level. I, being a long time afficianado of digital modes,
would expect that if frequencies in the 136 kHz range are to become
practical, it will be some kind of computer-based two-way system,
and not manually keyed CW, which obviously works better at
much higher frequences -- like 1800 kHz!

73 de Larry, K3LT

445. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 04:57:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030308235735.08747.00002412@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 62633

In article <Fimaa.4604$se1.2699970@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20030307230345.19751.00003185@mb-cu.aol.com...
>> The remaining 5 WPM Morse code testing requirement will most likely
>> be eliminated after the World Radiocommunication Conference (WRC-03)
>> happening this June in Geneva. This is when the ITU radio regulation
>> S25.5 will be presumably voted out of existence, making it possible for
>> the separate national radio regulatory agencies (like the FCC in the
>United
>> States) to eliminate code testing as a requirement for an amateur radio
>> license with full HF privileges. I have no doubt that this will, indeed,
>> occur. It will NOT be a good thing for the ARS. (That is my opinion,
>> not a "flame.")
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>One cannot be sure. They tried to get a vote at the last WRC and failed.
>So a person really should not count on it but instead proceed as if it were
>going to stay.
>
>Dee Flint, N8UZE

Dee:

Agreed. However, those actively interested in the elimination of the code
testing requirement are not likely to do so. They will more likely wait and
see what happens in Geneva this Summer than proceed to learn a fun and
useful communications skill in order to attain full amateur privileges.

73 de Larry, K3LT

446. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 04:57:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030308235736.08747.00002413@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 62632

In article <037E33C543827D5D.B9999C7F1D8F7F8F.A89A92274721CC45@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Ryan:
>>
>> Any radio amateur who selected a Vanity call sign with one of the
>> aforementioned suffixes, with the intention of provoking purient interest,
>> and then flaunting same in this newsgroup, would, indeed, be treated
>> as Kim's "equal."
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Oh? And what "treatment" would that be, Larry? I'm not sure that you mean
>"treatment" as in nice or mean treatment. I've never noticed one way or the
>other. Perhaps you can define...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Don't look now, but it means that they would receive a level of criticism
equal to that which you have received by Riley Hollingsworth, myself,
and others in this newsgroup.

73 de Larry, K3LT

447. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 04:57:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030308235736.08747.00002414@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 62634

In article <7C8509FB6DF83A2A.4B374A381CE82281.BA29A0415AEE833B@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:f45722ac.0303072005.365b0731@posting.google.com...
>> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>news:<20030305213805.09289.00002704@mb-ch.aol.com>...
>>
>> > Kim showed up in this
>> > newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign, and
>> > literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
>> > she asked for.
>> >
>> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>> Larry, that's rapist mentality.
>
>I told him that long ago...trouble is: he knows.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim/Brian:

A rapist is a person who commits violent sexual assault on a
woman against her will. A rapist is a felon, a criminal.

Now -- let me get this straight, and be VERY specific: Are you
accusing me of this? Are you accusing me of having a "mentality"
which could cause me to commit such an act? Please provide
your answer right here in the newsgroup -- before witnesses
known and unknown.

If you have any doubt as to whether the thing you insinuated
about me is true, I'd suggest some extremely rapid backpedaling --
and sincere, thoughtful, and contrite apologies offered both in
the newsgroup and in private E-mail. You have 72 hours from
the date/time of this posting. After that, I will assume that you
stand by your statements.

73 de Larry, K3LT

448. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 04:57:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030308235737.08747.00002415@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 62629

In article <f45722ac.0303072005.365b0731@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Kim showed up in this
>> newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign, and
>> literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
>> she asked for.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Larry, that's rapist mentality.

Brian:

Cecil, is that you in there -- trying to disguise yourself as Brian?

Anyway, no, Brian, it isn't. It is just an accurate description of what
Kim wanted to happen.

73 de Larry, K3LT

449. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 05:04:22 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA903586.12A14%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62636

"W5TIT" wrote:
>
> (snip) It seems to me that an emergency service organization
> (police, fire, ambulance, fire &rescue, etc.) would be able
> to avail themselves of amateur radio frequencies *IF* it were
> in an emergency (not just routine use). The reason I would
> interpret it this way is because of the rule for communication
> on any available radio frequency during an emergency. (snip)

You're referring to Sec. 2.405 and Sec. 97.403 of Title 47. The first is a general provision relating to all radio services licensed by the FCC (except broadcast and amateur stations) and the second is the Amateur Radio specific provision. Both provide wide leeway when it comes to emergency communications involving the "immediate" safety of human life or protection of property.

However, an emergency involving life or property is not the sole test. Both provisions include an additional requirement - "in which normal communication facilities are disrupted" or "when normal communication systems are not available." A ham operator volunteering for a fire department with it's own radio equipment would not meet this additional requirement.

> Unfortunately, it is being learned that the frequencies of
> fire, police, ambulance, etc., are inadequate--due to the
> fact that they cannot communicate with each other. After
> all, that is one of the many fundamental reasons for the
> amateur radio emergency communication network of services:
> the abiltiy of emergency organizations to communicate with
> each other. (snip)

I think you're comparing apple and oranges, Kim. The public safety frequencies are not normally inadequate. There are a wide range of frequencies available (HF, VHF, UHF, and 800MHz), allowing communications under almost any circumstance. So, instead, I think you're talking about extreme situations (disasters such as hurricanes, floods, etc) where normal communications is disrupted. And, of course, I agree with the concept of using ham radio here. However, this is not what the guy was asking about. He was asking about routine fire department communications when there is no unusual disruption of normal public safety radio communications.

> That is why I would support the purchase of ham radio
> equipment by emergency organizations -- and its use if
> the situation warrants. (snip)
>
> (snip) Remember, I am talking about the use of amateur

> radio frequencies by emergency organizations (or anyone,
> for that matter) in an emergency situation.

If you're talking about use of that equipment by unlicensed employees of those emergency organizations (unlicensed in ham radio), be careful to note the concept of "immediate" safety of human life or protection of property. They cannot use that equipment for routine calls, routine dispatch, or any other routine communications. That would require a licensed ham operator as the control operator (operating under the terms of the Amateur Radio rules governing supplemental public service communications).

> The rules governing ham radio would be that an emergency
> is defined as any threat to life or *property*. Fire is
> a huge threat to property, correct?

Not all fire calls involve the "immediate" threat to life or property. Many fire calls turn out to be false, for example, offering no threat to life or property. To meet the requirements of Sec. 2.405 and Sec. 97.403, there would almost have to be a person at the scene of a clear threat with no normal communications available. A dispatcher relaying a call of a fire would not meet those requirements, nor would a firefighter on the scene with a fire department radio clipped to his belt or installed in the truck.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

450. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 05:29:47 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA903B7A.12A16%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62637

"Moparholic@hotmail.com" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>> Okay, my friend,
>>
> I'm not your friend.

And I'm also not Aaron Voobner. But, somehow, you have it in your head I am and are out to take a shot at me whenever an opportunity presents itself. I've repeatedly told you I'm not Aaron Voobner, nor have I ever posted as Aaron Voobner. That doesn't seem to be enough for you, but I have no idea what else I can do to convince you. At this point, I'm through trying to convince you - all I'm thinking about now is what I can do to get you to leave me alone.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

451. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 05:30:58 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <b4ejii$2fbs$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 62638

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>In article <20030305190222.18155.00000058@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
>Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
>>>> All of the No Code Technicians are in the back of that bus due to
>>>treaties
>>>>signed by the United States, ratified byt the Congress of the United
>>States,
>>>>and NOT subject to unilateral interpretation by the FCC, and agency
>>>subordinate
>>>>to the Congress of the United States...
>>>
>>> Oh, my, were you admitted to a bar this afternoon and thought
>>> you had become a legal beagle? Arf, arf?
>>>
>>> Strange words. According to the FCC, not to mention a couple
>>> of Acts of Congress (one in 1934, another in 1996), only the
>>> FCC created the class of the (no-code-test) Technician license.
>>> Not the US Congress. Not the ITU.
>>
>> S25 limits Amateur Radio licensure to operators with no demonstrated
>>Morse Code proficiency to frequencies above 30 megahertz.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk..."S25" refers to the entire set of ITU-R
> Recommendations for amateur radio.

No it doesn't. S25 is not an ITU-R Recommendation (let alone a set of thiem).
S25 is an Article in the Radio Regulations. If you go to

http://www.itu.int

and attempt to buy the publication which includes S25, you won't find the
document in the ITU-R Recommendations publication section. It is in the
Radio Regulations.

> S25.5 is the specific Recommendation in regards to
> administrations giving International Morse Code testing for
> any amateur radio license having privileges below 30 MHz.

S25.5 is not a Recommendation. It is a paragraph in Article S25 of
the Radio Regulations.

> S25.5 does not "limit" anyone, since it merely indicates
> a frequency below which licensees should (not shall)
> demonstrate the ability to receive International Morse Code
> by ear and send by hand. Note that ITU-R Recommendations

> are just recommendations, not commands or regulations to
> be obeyed.

This is confused, I think. ITU-R Recommendations are standards documents which are produced by ITU study groups. They are indeed just recommendations, having no regulatory standing on their own. An administration may voluntarily choose to incorporate them in their own regulations if they want to, or sometimes ITU-R Recommendations are included in the Radio Recommendations by reference, in which case such Recommendations do become regulations of sorts.

The Radio Regulations, where paragraph S25.5 can be found, are not ITU-R Recommendations however. They are not produced by ITU study groups, but rather are the products of World Radiocommunication Conferences. As the name suggests, the Radio Regulations are in fact regulations, which member administrations do indeed agree to obey. In effect the Radio Regulations are a treaty which administrations enter into, and it would not even surprise me if the Radio Regulations were subject to congressional ratification in the US (though I don't know for sure).

> In the USA, the "send by hand" portion of S25.5 is an optional
> waive for all examinations. Administration members of ITU-R
> are not obliged to precisely obey all recommendations.

This is incorrect, Part 97 doesn't make an "optional waive" of any portion of S25.5. S25.5 says that a licensee must have proven that they can correctly send by hand, but does not explicitly indicate what consistutes proof of this. 97.503(a) explicitly (and not coincidentally) says that

(a) A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that the examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand...

so Part 97 goes out of its way to indicate that such proof is non-optional. That 97.509(g) says

(g) Passing a telegraphy receiving examination is adequate proof of an examinee's ability to both send and receive telegraphy

is simply a choice for what constitutes "proof" deemed sufficient to meet the (non-optional) regulation. Specifying this testing procedure as sufficient to meet the (unspecified) requirement for proof in S25.5 seems not inconsistent with the specification of 5 wpm as sufficient testing speed for S25.5 purposes.

> Japan has waived Recommendation S25.5 for a certain class of
> their amateur license which does have HF privileges.

I have no idea how Japan justified that, but I would be exceedingly surprised if the US decided to do anything similar.

The US already has the reputation of being an international bad boy when it comes to both adopting ITU Recommendations (for example, US

telecommunications companies ignore a ream of ITU Recommendations
for transmission facilities in favor of sometimes-nearly-compatible,
sometimes-incompatible ANSI standards; the Internet came to be by
studiously ignoring a different ream of ITU standards documents),
and by insisting that all sorts of exceptions and frequency misalignments
end up being included in the Radio Regulations themselves (often
inspired by military and other government requirements and preferences).
As the major source of international (tele,radio)communications discord in
defence of the interests of both US industry and military, however, the
US does compensate by being religious about observing the letter of
anything they've actually ended up agreeing to do, and that includes
the provisions of the Radio Regulations.

> Administrations are free to impose morse code testing for all
> amateur licensees if they so wish, or partial morse code
> testing for privileges above 30 MHz. It is all up to each nation's
> administrations.

What the US administration isn't free to do, however, is to entirely
eliminate all testing of Morse code skills for privileges below 30 MHz,
since by agreeing to the Radio Regulations the US has agreed to observe
this requirement in its own regulations.

Part 97 completely conforms to the regulations in Radio Regulations
Article S25, as far as I can tell. This won't change unless S25
changes.

Dennis Ferguson

452. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 06:06:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309010625.29016.00000652@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 62640

In article <b4e3h4$c4l$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Sorry to tell you Dee....but the short term ham license appears to be the
>'standard'. Folks dont know what PEP is, or how to measure it for the
>various modes. They don't know the basic 468/Fmhz formula for a 1/2 wave in
>free space dipole.
>
>Etc. Etc.

Lost your PEP, dynamite Dan? :-)

BTW, a dipole length in feet is approximately 468 divided by
the frequency in MegaHertz, not milliHertz. Tsk, tsk, tsk,
nothing is allocated below 9 Hz.

[do you know why that is an approximation?]

453. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 06:06:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309010626.29016.00000654@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 62639

In article <b4du13asv1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Does this cult require 'human sacrafice' ?? If so I have some
>recomendations.

Do you want to be first in line? Be our guest... :-)

454. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 06:06:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309010626.29016.00000653@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 62641

In article <wjwaa.5444$se1.2862049@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030308175823.09269.00000047@mb-fr.aol.com...
>> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>> >If they
>> >don't have time to study one element, they don't have time to study the
>> >others nor will they have time to operate. Therefore "lack of time" is an
>> >irrelevant argument.
>>
>> They would know <most of the> written material, so this would take alot less
>> time. On the other hand, it would take alot longer to learn the code. So,
they
>> would have time to learn the material, but not the code.
>
>No an electrical engineer would NOT know "most" of the material. The bulk
>of the material is rules, regs, operating procedures, propagation, station
>setup, digital modes, etc. The electronics is only a small portion of the
>testing.

Nonsense. Engineers are ALSO cognizant with regulations and
procedures...of considerably more radio services than just
amateur radio. They must also keep up to date, not only on the
new but that which is being developed...rather than stay frozen
in some strata of time on standards and practices of more than a
half century past.

Leonard H. Anderson
Life Member IEEE

>
>Dee Flint, N8UZE

455. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 06:06:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309010628.29016.00000655@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 62642

In article <OPuaa.5428$se1.2836550@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>You have jumped to conclusions that I neither stated nor implied.

Sorry, but your implication was quite clear. No need to jump to any conclusions.

>My
>statement was simple. That is if they don't have time to study one part of
>the material, they don't have time to study the rest of it either as the
>written portions will also take time and effort.

No, you are presumptuous in relating an aural-mental cognition skill about an aperiodic monotonic on-off pattern coding (morse code) AS IF it were exactly the same as knowing about regulations, theory, operating practices, etc. It obviously isn't.

>I did not imply nor state
>that any particular item was better or worse than another or had any
>particular virtue.

Ah, but the implication was clear to many. Witness the responses you've achieved.

>However, I will not be drawn into further discussion on this topic with you
>as I have already seen on this newsgroup how you extract conclusions not
>stated or even implied in the postings to which you respond.

You are miffed? :-)

You've already been drawn by making your first posting. There is no erasing of anything. Further denial or claims to the contrary is invalid.

You've related ALL test elements as some sort of "time in taking" concept...as if all had the same basis for comparison. They don't. Aural-mental cognition is NOT the same as intellectual knowledge (broad, general use of "intellectual") required on the written test elements.

What you previously wrote was:

>> >If they don't have time to study the code, then they don't have time to
>> >study for the written tests either.

Invalid. That equates skills necessary for test passing as the same for all TYPES of test elements. Those skills are NOT

the same. That should be obvious.

Let's consider the test elements from the FCC's probable point of view. They are the only USA agency granting US amateur radio licenses so that should be fair. The FCC has many regulations about US amateur radio and those regulations are of many types, from frequency allocations to modes and modulations to classes of licenses to quite a sizeable number of technical regulations. In none of those regulations does the FCC demand that OOK CW codings be done over and above any other allocated mode, any allocated band, by any class of licensee. Mode and modulation are all optional to use...yet there is only a single mode that has ever been required in a license examination, morse code.

The FCC has stated 13 years ago and again 4 years ago that it does not consider morse code skills as viable for its purpose in determining whether or not a license applicant should be granted that license. That should be a clue...but those who have bought into the concept of morse code skill as a prime requirement in amateur radio cannot accept it.

The retention or elimination of US amateur radio examination test element 1 is NOT about "time." It is about whether it is useful to the only agency that grants US amateur licenses. Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service operators cannot rule over the FCC no matter how much they demand that others do exactly as they did...once.

456. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 14:36:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6B5178.6398E3C6@att.net>
Source record: 62643

Dennis Ferguson wrote:

> Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
> >"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> writes:
> >
> >>Larry
> >>Since they have set a record that means they must be
> >>on the cutting edge of Amateur Radio. And they are
> >>using good old Morse's Code to accomplish it!
> [...]
> > That morse code was used at all is a tradition thing and
> > possibly bounded by regulations in the transmitting end's
> > home administration. Aperiodic, monotonic codings are
> > NOT optimum for very low signal communications.
>
> I don't quite understand why you think Morse is necessarily
> "aperiodic" (that's a function of how it is sent, it can be
> sent with very precise timing), but "optimum" is a quality whose
> evaluation is highly dependent on the system and the attributes of
> the system which you value. It is true that if maximum instantaneous
> power is limited then fully-voiced binary FSK and PSK modulations have
> an inherent 3 dB advantage over amplitude keying at the same information
> rate, but it requires significant additional transmitter and receiver
> complexity to implement these, particularly in the presence of ionospheric
> paths causing phase and frequency flutter, so what is "optimum" depends
> on one's evaluation of whether the additional system complexity is
> justified to achieve a 3 dB advantage. Note that production services
> running at similar frequencies often come down on the same side of this
> tradeoff. Of the time services I know of I think WWVB and MSF both use
> amplitude keying (though "off" isn't all the way off, but rather 10 dB
> down from "on") while I think DCF77 uses PSK. Loran C uses pulse
> modulation, but this is only advantageous if you have no bandwidth or
> instantaneous power limitations and solely need to optimize the cost of
> your power bill.
>
> Once you've decided on amplude keying, however, Morse coding isn't
> identifiably inferior to anything else. Its duty cycle doesn't often drop
> much below from 50% independent of what is being sent, and it provides a
> measure of compression for plain texts. Note that FEC doesn't automatically
> buy you anything much, it requires a coding-gain-versus-information-rate
> tradeoff which you need a lot of system knowledge to judge. I understand
> that the hobbyists doing LF experimentation under Part 15 have tended to
> use either slow Morse or slow BPSK using PSK31 coding and FEC, and while
> I think the latter is considered to give better results I don't think it

> is a whole lot better.
>
> > Compute the equivalent WPM rate for a dot period of 60
> > seconds. Use any method. "Farnsworth" method would,
> > if patterned on the US optional test rate, have a WPM rate
> > based on 3 times the basic dot period. As such, the single
> > word PARIS (of 70 dot periods in length) would require
> > 4,200 seconds to complete (70 minutes total) and the word
> > per minute rate would then be 1 per 3.5 hours. Is that in
> > the "proficient" category?
>
> Bad math, I think. PARIS is 50 dot periods, or 1 word every 50 minutes,
> so the word per minute rate is 1 per 0.833 hours, or 0.02 WPM. Still
> not too fast, though.
>
> Dennis Ferguson

Hey Dennis- Thankyew. I for one very much appreciate your very objective evaluation as opposed to
the very crippled,opionated diatribe by
Len-way-the-hell-over-21-but-acts-like-5.

I must also congratulate you on the fact that every time you evalute something in a post here, it comes
out the same-very objective and undistorted. I have no idea what you do for a vocation but in my view
your employer, assuming you have one, is very fortunate to have you on board.

73, Dick

457. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 14:43:24 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <B9A44966A136DF65.A3B816451D87F1AD.ED10237C982BF53F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62702

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E6AC11D.408DD595@earthlink.net...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E697740.457A8D17@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030305213805.09289.00002704@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> > > >
> > > > > Kim showed up in this
> > > > > newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign,
and
> > > > > literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got
what
> > > > > she asked for.
> > > > >
> > > > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > > >
> > > > Larry, that's rapist mentality.
> > >
> > > That'd be one of your less intelligent responses. I don't know of any
> > > rapists who do nothing other than give their "victim" a talking to or
a
> > > lecture on their lack of good taste.
>
> > How many do you know?
>
> You keep screwing up that reading part. You missed the word "of" which
> follows "know". Keep practicing.
>
> Dave K8MN

Yup. You did say that. Which means you don't know *any* rapists at all, or
you know rapists and Brian asked you how many. *You* keep practicing.

Kim W5TIT

458. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 14:43:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6B5304.3D1D6692@att.net>
Source record: 62644

Brian wrote:

> wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030308121846.19625.00000139@mb-bd.aol.com>...
> > >the code is a
> > >hinderance. (what Engineer who puts in 9+ hour
> > >workdays and has a family has the time to learn code?)
> >
> > If they dont have enough time to learn the code, then how will they have enough
> > time to operate?
>
> Learning the code was a huge sink of time. Trying to use it was
> another "less than useful" sink of time.
>

So continous posting of inane drivel to this NG is a productive use of your time by
comparison. We
see.

>
> I see that you never spent enough time at it to become "proficient"
> (proficient in the words of Larry, Dick, Dave, et al).

So tell us how you divined that brilliant conclusion.

459. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 14:44:46 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3668FDE4280613BE.93AC21E217B5073C.7517EC407E0E43A7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62707

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030308235736.08747.00002414@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article
<7C8509FB6DF83A2A.4B374A381CE82281.BA29A0415AEE833B@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >news:f45722ac.0303072005.365b0731@posting.google.com...
> >> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
> >news:<20030305213805.09289.00002704@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> >>
> >> > Kim showed up in this
> >> > newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign, and
> >> > literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
> >> > she asked for.
> >> >
> >> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >> Larry, that's rapist mentality.
> >
> >I told him that long ago...trouble is: he knows.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim/Brian:
>
> A rapist is a person who commits violent sexual assault on a
> woman against her will. A rapist is a felon, a criminal.
>
> Now -- let me get this straight, and be VERY specific: Are you
> accusing me of this? Are you accusing me of having a "mentality"
> which could cause me to commit such an act? Please provide
> your answer right here in the newsgroup -- before witnesses
> known and unknown.
>
> If you have any doubt as to whether the thing you insinuated
> about me is true, I'd suggest some extremely rapid backpedaling --
> and sincere, thoughtful, and contrite apologies offered both in
> the newsgroup and in private E-mail. You have 72 hours from
> the date/time of this posting. After that, I will assume that you
> stand by your statements.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Or, what? LOL

Kim W5TIT

460. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 14:46:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6B53BD.6A386679@att.net>
Source record: 62645

Brian wrote:

> Responding from the TOP,
>
> "Very Tiny Bandwidth" is a bad thing?
>
> "Limited Data Rate" is a bad thing?
>
> Perhaps by "words per month" you are implying that these world record
> setters are NOT proficient?

Brian, the conclusion is fast becoming inescapable that you're losing whatever reasoning powers you
may have once had. If you can't differntiate manual Morse code from that used by the very slow code
experimenters you're about ready for the looney bin.

461. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 14:49:02 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <B7E49A7D74330988.AF5C1A202496DA36.690DC89C3F5C3DBC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62703

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030308235736.08747.00002413@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article
<037E33C543827D5D.B9999C7F1D8F7F8F.A89A92274721CC45@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> Ryan:
> >>
> >> Any radio amateur who selected a Vanity call sign with one of the
> >> aforementioned suffixes, with the intention of provoking purient
interest,
> >> and then flaunting same in this newsgroup, would, indeed, be treated
> >> as Kim's "equal."
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >Oh? And what "treatment" would that be, Larry? I'm not sure that you
mean
> >"treatment" as in nice or mean treatment. I've never noticed one way or
the
> >other. Perhaps you can define...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Don't look now, but it means that they would receive a level of criticism
> equal to that which you have received by Riley Hollingsworth, myself,
> and others in this newsgroup.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Oh, that. Well, Larry. Contrary to however you think that is supposed to
do anything--it does nothing. I consider the source, in your case, and from
others it's not much different. What you have "delivered," Larry, is not
criticism in any way. It is nothing but prejudicial crap, innuendo,
rhetoric, and a display of your inability to communicate at all. Effective
communication has an effective impact. Remember that.

Kim W5TIT

462. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 14:51:53 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <B716935C79A1367A.818C004C4960E5C9.6C85B1FE5AF8AC88@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62704

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3E6AA18C.2794A0D0@ix.netcom.com...
> KC8PMX wrote:
>
> >
> > The only close situation I ran into while being a ham, as well as a
> > firefighter was about a year or so ago, and me and other firefighter
were on
> > a medical call at a biker rally and it reached a point where we were
> > concerned for our safety and could not easily back out. Upon trying our
> > department HT's and cell-phones, neither of them could reach the fire
> > repeater nor cell tower for the area we were in. The only other means
of
> > communication was utilizing the ham repeater which I could hit, and
called
> > 911 through the autopatch to request law enforcement assistance. Being
that
> > there were no other means of rendering assistance, I can only assume
that I
> > made the right decision in this case. It is funny to note that
there
> > are quite a few areas in my county where the stupid cell phones have
dead
> > spots and the ham radio repeater works better than the county fire
repeater
> > system. The ham repeater is about 30 watts at about 90-100 feet and
the
> > fire repeater is at 275 feet at about 100 watts.
>
> Sounds like your fire repeater has a deaf receiver (partially fried front
end)
> that greatly reduces sensitivity without killing it completely. Or bad
coax
> (water got in?) And that the
> people responsible for its maintenance are not doing their jobs.
>
> > 5 watt ham HT's seem to
> > have twice (or more) the coverage area than our stinkin' fire HT's while
> > working simplex or repeater frequencies!!!!! Go figure.....
>
> Around here, in NNJ, the local power company is called "Public
> Service". And if their powerlines are creating RFI, well that could
> be another thread with the same title "Public Service and Ham" :-)
>

Heh heh...yeah, and don't we all wish that was free!? I think the use of the ham repeater for calling 911 in the situation described above was absolutely within legal parameters!

Kim W5TIT

463. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 14:52:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6B5515.3B88DA08@att.net>
Source record: 62646

Brian wrote:

> Neb Revod <spammers@biteme.com> wrote in message
news:<MPG.18d32cda2ff2e519896c8@pdx.news.speakeasy.net>...
> > In article <v6j1b2s1cjv4fe@corp.supernews.com>, kb9tmp@juno.com says...
> > >
> > >
> > > Larry
> > > Since they have set a record that means they must be
> > > on the cutting edge of Amateur Radio. And they are
> > > using good old Morse's Code to accomplish it!
> > > So much for it being a "dead mode" of little use.
> >
> > Not quite right. Cutting edge? Arguably yes, but it was NOT "good old
> > Morse's Code" in any sense other than the actual encoding of characters.
> > Any arbitrary scheme of distinguishable periods of modulation, used to
> > encode the characters could have been used. Moreover, the feat required
> > the use of software (computers) at both ends. It could NOT have been
> > accomplished by two CW'ers putting fist to key.
>
> Extra Dick/W0EX knows how to thwart 'puter copy.
>
> Ask him about it.

Be glad to inform you, Slim. All it takes for most comuter programs I've seen to copy
garbage is any sort of
noise in the circuit. Or code which isn't near-perfect in its timing, such as some of that
sent by a bug or
some (many?) inept handkey senders.
Of course with your very crippled analytical abilities you have trouble putting facts
together to reach a
valid conclusion, as always.

>
> Wear your "bile" shield when you do, though.

464. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 14:53:48 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <87177F84FA833D64.05A561EDC4A1BB77.B14125297777A5CA@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62706

"me" <me@here.com> wrote in message
news:b4dt67$v3j$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> The orginial point was why should the engineers even have to learn the
code.
>
> Would an electrial engineer be an addition to a hobby that is interested
in
> electronics?
>
>

Isn't that a most arrogant attitude? Just because of your potential
contribution, you should be given leeway? Pshaw...

Kim W5TIT

465. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 14:55:25 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v6mlekqals6e28@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62647

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030308235733.08747.00002409@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article <v6j1b2s1cjv4fe@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
> writes:
>
> >Larry
> >Since they have set a record that means they must be
> >on the cutting edge of Amateur Radio. And they are
> >using good old Morse's Code to accomplish it!
> >So much for it being a "dead mode" of little use.
>
> Bill:
>
> Unfortunately, I don't think us Morse Code supporters can look to
> this story as proving anything too significant about the Morse code.

Other than the fact that they chose something they knew for sure
would work if the band allowed any kind of contact.

> I'm sure it was employed mainly as a matter of convenience, as
> opposed to formulating some other encoding system specifically
> for this VLF project.

I'm sure your right there.

> I just wonder if something like Hellschreiber
> would have worked?

Maybe they can try that next, I'd like to know the answer to
that one myself.

>
> Let's face it -- I'm not interested in a CW QSO in which I need to
> use a stopwatch in order to copy what the other station is sending!

As poor as I am at code that would be 'really' slow even for me!

>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

It's still interesting it was CW that was the first mode used instead
of psk 31, rtty, or anything else.

--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,

if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

466. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 14:58:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6B566D.E719B957@att.net>
Source record: 62648

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6A42CE.282F148B@att.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E659E71.9B04EDF2@att.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6423B8.5DA1FF8C@att.net>...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Steve - ever think the whole point of his postings might be to "brown you
off"?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Why, I thought we all knew that Lame Lennie aka AVeryFineSpeciMan is here for
the
> > > > > > > express purpose of
> > > > > > > "browning off" ham radio and everyone remotely involved in it. Ccept his little
> > > > > > > butty Brain "Mogodishu Slim"
> > > > > > > BurkeTurkey. He's already embarassingly red (and brown) enough.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dick/W0EX, you better spit out that bile before it chokes you.
> > > > >
> > > > > The bile is all yours, Slim. Enjoy. Oh, you've been enjoying for years. Right.
> > > >
> > > > I just don't want your callsign becoming available prematurely. Live
> > > > long and prosper.
> > >
> > >
> > That has long been the plan and still is. How're your plans going? Do
> > you think that someday you might find it in yourself to grow up, wise up
> > and move on
> > with your life? Or just sit it all out?
>
> Who's sitting it out?
>
> I've worked far more DX than your ever likely to, and I've been DX
> from rarer location than you'll ever be.

But you can't even give verbal confirmation, much less show evidence, Slim.

> I've even managed to operate
> HF OFF of the power mains, at beaches during BBQ's, Jamborees, and
> campouts.

Aw, No $hit?

>
>
> You need to wake up and smell something other than bile.

If you'd get your head out for a moment you could smell something else for once.

467. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 15:01:20 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <EDAF21B2823D0AD4.B863DE4A601815FE.DCAEBB686E132AD4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62705

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b4e3h4$c4l$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> Sorry to tell you Dee....but the short term ham license appears to be the
> 'standard'. Folks dont know what PEP is, or how to measure it for the
> various modes. They don't know the basic 468/Fmhz formula for a 1/2 wave
in
> free space dipole.
>
> Etc. Etc.
>
> But they are dang good at screaming 'contact', and such as that.
>
> Can someone help me here? What is a signal report of 7 by 9 mean and what
> the heck is Seventy Thirds?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

Hey Dan? Really. C'mon. There's got to be things about amateur radio, scientific and non-scientific that you've missed or don't know. Or do you know everything there is to know about it?

By the way--I know about PEP. I know that I don't want to be bothered with it, so the most power I'll ever run is about 50-100 watts. So, why would I have to keep that knowledge up in my brain? Are you a walking, talking encyclopedia of amateur radio. Have you retained absolutely everything you ever learned about amateur radio?

The items of which you speak above, by the way: the 7X9 signal report and people saying Seventy Thirds? You complain first of people not knowing what you believe to be some pretty important aspects of ham radio, but end with complaining about something pretty trite--the way someone chooses to communicate though they are within the rules and regs. Which is it that bothers you the most? Because I've heard some pretty darned "learned" ham radio operators that communicate like idiots. And, I've heard some pretty darned dumb amateur radio operators that communicate like experts. So, Dan, what is that you're actually angry about?

Kim W5TIT

468. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 15:07:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6B58A9.8093D1BD@att.net>
Source record: 62649

Brian wrote:

> > Given your track record I doubt many readers will be inclined to
> > accept anything you "know" at face value.
>
> I'd be disinclined to believe that. For example, you and Dave didn't
> know that a Commander had the authority to grant amateur operations in
> Somalia.

Un huh. And you don't have any realistic grip on the term "commander" at all. To say nothing of the
term "permission".

>
>
> You and Dave would knowingly work out of band Frenchmen on 6M.
>

You have no idea what constitutes knowledge either.

>
> You cannot figure out how to operate amateur radio away from the power
> mains.
>

You're so stupid to even make such a comment that it doesn't even deserve response.

>
> That's just some recent stuff. I don't have any more time to devote
> to your ineptness.
>

Inept is clearly another term you have no feel for, but that you describes you so very well.

>
> > If I was in QSO with a foreign ham and some clod came on the frequency
> > and informed me that I shouldn't be talking to that guy because that guy
> > was out of his allotted band I'd likely say "Buzz off Slim/Brian. You're
> > in no position to 'know'". And besides it's none of YOUR business, just
> > as it's none of your business how Dave handles his on the air contacts.
>
> Who's talking about "some clod???"
>
> I said you already knew the French allocation on 6M, yet you intend to
> go ahead and work them out of band.
>

Like I said, some clod -like you- comes on the frequency and yells "Hey that Frenchman you're talking to is
out of his band!" and now that constitutes "knowledge". So much for your grasp of that term, too.

Do you know very much about ANYTHING at all?

469. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 15:08:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6B58D7.14D0BDBF@att.net>
Source record: 62650

Dave Heil wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> >
> > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>
> > > >Are these UK amateurs considered proficient?
>
> > > I'd say they were.
>
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> > At what speed (in WPM) did they send their message?
>
> You'd have us believe that the speed used on 136 KHz was their maximum
> or are you, like Leonard H. confusing profiency with efficiency?
>
> Dave K8MN

That pair of lamebrains live in a state of confusion.

470. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 15:09:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6B5923.C7E1D6B2@att.net>
Source record: 62701

Dave Heil wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> >
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>
> > > Stop thinking of the code as a barrier. You advance by passing Element 1,
> > > that's how.
> >
> > Yes, yes, that's how I didit. But what of element two? And what of
> > people who cannot pass element one?
>
> They fail the exam. They may attempt it again--as many times as is
> necessary.
>
> > Dave thinks he's the World's Greatest DXer and is?
>
> Brian, are you attempting to emulate Len or are you a simpleton?
> You and only you have used the term "World's Greatest DXer" and
> attempted to apply it to me. I've not only never used it to refer to
> myself, I've previously corrected you when you've used it. Are you
> beyond honesty?

He's beyond rationality.

471. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 15:50:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E6B62E9.3040504@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62708

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
>
>>Brian wrote:
>>
>>>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>>>
>>>>Are these UK amateurs considered proficient?
>>>>
>>>I'd say they were.
>>>
>>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>>
>>>At what speed (in WPM) did they send their message?
>>>
>>You'd have us believe that the speed used on 136 KHz was their maximum
>>or are you, like Leonard H. confusing profiency with efficiency?
>>
>>Dave K8MN
>>
>
> That pair of lamebrains live in a state of confusion.
>

At the risk of turning this into a productive thread and getting an education, (always dangerous here in rrap!) What is the rationale for such slow data rate transmissions? I certainly would expect slower than normal for these initial tests, and of course the bandwidth at 136 kHz is limited, but I'm curious. Seems like since computers are doing the work, it would be possible to send at a more "normal" rate.

- Mike KB3EIA -

472. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 16:00:01 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <EB42B25B7C6860F7.50B332C053630C49.BC77376515D99977@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62709

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA903586.12A14%stewart@say.net...
> "W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) It seems to me that an emergency service organization
> > (police, fire, ambulance, fire &rescue, etc.) would be able
> > to avail themselves of amateur radio frequencies *IF* it were
> > in an emergency (not just routine use). The reason I would
> > interpret it this way is because of the rule for communication
> > on any available radio frequency during an emergency. (snip)
>
> You're referring to Sec. 2.405 and Sec. 97.403 of Title 47. The first is
a
> general provision relating to all radio services licensed by the FCC
(except
> broadcast and amateur stations) and the second is the Amateur Radio
specific
> provision. Both provide wide leeway when it comes to emergency
> communications involving the "immediate" safety of human life or
protection
> of property.
>

Yeah, that's about what I remembered reading and what I do hear said the
most often on the air.

>
> However, an emergency involving life or property is not the sole test.
> Both provisions include an additional requirement - "in which normal
> communication facilities are disrupted" or "when normal communication
> systems are not available." A ham operator volunteering for a fire
> department with it's own radio equipment would not meet this additional
> requirement.
>

I am confused by the above, Dwight--and I am not meaning to be smart-assed,
either. There would be nothing wrong with a ham radio operator volunteering
to use ham radio equipment owned by the fire department, in an emergency or
not I should say, would there? There would also be nothing wrong with
anyone (firefighter or not) using that same equipment in an emergency that
met the criteria you describe above, correct?

>
> > Unfortunately, it is being learned that the frequencies of
> > fire, police, ambulance, etc., are inadequate--due to the

> > fact that they cannot communicate with each other. [SNIP]
> >
>
> I think you're comparing apple and oranges, Kim. The public safety
> frequencies are not normally inadequate.
>

OK, I'll accept your assessment by things you've heard and understood. But I am stating that, from what I have heard and understood, the public safety equipment (not frequencies, per se) is wholly inadequate for emergency situations involving a need for varioius departments to communicate with each other. I know this by critiques I have heard about the tornadoes that struck OK down here a few years back; the critiques I've heard of the 9/11 disaster; and the critiques I've heard of the Shuttle Recovery mission--to name just a few.

>
> There are a wide range of
> frequencies available (HF, VHF, UHF, and 800MHz), allowing communications
> under almost any circumstance.
>

I don't think I have to clarify that the *availability* of frequencies alone does not infer adequate communication abilities. Our agencies must have the appropriate equipment, networks, and communication standards in order to avail themselves of the *available* frequencies. It is the equipment, networks and communication standards that inhibit the abiltiy for adequate communication, and it is that those agencies are funded by the public that is the reason. When budgets come up, most elected officials are unwilling to prepare for "whatifs" when they real situations going on presently that they must come up with funds for.

>
> So, instead, I think you're talking about
> extreme situations (disasters such as hurricanes, floods, etc) where
normal
> communications is disrupted.
>

Well, extreme, and even "normal" emergency communication. I mean, to what extent *do* we define an emergency? Is it limited by the number people? Dollars? If I'm in a burning building and I am the only person to be rescued by that fireman who is carrying a ham radio--I am pretty sure I want him using those frequencies where "his" frequencies won't work!

>
> And, of course, I agree with the concept of
> using ham radio here.
>

And, I agree with using ham (or any available affective) radio *any* time there is a defined emergency (left for interpretation, by the way, for that

reason--I believe). But, aren't we discussing the interpretation of the Rules & Regs?

>
> However, this is not what the guy was asking about. He
> was asking about routine fire department communications when there is no
> unusual disruption of normal public safety radio communications.
>

OK then, in *that* case, I'd say the Rules & Regs don't support his use. And, that is what I clarified, right? I hope I did. Routine communication does not fall within the category of emergency. BUT--what is routine? It is routine for a fire department to respond to fires every day. Those fires are emergency situations.

>
> > That is why I would support the purchase of ham radio
> > equipment by emergency organizations -- and its use if
> > the situation warrants. (snip)
> >
> > (snip) Remember, I am talking about the use of amateur
> > radio frequencies by emergency organizations (or anyone,
> > for that matter) in an emergency situation.
>
> If you're talking about use of that equipment by unlicensed employees of
> those emergency organizations (unlicensed in ham radio), be careful to
note
> the concept of "immediate" safety of human life or protection of property.
> They cannot use that equipment for routine calls, routine dispatch, or any
> other routine communications. That would require a licensed ham operator
as
> the control operator (operating under the terms of the Amateur Radio rules
> governing supplemental public service communications).
>

I think, and I bet, that the interpretation of routine is where we may be ending up here. Fundamentally, for the sake of debate, if an emergency organization is dispatching personnel and equipment to an emergency scene, or is at that scene needing communication, I believe the use of any available radio is appropriate and legal. While it is true that there is not a predominant use of ham radio by our fire and rescue organizations--I still think that it could be argued in their favor if they did use radios on ham radio frequencies.

Phil Kane, if you're following this thread, what do you think? Remember, the debate here is pretty hypothetical, but what do you think?

> >
> > The rules governing ham radio would be that an emergency
> > is defined as any threat to life or *property*. Fire is
> > a huge threat to property, correct?
>

> Not all fire calls involve the "immediate" threat to life or property.
>

OK, I am talking fire calls that do involve the immediate threat to life or property.

>
> Many fire calls turn out to be false, for example, offering no threat to
> life or property. To meet the requirements of Sec. 2.405 and Sec. 97.403,
> there would almost have to be a person at the scene of a clear threat with
> no normal communications available. A dispatcher relaying a call of a fire
> would not meet those requirements, nor would a firefighter on the scene
with
> a fire department radio clipped to his belt or installed in the truck.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

True, on the above. However, if the dispatcher had "lost" the ability to communicate the relay of that fire with their normal radio and frequencies, there would be nothing illegal about using ham radio (or any other) radio frequencies for dispatch. The same applies on the scene. If the firefighter's radio clipped to his belt is not working; he'd be within legal parameters to grab the ham radio and use it. That's all I'm saying. I think we are actually in agreement.

Kim W5TIT
PS--while serious, I *do* get this funny image of emergency persons carrying dozens of radios on their belts! :o

473. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 16:50:40 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9339787B0B3DDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 62710

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:s2vaa.5430$se1.2840183@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "me" <me@here.com> wrote in message
> news:b4dlj4muj1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
>> Let's see.. They have an electrical engineering degree. How hard would
>> the theory be. Oh gee, they now have to read the rules and
>> regulations. That should take an evening at worst case scenario.
>>
>> The code would take how long? And no plans to use it.
>>
>
> You have to MEMORIZE not just read the rules, regs, operating
> procedures, etc. That takes time. Very few engineers have a
> photographic memory. Even with an electrical engineering degree, it
> will take probably 30 hours to learn all the stuff for the tech test
> and another 30 for the general. Now there are exceptions but the guy
> who read the book one night and passed the test the next is NOT
> representative.
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
>
>>
>> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>> news:3E6A57F1.7050900@adelphia.net...
>> > me wrote:
>> >
>> > > At least, the engineers were smart enough to see the waste of time
>> > > in learning something that really don't want to do.
>> > >
>> >
>> > And since they don't have the time to learn, they don't have the
>> > time to be an asset to the hobby.
>> >
>> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>> >
>>
>>
>>
>
>
>

You are wrong, I'm afraid. I am an EE, and I went in to take the Tech, as I had a no-code UK licence, and passed also the General and Advanced papers **without** reading the books for those elements. That's not reading them the night before, but actually not reading them atall. I don't think that would be rare for an EE, I think it would be quite representative, especially if we were talking about someone lke myself who had actually worked in RF. I didn't take the Extra written on that occasion only because they didn't have a spare element 4B paper, but I could have passed that too. I had of course read Part 97 more than just the night before, and I had read a book on elements 2 and 3A. Could I have just read Part 97 the night before and then passed all the written elements in one session? In my opinion, yes, although I had a foreign ham ticket as well as an EE degree.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

BTW, I am a 20wpm Extra, and I have never made a single CW QSO

474. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 17:15:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4fsqu$eb7$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62711

Originally I had two suggestions...I now have three.

Dan/W4NTI

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030309010626.29016.00000654@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <b4du13asv1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Does this cult require 'human sacrafice' ?? If so I have some
> >recomendations.
>
> Do you want to be first in line? Be our guest... :-)

475. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 17:17:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4fsve$6f5$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62712

What Im angry about is the dumbing down of Amateur radio...as evidenced by
your idiotic response.

Have a nice day

Dan/W4NTI

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:EDAF21B2823D0AD4.B863DE4A601815FE.DCAEBB686E132AD4@lp.airnews.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b4e3h4$c4l$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > Sorry to tell you Dee....but the short term ham license appears to be
the
> > 'standard'. Folks dont know what PEP is, or how to measure it for the
> > various modes. They don't know the basic 468/Fmhz formula for a 1/2
wave
> in
> > free space dipole.
> >
> > Etc. Etc.
> >
> > But they are dang good at screaming 'contact', and such as that.
> >
> > Can someone help me here? What is a signal report of 7 by 9 mean and
what
> > the heck is Seventy Thirds?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> Hey Dan? Really. C'mon. There's got to be things about amateur radio,
> scientific and non-scientific that you've missed or don't know. Or do you
> know everything there is to know about it?
>
> By the way--I know about PEP. I know that I don't want to be bothered
with
> it, so the most power I'll ever run is about 50-100 watts. So, why would
I
> have to keep that knowledge up in my brain? Are you a walking, talking
> encyclopedia of amateur radio. Have you retained absolutely everything
you
> ever learned about amateur radio?
>
> The items of which you speak above, by the way: the 7X9 signal report and
> people saying Seventy Thirds? You complain first of people not knowing

what
> you believe to be some pretty important aspects of ham radio, but end with
> complaining about something pretty trite--the way someone chooses to
> communicate though they are within the rules and regs. Which is it that
> bothers you the most? Because I've heard some pretty darned "learned" ham
> radio operators that communicate like idiots. And, I've heard some pretty
> darned dumb amateur radio operators that communicate like experts. So,
Dan,
> what is that you're actually angry about?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

476. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 17:34:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6B7AF6.378F8076@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62713

W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E6AC11D.408DD595@earthlink.net...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:<3E697740.457A8D17@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
> news:<20030305213805.09289.00002704@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Kim showed up in this
> > > > > > newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign,
> and
> > > > > > literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got
> what
> > > > > > she asked for.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > > > > >
> > > > > Larry, that's rapist mentality.
> > > > >
> > > > That'd be one of your less intelligent responses. I don't know of any
> > > > rapists who do nothing other than give their "victim" a talking to or
> a
> > > > lecture on their lack of good taste.
> > >
> > > How many do you know?
> > >
> > You keep screwing up that reading part. You missed the word "of" which
> > follows "know". Keep practicing.

> Yup. You did say that. Which means you don't know *any* rapists at all, or
> you know rapists and Brian asked you how many. *You* keep practicing.

Looks like a tight race between you and Brian for the crown in lack of
comprehension. At no time did I write that I know or don't know any
rapists.
That, of course, isn't an issue at all. I wrote "don't know of". You
both seem incapable of understanding what that means. The point is that
Brian's silly statement about "rapist mentality" and your equally
foolish followup comments are laughable.

Dave K8MN

477. ARNewsline 1334 - March 7 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 17:57:20 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309125720.15851.00000190@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 62714

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1334 – March 7, 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1334 with a release date of Friday, March 7 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

A national ham radio socierty on the brink of faiulure and how ham radio will survive in space while the shuttles are grounded. These stories are first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1334 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

INTERNATIONAL: COLOMBIAS NATIONAL AMATEUR RADIO SOCIETY SAVED BY A MIRACLE

Colombia’s national Amateur Radio Society has received a reprieve from extinction. At least a temporary one. We have this in-depth look at what happened and whats being done to save the L-C-R-A.

--

Colombia’s national ham radio society remains on the brink of being dissolved and you may soon hear very few of that nations hams on the air. This, according to Fred Laun, K3ZO in a report that originally appeared in a number of D-X newsletters. The reason? The economy.

According to Laun, his old friend Beto Rojas, HK3DDD, in Bogota informed him that postal rates in Colombia were doubled as of January 1st. That it now costs the equivalent of $2.00 U-S to send a letter to the United States. And as a result Colombian hams would have to pay the equivalent of 13 cents per QSL to send outgoing cards through the bureau.

That 13 cent fee would not be to bad except for the fact that the bureau probably won't be available much longer. This, because the Colombian I-A-R-U member society -- the Liga Colombiana de Radioaficionados -- L-C-R-A -- was to meet on Saturday, March 1st to dissolve itself. The problem is that L-C-R-A membership is down. It now only has 200 paid members. It also had the equivalent of 8000 United States dollars in debt. It’s leaders felt that it could no longer stay in business.

But says Laun, a miracle actually happened. At the meeting one of the members donated $7000 to pay off most of the current debt. So, L-C-R-A will continue to operate as Colombia’s national society for at least the next three months. During that time the leadership will try to figure out what went wrong and see if they can get the organization back on an even keel.

In a note to Amateur Radio Newsline, Laun says that several Colombian hams were apparently moved by the messages they received from around the world and have vowed to try to rescue their almost 70 year old society from the brink of oblivion. Even so, HK3DDD tells Laun that many Colombian hams have stopped calling C-Q and some have even terminated all high frequency operations. This is because they can no longer afford to handle the economic consequences of the demand for QSL cards.

Also says HK3DDD, some Colombian DXers who are still on the air are simply listening, searching and pouncing on rare ones these days. Instead of being the DX, they are selectively looking for new countries for themselves.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Norm Seeley, KI7UP .

--

The bottom line to all of this? H-K prefix hams may soon become very rare on the H-F ands and those whom you work may never be able to QSL. (K3ZO)

**

RADIO RULES: WRC-03 GETS US POSITION

The U. S. Department of State has forwarded several agenda items to Geneva as being this nations opening position at the 2003 World Radiocommunictions Conference. The most important of these relate to International Radio Regulation s-25 and its sub-parts. Included in the initial United States position is rewording S 25 subpart 1 to give member nations more authority to determine the points of communication of the amateur stations it has licensed. The suggested modifuication reads that administrators shall verify the technical and operational qualifications of any person wishing to operate an Amateur station.

The United States is also proposing to eliminate regulation 25.5. This is the rule that mandates Morse Code peoficiency examinations for all candidates for an Amateur license with high frequency operating priveleges. The United States says that its time to remove the Morse testing requirement and leave the decision as whether or not to test for code up to individual I-T-U mermber nations. (W5YI)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: CREW OF 2 TO THE ISS

It will be a two man crew rather than a three man crew on the International Space Station until the U-S Space Shuttle flies again. But ham radio will remain on the air from the I-S-S as the investigation in the Columbia tragedy continues. Amateur Radio Newsline's Roy Neal, K6DUE, has more:

--

NASA'S WORST NIGHTMARE BECAME REALITY WHEN AN ORBITTING SPACE SHUTTLE BLEW UP, KILLING ALL SEVEN ABOARD AND PUTTING UNITED STATES SPACE ACTIVITY OH HOLD FOR AN INDEFINITE FUTURE. NOW, OUT OF THE DEBRIS, INVESTIGATION AND SORROW, NASA HAS BEGUN TO REORGANIZE.

ADMINISTRATOR SEAN O'KEEFE HAS TOLD A CONGRESSIONAL PANEL THAT AN AGREEMENT HAS BEEN REACHED WITH THE INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS. THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION WILL CONTINUE IN ORBIT FOR AT LEAST THE NEXT 18 MONTHS.

THE TWO ASTRONAUTS AND ONE COSMONAUT ON BOARD WILL BE BROUGHT BACK TO EARTH IN LATE APRIL OR EARLY MAY ABOARD THE SOYUZ SPACE SHIP THAT'S DOCKED AT THE STATION. THEY WILL BE REPLACED BY A NEW CREW OF ONLY 2 PEOPLE, ONE ASTRONAUT AND ONE COSMONAUT, PROBABLY ED LU AND YURI MALENCHENKO, WHO ARE NOW IN TRAINING AT RUSSIA'S STAR CITY. THEY WILL KEEP THE STATION OPERATIONAL, EVE N PLAN TO TALK TO ONE OR TWO SCHOOLS ON EARTH EVERY WEEK. FUTURE CREWS WILL COPNSIST OF TWO PEOPLE FOR THE TIME BEING.

RUSSIAN PROGRESS SPACECRAFT WILL BE USED TO FERRY SUPPLIES, SOYUZ WILL CARRY PASSENGERS. ONCE NASA HAS FIGURED OUT WHAT CAUSED THE SHUTTLE COLUMBIA TO DISINTIGRATE, THEY HOPE TO FIX AND FLY THE THREE REMAINING SPACE SHUTTLES. THE BOEING COMPANY HAS BEEN ASKED TO GO TO WORK ON A NEW CARRIER TO AUGMENT THE SHUTTLE FLEET.

RUSSIA HAS AGREED TO ACCELERATE THE DELIVERY OF 2 PROGRESS RE-SUPPLY VEHICLES FOR A TOTAL FLEET OF FOUR THIS YEAR AND FIVE IN 2004 AND THERE IS TALK OF AUGMENTING THE SOYUZ FLEET.

EXISTING HAM RADIO EQUIPMENT ON BOARD SHOULD KEEP THE STATION ON THE AIR. OTHER EQUIPMENT MAY BE SENT UP IF NEEDED. THE SPACE AGENCIES HAVE COMMITED TO STAYING IN SPACE WHILE THEY MAP A FUTURE AND HAM RADIO IS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THAT ORBITING STATION.

FOR THE AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE, ROY NEAL, K6DUE.

--

NASA says that having only two people aboard the I-S-S will help extend supplies while the shuttle fleet remains grounded. (NASA, ARNewsline™)

**

RESCUE RADIO: METRO-COMM AND THE NORTH-EAST BLIZZARD

A follow-up to our recent coverage of the severe weather that has blanketed the North-East in recent weeks. Steve Bromhead, KB2TRZ, reports that the Metro-Comm linked repeater system did yomens duty during last months blizzard.

According to Steve, their Snow Watch Net was activated for 42 consecutive hours handling storm related traffic for 12 counties in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware. This included 10 formal messages to the National Weather Service office in My. Holly New Jersey.

Steve says that Metro-Comm is a linked repeater system covering Binginghamton, New York to Ocean City, New Jersey. The system has machines on 144, 220, 432, and 1296 MHz as well as a packet BBS. (KB2TRZ)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the WD8AYE repeater and the Stark County ARES Net -- both serving Canton Ohio.

(5 sec pause here)

**

THE VEC SYSTEM: QPC RELEASES DRAFT GENERAL CLASS SYLLABUS

You have the answers. They have the questions. So says the Question Pool Committee of the National Conference of Volunteer Examiner Coordinators.

The Q-P-C has just released a draft syllabus for the new Element 3 General class Question Pool. This is the syllabus will be used when developing the new General class question pool that will become effective July 1, 2004.

This draft syllabus is available for download at www.arrl.org/arrlvec/pools.html. The public is invited to comment on this syllabus, as well as to suggest questions for consideration in the next General Pool.

The Question Pool Committe says that all responses must be received prior to July 15, 2003. Please direct your comments to the following people:
Scotty Neustadter, W4WW, Chair QPC email: W4WW@arrl.net
Bart Jahnke, W9JJ, Member QPC email: vec@arrl.org
Fred Maia, W5YI, Member QPC email: w5yi@w5yi.org
John Johnston, W3BE, Member QPC email: johnston.john1@worldnet.att.net (NCVEC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: NO RULES BROKEN

A ham accused of running a telephone call-in program on 75 meters has been cleared of any wrong doing. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Bruce Tennant, K6PZW has good news for one California ham:

--
Back on October 15, 2002, the FCC wrote to James S. Watkins, KI6GU, of Burbank California. This, regarding complaints that his station was involved in a telephone call-in like program on 3.830 MHz on August 16th and 24th.

The complaints alleged that Watkins had operated the call-in show using reverse phone patch. Copies were provided to him and the FCC requested additional information from Watkins in regard to that operation.

Watkins provided the requested information in a response dated last November 12th. Following a thorough review the FCC now says that that there were no violations of Commission rules since licensed operators were in control of the station during all transmissions. As a result the inquiry is closed and no enforcement action is deemed to be necessary.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bruce Tennant, K7PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

The FCC also thanked Watkins for what it termed as his quick reply and his cooperation. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: WARNING LERTTER FOR ALLEGED KEY-DOWN

A Michigan ham has recieved a Warning Notice from the FCC. This time the letter went to to George Albrecht, N8PGB, of Lansing , and says that the FCC is in posession of information alleging that Albrecht's station was the source of deliberate interference to the W8LCC repeater system on 442.025 Mhz.

The notice says that the interference took the form of unidentified transmissions and keying down to cause sound effects from a link to 52.525 Mhz. In its note the FCC warned all Albrecht of the possibility of fines and revocation proceedings against him if the alleged problems continue. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: NY CAR SERVICE FINED FOR UNLICENSED OPERATION

International Car Service, Inc. of Brooklyn, New York has been fined $10,000. This, for operating of unlicensed radio transmitters on 33.20 Mhz.

The original forfeiture order was issued on October 22, 2002 by the District Director of the Commission's New York Field Office. International Car Service never filed a response to the N-A-L. Based on the information before the Commission, the fine has been affirmed and International has been ordered to pay. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: HACKER SENTENCED

A federal judge has ruled that a California man who quit his job to work for a competitor and used his old computer password to snoop on his former employer must pay $21,600 and serve five years probation. The sentence comes after the San Dimas man pleaded guilty in September of 2002 to one count of illegally obtaining information from a protected computer

Until February of last year, the man reportedly worked for a contractor specializing in large retail buildings. After leaving that job to work for a competitor, the man admitted that he used a password to access its computer system more than 20 times. (Published reports)

**

FM AND REPEATERS: REPEATERLINK.ORG WANTS YOU

Hams and repeater owner operators interested in connecting their system to another cirty or another nation now have a new resource. Its in cyberspace at www.repeaterlink.org and once there you will find a growing list of who'se repeater is linked to where and how its being done.

repeaterlink.org is the work of Jim Willmore, KC9BIX. He says over several Internet remailers that his site is unique in that it lets you to search for

repeater systems that connect two different cities together or linked systems that have repeater in a specific city. It also allows hams who own a repeater system to log in and maintain your own system information in real time.

According to Willmore, repeaterLink.org is totally independant and supported by the ham radio community. It does not buy data from the FCC or the ARRL, but rather relies on the architects and engineers who own the repeater networks to register their own systems.

Again, that site is www.repeaterlink.org. If you have any questions about the site, email Jim at kc9bix@repeaterlink.org (KC9BIX)

**

HAM RADIO HONORS: NAB ENGINEERING ACHIEVEMENT AWARD WINNERS ANNOUNCED

The National Association of Broadcasters has honored a ham radio oprtator with one of its two, 2003 Engineering Achievement Awards for Radio and Television.

John Reiser, WQ4L, the retired Senior Broadcast Engineer of the FCC International Bureau, will receive the award for Radio. Robert Eckert, Branch Chief - Electromagnetic Compatibility Division, Technical Analysis Branch of the FCC's Office of Engineering and Technology, will receive the award for TV.

The Engineering Achievement Awards for Radio and Television will be presented at NAB's Technology Luncheon on April 9th. The NAB annual convention takes place April 5 - 10 at the Las Vegas Convention Center. The Amasteur Radio Reception is Wednesday April 9th from 6 to 8 P.M. right next door at the Las Vegas Hilton Hotel. The complete details are in cyberspace at www.nab.org/newsroom/pressrel/n2003/c2603.htm) (CGC)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: THE ZL TECHNOLOGY CONVENTION

No plans for this springs Easter holiday? Well think down-under as in Hamilton New Zealand because that’s where this years Technology Convention will take place. The dates are April 19th and 20th at the Hamilton Astronomical Society meeting facility.

This years Technology Convention will be hosted by the Hamilton Amateur Radio Club. Plans for the event call for presentations on such subjects as microwave equipment construction, homebrew test equipment, APRS, 10 GHz ATV, plus others state of the art Amateur radio disciplines. And if the weather permits, some viewing of the Southern Hemisphere’s night sky from the facility’s optical telescope may be included.

Want to find out more? You can write to the New Zealand Technology Convention 2003, PO Box 606 Hamilton New Zealand. Or better yet send an e-mail to Gavin Petrie at gavinwp@ihug.co.nz. (NZART)

**

HAMFESTS AND CONVENTIONS: WEAK SIGNAL BANQUET IN DAYTON OHIO

Here in the United States tickets are now on sale for the 11th Weak Signal Banquet slated for on Friday night May 16th in Dayton Ohio. This is one of the largest gatherings of V-H-F weak signal enthusiasts held anywhere in the United States and is timed to coincide with the Dayton Hamvention. Cost is $35 per person and only 125 people can be accommodated. For information and reservation information take your web browser to www.wa8wzg.com and click on Dayton Banquet 2003. (WA8WZG)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

TRAVEL WARNING: DX'ERS ADVISED TO USE CARRY-ON LUGGAGE ONLY

If you are planning a D-Xpedition, you might want to think in terms of smaller being better. This following reports of vandalism to the luggage of a recent DXpedition by none other than those highly trained security folks at Seattle Washington's Sea-Tac Airport. Amateur Radio Newsline's Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, in Auckland New Zealand reports on what happened to a bunch of DXpedition operators who were headed home:

--
When the D-Xpedition group returning from the recent AH3D operation reached Seattle for their connection to Copenhagen Denmark, all their Samsonite case's locks were been broken by the Sea-Tac Airport security people who just had to take a peek inside. The checking was done in a secure area of the Seattle airport. As most seasoned travelers know, security is supposed to find the passengers to get the keys to luggage that they want to inspect. In this case security simply broke into them, resulting in damage to the luggage and some rather messy repacking.

As a result of this experience, D-X'er Martti Laine, OH2BH, says he will be going hand carried from now on. When he operates the ARRL SSB Contest from the Canary Islands as EA8BH it will be using the new Yaesu FT-897. This is a radio that weighs in at only 8 and 1/2 pounds and can be toted along in the passanger cabin with him.

Laine says that EA8BH will be on the air on all bands using the new Yaesu radio. He adds that the QSL for this operation will feature information on this new, compact DXpedition, approach.

From down-under I'm Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Several D-X publications quote Laine as saying that during these turbulent times it is advantageous to have all your equipment hand carried. He says that such rigs as the FT-897 and the FinnFet FF-1001 solid-state kilowatt will all fit into a small airline hand-carry bag. Laine adds that if you work him, QSL direct to OH2BH. (OPDX, others)

**

ON THE AIR: CELEBRATING THE FIRST NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Meanwhile, closer to home, the Vero Beach Amateur Radio Club as announced a special evebt operation for March 15th and 16th. From 1400 to 2100 UTC both dats the club will operate station W4OT to celebrate the 100th Anniversary of the nation's first National Wildlife Refuge on Pelican Island. Suggested frequencies are 14.290, 21.360 and 28.390 Mhz. If you make contact QSL to P O Box 2082, Vero Beach Florida. The zipcode is 32961. (VBARC)

**

INTERNATIONAL - UK: THE RADIO COMMUNICATIONS FOUNDATION

The Radio Society of Great Britain has announced the launch of the Radio Communications Foundation. As envisioned. the new foundation will be used by the RSGB to channel all its work in the field of education and training. It will support the promotion of amateur radio to a wider audience in the U-K. The Foundation is being registered as a charity and will operate independently of the normal commercial activities of the RSGB. (GB2RS)

**

INTERNATIONAL - GERMANY: NOMINATIONS SOUGHT FOR THE HORKHEIMER PRIZE

The German national ham radio society -- the DARC -- is seeking nominations for the 3003 Horkheimer Prize. The award is named after Rudolf Horkheimer was one of the first radio amateurs in Germany. Its awarded annually by the DARC for contributions to amateur radio, its further development, and the goals of the society.

According to DARC, the prize can be awarded to one or more persons or institutions. Any member of an amateur radio society in the IARU is entitled to field a nomination and self-nominations are also allowed.

The 2003 prize will be awarded during the Ham Radio 2003 fair in Friedrichshafen. Nominations must be submitted by March 31st to DARC, Lindenallee 4, 34225 Baunatal, Germany. (GB2RS)

**

THE WORLD ABOVE 50 MHZ: QSOP PARTY HONOR ROLLS POSTED

Back here in the U-S-A, Tim Marek, K7XC, says over the W6YX VHF Reflector that the V-H-F Q-S-O Party Honor Rolls through September 2002 have been updated and posted to his website. The U-R-L is a bit complex to read, so look for them in the print edition of this week’s Amateur Radio Newsline report. You can find it http://k7xc.tripod.com/VHF_Records/index.html (K7XC)

**

DX

In D-X word that G3TBK, is returning to work in St. Vincent and will be active again as J88DR until the 10th of April. He will be on all bands from 80 through 10 meters. mostly CW. There may also be a possibility of some operation on 160 metres if he can find sufficient space for an antenna. All QSLs go to G3TBK, either via the bureau or direct. (RSGB)

And FO5RK reports that he is planning to be active again from Rapa Island through March 20th. Rapa Island is located in the Australs group, which counts as a separate DXCC entity from French Polynesia. QSL this one as directed on the air. (OPDX)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: W2NSD ADVISES ON THE WAR ON TERRORISM

And finally this week a word on how to win the War on Terrorism without firing very many shots. It comes in some advice from 73 Magazine's Wayne Green, W2NSD. And as we hear from Blair Alper, KA9SEQ, Green has some rather interesting albeit offbeat ideas -- all using radio:

--

Writing in his March editorial, the prolific W-2-Never-Die quotes a rather strange idea he says comes from Newsmax.com. Its a story recommending that Israel set up narrow passages at every checkpoint with sandbags to absord any explosions. Then use UHF transmitters to detonate any explosives that a terrorist may be trying to sneak in. That says Green would get rid of a lot of suicide bombers in short order.

But Green takes it a lot futher. He suggests that the United States adopt a psychological approach to fighting terrorists. He says that we should set up a series of radio and television broadcasts in the Arabic language. He says that the programs would be made up of psychics supposedly interviewing dead suicide bombers who are screaming that they are roasting in hell and not enjoying the after-life that they were promised. The psychics would also claim that God is furious with them and has put a curse on their families.

Would it work? On this one we won't even venture a guess. But 73's Green does add this comment. He says that it is far better to outsmart enemies than to try to outfight them. It's cheaper, says W2NSD, and that it saves lives.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Blair Alper, KA9SEQ.

--

Green also has some advice for the United States military on how not to fight a war with Iraq. That one you really have to read for yourself. You will find that information on page 4 of the March 2003 issue of 73. (73 Magazine)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline™. Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's™ only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, saying 73 and we thank you for listening. Amateur Radio Newsline™ is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

478. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 18:34:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303090514.65412014@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62717

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E6AC066.3A6E46F8@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>
> > > > >Are these UK amateurs considered proficient?
>
> > > > I'd say they were.
>
> > > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> > > At what speed (in WPM) did they send their message?
>
> You'd have us believe that the speed used on 136 KHz was their maximum
> or are you,

Not at all. Why would you say something like that?

> like Leonard H. confusing profiency with efficiency?

Just as long as you don't confuse it.

Is 0.02WPM proficient?

Is 0.02WPM efficiant?

> Dave K8MN

479. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 18:43:22 UTC
From: deehays@qix.net
Message-ID: <f7f8aca6.0303090536.4566bb32@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62718

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030309010626.29016.00000653@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> Nonsense. Engineers are ALSO cognizant with regulations and
> procedures...of considerably more radio services than just
> amateur radio. They must also keep up to date, not only on the
> new but that which is being developed...rather than stay frozen
> in some strata of time on standards and practices of more than a
> half century past.

And just when did colleges and universities add radio service rules
and regulations to the EE curriculum or any other curriculum?
Engineers won't know them without studying them.

480. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 18:43:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303090536.385a6a43@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62719

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030308235737.08747.00002415@mb-cg.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0303072005.365b0731@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> Kim showed up in this
> >> newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign, and
> >> literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
> >> she asked for.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >Larry, that's rapist mentality.
>
> Brian:
>
> Cecil, is that you in there -- trying to disguise yourself as Brian?
>
> Anyway, no, Brian, it isn't. It is just an accurate description of what
> Kim wanted to happen.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

And you took the bait?

481. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 18:43:54 UTC
From: deehays@qix.net
Message-ID: <f7f8aca6.0303090536.4f9e6aaf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62720

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030309010626.29016.00000653@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> Nonsense. Engineers are ALSO cognizant with regulations and
> procedures...of considerably more radio services than just
> amateur radio. They must also keep up to date, not only on the
> new but that which is being developed...rather than stay frozen
> in some strata of time on standards and practices of more than a
> half century past.

And just when did colleges and universities add radio service rules
and regulations to the EE curriculum or any other curriculum?
Engineers won't know them without studying them.

482. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 18:46:44 UTC
From: deehays@qix.net
Message-ID: <f7f8aca6.0303090544.36052991@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62721

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030308174635.09269.00000046@mb-fr.aol.com>...
> From: "N3THJ" n3thj2000nospam@hotmail.com
>
> >Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>
> Too late. (See posts below).
>
> From: "KB9TMP" kb9tmp@juno.com
> >I hope they don't
> >get rid of the 5WPM test. Now I'm glad I had to
> >do it! I learned something I otherwise never would
> >have tried to learn.
>
> Do you often not like doing something and then enjoy it after you are pressured
> to?

Actually this ends up being quite common in the everyday world. I know many adults who have state that they are glad their parents made them take piano lessons or on the other hand regretted that their parents let them give it up. As kids, they did not like it but as adults their perspective had changed.

The same happens in college. For example, I had to take some computer programming classes even though I was in engineering not computer science. I did not care for it at the time. Yet later, this became one of my favorite job activities. I could have avoided jobs needing this skill but having it opened up more opportunities.

One could go on and on with examples of things that people are required to learn throughout their lives that at the time they don't see any reason for but later find useful.

483. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 18:49:02 UTC
From: me <me@here.com>
Message-ID: <b4g29l$hc3$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62722

Still, no answer to the question of the engineers being an addition to the hobby.

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message news:87177F84FA833D64.05A561EDC4A1BB77.B14125297777A5CA@lp.airnews.net...
> "me" <me@here.com> wrote in message
> news:b4dt67$v3j$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> > The orginial point was why should the engineers even have to learn the
> code.
> >
> > Would an electrial engineer be an addition to a hobby that is interested
> in
> > electronics?
> >
> >
>
> Isn't that a most arrogant attitude? Just because of your potential
> contribution, you should be given leeway? Pshaw...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

484. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 18:55:58 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303090609.469145f5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62723

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030308235736.08747.00002414@mb-cg.aol.com>...
> In article <7C8509FB6DF83A2A.4B374A381CE82281.BA29A0415AEE833B@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >news:f45722ac.0303072005.365b0731@posting.google.com...
> >> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
> news:<20030305213805.09289.00002704@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> >>
> >> > Kim showed up in this
> >> > newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign, and
> >> > literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
> >> > she asked for.
> >> >
> >> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >> Larry, that's rapist mentality.
> >
> >I told him that long ago...trouble is: he knows.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim/Brian:
>
> A rapist is a person who commits violent sexual assault on a
> woman against her will. A rapist is a felon, a criminal.

Correct.

> Now -- let me get this straight, and be VERY specific: Are you
> accusing me of this?

No. Everyone knows that you can't rape someone through a modem. At
least I hope they know that. People can be bullied through a modem,
however.

Are you accusing me of having a "mentality"
> which could cause me to commit such an act?

Only you can answer that question. I assume that you're not a rapist.

Please provide
> your answer right here in the newsgroup -- before witnesses
> known and unknown.

See above. See below.

> If you have any doubt as to whether the thing you insinuated
> about me is true, I'd suggest some extremely rapid backpedaling --
> and sincere, thoughtful, and contrite apologies offered both in
> the newsgroup and in private E-mail. You have 72 hours from
> the date/time of this posting. After that, I will assume that you
> stand by your statements.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

I have no doubt that you are NOT a rapist. Please accept my sincere,
thoughtful, and contrite apology that you are not a rapist.

Google does not permit forwarding this to your private e-mail address,
so I cannot satisfy your private e-mail request.

Brian

485. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 19:14:19 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <foMaa.5701$se1.3059201@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62715

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns9339787B0B3DDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> You are wrong, I'm afraid. I am an EE, and I went in to take the Tech, as
> I had a no-code UK licence, and passed also the General and Advanced
> papers **without** reading the books for those elements. That's not
> reading them the night before, but actually not reading them atall. I
> don't think that would be rare for an EE, I think it would be quite
> representative, especially if we were talking about someone lke myself who
> had actually worked in RF. I didn't take the Extra written on that
> occasion only because they didn't have a spare element 4B paper, but I
> could have passed that too. I had of course read Part 97 more than just
> the night before, and I had read a book on elements 2 and 3A. Could I have
> just read Part 97 the night before and then passed all the written
> elements in one session? In my opinion, yes, although I had a foreign ham
> ticket as well as an EE degree.
>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>
> BTW, I am a 20wpm Extra, and I have never made a single CW QSO

You are definitely NOT representative of the typical EE. You already had a ham radio background so you already knew theory, propagation and operating procedures. You read Part 97 fairly thoroughly from your own admission. Thus you had done the equivalent studying. You don't have to use pre-prepared study guides but must learn the material somewhere, which is what you did. Even if you could have done it all in the night before that doesn't mean that every EE could have. A person doesn't have to use any particular method of learning or particular set of books.

Some one with ONLY an electrical engineering degree and no other background could have passed the tests with no further study. They aren't born knowing the material on rules, regs, propagation,etc and they don't learn it in college.

The books are merely a handy compilation of the material that will be addressed in the tests. There's no requirement to use that particular approach to preparing for the test. Since you had already covered the material by other means of learning and studying, it would have been pointless to have read them.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

486. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 19:26:28 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <EzMaa.5705$se1.3061770@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62716

Type error in my reply. My second paragraph should have said "... could not have passed ..."

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message news:foMaa.5701$se1.3059201@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns9339787B0B3DDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > You are wrong, I'm afraid. I am an EE, and I went in to take the Tech, as
> > I had a no-code UK licence, and passed also the General and Advanced
> > papers **without** reading the books for those elements. That's not
> > reading them the night before, but actually not reading them atall. I
> > don't think that would be rare for an EE, I think it would be quite
> > representative, especially if we were talking about someone lke myself who
> > had actually worked in RF. I didn't take the Extra written on that
> > occasion only because they didn't have a spare element 4B paper, but I
> > could have passed that too. I had of course read Part 97 more than just
> > the night before, and I had read a book on elements 2 and 3A. Could I have
> > just read Part 97 the night before and then passed all the written
> > elements in one session? In my opinion, yes, although I had a foreign ham
> > ticket as well as an EE degree.
> >
> > 73 de Alun, N3KIP
> >
> > BTW, I am a 20wpm Extra, and I have never made a single CW QSO
>
> You are definitely NOT representative of the typical EE. You already had a
> ham radio background so you already knew theory, propagation and operating
> procedures. You read Part 97 fairly thoroughly from your own admission.
> Thus you had done the equivalent studying. You don't have to use
> pre-prepared study guides but must learn the material somewhere, which is
> what you did. Even if you could have done it all in the night before that
> doesn't mean that every EE could have. A person doesn't have to use any
> particular method of learning or particular set of books.
>
> Some one with ONLY an electrical engineering degree and no other background
> could have passed the tests with no further study. They aren't born knowing

> the material on rules, regs, propagation,etc and they don't learn it in
> college.
>
> The books are merely a handy compilation of the material that will be
> addressed in the tests. There's no requirement to use that particular
> approach to preparing for the test. Since you had already covered the
> material by other means of learning and studying, it would have been
> pointless to have read them.
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
>

487. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 19:30:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6B9666.D5CEA762@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62724

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6AC46B.27CA6E34@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > >
> > > > Stop thinking of the code as a barrier. You advance by passing Element 1,
> > > > that's how.
> > >
> > > Yes, yes, that's how I didit. But what of element two? And what of
> > > people who cannot pass element one?
> > >
> > They fail the exam. They may attempt it again--as many times as is
> > necessary.
>
> As is necessary for what?

Give it some study. Ponder it. Let it sink in. Maybe the answer will
come to you.

> > > Dave thinks he's the World's Greatest DXer and is?
> > >
> > Brian, are you attempting to emulate Len or are you a simpleton?
>
> Talk like that isn't going to get you anywhere.

It has been my experience that writing (we aren't talking) anything
directed to you doesn't often get through your perma-haze.

> Must it be one or the other? Even the VEC exams offer four choices.
>
> > You and only you have used the term "World's Greatest DXer" and
> > attempted to apply it to me. I've not only never used it to refer to
> > myself, I've previously corrected you when you've used it. Are you
> > beyond honesty?
>
> Sorry. I forgot.
>
> Now I remember. You are God.

Nope, wrong again. You just can't be honest.

Dave K8MN

488. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 19:33:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6B973D.14A773C8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62725

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6AC066.3A6E46F8@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
> > >
> > > > >Are these UK amateurs considered proficient?
> > >
> > > > I'd say they were.
> > >
> > > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> > > At what speed (in WPM) did they send their message?
> > >
> > You'd have us believe that the speed used on 136 KHz was their maximum
> > or are you,
>
> Not at all. Why would you say something like that?

...because, like Leonard H., you seem to confuse to words: efficient and
proficient.

> > like Leonard H. confusing profiency with efficiency?
>
> Just as long as you don't confuse it.
>
> Is 0.02WPM proficient?

It can't be proficient or unproficient. Are the two ops *morse
proficient*?

> Is 0.02WPM efficiant?

I don't know about "efficiant" but it isn't efficient.

Dave K8MN

489. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 20:48:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303091248.562566d1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62726

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6B53BD.6A386679@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Responding from the TOP,
> >
> > "Very Tiny Bandwidth" is a bad thing?
> >
> > "Limited Data Rate" is a bad thing?
> >
> > Perhaps by "words per month" you are implying that these world record
> > setters are NOT proficient?
>
> Brian, the conclusion is fast becoming inescapable that you're losing whatever reasoning powers you
> may have once had. If you can't differntiate manual Morse code from that used by the very slow code
> experimenters you're about ready for the looney bin.

I think it was obvious that when you introduced your "banana boat swing" to evade machine copy that I understood the difference.

Why would today be any different than then?

490. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 20:51:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303091251.5eed4a00@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62727

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6B5178.6398E3C6@att.net>...
> Dennis Ferguson wrote:

> > Bad math, I think. PARIS is 50 dot periods, or 1 word every 50 minutes,
> > so the word per minute rate is 1 per 0.833 hours, or 0.02 WPM. Still
> > not too fast, though.
> >
> > Dennis Ferguson
>
> Hey Dennis- Thankyew. I for one very much appreciate your very objective
> evaluation as opposed to
> the very crippled,opionated diatribe by
> Len-way-the-hell-over-21-but-acts-like-5.
>
> I must also congratulate you on the fact that every time you evalute something
> in a post here, it comes
> out the same-very objective and undistorted. I have no idea what you do for a
> vocation but in my view
> your employer, assuming you have one, is very fortunate to have you on board.
>
> 73, Dick

I appreciate it as well. Like the time when Dennis came through on
the Morse definition issue, and the other time when he came through on
the French hams out of band issue.

My hat is off to you, Dennis. Thanks.

Brian

491. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 20:54:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303091254.3fda837@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62728

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6B5515.3B88DA08@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Neb Revod <spammers@biteme.com> wrote in message
news:<MPG.18d32cda2ff2e519896c8@pdx.news.speakeasy.net>...
> > > In article <v6j1b2s1cjv4fe@corp.supernews.com>, kb9tmp@juno.com says...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Larry
> > > > Since they have set a record that means they must be
> > > > on the cutting edge of Amateur Radio. And they are
> > > > using good old Morse's Code to accomplish it!
> > > > So much for it being a "dead mode" of little use.
> > >
> > > Not quite right. Cutting edge? Arguably yes, but it was NOT "good old
> > > Morse's Code" in any sense other than the actual encoding of characters.
> > > Any arbitrary scheme of distinguishable periods of modulation, used to
> > > encode the characters could have been used. Moreover, the feat required
> > > the use of software (computers) at both ends. It could NOT have been
> > > accomplished by two CW'ers putting fist to key.
> >
> > Extra Dick/W0EX knows how to thwart 'puter copy.
> >
> > Ask him about it.
>
> Be glad to inform you, Slim. All it takes for most comuter programs I've seen to copy
garbage is any sort of
> noise in the circuit. Or code which isn't near-perfect in its timing, such as some of
that sent by a bug or
> some (many?) inept handkey senders.

Then there is the intentional sloppy sending of some vile Extra, who
bragged on here that he could evade machine copy by less than worthy
no-code Techs.

> Of course with your very crippled analytical abilities you have trouble putting facts
together to reach a
> valid conclusion, as always.

I was just taking you at your word, DICK.

492. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 21:25:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303091325.21587652@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62729

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6B58A9.8093D1BD@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > > Given your track record I doubt many readers will be inclined to
> > > accept anything you "know" at face value.
> >
> > I'd be disinclined to believe that. For example, you and Dave didn't
> > know that a Commander had the authority to grant amateur operations in
> > Somalia.
>
> Un huh. And you don't have any realistic grip on the term "commander" at all. To say nothing of the
> term "permission".

Sure I do.

> > You and Dave would knowingly work out of band Frenchmen on 6M.
>
> You have no idea what constitutes knowledge either.

It constitutes something other than hazing rituals and tea ceremonies.

> > You cannot figure out how to operate amateur radio away from the power
> > mains.
>
> You're so stupid to even make such a comment that it doesn't even deserve response.

I merely took you at your word. You said you couldn't operate HF away
from home. Is your word no good anymore?

> > That's just some recent stuff. I don't have any more time to devote
> > to your ineptness.
>
> Inept is clearly another term you have no feel for, but that you describes you so very well.

Do tell.

> > > If I was in QSO with a foreign ham and some clod came on the frequency
> > > and informed me that I shouldn't be talking to that guy because that guy
> > > was out of his allotted band I'd likely say "Buzz off Slim/Brian. You're
> > > in no position to 'know'". And besides it's none of YOUR business, just
> > > as it's none of your business how Dave handles his on the air contacts.
> >
> > Who's talking about "some clod???"
> >
> > I said you already knew the French allocation on 6M, yet you intend to

> > go ahead and work them out of band.
> >
>
> Like I said, some clod -like you- comes on the frequency and yells "Hey that Frenchman you're talking to is
> out of his band!" and now that constitutes "knowledge". So much for your grasp of that term, too.

Well, I think Dennis Ferguson put that one to bed. Too bad you don't
buy into regulations that you've been informed of. Before the fact
ignorance is one thing. You're something else.

> Do you know very much about ANYTHING at all?

I know you are Extra Dick.

493. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 21:27:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309162717.27873.00001001@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 62730

In article <b4ejii$2fbs$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) writes:

(exceedingly readable and balanced treatment of S25.5 and how it is a regulation, not a recommendation, snipped for brevity.)

>> Japan has waived Recommendation S25.5 for a certain class of
>> their amateur license which does have HF privileges.

>I have no idea how Japan justified that, but I would be exceedingly
>surprised if the US decided to do anything similar.

Dennis,

Here's how:

Japan issues ham licenses with HF privileges but with no code test. These are "4th class" licenses, and Japan uses the following argument to justify not having a code test for them:

1) The purpose of the ITU treaty is to avoid harmful interference and to promote orderly use of the radio spectrum.

2) In regards to Japanese amateur radio, two kinds of harmful interference need to be dealt with: interference to non-amateur radio services of all countries, and interference to non-Japanese radio amateurs.

3) 4th class Japanese hams' HF privileges are only on frequencies that are worldwide exclusive amateur, so interference to nonamateur sevices is prevented.

4) 4th class Japanese hams are only allowed to use very low power on HF (10 watts PEP, as I recall), and Japan is an island nation, so harmful interference to amateurs of other countries is avoided.

Thus, Japan says it is not in violation of the treaty, because its measures re 4th class licenses meet the goals of the treaty. You may not agree with Japan's reasoning, but to my knowledge no other country has challenged Japan on it in at least the past 35 years.

Note that the other three classes of Japanese amateur radio license DO require a code test.

73 de Jim, N2EY

494. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 21:27:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309162718.27873.00001002@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 62731

In article <Mkeaa.4548$se1.2614504@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>While there are people working to do this, there is no way to be certain if
>or when it will happen. Even though it may be considered at this summers
>conference, there's no guarantee that it will be voted on and there's no
>guarantee what direction such a vote would take.

Agreed, Dee, but if/when the question does come up, I doubt very much that there will be adequate support among the various nations to keep the Morse code test requirement in place. Just my opinion, based on a lot of things I've read.

>In addition, even if the
>ITU drops the requirement, each country will still have the freedom to keep
>it if they so use.

Agreed. And this is one of the arguments that will most probably be used against keeping the ITU requirement! Boils down to 'if the government of Country X wants to keep the Morse code test(s), nothing in the ITU treaty will stop them. However, Countries Y and Z won't have to do so.'

>Here in the US, it would take many months. First of
>all the FCC would put out a Notice of Proposed Rule Making. Then there
>would be time allowed for comments. And finally the FCC might or might not
>change it. This entire process would take quite a long time.
>
Maybe not.

FCC asked for commentary on the code test requirements as part of the 2000 restructuring NPRM (98-143). Well over 2000 comments were received, the majority of them supporting continued code testing at either two speeds or three speeds.

FCC, however, reduced the code test requirement to the single 5 wpm code test (Element 1). FCC specifically said it found only one reason to keep any code tests at all. That reason was the ITU treaty requirement.

FCC said code testing served 'no regulatory purpose' other than meeting the treaty requirement for HF/MF ham licenses.

FCC also denied all petitions for reconsideration of its decision.

Seems pretty obvious that without the treaty requirement, FCC could just eliminate Element 1 and be done with it. FCC could say that the issue had been adequately argued in 1998, 1999 and 2000 and that they were simply acting on their previous conclusion.

As you say, Dee, no guarantees, but it looks pretty promising.

However, before the FCC does remove the code test, it's pretty obvious that S25.5 would have to go away (mid-summer at the earliest?) AND the Senate would have to ratify the revised ITU treaty (fall? winter?). Even if FCC doesn't do the full NPRM thing, it will be late this year at the earliest before we see changes.

>In the time that it would take for this change to happen, IF it happens, a
>person could learn the code and be on the air for months. It is pointless
>to wait. Especially since the sunspot cycle is on the declining side of the
>cycle. The average person can learn the 5wpm in approximately 30 hours of
>study and practice using modern study methods. Two fifteen minute sessions
>per day every day and you've got it in only two months.

I agree 100%. There's lots of great freeware out there (G4FON's was mentioned here recently, for example) to make learning as easy as possible.

And in the process, a ham will have learned a very useful basic radio communication skill.

73 de Jim, N2EY

495. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 22:08:52 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309170852.09269.00000065@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 62732

From: deehays@qix.net (Dee)
>One could go on and on with examples of things that people are
>required to learn throughout their lives that at the time they don't
>see any reason for but later find useful.

You have given some good examples. I see that now.

496. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 22:28:16 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309172816.09269.00000069@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 62733

From: deehays@qix.net (Dee)
>And just when did colleges and universities add radio service rules
>and regulations to the EE curriculum or any other curriculum?
>Engineers won't know them without studying them.

Having an EE degree helps alot for the written test. Even for the rules and regulations section. You're right - these sections usually do not get covered in an EE curriculum. One can benefit from these aspects. Thats one thing I like about the written tests. The material for the tests is very good - IF one learns the material. It gives good coverage in the various aspects of amateur radio.

Believe it or not, I really appreciate the safety section, rules section, etc. True, I focus on the circuit theory section, but I appreciate the rules and regulations section. I may not want to master those areas, but I appreciate having some knowledge of these areas.

497. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 22:47:45 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309174745.09269.00000070@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 62734

>From: "me" me@here.com
>Still, no answer to the question of the engineers being an addition to the
>hobby.

By the way, who is "me".

I have addressed that question in this thread. I believe EEs would feel out of place in Ham radio clubs today, and therefore not want to join.

I believe that engineers would benefit the hobby. Lets not drive away people, the addition of, who can be a benefit to the hobby's publicity.

The way to do this is to start or join "experimenter" clubs. Also, having more awards such as "Worked All Bands" as opposed to "Worked All States". This would encourage acheivements in these areas. Having topics such as "return loss" at conventions, instead of "how to use soup cans in building antennas" would help also.

498. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 23:07:50 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <jtln6vknuh8r5rnduk2hm6uaeesk888ciq@4ax.com>
Source record: 62735

On 09 Mar 2003 04:57:36 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:
>>news:<20030305213805.09289.00002704@mb-ch.aol.com>...
>>>
>>> > Kim showed up in this
>>> > newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign, and
>>> > literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
>>> > she asked for.
>>> >
>>> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>>
>>> Larry, that's rapist mentality.
>>
>>I told him that long ago...trouble is: he knows.
>>
>>Kim W5TIT
>
>Kim/Brian:
>
>A rapist is a person who commits violent sexual assault on a
>woman against her will. A rapist is a felon, a criminal.
>
>Now -- let me get this straight, and be VERY specific: Are you
>accusing me of this? Are you accusing me of having a "mentality"
>which could cause me to commit such an act? Please provide
>your answer right here in the newsgroup -- before witnesses
>known and unknown.
>
>If you have any doubt as to whether the thing you insinuated
>about me is true, I'd suggest some extremely rapid backpedaling --
>and sincere, thoughtful, and contrite apologies offered both in
>the newsgroup and in private E-mail. You have 72 hours from
>the date/time of this posting. After that, I will assume that you
>stand by your statements.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

With the world on the brink of war, the global economy falling apart
at the seams, and terrorism making the headlines around the world on a
daily basis....

IS THE THE BEST FREAKING THING YOU PEOPLE HAVE TO ARGUE ABOUT?

For Christ's sake, GROW UP!

I see so much petty nitpicking, name-calling, and posturing going on here, we might as well rename the channel rec.radio.CBWANNABES.policy.

Damn. You people make me ashamed to be a ham.

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

499. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 23:45:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303091545.7dcc9f37@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62736

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E6B973D.14A773C8@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6AC066.3A6E46F8@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>
> > > > > >Are these UK amateurs considered proficient?
>
> > > > > I'd say they were.
>
> > > > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> > > > At what speed (in WPM) did they send their message?
> > > >
> > > You'd have us believe that the speed used on 136 KHz was their maximum
> > > or are you,
> > >
> > Not at all. Why would you say something like that?
>
> ...because, like Leonard H., you seem to confuse to words: efficient and
> proficient.

Two? OK.

Why would I confuse them?

> > > like Leonard H. confusing profiency with efficiency?
> > >
> > Just as long as you don't confuse it.
> >
> > Is 0.02WPM proficient?
>
> It can't be proficient or unproficient. Are the two ops *morse
> proficient*?

You say that 5wpm Morse ops aren't proficient, but you don't know if
0.02wpm Morse ops are or aren't proficient.

Sounds like some kind of bias.

> > Is 0.02WPM efficiant?
>
> I don't know about "efficiant" but it isn't efficient.

>
> Dave K8MN

Now now, Dave. Pick yourself up and dust yourself off. I didn't intentionally mispell a word in order to trip you up. It was purely an accident.

Brian

500. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 23:54:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309185413.23598.00000707@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 62738

In article <20030306194404.06818.00000150@mb-cl.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0303050909.659aa95c@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
>>news:<3E659A78.861C802B@att.net>...
>>> N2EY wrote:
>>
>>> > Show us some numbers, Len.....
>>>
>>> snip
>>>
>>> All Len will *ever* show is his bare backside.
>>>
>>> AVeryFineSpeciMan indeed.
>>
>>Dick,
>>
>>Why so negative? Perhaps Len has some useful information about ARS
>>license numbers that he hasn't shared yet.
>
> I've "shared" information 5 years ago on the FCC's own database
> (available then, as now, free to the public).

I've posted actual numbers of licensed hams, derived from that database.

> Got arguments and
> charges of "lying" about it...:-)

"Poor baby. Can't you take a little tweak?" (those are your words) ;-) ;-) ;-)
>
>>For example, if he has old
>>Callbooks or CD-ROMs, he could generate a listing of license class
>>totals over various time periods and share it with the newsgroup.
>
> FCC grants US amateur radio licenses, not the Callbook or
> CD-ROMs. :-)

So what's your point?

Do you have actual data to back up your claims or not?
>
> Ever since the restructuring period, the AH0A stat pages have
> lumped the two Technician totals into one pseudo-class.

So what?

I've posted the US license totals right here in this thread and kept Tech Pluses separate from Techs. 'Taint hard at all.

> That
> was clever for Speroni, an avowed PCTA...

Why?

> especially when the
> no-code-test Technicians can't be readily extracted to show
> the actual growth of non-morse hobbyists in the USA.

So now you finally admit that some Technicians are code tested and some are not.

> The
> rationales for them "being essentially the same" abound. :-)

From whom?

> One CAN get somewhat-old data from the Speroni stat site
> for a relatively short period before restructuring.

I don't use that data for license totals.

(N2EY)

> has
> never accepted such arguments

What arguments?

All I recall is you claiming over and over that all Techs were non-code-tested and had no HF privileges - with or without CSCEs.

Perhaps you could refresh my memory?

> since he too is an avowed
> PCTA and insists on the morse code test not being any sort of
> valid reason. :-)

Ah, the old ad hominem attack.
>
>>Such data could either support or work against his claims.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. In previous numbers games in here,

(N2EY)

> has been steadfast in rationalizing his viewpoints and using
> sources and presentations from those sources which are
> biased towards his own viewpoints (that of an avowed PCTA).

Really? What sources would those be? Callbooks? Do you have other sources that show different numbers?

>
> ALL of those exchanges are in Google. :-)

So show us some where you prove your points.
>
> The FCC makes the entire US amateur radio license database
> available to the public, updated each week.

And I post the license class totals here twice a month.

> That is the source
> of "Callbook data" and "CD-ROM data" except that downloaders
> often do further sorting for their own purposes. Such sorting and
> tabulation is NOT government approved, just based on
> government data.

So what's your point? The discussion is about historic data.

(N2EY)

> is free to download the FCC data-
> base and sort his own directly.

So are you. You've got the time, and you're the one making the claims about
growth.
>
>>Without
>>such data, those claims are just wild speculation presented as facts.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk! "Wild speculation!" :-)

Yup. About all you do here, Len, besides sling insults ;-)
>
> PCTAs in here seem to be imbued with morsemen's wild hair
> on even the least negative attitude towards morse code's
> macho magnificence.

Where?

> [see Mr.N2EY, Dickiebird, the colonel,
> the flipped-out hostile action hero, and some other bus riders,
> see also Dick and Jane plus Archie from ARRL in old ham
> comic book strips]

And we should look to YOU for guidance??
>
> There's very selective non-acceptance of "facts" in here by the
> PCTA regulars if such facts do not exemplify, honor, and
> revere mighty morse. QED. "It is as demonstrated."

First you need to present some facts.
>
> Since my two Callbooks (same year, different sorting) from the
> mid 1970s long since went to the recycling can...so did my

> three IEEE membership directories (from different years), old
> telephone directories, old industry periodicals and old catalogs...
> stating the personal presence of such data sources is not
> strictly "factual." Factual implies that a data source is available
> for anyone to peruse, reference, or check...and remains un-
> changed in content. Anyone.

Sounds like you really don't have any data, huh Len?
>
> Deliberate biasing of true factual data is bogus, the "wild
> speculation" of

(N2EY)'s

> charge.

Then why do you do it so often, Len? ;-)

> An example is the bundling
> together of the Speroni stats for Technician and Technician-Plus
> so as to mask those that were code tested versus those that
> were not code tested for their licenses.

Guess what, Len: Some Technicians are code tested and some aren't. Both before and after restructuring.

btw, I'm not AH0A.

(N2EY)

> should busy himself with downloading the weekly FCC
> free databases and sorting them out himself..

Why? You are the one making the claims, you should be doing the data processing.

> instead of using
> others' databases?

Why duplicate work already done?

> Or prepare another Sermon on the Antenna
> Mount evangelizing the Right Attitude on the worship and
> reverence of morsemanship.

Sounds like you have no data to share.

501. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 23:54:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309185414.23598.00000708@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 62737

In article <3e6a0ac8@snipnews.snip.net>, "Radio Funtimes"
<stinkyhamops444@yahoo.com> writes:

>Bill, I know 4 good Electrical Engineers who would
>get their ham ticket tomorrow if they did not have
>to learn the stupid arcane archaic code.

Don't they know that the Technician class of amateur radio license has not had
a code test for more than 12 years?

>These people
>would be an asset to the hobby,

If they cannot spare the time to learn enough to pass the 5 wpm code test, when
will they have the time to be "an asset to the hobby"?

> yet the code is a
>hinderance.

Do you mean the code TEST or the code itself?

>(what Engineer who puts in 9+ hour
>workdays and has a family has the time to learn code?)

Plenty that I know.

What about people from other walks of life? Do you think 'engineers' should get
some sort of free ride?

>The only reason I did is I was single whe I got my
>ticket back in '76. You would thisnk ARRL would
>put code to bed once and for all.

Code or code test?

Besides, it's the FCC who make the rules, not ARRL. And FCC won;t change the
rules until the ITU treaty changes.

>Finally, to anyone
>who thinks code is a "screwball barrier" take a listen
>to 14.313 14.275 and parts of 75 at night.
>So much for that hollow-argument!! Oy Vey.... :)

Are any of those folks actually USING code to communicate?

73 de Jim, N2EY (also MSEE & BSEE)

502. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 23:56:41 UTC
From: me <me@here.com>
Message-ID: <b4gsf5$l2t$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62747

Who is vshah101? This is me.

The addition of awards would only add interest to a limited group of individuals in the hobby.

Internet is doing a better job at attracting interest. One could only imagine how far the Internet would have gotten if it had a 5 WPM code requirement.

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030309174745.09269.00000070@mb-fr.aol.com...
> >From: "me" me@here.com
> >Still, no answer to the question of the engineers being an addition to the
> >hobby.
>
> By the way, who is "me".
>
> I have addressed that question in this thread. I believe EEs would feel out of
> place in Ham radio clubs today, and therefore not want to join.
>
> I believe that engineers would benefit the hobby. Lets not drive away people,
> the addition of, who can be a benefit to the hobby's publicity.
>
> The way to do this is to start or join "experimenter" clubs. Also, having more
> awards such as "Worked All Bands" as opposed to "Worked All States". This would
> encourage acheivements in these areas. Having topics such as "return loss" at
> conventions, instead of "how to use soup cans in building antennas" would help
> also.

503. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-09 23:57:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303091557.62315767@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62739

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6B5304.3D1D6692@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030308121846.19625.00000139@mb-bd.aol.com>...
> > > >the code is a
> > > >hinderance. (what Engineer who puts in 9+ hour
> > > >workdays and has a family has the time to learn code?)
> > >
> > > If they dont have enough time to learn the code, then how will they have enough
> > > time to operate?
> >
> > Learning the code was a huge sink of time. Trying to use it was
> > another "less than useful" sink of time.
> >
>
> So continous posting of inane drivel to this NG is a productive use of your time by
comparison. We
> see.

Seems to work for you, Extra DICK.

> > I see that you never spent enough time at it to become "proficient"
> > (proficient in the words of Larry, Dick, Dave, et al).
>
> So tell us how you divined that brilliant conclusion.

Through brilliance and divination.

504. Wayne is one funny dude:Re: ARNewsline 1334 - March 7 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 00:27:12 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303091627.bbd2522@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62740
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.survival

radionews@aol.com (Radionews) wrote in message
news:<20030309125720.15851.00000190@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1334 – March 7, 2003

big snip

> --
>
> Writing in his March editorial, the prolific W-2-Never[-Say]-Die quotes a rather
> strange idea he says comes from Newsmax.com. Its a story recommending that
> Israel set up narrow passages at every checkpoint with sandbags to absord any
> explosions. Then use UHF transmitters to detonate any explosives that a
> terrorist may be trying to sneak in. That says Green would get rid of a lot of
> suicide bombers in short order.

Sure. Hook it up to the web and let the gamers go at it. Some might
even pay good money to zap the bad guys. But where do you get blast
proof UHF antennas and cameras?

> But Green takes it a lot futher. He suggests that the United States adopt a
> psychological approach to fighting terrorists. He says that we should set up a
> series of radio and television broadcasts in the Arabic language. He says that
> the programs would be made up of psychics supposedly interviewing dead suicide
> bombers who are screaming that they are roasting in hell and not enjoying the
> after-life that they were promised. The psychics would also claim that God is
> furious with them and has put a curse on their families.

Maybe the gal with the Jamaican accent could make out a deal for work
release.

> Would it work? On this one we won’t even venture a guess. But 73’s Green
> does add this comment. He says that it is far better to outsmart enemies than
> to try to outfight them. It’s cheaper, says W2NSD, and that it saves lives.

I'll have to admit that George and Tom are breaking the bank on this
one, which is what the Terrs had hoped for anyway, right?

> For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Blair Alper, KA9SEQ.
>
> --
>
> Green also has some advice for the United States military on how not to fight a
> war with Iraq. That one you really have to read for yourself. You will find
> that information on page 4 of the March 2003 issue of 73. (73 Magazine)

Looks like I need to pick up a copy of 73 Mad Magazine.

505. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 01:07:07 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <99EC6478B0E720F5.1735DD57EE2092F8.73833F072EB5DB27@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62742

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b4fsve$6f5$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> What Im angry about is the dumbing down of Amateur radio...as evidenced by
> your idiotic response.
>
> Have a nice day
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

And, I think your response accurately reflects that I hit the nail on the
head. You have a nice day, too.

Kim W5TIT

> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:EDAF21B2823D0AD4.B863DE4A601815FE.DCAEBB686E132AD4@lp.airnews.net...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:b4e3h4$c4l$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > Sorry to tell you Dee....but the short term ham license appears to be
> the
> > > 'standard'. Folks dont know what PEP is, or how to measure it for
the
> > > various modes. They don't know the basic 468/Fmhz formula for a 1/2
> wave
> > in
> > > free space dipole.
> > >
> > > Etc. Etc.
> > >
> > > But they are dang good at screaming 'contact', and such as that.
> > >
> > > Can someone help me here? What is a signal report of 7 by 9 mean and
> what
> > > the heck is Seventy Thirds?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> >
> > Hey Dan? Really. C'mon. There's got to be things about amateur radio,
> > scientific and non-scientific that you've missed or don't know. Or do
you
> > know everything there is to know about it?
> >
> > By the way--I know about PEP. I know that I don't want to be bothered

> with
> > it, so the most power I'll ever run is about 50-100 watts. So, why
would
> I
> > have to keep that knowledge up in my brain? Are you a walking, talking
> > encyclopedia of amateur radio. Have you retained absolutely everything
> you
> > ever learned about amateur radio?
> >
> > The items of which you speak above, by the way: the 7X9 signal report
and
> > people saying Seventy Thirds? You complain first of people not knowing
> what
> > you believe to be some pretty important aspects of ham radio, but end
with
> > complaining about something pretty trite--the way someone chooses to
> > communicate though they are within the rules and regs. Which is it that
> > bothers you the most? Because I've heard some pretty darned "learned"
ham
> > radio operators that communicate like idiots. And, I've heard some
pretty
> > darned dumb amateur radio operators that communicate like experts. So,
> Dan,
> > what is that you're actually angry about?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
>

506. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 01:10:32 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <53BCD908063FD0A9.2A63ECDFB9CC7B6D.70516F9F2AB2A01B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62744

```
"me" <me@here.com> wrote in message
news:b4g29l$hc3$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> Still, no answer to the question of the engineers being an addition to the
> hobby.
>

Of course! Anyone is a great addition to the hobby. What I was responding
to is the statement "...why should the engineers even have to learn the
code."

Kim W5TIT

>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:87177F84FA833D64.05A561EDC4A1BB77.B14125297777A5CA@lp.airnews.net...
> > "me" <me@here.com> wrote in message
> > news:b4dt67$v3j$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > The orginial point was why should the engineers even have to learn the
> > code.
> > >
> > > Would an electrial engineer be an addition to a hobby that is
interested
> > in
> > > electronics?
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Isn't that a most arrogant attitude? Just because of your potential
> > contribution, you should be given leeway? Pshaw...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
>
```

507. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 01:14:13 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <110991C41A93E2D9.D8A1DCAE07231395.36FB3599140A4573@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62743

"AB2HR" <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:jtln6vknuh8r5rnduk2hm6uaeesk888ciq@4ax.com...
> On 09 Mar 2003 04:57:36 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
> >>news:<20030305213805.09289.00002704@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> >>>
> >>> > Kim showed up in this
> >>> > newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign,
and
> >>> > literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
> >>> > she asked for.
> >>> >
> >>> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>>
> >>> Larry, that's rapist mentality.
> >>
> >>I told him that long ago...trouble is: he knows.
> >>
> >>Kim W5TIT
> >
> >Kim/Brian:
> >
> >A rapist is a person who commits violent sexual assault on a
> >woman against her will. A rapist is a felon, a criminal.
> >
> >Now -- let me get this straight, and be VERY specific: Are you
> >accusing me of this? Are you accusing me of having a "mentality"
> >which could cause me to commit such an act? Please provide
> >your answer right here in the newsgroup -- before witnesses
> >known and unknown.
> >
> >If you have any doubt as to whether the thing you insinuated
> >about me is true, I'd suggest some extremely rapid backpedaling --
> >and sincere, thoughtful, and contrite apologies offered both in
> >the newsgroup and in private E-mail. You have 72 hours from
> >the date/time of this posting. After that, I will assume that you
> >stand by your statements.
> >
> >73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> With the world on the brink of war, the global economy falling apart
> at the seams, and terrorism making the headlines around the world on a
> daily basis....
>

> IS THE THE BEST FREAKING THING YOU PEOPLE HAVE TO ARGUE ABOUT?
>
> For Christ's sake, GROW UP!
>
> I see so much petty nitpicking, name-calling, and posturing going on
> here, we might as well rename the channel rec.radio.CBWANNABES.policy.
>
> Damn. You people make me ashamed to be a ham.
>
> Raymond Sirois AB2HR
> SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
> 607-733-5745
> telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000
>

Ho hum. Whatevah...

Kim W5TIT

508. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 01:19:25 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v6nq38h7aikgc2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62741

No, but I wonder if PSK31 might be adapted. Rather than 31 baud, slow it down to 3.1 baud and adapt other tones to bring the bandwidth down. Using DSP techniques, one might get down to a 5 Hz bandwidth and still enjoy five words per minute transmission. On off keying is not as rugged as frequency shift keying. Sure, they made contact (that is great), but using on/off keying, I doubt you'd get anything useful if it is buried that deep in noise :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim
ps - I used to love CW and hope to get back on HF and enjoy it again. It is not exactly state-of-the-art and let's not start the CW/no code thread again :)

--

> Responding from the TOP,
>
> "Very Tiny Bandwidth" is a bad thing?
>
> "Limited Data Rate" is a bad thing?
>
> Perhaps by "words per month" you are implying that these world record
> setters are NOT proficient?
>
> Brian
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.459 / Virus Database: 258 - Release Date: 2/25/03

509. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 01:37:32 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309203732.01362.00000090@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 62745

From: "Dan/W4NTI"
>Does this cult require 'human sacrafice' ??

No, the Ham radio cult does not require human sacrifice.
A subcult of Ham radio (Wouff Hong) believes in torture (by some odd looking
torture device), however.

510. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 02:08:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4gs8o$o6i$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62746

"N3THJ" <n3thj2000nospam@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:01c2e4de$e56884a0$82878685@clip...
> A friend of mine is looking at upgrading to General, and
> was inquiring about the elimination of the code requirement.
> I really didn't have an answer, other than they were supposedly
> taking it up this month at the big meeting. Has anyone in here
> heard anything in regards to what may happen or when?
> This is an honest question and I am looking for honest
> answers. Please reply to the NG, as I don't need my mailbox filled
> with flames.
> Thanks, Bill

FYI, from the Amateur radio Newsline #1334, March 7, 2003

RADIO RULES: WRC-03 GETS US POSITION

The U. S. Department of State has forwarded several agenda items to Geneva
as
being this nations opening position at the 2003 World Radiocommunictions
Conference. The most important of these relate to International Radio
Regulation s-25 and its sub-parts. Included in the initial United States
position is rewording S 25 subpart 1 to give member nations more authority
to
determine the points of communication of the amateur stations it has
licensed.
The suggested modifuication reads that administrators shall verify the
technical and operational qualifications of any person wishing to operate an
Amateur station.

The United States is also proposing to eliminate regulation 25.5. This is
the
rule that mandates Morse Code peoficiency examinations for all candidates
for
an Amateur license with high frequency operating priveleges. The United
States
says that its time to remove the Morse testing requirement and leave the
decision as whether or not to test for code up to individual I-T-U mermber
nations. (W5YI)

511. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10 02:22:26 UTC
From: me <me@here.com>
Message-ID: <b4gsrn$p58$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62748

```
Thank you for your response to the question.

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:53BCD908063FD0A9.2A63ECDFB9CC7B6D.70516F9F2AB2A01B@lp.airnews.net...
>
> "me" <me@here.com> wrote in message
> news:b4g29l$hc3$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> > Still, no answer to the question of the engineers being an addition to
the
> > hobby.
> >
>
> Of course! Anyone is a great addition to the hobby. What I was
responding
> to is the statement "...why should the engineers even have to learn the
> code."
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
> >
> > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> >
news:87177F84FA833D64.05A561EDC4A1BB77.B14125297777A5CA@lp.airnews.net...
> > > "me" <me@here.com> wrote in message
> > > news:b4dt67$v3j$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > > The orginial point was why should the engineers even have to learn
the
> > > code.
> > > >
> > > > Would an electrial engineer be an addition to a hobby that is
> interested
> > > in
> > > > electronics?
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > Isn't that a most arrogant attitude? Just because of your potential
> > > contribution, you should be given leeway? Pshaw...
> > > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> >
```

>
>

512. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 02:22:56 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v6ntqced8eof0f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62749

Jim,

Folks would be surprised how quickly one can learn the code. When Vietnam was hot, the Navy needed people as hospital corpsmen and radiomen. The entire company ahead of me in RM A school was shipped to 'Nam. Fail and sail. Of my class, only two of us could copy Morse code when we started. There were a few dozen folks in that class - and every one of 'em went from zero to 16 words per minute in a fairly limited number of weeks (in addition to having to memorize the baudot code for teletype along with everything else). A lot of people whine about ham radio being a 'cult', then turn on their transceivers and start yelling 'audiooooooo' and '10-4, good buddy'. Heck, what is this 'eagle' stuff with golf? Must be a cult, huh? What is a pre-emptive bid in bridge? All they're trying to do is prevent the opposition from bidding, so why not call it something like a 'shut-out' bid? Gee, must be a cult. All these rules and regulations! Heck, I drive the speed limit or less, why should someone tell me I must drive on the right side of the road when I'm left-handed? Must be discrimination, right? Well, I guess I got suckered into this old thread once again :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

--

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030309185414.23598.00000708@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3e6a0ac8@snipnews.snip.net>, "Radio Funtimes"
> <stinkyhamops444@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >Bill, I know 4 good Electrical Engineers who would
> >get their ham ticket tomorrow if they did not have
> >to learn the stupid arcane archaic code.
>
> Don't they know that the Technician class of amateur radio license has not
had
> a code test for more than 12 years?
>
> >These people
> >would be an asset to the hobby,
>
> If they cannot spare the time to learn enough to pass the 5 wpm code test,
when
> will they have the time to be "an asset to the hobby"?
>
> > yet the code is a

> >hinderance.
>
> Do you mean the code TEST or the code itself?
>
> >(what Engineer who puts in 9+ hour
> >workdays and has a family has the time to learn code?)
>
> Plenty that I know.
>
> What about people from other walks of life? Do you think 'engineers'
should get
> some sort of free ride?
>
> >The only reason I did is I was single whe I got my
> >ticket back in '76. You would thisnk ARRL would
> >put code to bed once and for all.
>
> Code or code test?
>
> Besides, it's the FCC who make the rules, not ARRL. And FCC won;t change
the
> rules until the ITU treaty changes.
>
> >Finally, to anyone
> >who thinks code is a "screwball barrier" take a listen
> >to 14.313 14.275 and parts of 75 at night.
> >So much for that hollow-argument!! Oy Vey.... :)
>
> Are any of those folks actually USING code to communicate?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY (also MSEE & BSEE)
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.459 / Virus Database: 258 - Release Date: 2/25/03

513. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 03:11:37 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <mjTaa.24466$Wy.17741@fe09.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 62750

Lloyd <Stumpjumper@Stumpjumper38945.net> wrote in message
news:b4btd7auq0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Hillary Hodunk" <Gomerez@gogomerezup.org> wrote in message
> news:b49bln$t3r$0@pita.alt.net...
> > Only thing more entertaining than reading ham radio
> > operators bicker over unimportant matters of no consequence
> > is going to a hamfest and actually seeing hundreds of
> > societal rejects and human debris wandering around
> > aimlessly.

Sounds like Loyd and Hillary are members of that group of persons who shall
nameness who live in
ratty trailer parks, and drive "Shivver-lo-lay" trucks with big whips on the
back.

My, my, aren't we jealous of all those frequencies, bands the FCC readily
allocates, whenever
possible, to all those worthless humans.
> >
> > Go go gomerieeze
>
>
> Jerry Springer should set up a booth for interviews at
> Hamfests. He would have an endless supply of guests for his
> shows. It was once said that Hamfests are in reality an
> endless parade of human debris.
>
> Lloyd

AW whassamatter, bud? Can't you muster the brain matter to pass that little
code test?

10-4, thar?

J

>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.435 / Virus Database: 244 - Release Date: 12/30/02

514. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 03:27:14 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.com>
Message-ID: <3E6C0612.8010000@mailcity.com>
Source record: 62773

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Brian:
> What may seem to
> be an innocently witty joke to her could easily cause potential hams to
> decide to take up a different hobby -- and I couldn't blame them.

As Charlie Brown would say, "good grief!". Get a grip Roll, I am
not defending her choice of a call sign by any means, it is in
poor taste, but if someone is so weak minded as to be put off of
ham radio because of it, then they don't need to be in ham radio.

515. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 03:28:31 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.com>
Message-ID: <3E6C065F.8050402@mailcity.com>
Source record: 62774

Brian wrote:

>
> DICK does that for me, but hey, he's a Vet too.

You mean he doctors animals?

516. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 03:58:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6C0D92.98A8FD37@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62751

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6B973D.14A773C8@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6AC066.3A6E46F8@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
> >
> > > > > > >Are these UK amateurs considered proficient?
> >
> > > > > > I'd say they were.
> >
> > > > > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> > > > > At what speed (in WPM) did they send their message?
> > > > >
> > > > You'd have us believe that the speed used on 136 KHz was their maximum
> > > > or are you,
> > > >
> > > Not at all. Why would you say something like that?
> >
> > ...because, like Leonard H., you seem to confuse to words: efficient and
> > proficient.
>
> Two? OK.
>
> Why would I confuse them?

Seemingly because you didn't know what at least one of them means.

> > > > like Leonard H. confusing profiency with efficiency?
> > >
> > > Just as long as you don't confuse it.
> > >
> > > Is 0.02WPM proficient?
> >
> > It can't be proficient or unproficient. Are the two ops *morse
> > proficient*?
>
> You say that 5wpm Morse ops aren't proficient, but you don't know if
> 0.02wpm Morse ops are or aren't proficient.

>
> Sounds like some kind of bias.

Why not at all, Brian. Sounds like you didn't understand much of what has been written about all of this previously. You often have that trouble. Previously I'd written about operators whose maximum receiving speed was five word per minute. Do you think the ops described in the story about a DX contact on 136 KHz were using their top morse receiving speed?

> > > Is 0.02WPM efficiant?
> >
> > I don't know about "efficiant" but it isn't efficient.

> Now now, Dave. Pick yourself up and dust yourself off. I didn't
> intentionally mispell a word in order to trip you up. It was purely
> an accident.

I don't believe your misspelling was intentional.

Dave K8MN

517. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 04:04:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309230402.27196.00002045@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 62759

In article <3E6B62E9.3040504@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

> At the risk of turning this into a productive thread and getting an
>education, (always dangerous here in rrap!) What is the rationale for
>such slow data rate transmissions? I certainly would expect slower than
>normal for these initial tests, and of course the bandwidth at 136 kHz
>is limited, but I'm curious. Seems like since computers are doing the
>work, it would be possible to send at a more "normal" rate.

Define "normal."

"Education" for yourself is a personal thing and does not drive
this newsgroup. Insults hurled by outraged, wounded egos
drive the newsgroup. :-)

Extremely compressed "education" -

Time is the inverse of frequency. Bandwidth refers to the total
amount of spectrum space necessary for reception and
minimally adequate reproduction of orginal transmitted
information. Noise is the random noise from all sources in the
universe that does not carry information desired. Noise is
expressed as a power in Watts and generally (but not always)
assumed to have an equal average power at all frequencies
below 100 GHz and above absolute zero (-273 degrees C). In
most receivers the major source of noise is the input stage
beginning with the antenna itself, the antenna coupling method
and all components therein, the first active amplification stage.

In a 1947 seminal paper on communication circuit efficiency,
Claude E. Shannon showed the relationship between
information rate, bandwidth, noise, and error probability of
communication of the information. Those relationships were
adopted worldwide by industry, academicians, theorists, and
engineers. It is familiarly known as "Shannon's Law." [first
printed in the monthly Bell Systems Technical Journal, copies
were available from the University of Illinois on-line library of
historical documents...I have one in PDF]

Shannon's Law works on probabilities of correct information
transferrence. The "better" a communication circuit, the lesser
the number of errors. There is no such thing as "perfect copy"
but rather an extremely low probability of errors from any
source.

Noise power in a communications circuit is proportional to the square-root of the bandwidth necessary to preserve the original transmitted information. Since that noise is assumed completely random, that proportionality has been shown to be correct. While not relating directly to Shannon's Law as applied, a completely random noise source power will always add to the noise power from another completely random noise source in a linear mixing device.

Errors in a communication circuit are related to the signal to noise powers ratio. As that ratio goes lower, the error probability due to noise increases. Conversely, as the ratio goes higher, the error probability decreases. That ratio becomes a figure of merit for a communications circuit, familiarly known as the "signal to noise ratio" (sometimes "SNR" or "S:N") generally and "bit error rate" or BER to all those in any form of digital communications.

Noise power can be reduced by narrowing the communications bandwidth (square-root numerical as stated). But, bandwidth is limited by the rate of the information to be communicated. In simple carrier modulation applications the necessary bandwidth is approximately the inverse of the information rate expressed in units of time. [the now-common computer modem uses both amplitude and phase modulation plus bit combinations to increase the overall information communications rate without violation of bandwidth necessary for a single modulation of just AM or PM]

Since both noise and a desired signal are powers, statistical mathematics laws can be used to identify periods of time having just noise or the noise-plus-signal. Given enough time to do the averaging and other determinations of correctness, it is possible to detect a signal-plus-noise power that is only a small fraction of a decibel above just the noise power. The statistical averaging is generally done with some form of computer assistance for convenience although analogue methods could be used. Radio astronomers have been working regularly and successfully for over three decades on separating stellar radio objects where the signal source power was at least 20 db below natural noise power. The ability of such seemingly minute discrimination of noise versus signal-plus-noise can only be done for relatively long periods of time (relative to whatever minimum bandwidth is required).

The use of statistical mathematical laws allows a communications circuit to redefine its bandwidth, to make it an inverse of the time of averaging-comparison of signal-plus-noise to noise. Increasing time is equivalent to a decrease of bandwidth. As bandwidth is reduced, so is the total noise power. As noise power is reduced, the probability of error is also reduced. A communications information rate of 100 seconds per unit (0.01 Hertz) will have an effective signal to noise ratio of 10 db in power versus a rate of 1 second per unit of information (1.0 Hz). Effective bandwidth

reduction is 100:1 but the square-root relationship makes it a 10:1 change for the same probability of error. The downside is that information transfer rate is still at a 100:1 ratio.

Digital Signal Processing or DSP uses statistical mathematics and several other mathematical relationships plus very fast digital computation to discriminate signal-plus-noise to noise and to extract repetitive frequency components from just signal amplitudes over time. Such applications have been used for three decades in passive sonar, seismometry, civil engineering analyses of building structures and deep earth strata to some mundane consumer electronics gadgetry such a presenting a frequency spectrum display of music. Most audio range spectrum analyzers today are basically time-to-frequency DSP-driven instruments rather than conventional analogue electronic architecture instruments.

Could such a record be done using "faster" ("normal") or more conventional information modes? Possibly. To realize that requires an analysis of a proposed circuit path, available RF power, worst-case propagation loss at the radio frequency, narrowest receiving analogue bandwidth, and tolerable analogue signal to noise ratio plus several other more minor factors. Digital computation can then be applied to reduce the effective bandwidth and provide more discrimination between signal and noise. Utilization of error-correcting digital codes as part of the information transferred will reduce the error probability even further.

Class over. There will be an open-book test next Wednesday. Dismissed. :-)

518. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 04:04:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309230403.27196.00002046@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 62755

In article <3E6B5178.6398E3C6@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>> Dennis Ferguson
>
> Hey Dennis- Thankyew. I for one very much appreciate your very objective
>evaluation as opposed to
>the very crippled,opionated diatribe by
>Len-way-the-hell-over-21-but-acts-like-5.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

> I must also congratulate you on the fact that every time you evalute
>something
>in a post here, it comes
>out the same-very objective and undistorted.

Yes, you can't understand what Dennis is saying, but you think
he is "beating me up" in words...something you've not been
able to accomplish in here. :-)

> I have no idea what you do for a
>vocation but in my view
>your employer, assuming you have one, is very fortunate to have you on
>board.

...yes, you need all the "help" you can get, old-timer. :-)

519. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 04:04:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309230404.27196.00002048@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 62753

In article <3E6AC066.3A6E46F8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>> At what speed (in WPM) did they send their message?
>
>You'd have us believe that the speed used on 136 KHz was their maximum
>or are you, like Leonard H. confusing profiency with efficiency?

Everyone has seen Heil use "mediocrity" in describing morse
rates below 5 WPM.

One-minute dot times would make that so "mediocre" as to edge
into the "ludicrous" category for proficiency, wouldn't it? :-)

520. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 04:04:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309230404.27196.00002047@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 62756

In article <20030308235733.08747.00002409@mb-cg.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Unfortunately, I don't think us Morse Code supporters can look to
>this story as proving anything too significant about the Morse code.
>I'm sure it was employed mainly as a matter of convenience, as
>opposed to formulating some other encoding system specifically
>for this VLF project. I just wonder if something like Hellschreiber
>would have worked?

Tsk, tsk, tsk, the extra of many, many callsigns and years
in amateur radio cannot figure this out for himself?!?!?

>Let's face it -- I'm not interested in a CW QSO in which I need to
>use a stopwatch in order to copy what the other station is sending!

Tsk, tsk, tsk, then one-minute dot time morse code is NOT
proficient, is it? It must be very, very "mediocre" at such
slow rates!

521. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 04:04:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309230406.27196.00002049@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 62758

In article <b4e7vk$1tti$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) writes:

>Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>>"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> writes:
>>
>>>Larry
>>>Since they have set a record that means they must be
>>>on the cutting edge of Amateur Radio. And they are
>>>using good old Morse's Code to accomplish it!
>[...]
>> That morse code was used at all is a tradition thing and
>> possibly bounded by regulations in the transmitting end's
>> home administration. Aperiodic, monotonic codings are
>> NOT optimum for very low signal communications.
>
>I don't quite understand why you think Morse is necessarily
>"aperiodic" (that's a function of how it is sent, it can be
>sent with very precise timing), but "optimum" is a quality whose
>evaluation is highly dependent on the system and the attributes of
>the system which you value.

Hello? International Morse Code is defined by (an old CCITT document revised by the ITU-T, revision not mentioned by FCC) a dash time three times longer than dot time. Inter-character spacing is another value and I don't recall a "word" defined there despite the commonly-accepted definition of a telegraphic "word" being five characters plus a space. Space between "words" is another, different dot-time value.

By comparison, an "8-level" teleprinter code has ten bits to each character, each of them the same length. Even the old, obsolete "Baudot" 5-level teleprinter code had only two separate bit times, the difference being in just one while the other six bit times were equal. Teleprinter printable characters, spaces, carriage returns, non-printing characters all take the same amount of time. Very periodic.

Yes, I'd say that International Morse Code was aperiodic since there are four separate times to its coding. If you don't like the word "aperiodic," then suggest another one to differentiate one from the other.

>It is true that if maximum instantaneous
>power is limited then fully-voiced binary FSK and PSK modulations have
>an inherent 3 dB advantage over amplitude keying at the same information

>rate, but it requires significant additional transmitter and receiver
>complexity to implement these, particularly in the presence of ionospheric
>paths causing phase and frequency flutter, so what is "optimum" depends
>on one's evaluation of whether the additional system complexity is
>justified to achieve a 3 dB advantage.

Oooooo. :-)

>Note that production services
>running at similar frequencies often come down on the same side of this
>tradeoff. Of the time services I know of I think WWVB and MSF both use
>amplitude keying (though "off" isn't all the way off, but rather 10 dB
>down from "on") while I think DCF77 uses PSK.

"Production services?"

My little Oregon Scientific "radio clock" sits on one book shelf
about two feet above this computer monitor and periodically
checks itself against WWVB a few times a day. WWVB does
indeed transmit at a slow rate...1-second AM bits with 10 db
"on-off" levels of "negative logic" and BCD per digit. With that
periodicity, no more than 3 different "on" versus "off" lengths
per bit, that little $39 clock works just fine in Los Angeles,
some distance from Fort Collins, CO. Not much inside it but
the heart of it is an ASIC using extensive DSP to really, really
improve the signal to noise ratio. Weighs maybe an ounce.
Maybe a couple dozen plus other makers listed at the NIST
website, all small and comparable, including at least one
radio wristwatch. [Oregon Scientific model RM806, older
model purchased at Fry's Electronics about 3 years ago]

>Loran C uses pulse
>modulation, but this is only advantageous if you have no bandwidth or
>instantaneous power limitations and solely need to optimize the cost of
>your power bill.

I will keep that under advisement next time I am planning a
Loran C installation. For my own navigation needs, I'll go to
Good Guys or Best Buy and check out a GPS handheld
for $99. :-)

>Once you've decided on amplude keying, however, Morse coding isn't
>identifiably inferior to anything else. Its duty cycle doesn't often drop
>much below from 50% independent of what is being sent, and it provides a
>measure of compression for plain texts.

By gosh and golly, a wonderful revelation of high speed morse.
I'll take that under advisement, too, while you are petitioning
all the other radio services to drop all those inefficient data
modes in favor of that champion morse!

>Note that FEC doesn't automatically
>buy you anything much, it requires a coding-gain-versus-information-rate

>tradeoff which you need a lot of system knowledge to judge.

Gosh yes, "not much." Except maybe less error in
transmission on noisy channels. Lots of "system smarts"
in the system? One or two ASICs, maybe a handful of
MSI/LSI chips for FEC. BFD.

>I understand
>that the hobbyists doing LF experimentation under Part 15 have tended to
>use either slow Morse or slow BPSK using PSK31 coding and FEC, and while
>I think the latter is considered to give better results I don't think it
>is a whole lot better.

Well, "there we have it."

>Bad math, I think. PARIS is 50 dot periods, or 1 word every 50 minutes,
>so the word per minute rate is 1 per 0.833 hours, or 0.02 WPM. Still
>not too fast, though.

Not "bad math," just not remembering the EXACT dot period of
"PARIS" in some necessity (?) for picking fly shit out of black
pepper to prove the "superiority" of morse codes.

If you want EXACTNESS of word rate, define the inter-word
spacing in dot times and add that to the EXACT time of "PARIS"
in morse code.

"...not too fast" is perhaps one of the understatements of the
year in here! At dot times of ONE MINUTE, 50 dot times is
FIFTY MINUTES TO SEND ONE WORD!

522. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 04:04:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309230407.27196.00002050@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 62754

In article <87177F84FA833D64.05A561EDC4A1BB77.B14125297777A5CA@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"me" <me@here.com> wrote in message
>news:b4dt67$v3j$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
>> The orginial point was why should the engineers even have to learn the code.
>>
>> Would an electrial engineer be an addition to a hobby that is interested in
>> electronics?
>
>Isn't that a most arrogant attitude? Just because of your potential
>contribution, you should be given leeway? Pshaw...

Kim, you know personally this "me@here.com"?

The "me@here.com" reiterated a previous question, then added
another question. Are questions indicative of an "arrogant
attitude" or is that some secret hamspeak?

523. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 04:04:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309230408.27196.00002051@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 62757

In article <s2vaa.5430$se1.2840183@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>> The code would take how long? And no plans to use it.
>
>You have to MEMORIZE not just read the rules, regs, operating procedures,
>etc. That takes time. Very few engineers have a photographic memory. Even
>with an electrical engineering degree, it will take probably 30 hours to
>learn all the stuff for the tech test and another 30 for the general.

Oh? Last I was in formal engineering classes, we didn't have
any eidetic prerequisites or required units in "photographic
memory" courses or training. :-) Such is not in any syllabus
familiar to me. Maybe things have changed...?

>Now
>there are exceptions but the guy who read the book one night and passed the
>test the next is NOT representative.

Good point. Back at the beginning of March, 1956, I borrowed
a loose-leaf notebook of all the FCC Rules and Regulations (old
system of distributing paper hard-copies and revisions) and
crammed for a week prior to test time in Chicago, 90 miles
away. Took all four parts of the First Class Radiotelephone
(Commercial) test, passed them all. I crammed from a borrowed
set of regs because I couldn't get a Q&A book that went to
First in my home town of 80 thousand population that year.
I was 23, a few weeks after release from active Army duty, then
only a high school graduate and US Army schools did not cover
civil radio standards and practices. US Army did not teach
morse code to all signal corps personnel 1950s. In fact, not a
single one of the 43 high-powered transmitters at ADA in Tokyo
used morse codings to link the Far East Command Hq with
the USA and rest of Pacific armed forces 1953 to 1956. They
still don't and ADA is still the callsign of Hq USARPAC.

524. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 04:04:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030309230411.27196.00002052@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 62760

In article <b4ejii$2fbs$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) writes:

>Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>>In article <20030305190222.18155.00000058@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>>Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>> Tsk, tsk, tsk..."S25" refers to the entire set of ITU-R
>> Recommendations for amateur radio.
>
>No it doesn't. S25 is not an ITU-R Recommendation (let alone a set of thiem).
>S25 is an Article in the Radio Regulations. If you go to
>
> http://www.itu.int
>
>and attempt to buy the publication which includes S25, you won't find the
>document in the ITU-R Recommendations publication section. It is in the
>Radio Regulations.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Well, we are getting to fly shit versus pepper level, aren't we? :-)

One, I'm NOT buying anything from ITU if I can get away from paying for a download...that won't make their documents any less or more. Second, I call them RECOMMENDATIONS because that's what ITU-R calls them. Third, there are no, repeat NO International Radio Police to enforce "regulations." Everything is on an honor system of each member nation's administration enforcing their OWN national regulations. Each member nation's administration codifies its own laws for its own citizens.

>> S25.5 is the specific Recommendation in regards to
>> administrations giving International Morse Code testing for
>> any amateur radio license having privileges below 30 MHz.
>
>S25.5 is not a Recommendation. It is a paragraph in Article S25 of
>the Radio Regulations.

Geez, starting to grade both the pepper grains and the fly shit for size and color?!?

Are the International Literary Police going to come and arrest me for not paying enough syntax to you toll house cookie crumblers demanding EXACTNESS in everything? :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Japan got away with a "violation" of S25.5, didn't
it? Last I was at ITU-R pages, Japan was still a member nation.

>This is confused, I think. ITU-R Recommendations are standards
>documents which are produced by ITU study groups. They are indeed
>just recommendations, having no regulatory standing on their own. An
>administration may voluntarily choose to incorporate them in their own
>regulations if they want to, or sometimes ITU-R Recommendations are
>included in the Radio Recommendations by reference, in which case such
>Recommendations do become regulations of sorts.
>
>The Radio Regulations, where paragraph S25.5 can be found, are not
>ITU-R Recommendations however. They are not produced by ITU study
>groups, but rather are the products of World Radiocommunication
>Conferences. As the name suggests, the Radio Regulations are
>in fact regulations, which member administrations do indeed
>agree to obey. In effect the Radio Regulations are a treaty
>which administrations enter into, and it would not even surprise me
>if the Radio Regulations were subject to congressional ratification
>in the US (though I don't know for sure).

The US Congress has NO power to alter any agreements of a
United Nations organization or any foreign country. Congress
cannot "ratify" those, despite the wishes of certain members of
Congress. Any agency CAN INCLUDE mention of an inter-
national THING (word used to be all encompassing of pepper,
salt, whatever grains, any size) as a definition. That is NOT any
"ratification," just a reference.

>> In the USA, the "send by hand" portion of S25.5 is an optional
>> waive for all examinations. Administration members of ITU-R
>> are not obliged to precisely obey all recommendations.
>
>This is incorrect, Part 97 doesn't make an "optional waive" of any
>portion of S25.5. S25.5 says that a licensee must have proven that they
>can correctly send by hand, but does not explicitly indicate what
>consistutes proof of this. 97.503(a) explicitly (and not coincidentally)
>says that
>
> (a) A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that the
> examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand...
>
>so Part 97 goes out of its way to indicate that such proof is non-optional.
>That 97.509(g) says
>
> (g) Passing a telegraphy receiving examination is adequate proof of
> an examinee's ability to both send and receive telegraphy
>
>is simply a choice for what constitutes "proof" deemed sufficient to meet
>the (non-optional) regulation. Specifying this testing procedure as
>sufficient to meet the (unspecified) requirement for proof in S25.5 seems
>not inconsistent with the specification of 5 wpm as sufficient testing

>speed for S25.5 purposes.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, back to the "fly" thing? :-)

I see that waiver as a WAIVER, some cleverness in wordsmithing,
but it is a WAIVER to me and many others. Obviously your
mileage varies, no doubt the odometer calibrated in a morse shop?

>> Japan has waived Recommendation S25.5 for a certain class of
>> their amateur license which does have HF privileges.
>
>I have no idea how Japan justified that, but I would be exceedingly
>surprised if the US decided to do anything similar.

No idea? I didn't see any different kinds of pepper there in
the three years I was stationed there. Times change, though.

>The US already has the reputation of being an international bad boy
>when it comes to both adopting ITU Recommendations (for example, US
>telecommunications companies ignore a ream of ITU Recommendations
>for transmission facilities in favor of sometimes-nearly-compatible,
>sometimes-incompatible ANSI standards; the Internet came to be by
>studiously ignoring a different ream of ITU standards documents),
>and by insisting that all sorts of exceptions and frequency misalignments
>end up being included in the Radio Regulations themselves (often
>inspired by military and other government requirements and preferences).

? Oh, my, the bad old USA having its flag on fire or something?

Hmmm...the Internet is a "bad thing" and the fault of the USA?
What, for being first and using FOREIGN parts to protocol and
procedure as part of it? Since 1991 it has spread rather far and
fast all over the world...must be the "devil's work" or something?

Yup, Evil Military-Industrial Complex of running-dog Capitalists
created wired telegraphy (since 1844) first in the USA...then the
terrible telephone monopoly of good wired comm of AT&T...while
the first SSB (from The Netherlands) was "ignored" when USA
radio broadcasting spread before WW2...while nasty USA was
the first for color TV using the totally useless "Never The Same
Color" inefficient compatible system was adopted by many
other countries cowed by might of evil USA dictatorship.

>As the major source of international (tele,radio)communications discord in
>defence of the interests of both US industry and military, however, the
>US does compensate by being religious about observing the letter of
>anything they've actually ended up agreeing to do, and that includes
>the provisions of the Radio Regulations.

Dennis, did you volunteer to be a "human shield" and were
rejected? Are you Yurp born?

As to "discord," let me remind you that the IARU has suggested
a nearly FULL REWRITE of ALL parts of S25, while ARRL (a

USA membership thing and amateur regulator wannabe) has
taken a neutral position on S25.5. Neutral, no opinion.

>> Administrations are free to impose morse code testing for all
>> amateur licensees if they so wish, or partial morse code
>> testing for privileges above 30 MHz. It is all up to each nation's
>> administrations.
>
>What the US administration isn't free to do, however, is to entirely
>eliminate all testing of Morse code skills for privileges below 30 MHz,
>since by agreeing to the Radio Regulations the US has agreed to observe
>this requirement in its own regulations.

Oh? They are "not free?!?" Will the International Radio Police
attack the USA if we don't conform to all those Radio
Regulations? I don't think so. There is no "IRP."

There is only the Honor Obligation in any treaty or agreement. On
ANY subject.

>Part 97 completely conforms to the regulations in Radio Regulations
>Article S25, as far as I can tell. This won't change unless S25
>changes.

Sorry, it does NOT "conform completely." We've been over that
in another set of messages. The FCC has not YET corrected
its morse code definition reference. There is NO, repeat NO
equivalent word rate for "receiving by ear" or "sending by hand"
in any of S25. The USA could simply say test element 1 be
done at an equivalent word rate of 1 WPM (as an example).
That would "conform" just fine since there is NO ITU-R rate
given.

525. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 04:04:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303091947.23d29357@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62752

AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<jtln6vknuh8r5rnduk2hm6uaeesk888ciq@4ax.com>...

> With the world on the brink of war, the global economy falling apart
> at the seams, and terrorism making the headlines around the world on a
> daily basis....

You gotta be high. The Iraqi's are already surrendering, and the
bullets aren't even flying yet. Just call it Desert Storm Part Duex.

FWIW, more soldiers are killed in training accidents than going up
against Arab tyrants.

> IS THE THE BEST FREAKING THING YOU PEOPLE HAVE TO ARGUE ABOUT?

What would you have us argue about? World Peace? Matching WorldCom
stock in a 401K? Wait while I bite my knuckle and think of some other
tragedy.

> For Christ's sake, GROW UP!

Well, you might have a point, but I'm not going to give it to you.

> I see so much petty nitpicking, name-calling, and posturing going on
> here, we might as well rename the channel rec.radio.CBWANNABES.policy.

Don't you dare.

> Damn. You people make me ashamed to be a ham.

DICK does that for me, but hey, he's a Vet too.

> Raymond Sirois AB2HR
> SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
> 607-733-5745
> telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

Ray, I think Larry and I have earned the right to talk about any
damned thing we please. And we earned it for you as well. So instead
of insulting us, you might think about thanking us.

You're welcome.

Brian

526. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 04:11:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6C1085.6C0E0B4B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62761

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E6AC066.3A6E46F8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >> At what speed (in WPM) did they send their message?
> >
> >You'd have us believe that the speed used on 136 KHz was their maximum
> >or are you, like Leonard H. confusing profiency with efficiency?
>
> Everyone has seen Heil use "mediocrity" in describing morse
> rates below 5 WPM.
>
> One-minute dot times would make that so "mediocre" as to edge
> into the "ludicrous" category for proficiency, wouldn't it? :-)

Len, meet Brian. Brian, meet Len. You two will find that you have much
in common.

Dave K8MN

527. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 05:01:11 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E6C1C26.2030007@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62762

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <3E6B62E9.3040504@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
>
>> At the risk of turning this into a productive thread and getting an
>>education, (always dangerous here in rrap!) What is the rationale for
>>such slow data rate transmissions? I certainly would expect slower than
>>normal for these initial tests, and of course the bandwidth at 136 kHz
>>is limited, but I'm curious. Seems like since computers are doing the
>>work, it would be possible to send at a more "normal" rate.
>>
>
> Define "normal."

hmm, I know I'm not! 8^)

> "Education" for yourself is a personal thing and does not drive
> this newsgroup. Insults hurled by outraged, wounded egos
> drive the newsgroup. :-)

Sigh... You're probably right. But it's a nice change of pace. And in the
end probably more important.

> Extremely compressed "education" -

<A whole bunch of good stuff snipped>

> Class over. There will be an open-book test next Wednesday.
> Dismissed. :-)

Thank you very much, Len. I found your answer very good (which is to mean
I understood it, heh heh!) I appreciate it.

- Mike KB3EIA -

528. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 05:01:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030310000125.15648.00000739@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 62763

In article <3668FDE4280613BE.93AC21E217B5073C.7517EC407E0E43A7@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>Or, what? LOL
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

For starters, you will have shown yourself to be willing to make irresponsible,
slanderous and libelous insinuations about people in this newsgroup, with the
potential reduction in what may be viewed as your already tenuous credibility.

Beyond that, only time can tell.

73 de Larry, K3LT

529. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 05:01:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030310000125.15648.00000740@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 62764

In article <3668FDE4280613BE.93AC21E217B5073C.7517EC407E0E43A7@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> If you have any doubt as to whether the thing you insinuated
>> about me is true, I'd suggest some extremely rapid backpedaling --
>> and sincere, thoughtful, and contrite apologies offered both in
>> the newsgroup and in private E-mail. You have 72 hours from
>> the date/time of this posting. After that, I will assume that you
>> stand by your statements.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Or, what? LOL
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

This is not a laughing matter. If someone got the idea that I was a
violent criminal based on something that was said about me in this
newsgroup, which is a public forum, then the damage to my
reputation could be potentially disastrous. Therefore, you need to
seriously reflect on that which you implied about me, and decide
whether or not you wish to continue to be associated with that
allegation. I respectfully suggest that you try again.

73 de Larry, K3LT

530. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 05:01:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030310000126.15648.00000741@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 62766

In article <f45722ac.0303090536.385a6a43@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> >> Kim showed up in this
>> >> newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign, and
>> >> literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
>> >> she asked for.
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>> >
>> >Larry, that's rapist mentality.
>>
>> Brian:
>>
>> Cecil, is that you in there -- trying to disguise yourself as Brian?
>>
>> Anyway, no, Brian, it isn't. It is just an accurate description of what
>> Kim wanted to happen.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>And you took the bait?

Brian:

It isn't a question of taking the "bait." Kim came in here with her self-selected Vanity call sign which has been widely construed to be potentially damaging to the image of all radio amateurs, and YL's in particular. She went so far as to attempt to get Riley Hollingsworth to endorse it based on her "right" to select it, but instead was told, in so many words, that she has a perfect "right" to make a fool of herself to the possible detriment of the entire ham community. Moreover, instead of correcting the situation, she has stubbornly proceeded to defend the indefensible. I, for one, see little point in engaging her in any further discussion of the subject -- she knows what she has to do, and only she can make the decision to do the right thing. If she chooses not to, that will reflect poorly on her -- with the potential consequences so eloquently enumerated by Mr. Hollingsworth. What may seem to be an innocently witty joke to her could easily cause potential hams to decide to take up a different hobby -- and I couldn't blame them.

73 de Larry, K3LT

531. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 05:01:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030310000127.15648.00000742@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 62765

In article <jtln6vknuh8r5rnduk2hm6uaeesk888ciq@4ax.com>, AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
writes:

>>If you have any doubt as to whether the thing you insinuated
>>about me is true, I'd suggest some extremely rapid backpedaling --
>>and sincere, thoughtful, and contrite apologies offered both in
>>the newsgroup and in private E-mail. You have 72 hours from
>>the date/time of this posting. After that, I will assume that you
>>stand by your statements.
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>With the world on the brink of war, the global economy falling apart
>at the seams, and terrorism making the headlines around the world on a
>daily basis....
>
>IS THE THE BEST FREAKING THING YOU PEOPLE HAVE TO ARGUE ABOUT?
>
>For Christ's sake, GROW UP!
>
>I see so much petty nitpicking, name-calling, and posturing going on
>here, we might as well rename the channel rec.radio.CBWANNABES.policy.
>
>Damn. You people make me ashamed to be a ham.
>
>Raymond Sirois AB2HR
>SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
>607-733-5745
>telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

Raymond:

I don't consider public slander and libel to be "petty nitpicking." Such
name-calling has serious implications, and I, for one, am not going to
tolerate being referred to as a violent criminal. Not here, not
anywhere. I have already received and accepted Brian's apology -- Kim's
is forthcoming, hopefully -- I haven't finished reading the new postings on
this thread yet. I will not interpret the "grow up" comment to have been
directed toward me, personally, but I'd advise you to immediately clarify
the fact that it wasn't.

In years past, we have indulged ourselves in making some rather harsh
statements toward each other in this newsgroup, but the comments
currently in question have gone a bit too far. I have always been quickly
forthcoming in my apologies whenever I've made remarks which could

be construed to be personally offensive, and I expect no less from others in this newsgroup.

73 de Larry, K3LT

532. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 05:22:58 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns933A3E1A2BD1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 62767

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:EzMaa.5705$se1.3061770@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

> Type error in my reply. My second paragraph should have said "...
> could not have passed ..."
>
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:foMaa.5701$se1.3059201@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>>
>> "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> news:Xns9339787B0B3DDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> > You are wrong, I'm afraid. I am an EE, and I went in to take the
>> > Tech, as
>> > I had a no-code UK licence, and passed also the General and Advanced
>> > papers **without** reading the books for those elements. That's not
>> > reading them the night before, but actually not reading them atall.
>> > I don't think that would be rare for an EE, I think it would be
>> > quite representative, especially if we were talking about someone
>> > lke myself who had actually worked in RF. I didn't take the Extra
>> > written on that occasion only because they didn't have a spare
>> > element 4B paper, but I could have passed that too. I had of course
>> > read Part 97 more than just the night before, and I had read a book
>> > on elements 2 and 3A. Could I have just read Part 97 the night
>> > before and then passed all the written elements in one session? In
>> > my opinion, yes, although I had a foreign ham ticket as well as an
>> > EE degree.
>> >
>> > 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>> >
>> > BTW, I am a 20wpm Extra, and I have never made a single CW QSO
>>
>> You are definitely NOT representative of the typical EE. You already
>> had a ham radio background so you already knew theory, propagation and
>> operating procedures. You read Part 97 fairly thoroughly from your own
>> admission. Thus you had done the equivalent studying. You don't have
>> to use pre-prepared study guides but must learn the material
>> somewhere, which is what you did. Even if you could have done it all
>> in the night before that doesn't mean that every EE could have. A
>> person doesn't have to use any particular method of learning or
>> particular set of books.
>>
>> Some one with ONLY an electrical engineering degree and no other
>> background could have passed the tests with no further study. They

>> aren't born knowing the material on rules, regs, propagation,etc and
>> they don't learn it in college.
>>
>> The books are merely a handy compilation of the material that will be
>> addressed in the tests. There's no requirement to use that particular
>> approach to preparing for the test. Since you had already covered the
>> material by other means of learning and studying, it would have been
>> pointless to have read them.
>>
>> Dee Flint, N8UZE
>>
>>
>
>

I realised that's what you meant to say. I still think that an EE who had actually worked in RF could just have read part 97 the night before. Now, if we were talking about someone whose professional background was, say, computers or power generating, then maybe you're right.

533. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 05:25:07 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns933A43FC755Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 62768

deehays@qix.net (Dee) wrote in
news:f7f8aca6.0303090536.4566bb32@posting.google.com:

> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> news:<20030309010626.29016.00000653@mb-fy.aol.com>...
>> Nonsense. Engineers are ALSO cognizant with regulations and
>> procedures...of considerably more radio services than just
>> amateur radio. They must also keep up to date, not only on the
>> new but that which is being developed...rather than stay frozen
>> in some strata of time on standards and practices of more than a
>> half century past.
>
>
> And just when did colleges and universities add radio service rules
> and regulations to the EE curriculum or any other curriculum?
> Engineers won't know them without studying them.
>

Studying rules isn't rocket science, though. It doesn't add up to much
compared with learning the theory.

534. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 05:25:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310002542.09900.00002446@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 62771

In article <v6ntqced8eof0f@corp.supernews.com>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Folks would be surprised how quickly one can learn the code. When Vietnam
>was hot, the Navy needed people as hospital corpsmen and radiomen. The
>entire company ahead of me in RM A school was shipped to 'Nam. Fail and
>sail.

US amateur radio is NOT the USN or any other branch of the
military. Really.

The Southeast Asia Live Fire Exercise was 1964 to 1973, over
thirty years ago. Lots of things have changed in the last 30
years. Really.

Have you inquired whether or not any branch of the US armed
forces uses morse code for regular or tactical communications?
Outside of passive ELINT operations, part of the M.I., none is
used today. Really.

But, to reiterate, US amateur radio is NOT a branch of the US
armed forces. Really.

>Well, I guess I got suckered into this old thread once again :)

Yes, I guess you did. Really. :-)

535. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 05:25:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310002543.09900.00002448@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 62769

In article <20030309185413.23598.00000707@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>> Or prepare another Sermon on the Antenna
>> Mount evangelizing the Right Attitude on the worship and
>> reverence of morsemanship.
>
>Sounds like you have no data to share.

Poor baby...that bowl of ad hominem grits upset your tummy?

I'm just waiting for your Sermon, Reverend Jim. :-)

536. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 05:25:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310002543.09900.00002447@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 62772

In article <f7f8aca6.0303090536.4566bb32@posting.google.com>, deehays@qix.net (Dee) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030309010626.29016.00000653@mb-fy.aol.com>...
>> Nonsense. Engineers are ALSO cognizant with regulations and
>> procedures...of considerably more radio services than just
>> amateur radio. They must also keep up to date, not only on the
>> new but that which is being developed...rather than stay frozen
>> in some strata of time on standards and practices of more than a
>> half century past.
>
>And just when did colleges and universities add radio service rules
>and regulations to the EE curriculum or any other curriculum?
>Engineers won't know them without studying them.

Sorry to break the news to you, but engineers don't stop learning the minute they graduate. :-)

True, rules and regs are seldom a topic in any engineering class, but regulations and standards and such have the annoying habit of changing! In order to keep up, engineers have to study those at work or on their own time. Not in a formal school classroom.

There a different kind of "test" on "knowing regulations" pertaining to work. If required to know them, engineers get paid. If they are required to know them but don't, chances are good they won't get paid. Sound reasonable? :-) No pretty certificates if what is needed to know is known, no callsigns to write after a signature, just the regular paycheck being regular.

Ever hear of "MIL-STD?" :-)

537. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 05:25:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310002544.09900.00002449@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 62770

In article <3E6B9666.D5CEA762@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>

>> Sorry. I forgot.
>>
>> Now I remember. You are God.
>
>Nope, wrong again. You just can't be honest.

You are NOT God?!?!?!?

538. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 05:42:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310004218.05048.00001056@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62775

In article <3E6C1C26.2030007@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> In article <3E6B62E9.3040504@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>> writes:
>>
>>
>>> At the risk of turning this into a productive thread and getting an
>>>education, (always dangerous here in rrap!) What is the rationale for
>>>such slow data rate transmissions? I certainly would expect slower than
>>>normal for these initial tests, and of course the bandwidth at 136 kHz
>>>is limited, but I'm curious. Seems like since computers are doing the
>>>work, it would be possible to send at a more "normal" rate.
>>>
>>
>> Define "normal."
>
> hmm, I know I'm not! 8^)
>
>> "Education" for yourself is a personal thing and does not drive
>> this newsgroup. Insults hurled by outraged, wounded egos
>> drive the newsgroup. :-)
>
> Sigh... You're probably right. But it's a nice change of pace. And in
the
>end probably more important.
>
>> Extremely compressed "education" -
>
>
>
>
>> Class over. There will be an open-book test next Wednesday.
>> Dismissed. :-)
>
>
> Thank you very much, Len. I found your answer very good (which is to
mean
>I understood it, heh heh!) I appreciate it.

You are very welcome. :-)

But...you wait. A few certain types will jump in on that with all kinds of "charges" ranging from "error" to "mistake" to "wild speculation" to just #$%^&!!!*&@#!!! and words of similar mien. :-)

539. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 06:24:39 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b4i1t001pb6@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 62800

(snippage)
>
> Sounds like your fire repeater has a deaf receiver (partially fried front
end)
> that greatly reduces sensitivity without killing it completely. Or bad
coax
> (water got in?) And that the
> people responsible for its maintenance are not doing their jobs.
>

Sounds like you may be right, or any other number of possible problems as well. From my understanding the equipment used is at least 25 or more years old. Possibly time for an upgrade??

Ryan

540. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 06:26:59 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b4i1t111pb6@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 62651

Yeah, still a little fuzzy about the legality of this still now, but at the time, I had to make a judgement call, and our safety was more of the concern (as well as the patient's) that I was considering.

Ryan

(snippage)
>
>
> Heh heh...yeah, and don't we all wish that was free!? I think the use of
> the ham repeater for calling 911 in the situation described above was
> absolutely within legal parameters!
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

541. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 07:33:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6C3FBC.67AC1B61@att.net>
Source record: 62776

Brian wrote:

> Is 0.02WPM proficient?
>
> Is 0.02WPM efficiant?

What do YOU think, if you can? Does the term "depends on the application" mean anything at all to you?

542. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 07:34:41 UTC
From: kf6vyh@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310023441.09964.00000086@mb-mp.aol.com>
Source record: 62777

no

543. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 07:37:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6C4089.1B0F24CC@att.net>
Source record: 62778

me wrote:

> Still, no answer to the question of the engineers being an addition to the
> hobby.
>

What makes you think that just because someone is an engineer he would
automatically be
a valuable addition to ham radio?

544. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 07:41:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6C418E.106B3710@att.net>
Source record: 62779

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6B53BD.6A386679@att.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > Responding from the TOP,
> > >
> > > "Very Tiny Bandwidth" is a bad thing?
> > >
> > > "Limited Data Rate" is a bad thing?
> > >
> > > Perhaps by "words per month" you are implying that these world record
> > > setters are NOT proficient?
> >
> > Brian, the conclusion is fast becoming inescapable that you're losing whatever
reasoning powers you
> > may have once had. If you can't differntiate manual Morse code from that used by the
very slow code
> > experimenters you're about ready for the looney bin.
>
> I think it was obvious that when you introduced your "banana boat
> swing" to evade machine copy that I understood the difference.
>
> Why would today be any different than then?

Who said it would? I'm rather sure you never heard a banana boat swing. If you ever
listened much
to the CW bands you'd have. It's common in some parts. I didn't introduce it. But anyone
could
should he find some need to confuse a computer. Why should you have a problem with that?
Why should I even ask? You're the epitome of confusion..

545. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 07:53:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6C4456.6945282@att.net>
Source record: 62780

Mike Coslo wrote:

> What is the rationale for
> such slow data rate transmissions? I certainly would expect slower than
> normal for these initial tests, and of course the bandwidth at 136 kHz
> is limited, but I'm curious. Seems like since computers are doing the
> work, it would be possible to send at a more "normal" rate.

I haven't read a full explanation but I believe it to be a very subtle change in the
noise floor with keying that can only be reliably detected over time by a computer
program. I know that in the past I have copied manual CW a few times that was so weak that a change in the noise was all that you could hear as the characters
were being sent. Taken even further into the noise a computer program as they used
would be needed to detect and decode it.

It's always argueable whether or not such a capability is "useful". Of course the cod-
haters argue that Morse code itself is useless, so there you have it.

Dick

546. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 08:01:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6C462D.7062715B@att.net>
Source record: 62781

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6B5178.6398E3C6@att.net>...
> > Dennis Ferguson wrote:
>
> > > Bad math, I think. PARIS is 50 dot periods, or 1 word every 50 minutes,
> > > so the word per minute rate is 1 per 0.833 hours, or 0.02 WPM. Still
> > > not too fast, though.
> > >
> > > Dennis Ferguson
> >
> > Hey Dennis- Thankyew. I for one very much appreciate your very objective
> > evaluation as opposed to
> > the very crippled,opionated diatribe by
> > Len-way-the-hell-over-21-but-acts-like-5.
> >
> > I must also congratulate you on the fact that every time you evalute something
> > in a post here, it comes
> > out the same-very objective and undistorted. I have no idea what you do for a
> > vocation but in my view
> > your employer, assuming you have one, is very fortunate to have you on board.
> >
> > 73, Dick
>
> I appreciate it as well. Like the time when Dennis came through on
> the Morse definition issue, and the other time when he came through on
> the French hams out of band issue.
>
> My hat is off to you, Dennis. Thanks.
>
> Brian

Sounds like he ran you through several times. Couldn't you dodge fast enough?

547. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 08:04:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6C46E3.F4D38512@att.net>
Source record: 62782

Brian wrote:

> > Be glad to inform you, Slim. All it takes for most comuter programs I've seen to copy garbage is any sort of
> > noise in the circuit. Or code which isn't near-perfect in its timing, such as some of that sent by a bug or
> > some (many?) inept handkey senders.
>
> Then there is the intentional sloppy sending of some vile Extra, who
> bragged on here that he could evade machine copy by less than worthy
> no-code Techs.
>
> > Of course with your very crippled analytical abilities you have trouble putting facts together to reach a
> > valid conclusion, as always.

If you're so lame you have no way other than some worthless computer program with which to copy code you'll just have to live with it, won't you? No action is needed on the part of anyone sending. Unless
you plan on getting together with the .02WPM boys you're a lost cause anyway.

548. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 08:05:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6C4749.F878178D@att.net>
Source record: 62783

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6B5923.C7E1D6B2@att.net>...
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> >
> > > > > Stop thinking of the code as a barrier. You advance by passing Element 1,
> > > > > that's how.
> > > >
> > > > Yes, yes, that's how I didit. But what of element two? And what of
> > > > people who cannot pass element one?
> > >
> > > They fail the exam. They may attempt it again--as many times as is
> > > necessary.
> > >
> > > > Dave thinks he's the World's Greatest DXer and is?
> > >
> > > Brian, are you attempting to emulate Len or are you a simpleton?
> > > You and only you have used the term "World's Greatest DXer" and
> > > attempted to apply it to me. I've not only never used it to refer to
> > > myself, I've previously corrected you when you've used it. Are you
> > > beyond honesty?
> >
> > He's beyond rationality.
>
> I'm not the one who sends poorly formed Morse Code character to foil
> attempts by less than worthy No-Code Techs from copying my secret
> messages with a computer.

Just for the record- nether am I! Why would you conclude that I'd find it desireable
to waste my time
doing such a thing just because I once said it'spossible? We know, all this is just
some more of your
juvenile lamebrain output.

549. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 08:07:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6C47A8.8EC1B7B3@att.net>
Source record: 62784

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6A4298.F48704@att.net>...
>
> > I'm sure you said that in jest.... the one thing he's never showed us
> > is real
> > information re ham radio. And never will.
>
> Yep. Ham radio is magically different from other forms of radio.
> Different physics or something. For example, you cannot use
> 468/f(MHz) outside of ham radio.
>

So that isn't really *ham radio* information, is it?

>
> DICK, you're a hoot.

You're a simpleton.

550. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 08:12:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6C48CB.316F6DE2@att.net>
Source record: 62785

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6B58A9.8093D1BD@att.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > Given your track record I doubt many readers will be inclined to
> > > > accept anything you "know" at face value.
> > >
> > > I'd be disinclined to believe that. For example, you and Dave didn't
> > > know that a Commander had the authority to grant amateur operations in
> > > Somalia.
> >
> > Un huh. And you don't have any realistic grip on the term "commander" at all. To say
nothing of the
> > term "permission".
>
> Sure I do.
>
> > > You and Dave would knowingly work out of band Frenchmen on 6M.
> >
> > You have no idea what constitutes knowledge either.
>
> It constitutes something other than hazing rituals and tea ceremonies.
>
> > > You cannot figure out how to operate amateur radio away from the power
> > > mains.
> >
> > You're so stupid to even make such a comment that it doesn't even deserve response.
>
> I merely took you at your word. You said you couldn't operate HF away
> from home. Is your word no good anymore?

Google up that post and show where I said that. Youre still a friggin liar, and if you know
anything you know
it. I'm not optimistic.
What I *did* say was that I was away from home visiting relatives where it would be
difficult to install coax
through into a brick home, so since I wasn't to be there long I left my rig at home. Your
twisted mind made all
sorts of unreal moves as usual, and you come up with this.

Time to dump your lame ass into the
crapper again, this time for good. Goodbye, idiot.

>
>
> > > That's just some recent stuff. I don't have any more time to devote
> > > to your ineptness.
> >
> > Inept is clearly another term you have no feel for, but that you describes you so very
well.
>
> Do tell.
>
> > > > > If I was in QSO with a foreign ham and some clod came on the frequency
> > > > > and informed me that I shouldn't be talking to that guy because that guy
> > > > > was out of his allotted band I'd likely say "Buzz off Slim/Brian. You're
> > > > > in no position to 'know'". And besides it's none of YOUR business, just
> > > > > as it's none of your business how Dave handles his on the air contacts.
> > > >
> > > > Who's talking about "some clod???"
> > > >
> > > > I said you already knew the French allocation on 6M, yet you intend to
> > > > go ahead and work them out of band.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Like I said, some clod -like you- comes on the frequency and yells "Hey that Frenchman
you're talking to is
> > > out of his band!" and now that constitutes "knowledge". So much for your grasp of that
term, too.
>
> Well, I think Dennis Ferguson put that one to bed. Too bad you don't
> buy into regulations that you've been informed of. Before the fact
> ignorance is one thing. You're something else.
>
> > Do you know very much about ANYTHING at all?
>
> I know you are Extra Dick.

551. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 10:51:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303100251.7fa45082@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62786

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6C462D.7062715B@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6B5178.6398E3C6@att.net>...
> > > Dennis Ferguson wrote:
>
> > > > Bad math, I think. PARIS is 50 dot periods, or 1 word every 50 minutes,
> > > > so the word per minute rate is 1 per 0.833 hours, or 0.02 WPM. Still
> > > > not too fast, though.
> > > >
> > > > Dennis Ferguson
> > >
> > > Hey Dennis- Thankyew. I for one very much appreciate your very objective
> > > evaluation as opposed to
> > > the very crippled,opionated diatribe by
> > > Len-way-the-hell-over-21-but-acts-like-5.
> > >
> > > I must also congratulate you on the fact that every time you evalute something
> > > in a post here, it comes
> > > out the same-very objective and undistorted. I have no idea what you do for a
> > > vocation but in my view
> > > your employer, assuming you have one, is very fortunate to have you on board.
> > >
> > > 73, Dick
> >
> > I appreciate it as well. Like the time when Dennis came through on
> > the Morse definition issue, and the other time when he came through on
> > the French hams out of band issue.
> >
> > My hat is off to you, Dennis. Thanks.
> >
> > Brian
>
> Sounds like he ran you through several times. Couldn't you dodge fast enough?

Dodge? Isn't that some kinds of broken down, rusted out Chrysler?

No, Dennis presented objective and undistorted facts, for which you
were just thanking him. I thanked him for the same.

552. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 10:56:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303100256.1d2c029b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62787

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6C418E.106B3710@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6B53BD.6A386679@att.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > Responding from the TOP,
> > > >
> > > > "Very Tiny Bandwidth" is a bad thing?
> > > >
> > > > "Limited Data Rate" is a bad thing?
> > > >
> > > > Perhaps by "words per month" you are implying that these world record
> > > > setters are NOT proficient?
> > >
> > > Brian, the conclusion is fast becoming inescapable that you're losing whatever
reasoning powers you
> > > may have once had. If you can't differntiate manual Morse code from that used by the
very slow code
> > > experimenters you're about ready for the looney bin.
> >
> > I think it was obvious that when you introduced your "banana boat
> > swing" to evade machine copy that I understood the difference.
> >
> > Why would today be any different than then?
>
> Who said it would? I'm rather sure you never heard a banana boat swing. If you ever
listened much
> to the CW bands you'd have. It's common in some parts. I didn't introduce it. But anyone
could
> should he find some need to confuse a computer. Why should you have a problem with that?
> Why should I even ask? You're the epitome of confusion..

Dick, you introduced the term "banana boat swing" to the newsgroup in
a desperate and pathetic attempt to thwart machine copy by unworthy
No-Code Techs.

That is all.

553. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 11:00:09 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303100300.53bc1c85@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62788

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E6C0D92.98A8FD37@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6B973D.14A773C8@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6AC066.3A6E46F8@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>
> > > > > > >Are these UK amateurs considered proficient?
>
> > > > > > I'd say they were.
>
> > > > > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> > > > > > At what speed (in WPM) did they send their message?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You'd have us believe that the speed used on 136 KHz was their maximum
> > > > > > or are you,
> > > > >
> > > > > Not at all. Why would you say something like that?
> > > >
> > > ...because, like Leonard H., you seem to confuse to words: efficient and
> > > proficient.
> > >
> > Two? OK.
> >
> > Why would I confuse them?
>
> Seemingly because you didn't know what at least one of them means.

Which one?

> > > > > like Leonard H. confusing profiency with efficiency?
> > > > >
> > > > > Just as long as you don't confuse it.
> > > > >
> > > > > Is 0.02WPM proficient?
> > > >
> > > It can't be proficient or unproficient. Are the two ops *morse
> > > proficient*?

> >
> > You say that 5wpm Morse ops aren't proficient, but you don't know if
> > 0.02wpm Morse ops are or aren't proficient.
> >
> > Sounds like some kind of bias.
>
> Why not at all, Brian. Sounds like you didn't understand much of what
> has been written about all of this previously. You often have that
> trouble. Previously I'd written about operators whose maximum receiving
> speed was five word per minute. Do you think the ops described in the
> story about a DX contact on 136 KHz were using their top morse receiving
> speed?

There's no way to tell. The information was not provided.

> > > > Is 0.02WPM efficiant?
> > >
> > > I don't know about "efficiant" but it isn't efficient.
>
> > Now now, Dave. Pick yourself up and dust yourself off. I didn't
> > intentionally mispell a word in order to trip you up. It was purely
> > an accident.
>
> I don't believe your misspelling was intentional.

I hope you didn't skin you knee.

554. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 11:06:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303100306.3d0778f3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62789

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6C4089.1B0F24CC@att.net>...
> me wrote:
>
> > Still, no answer to the question of the engineers being an addition to the
> > hobby.
> >
>
> What makes you think that just because someone is an engineer he would
> automatically be
> a valuable addition to ham radio?

What makes you think that someone who cannot pass a 5wpm code exam
wouldn't be a valuable addition to HF ham radio?

555. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 11:09:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303100309.15c2dda7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62790

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.com> wrote in message news:<3E6C065F.8050402@mailcity.com>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> >
> > > DICK does that for me, but hey, he's a Vet too.
>
>
> You mean he doctors animals?

I don't know if I would stretch it that far. Lets just say he was
issued a set of dog tags.

556. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 11:27:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310062717.05048.00001057@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62791

In article <20030310002543.09900.00002448@mb-fc.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030309185413.23598.00000707@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) >writes:
>
>
>
>>> Or prepare another Sermon on the Antenna
>>> Mount evangelizing the Right Attitude on the worship and
>>> reverence of morsemanship.
>>
>>Sounds like you have no data to share.
>
> Poor baby...that bowl of ad hominem grits upset your tummy?

Ah - so you admit to ad hominem attacks rather than presenting actual data to back up your arguments.

>
> I'm just waiting for your Sermon, Reverend Jim. :-)
>

As suspected, Len Over 21 (that's his real name, right?) has no data to present, no factual basis for his wild speculations, and just wants to sling insults.

557. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 11:55:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA91E76B.12B4F%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62792

"AB2HR" wrote:

> With the world on the brink of war, the global
> economy falling apart at the seams, and terrorism
> making the headlines around the world on a daily
> basis....
>
> IS THE THE BEST FREAKING THING YOU PEOPLE HAVE
> TO ARGUE ABOUT?

This is a ham radio newsgroup, Raymond. While political discussions about non-ham issues do occasionally occur here, this is not really the place for them.

Furthermore, with the recent dramatic changes in this government (the creation of the Homeland Security Department, for example, with its not yet clearly defined authority and limitations), many opposed to a war with Iraq feel threatened talking about it. That leaves nobody for those supporting a war to argue with - a situation not exactly conducive to discussion.

Perhaps you'll have more success finding discussion about those topics in the political discussion newsgroups.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

558. Re: Here's your chance

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 12:12:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310071241.04339.00000066@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 62793

>Subject: Here's your chance
>From: "Kï¿½HB" kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG
>Date: 3/7/03 11:21 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <ky4aa.7210$wJ1.707135@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Your suggestions and comments may be sent to qpc@arrl.org.

NO, HANS! That might require doing something SERIOUS for once!

73

Steve, K4YZ

559. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 12:20:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310072055.04339.00000067@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 62794

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/8/03 5:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030308181817.09269.00000048@mb-fr.aol.com>

>The general and Extra tests are just as easy as the technician class test.

Having not taken them, from what authoratative source are you basing your
opinion, Vipul?

>Are you saying, one 8
>hour session on a weekend is too much time?

WHOA! YOU have stated in here how the additional tests required to
upgrade are a WASTE of time...So now YOU are insinuating how EASY it is to
upgrade? Then why haven't YOU, Vipul?

>At least 75% of
>those pass on the first try.

Afraid you won't make the cut?

Steve, K4YZ

560. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 12:26:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310072618.04339.00000068@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 62795

>Subject: Slow-Coders do good
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/7/03 10:01 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303072001.136673ec@posting.google.com>

DO WELL, Brian....

"Slow-Coders do WELL"

73

Steve, K4YZ

561. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 12:50:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310075044.21516.00000103@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62796

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/9/03 10:04 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030309230411.27196.00002052@mb-ba.aol.com>

>Tsk, tsk, tsk. Well, we are getting to fly shit versus pepper level,
> aren't we?

Having once again been "bested" in newsgroup messaging, Lennie once again reverts to profanity to try and get his "point" across.

>One, I'm NOT buying anything from ITU...(SNIP)

That's alright, Lennie, we don't "buy" anything from you, either.

>>> S25.5 is the specific Recommendation in regards to
>>> administrations giving International Morse Code testing for
>>> any amateur radio license having privileges below 30 MHz.
>>
>>S25.5 is not a Recommendation. It is a paragraph in Article S25 of
>>the Radio Regulations.
>
> Geez, starting to grade both the pepper grains and the fly shit
> for size and color?!?

Again, caught with his zipper down (not that we'll actually SEE anything...) Lennie refers to FACTS vs his FICTION as "pepper grains" as opposed to "fly (excrement)".

>Are the International Literary Police going to come and arrest
> me for not paying enough syntax to you toll house cookie
> crumblers demanding EXACTNESS in everything?

THIS is cute...Mr. "I Am A Radio Professional" trying to bail himself out from NOT being able to specifiy facts in a radio regulation matter...

Sheesh!

>The US Congress has NO power to alter any agreements of a
> United Nations organization or any foreign country. Congress
> cannot "ratify" those, despite the wishes of certain members of
> Congress. Any agency CAN INCLUDE mention of an inter-
> national THING (word used to be all encompassing of pepper,
> salt, whatever grains, any size) as a definition. That is NOT any
> "ratification," just a reference.

You've already been proven wrong and Phil Kane did a nice job of doing it. Need another spanking, Lennie, or still stinging from the first?

>Oh, my, the bad old USA having its flag on fire or something?

Hmmmmmm.....First you try to embellish your military "career" by misrepresenting your relationship with Army KIA's from the "active" phase of the Korean War.

NOW you are making fun of the United States as a whole and seemingly supporting the idea of flag burning.

Scumbag.

>There is only the Honor Obligation in any treaty or agreement. On
> ANY subject.

What would YOU know of "honor"...?!?!

562. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 12:55:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310075551.21516.00000104@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62797

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/8/03 8:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303081845.41f48ef@posting.google.com>

>So people think they have cancer and die?

>They think they're going to have a heart attack and die?

Unfortunately for them (and especially your rant), yes, they do.

It IS a known phenomena and does happen.

>Dave thinks he's the World's Greatest DXer and is?

I haven't seen Dave say this, however I see him in DX columns from time to time (ie: 5H3US). However I do NOT see "N0IMD" in ANY of those columns. (I ESPECIALLY do NOT see T5/N0IMD in any of those columns...)

Maybe not the "World's Greatest", but certainly better than YOU, Brian...

563. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 12:59:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310075943.21516.00000105@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62798

>Subject: Re: Public Service and Ham
>From: kf6vyh@aol.com (Kf6vyh)
>Date: 3/10/03 1:34 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030310023441.09964.00000086@mb-mp.aol.com>
>
>no

OK...I'll bite..."no" what? To whose comments were you responding?

Steve, K4YZ

564. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 13:20:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA91FB3A.12B51%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62799

"W5TIT" wrote:
>
> (snip) There would be nothing wrong with a ham
> radio operator volunteering to use ham radio
> equipment owned by the fire department, in
> an emergency or not I should say, would there?

As long as he/she is operating under the rules governing supplemental public safety communications, nothing wrong with it. The "or not" following emergency in the sentence above is questionable. More on this below.

> There would also be nothing wrong with anyone
> (firefighter or not) using that same equipment
> in an emergency that met the criteria you
> describe above, correct?

As long as it meets the emergency criteria described by the FCC (its not my description), again nothing wrong with it.

> (snip) Well, extreme, and even "normal" emergency
> communication. I mean, to what extent *do* we
> define an emergency? (snip)

Since the FCC has already done so, we don't have to define it. It is communications involving the immediate safety of human life or protection of property where normal communication facilities are disrupted or when normal communication systems are not available. Lets stick to that definition in this discussion.

Clearly that definition doesn't include communications where normal communication systems (the fire department's radios) are available, nor does give leeway for fire personnel to go frequency hunting because elected officials fail to buy enough radios.

However, the definition does cover, in both situations described in the paragraph above, isolated incidents involving the "immediate" safety of human life or protection of property.

Getting back to the supplemental public safety communications mentioned above, the definition also does not give leeway for fire departments, or fire department personnel, or ham operators operating for the fire department, to move the department's communications over to the ham radio frequencies. The rules governing supplemental public safety communications involves unusual situations (disasters disrupting normal communication facilities, etc), not usual or routine situations.

> (snip) Fundamentally, for the sake of debate, if an
> emergency organization is dispatching personnel and
> equipment to an emergency scene, or is at that scene
> needing communication, I believe the use of any
> available radio is appropriate and legal. While it
> is true that there is not a predominant use of ham
> radio by our fire and rescue organizations -- I
> still think that it could be argued in their favor
> if they did use radios on ham radio frequencies. (snip)

That is where we would disagree. Unless it was an unusual situation (an immediate emergency with a disruption of the normal communication facilities, for example), I think it would be very inappropriate. It that were not the case, it would be equally appropriate for fire departments to use the frequencies of any other radio service (broadcast television, broadcast radio, military, etc). Clearly, such indiscriminate use would not be appropriate.

> PS--while serious, I *do* get this funny image of
> emergency persons carrying dozens of radios on
> their belts! :o

Most paid fire personnel don't, but check out some of the volunteer firemen when you get a chance. Some do go a "little" overboard in that regard. :)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

565. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 13:56:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310085659.27785.00000074@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 62652

>Subject: Re: Public Service and Ham
>From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
>Date: 3/10/03 12:26 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <b4i1t111pb6@enews3.newsguy.com>
>
>Yeah, still a little fuzzy about the legality of this still now, but at the
>time, I had to make a judgement call, and our safety was more of the concern
>(as well as the patient's) that I was considering.

It's not all that confusing, really...

You cannot use Amateur Radio in the ROUTINE pursuit of your employment. I realize that as a firefighter EVERY call is an "emergency", however that's not how the FCC would see it, I am sure.

Routine dispatching, dissemination of fireground orders, or intersquad communications would NOT be seen as appropriate for Amateur applications. Those are events that are routinely trained for.

Calling in a 9-1-1 response because you just rolled up on an MVA at which no other emergency responder is at would be a legit use.

Using Amateur Radio for "dispatching" or tasking of firefighting or EMS assets is only appropriate when all other resources for doing it are incapacitated.

As much as I support using Amateur Radio for subsequently supporting Fire, EMS, etc, the practicallity is that as a firefighter you shouldn't stray from Fire channels, especially on the fireground. If you wander off on some discreet channel to talk with other squad members you could miss that call to evacuate...I don't think that's a good time to be off on 146.52!~

73 and stay cool!

Steve, K4YZ

566. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 14:28:35 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <ni1ba.17269$gi1.6254@nwrdny02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 62653

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b4asgqkqt1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> The next WARC conference (this year I think) will possibly consider that
> issue. If they vote to not require CW any longer then the FCC will likely
> do the same. But don't get in a rush. It ain't gonna happen tomorrow.
>
> And for goodness sakes ... how hard is 5 words per minute.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Re. your last question, Dan; I really don't think many of them don't even
want to give it an honest try. Otherwise, the question might be...how easy
is 5-wpm?

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

567. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 16:19:49 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v6pep5qftkla96@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62654

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:ni1ba.17269$gi1.6254@nwrdny02.gnilink.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b4asgqkqt1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> > The next WARC conference (this year I think) will possibly consider
that
> > issue. If they vote to not require CW any longer then the FCC will
likely
> > do the same. But don't get in a rush. It ain't gonna happen tomorrow.
> >
> > And for goodness sakes ... how hard is 5 words per minute.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Re. your last question, Dan; I really don't think many of them don't even
> want to give it an honest try. Otherwise, the question might be...how easy
> is 5-wpm?

Bert
I studied code for 3 years before passing the test, but I didn't try that
hard
the first 2 1/2 years. The last 6 months is when I got serious and got with
it!
It still wasn't "easy", but it was something that "most" anyone can do!

I'm glad I went ahead and did it, instead of waiting for the ITU to drop it.

>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

568. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 16:36:18 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v6pfo2e9ifui58@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62655

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA91FB3A.12B51%stewart@say.net...
> "W5TIT" wrote:

<SNIP>

> > There would also be nothing wrong with anyone
> > (firefighter or not) using that same equipment
> > in an emergency that met the criteria you
> > describe above, correct?
>
>
> As long as it meets the emergency criteria described by the FCC (its not
> my description), again nothing wrong with it.
>
<SNIP>

Dwight
The problem on the "firefighter or not" question is the "not"s. In this
area we have enhanced 911 that rings in to the county dispatchers.
We all know that the 911 phone number is for "Emergencies" and
nothing else. The problem is the non-firefighter group that calls 911
asking questions that should not be ask on a 911 call, or calling
911 to report a dog loose in the neighborhood and that kind of thing.

There are people in the "real world" that aren't smart enough to
know the difference between a real emergency and a non-emergency.
Those are the ones that would screw up the whole deal on meeting
any requirements that is placed on the use of ham band or public
service bands during emergencies.

I can just see some dumb &^% getting on the local police, fire,
or ham repeater frequency and asking for directions because they
got lost and are in to big of a hurry to stop and ask somebody
they see along the road/street.

--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

569. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 18:20:18 UTC
From: me <me@here.com>
Message-ID: <b4il0u$tv5$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62656

Well, duh... What's the hobby about? Do I need to expplain it to you?

Duh?

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3E6C4089.1B0F24CC@att.net...
>
>
> me wrote:
>
> > Still, no answer to the question of the engineers being an addition to
the
> > hobby.
> >
>
> What makes you think that just because someone is an engineer he would
> automatically be
> a valuable addition to ham radio?
>

570. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 19:02:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303101102.6c60dbee@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62657

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030310072618.04339.00000068@mb-mr.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Slow-Coders do good
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/7/03 10:01 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303072001.136673ec@posting.google.com>
>
> DO WELL, Brian....
>
> "Slow-Coders do WELL"
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Not according to the people in the know. Slow-Coders don't do anything well.

571. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 19:05:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310140532.05048.00001060@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62660

In article <f45722ac.0303100306.3d0778f3@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E6C4089.1B0F24CC@att.net>...
>> me wrote:
>>
>> > Still, no answer to the question of the engineers being an addition to the
>> > hobby.
>>
>> What makes you think that just because someone is an engineer he would
>> automatically be a valuable addition to ham radio?
>
>What makes you think that someone who cannot pass a 5wpm code exam
>wouldn't be a valuable addition to HF ham radio?

According to the olde tyme hamateurs in here, no-coders don't
have the Right Attitude. They aren't valuable unless they've
been tested at 20 WPM morse. :-)

See Roll, see Heil, see Dick snarl and sneer down the hill...:-)

572. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 19:05:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310140533.05048.00001061@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62661

In article <20030310072055.04339.00000067@mb-mr.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>The general and Extra tests are just as easy as the technician class test.
>
> Having not taken them, from what authoratative source are you basing
>your opinion, Vipul?

When did the hostile action hero last take an amateur radio examination? :-)

There are at least two separate "test" simulators on-line, both of which use the very same question pool data as any VE session. It is very, very easy to gauge the "easiness" or "hardness" of all the written test elements...by anyone.

>>Are you saying, one 8
>>hour session on a weekend is too much time?
>
> WHOA! YOU have stated in here how the additional tests required to
>upgrade are a WASTE of time...So now YOU are insinuating how EASY it is to
>upgrade? Then why haven't YOU, Vipul?

The morse code test is considered a waste of time by many. FCC is on record as far back as 1990 on its opinion that a morse code test is not worthwhile to its evaluation of license grants.

Two four-year-olds "passed" a Novice and Technician class respectively in 1998...under the old (pre-restructuring) amateur regulations. Shall everyone "upgrade" to four-year-old intellectual radio capacity?

>>At least 75% of
>>those pass on the first try.
>
> Afraid you won't make the cut?

Steam, we'll just put you down as maybe nine-year-old level, how's that? :-)

573. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 19:05:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310140535.05048.00001062@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62662

In article <20030310075044.21516.00000103@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Tsk, tsk, tsk. Well, we are getting to fly shit versus pepper level,
>> aren't we?
>
> Having once again been "bested" in newsgroup messaging, Lennie once
>again reverts to profanity to try and get his "point" across.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, the magificent marine (ex) of 18 1/2 years thinks the word "shit" is profanity?!?! :-)

Oh, my, and the magnificent marine (ex) has signed off as "putz" so many times! Oy gevalt!

>>One, I'm NOT buying anything from ITU...(SNIP)
>
> That's alright, Lennie, we don't "buy" anything from you, either.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...editing and snipping pieces out of context.

I've purchased four downloads from the ITU. One of them was the referenced document (from CCITT) on morse code definitions given in Part 97, the only download from ITU about amateur radio. There was a go-around in here some while back on that morse definition document. Must have slipped your mind. [not difficult, it seems]

> Again, caught with his zipper down (not that we'll actually SEE
>anything...) Lennie refers to FACTS vs his FICTION as "pepper grains" as
>opposed to "fly (excrement)".

Tsk, tsk, tsk...a colloquial phrase (that means in common use among the people) was NOT the subject, was it?

The subject was "Regulation" versus "Recommendation" in ITU-R.

Dennis Ferguson argues for exactness in naming, implying the international law thing. I argue for "Recommendation" from the ITU-R Study Groups as extending to all "regulations" on the basis of a common-agreement honor thing by all member parties.

Steam Robespierre can only wave his scatological sabre wildly trying to get into the act. Bad acting. [play closed in Chatanooga...]

> THIS is cute...Mr. "I Am A Radio Professional" trying to bail himself out
>from NOT being able to specifiy facts in a radio regulation matter...

Tsk, tsk, tsk...send out the International Literary Police! :-)

> You've already been proven wrong and Phil Kane did a nice job of doing
it.
> Need another spanking, Lennie, or still stinging from the first?

There's been NO "proven wrong" since there is no International
Radio Police to enforce the ITU-R "regulations." US citizens on
US territory are subject to US law, not some "international law."

It's the difference between "de facto" and "de jure."

Codified US law may reference "international laws" as part of
US law, but, still US citizens are subject to US law on US
territory. That's "de jure." Fancy word, Latin origin, look it up
and learn something.

Too many folks interpret "international laws" as applying directly
to themselves/whatever, the same as US law on US territory.
Actually, what has happened is that US law on US territory has
referenced the international thing AS IF the international laws
applied. That's "de facto." US laws apply on US territory, none
other, regardless of the spin applied by certain legal wordsmiths.

If you don't understand the difference between de jure and de
facto as applying to the discussion, then all you are doing is
just another useless flame war Hostile Action. Tsk, tsk,.tsk.

> Hmmmmmm.....First you try to embellish your military "career" by
>misrepresenting your relationship with Army KIA's from the "active" phase of
>the Korean War.

Firstly, personal military experience was NOT in the discussion
thread.

Secondly, what began as the 71st Signal Service Battalion, US
Army, back in 1946 as part of the US Army of Occupation in
Japan remains today as the 78th Signal Service Battalion at
Camp Zama, Japan, under the 516th Signal Brigade at Fort
Shafter, Hawaii, as part of US Army Pacific. I was assigned to
the 71st Sig Svc Bn on Februrary, 1953. 19 members of the 71st
died on 1 July 1950, ordered there by Far East Command Hq to
support Korean communications at the outbreak of the Korean War.
That is NOT "embellishment," simply known historical fact in the
history of USARPAC.

Third, try to stay focussed on the thread SUBJECT instead of
nursing old, aggravated ego wounds from long ago messaging.

> NOW you are making fun of the United States as a whole and seemingly
>supporting the idea of flag burning.

Poor baby...terrible reading comprehension...tsk, tsk, tsk.

> Scumbag.
>
> What would YOU know of "honor"...?!?!

That pretty much sums up the interest of this extraordinary amateur extra in this newsgroup...fight, fight, fight in a continuous set of hostile actions in messages. :-)

Now, do you have any data to share on ARS license numbers?

Remember that you must be Serious, just like Reverend Jim.

574. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 19:05:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310140536.05048.00001063@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62659

In article <20030310062717.05048.00001057@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030310002543.09900.00002448@mb-fc.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20030309185413.23598.00000707@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>>
>>>> Or prepare another Sermon on the Antenna
>>>> Mount evangelizing the Right Attitude on the worship and
>>>> reverence of morsemanship.
>>>
>>>Sounds like you have no data to share.
>>
>> Poor baby...that bowl of ad hominem grits upset your tummy?
>
>Ah - so you admit to ad hominem attacks rather than presenting actual data to
>back up your arguments.

Noooo. :-) It's what you served up for your own meal. :-)

>> I'm just waiting for your Sermon, Reverend Jim. :-)
>>
>As suspected, Len Over 21 (that's his real name, right?) has no data to
>present, no factual basis for his wild speculations, and just wants to sling
>insults.

Poor baby. Everything contrary is "wild speculation" but anything
in agreement with your melifluous magnificent mumbling is hard,
factual evidence? :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk. This newsgroup has gone round and round on
the numbers game before and you must have your way and
only your way on interpretation of the numbers. Sounds more
like a con game for the Right Attitude...with a lot of self-
righteousness on Your Way is the Only Way. :-)

Everyone is still waiting for the Sermon on the Antenna Mount.
We missed you this Sunday. [we'll aim better next time...]

Try to be Serious now. Amateur radio is all about Work, Study,
Devotion, Upgrading, and Working DX on HF with CW. It isn't
a hobby...it is a Service. Try to instill that in the masses, the
ignorant inferior beings who have not seen the Greater Glory of

Morse Magnificence! :-)

575. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 19:05:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303101105.4d729da@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62658

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6C46E3.F4D38512@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > > Be glad to inform you, Slim. All it takes for most comuter programs I've seen to copy garbage is any sort of
> > > noise in the circuit. Or code which isn't near-perfect in its timing, such as some of that sent by a bug or
> > > some (many?) inept handkey senders.
> >
> > Then there is the intentional sloppy sending of some vile Extra, who
> > bragged on here that he could evade machine copy by less than worthy
> > no-code Techs.
> >
> > > Of course with your very crippled analytical abilities you have trouble putting facts together to reach a
> > > valid conclusion, as always.
>
> If you're so lame you have no way other than some worthless computer program with which to
> copy code you'll just have to live with it, won't you? No action is needed on the part of anyone sending. Unless
> you plan on getting together with the .02WPM boys you're a lost cause anyway.

Well, DICK, I happened to have learned the code prior to ever owning a computer.

Is there anything else you'd like to add?

576. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 19:27:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310142733.29016.00000704@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 62663

In article <20030309230411.27196.00002052@mb-ba.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <b4ejii$2fbs$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis
>Ferguson) writes:
>
>>Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>>>In article <20030305190222.18155.00000058@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>>Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
>>> Tsk, tsk, tsk..."S25" refers to the entire set of ITU-R
>>> Recommendations for amateur radio.
>>
>>No it doesn't. S25 is not an ITU-R Recommendation (let alone a set of
>thiem).
>>S25 is an Article in the Radio Regulations. If you go to
>>
>> http://www.itu.int
>>
>>and attempt to buy the publication which includes S25, you won't find the
>>document in the ITU-R Recommendations publication section. It is in the
>>Radio Regulations.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Yes, tsk, tsk, tsk. One would think Len Over 21 would know the difference
between a Recommendation and a Regulation.

>Well, we are getting to

(expletive deleted)

> versus pepper level,
> aren't we? :-)
>
Nope ;-)

We're at the 'Len Over 21 made an error and won't admit it' level.

> One, I'm NOT buying anything from ITU if I can get away from paying
> for a download...that won't make their documents any less or more.

Irrelevant.

> Second, I call them RECOMMENDATIONS because that's what
> ITU-R calls them.

No, ITU-R calls them 'regulations'.

> Third, there are no, repeat NO International Radio
> Police to enforce "regulations."

So?

Is a regulation not a regulation if there are no 'police' around?

> Everything is on an honor system
> of each member nation's administration enforcing their OWN national
> regulations. Each member nation's administration codifies its own
> laws for its own citizens.

And the USA has agreed to follow the ITU-R regulations.
>
>>> S25.5 is the specific Recommendation in regards to
>>> administrations giving International Morse Code testing for
>>> any amateur radio license having privileges below 30 MHz.
>>
>>S25.5 is not a Recommendation. It is a paragraph in Article S25 of
>>the Radio Regulations.
>
> Geez, starting to grade both the pepper grains and the

(expletive deleted)

> for size and color?!?

No, Mr. Ferguson is just correcting your error. Live with it. ;-) ;-)
>
> Are the International Literary Police going to come and arrest
> me for not paying enough syntax to you toll house cookie
> crumblers demanding EXACTNESS in everything? :-)

Is there a problem with accuracy? ;-)

> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Japan got away with a "violation" of S25.5, didn't
> it?

No.

> Last I was at ITU-R pages, Japan was still a member nation.
>
Do you think the USA should adopt Japan's type of no-code-test HF amateur
license?

>>This is confused, I think. ITU-R Recommendations are standards
>>documents which are produced by ITU study groups. They are indeed
>>just recommendations, having no regulatory standing on their own. An
>>administration may voluntarily choose to incorporate them in their own
>>regulations if they want to, or sometimes ITU-R Recommendations are
>>included in the Radio Recommendations by reference, in which case such
>>Recommendations do become regulations of sorts.
>>

>>The Radio Regulations, where paragraph S25.5 can be found, are not
>>ITU-R Recommendations however. They are not produced by ITU study
>>groups, but rather are the products of World Radiocommunication
>>Conferences. As the name suggests, the Radio Regulations are
>>in fact regulations, which member administrations do indeed
>>agree to obey. In effect the Radio Regulations are a treaty
>>which administrations enter into, and it would not even surprise me
>>if the Radio Regulations were subject to congressional ratification
>>in the US (though I don't know for sure).
>
> The US Congress has NO power to alter any agreements of a
> United Nations organization or any foreign country. Congress
> cannot "ratify" those, despite the wishes of certain members of
> Congress. Any agency CAN INCLUDE mention of an inter-
> national THING (word used to be all encompassing of pepper,
> salt, whatever grains, any size) as a definition. That is NOT any
> "ratification," just a reference.

Phil Kane has told us here that ITU-R is a treaty and is ratified by the
Senate. IS Phil Kane mistaken about that?
>
>>> In the USA, the "send by hand" portion of S25.5 is an optional
>>> waive for all examinations. Administration members of ITU-R
>>> are not obliged to precisely obey all recommendations.
>>
>>This is incorrect, Part 97 doesn't make an "optional waive" of any
>>portion of S25.5. S25.5 says that a licensee must have proven that they
>>can correctly send by hand, but does not explicitly indicate what
>>consistutes proof of this. 97.503(a) explicitly (and not coincidentally)
>>says that
>>
>> (a) A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that the
>> examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand...
>>
>>so Part 97 goes out of its way to indicate that such proof is non-optional.
>>That 97.509(g) says
>>
>> (g) Passing a telegraphy receiving examination is adequate proof of
>> an examinee's ability to both send and receive telegraphy
>>
>>is simply a choice for what constitutes "proof" deemed sufficient to meet
>>the (non-optional) regulation. Specifying this testing procedure as
>>sufficient to meet the (unspecified) requirement for proof in S25.5 seems
>>not inconsistent with the specification of 5 wpm as sufficient testing
>>speed for S25.5 purposes.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, back to the "fly" thing? :-)

No, Mr. Ferguson is just correcting your error. Live with it. ;-) ;-)
>
> I see that waiver as a WAIVER, some cleverness in wordsmithing,

> but it is a WAIVER to me and many others.

Who else?

> Obviously your
> mileage varies, no doubt the odometer calibrated in a morse shop?
>
No, Mr. Ferguson is just correcting your error. Live with it. ;-) ;-)

>>> Japan has waived Recommendation S25.5 for a certain class of
>>> their amateur license which does have HF privileges.

No, they did not.
>>
>>I have no idea how Japan justified that, but I would be exceedingly
>>surprised if the US decided to do anything similar.

Here's how:

Japan issues ham licenses with HF privileges but with no code test. These are "4th class" licenses, and Japan uses the following argument to justify not having a code test for them:

1) The purpose of the ITU treaty is to avoid harmful interference and to promote orderly use of the radio spectrum.

2) In regards to Japanese amateur radio, two kinds of harmful interference need to be dealt with: interference to non-amateur radio services of all countries, and interference to non-Japanese radio amateurs.

3) 4th class Japanese hams' HF privileges are only on frequencies that are worldwide exclusive amateur, so interference to nonamateur sevices is prevented.

4) 4th class Japanese hams are only allowed to use very low power on HF (10 watts PEP, as I recall), and Japan is an island nation, so harmful interference to amateurs of other countries is avoided.

Thus, Japan says it is not in violation of the treaty, because its measures re 4th class licenses meet the goals of the treaty. You may or may not agree with Japan's reasoning, but to my knowledge no other country has challenged Japan on it in at least the past 35 years.
>
> No idea? I didn't see any different kinds of pepper there in
> the three years I was stationed there. Times change, though.

Where there no-code-test Japanese hams back then? ;-)

>>The US already has the reputation of being an international bad boy
>>when it comes to both adopting ITU Recommendations (for example, US
>>telecommunications companies ignore a ream of ITU Recommendations
>>for transmission facilities in favor of sometimes-nearly-compatible,
>>sometimes-incompatible ANSI standards; the Internet came to be by
>>studiously ignoring a different ream of ITU standards documents),

>>and by insisting that all sorts of exceptions and frequency misalignments
>>end up being included in the Radio Regulations themselves (often
>>inspired by military and other government requirements and preferences).
>
> ? Oh, my, the bad old USA having its flag on fire or something?

The correct way to dispose of an American flag is by burning.

> Hmmm...the Internet is a "bad thing" and the fault of the USA?
> What, for being first and using FOREIGN parts to protocol and
> procedure as part of it? Since 1991 it has spread rather far and
> fast all over the world...must be the "devil's work" or something?
>
> Yup, Evil Military-Industrial Complex of running-dog Capitalists
> created wired telegraphy (since 1844) first in the USA...then the
> terrible telephone monopoly of good wired comm of AT&T...while
> the first SSB (from The Netherlands) was "ignored" when USA
> radio broadcasting spread before WW2...while nasty USA was
> the first for color TV using the totally useless "Never The Same
> Color" inefficient compatible system was adopted by many
> other countries cowed by might of evil USA dictatorship.

What does any of that have to do with ITU-R regulations?
>
>>As the major source of international (tele,radio)communications discord in
>>defence of the interests of both US industry and military, however, the
>>US does compensate by being religious about observing the letter of
>>anything they've actually ended up agreeing to do, and that includes
>>the provisions of the Radio Regulations.
>
> Dennis, did you volunteer to be a "human shield" and were
> rejected? Are you Yurp born?

No smiley?
>
> As to "discord," let me remind you that the IARU has suggested
> a nearly FULL REWRITE of ALL parts of S25, while ARRL (a
> USA membership thing and amateur regulator wannabe) has
> taken a neutral position on S25.5. Neutral, no opinion.

As in "neither support nor oppose". Which could change at any time.
>
>>> Administrations are free to impose morse code testing for all
>>> amateur licensees if they so wish, or partial morse code
>>> testing for privileges above 30 MHz. It is all up to each nation's
>>> administrations.
>>
>>What the US administration isn't free to do, however, is to entirely
>>eliminate all testing of Morse code skills for privileges below 30 MHz,
>>since by agreeing to the Radio Regulations the US has agreed to observe
>>this requirement in its own regulations.
>

> Oh? They are "not free?!?"

Nope.

> Will the International Radio Police
> attack the USA if we don't conform to all those Radio
> Regulations? I don't think so. There is no "IRP."
>
> There is only the Honor Obligation in any treaty or agreement. On
> ANY subject.

And FCC has repeatedly said the remaining code test would NOT be eliminated as long as the treaty remains as-is. Is FCC "wrong"?

>
>>Part 97 completely conforms to the regulations in Radio Regulations
>>Article S25, as far as I can tell. This won't change unless S25
>>changes.
>
> Sorry, it does NOT "conform completely." We've been over that
> in another set of messages.

How?

> The FCC has not YET corrected
> its morse code definition reference.

So? Would that change anything?

> There is NO, repeat NO
> equivalent word rate for "receiving by ear" or "sending by hand"
> in any of S25.

What do you suggest?

> The USA could simply say test element 1 be
> done at an equivalent word rate of 1 WPM (as an example).

WHY? Would that make any difference to anyone?

> That would "conform" just fine since there is NO ITU-R rate
> given.

So? What difference would it make? Some might even say that 1 wpm is actually harder to read than 5 wpm.

577. XM-Radio compatible with 2M/450?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 20:16:13 UTC
From: K<unk>HB <k<unk>hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <ho6ba.12487$wJ1.1204101@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 62664
Cross-posted to: rec.outdoors.rv-travel,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.trucks.chevy

My new tow vehicle ('03 Silverado 2500HD LT Duramax/Allison) came equipped with Bose XM Satellite radio. In the literature it makes some vague warning about damage from radio transmitters. I suspect this might just be some lawyers CYA boilerplate, but wonder if any of the gathered multitude have run XM radio and UHF/VHF ham radio in their vehicles?

<unk><unk><unk> 73, de Hans, K0HB
--

578. Re: Wayne is one funny dude:Re: ARNewsline 1334 - March 7 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 20:27:17 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <Fy6ba.30955$eG2.5876@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 62665

I canned 73 mag after Wayne's electro purifier for AIDS patients. There were a lot of things that made 73 interesting including Wayne himself but the lymphatic stimulator-cleanser was a step too far.

God Bless 73 KI3R Tom nr Pittsburgh

> Looks like I need to pick up a copy of 73 Mad Magazine.

579. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 21:08:51 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v6pvpd6n048lbd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62666

Len,
1) Yes, Vietnam was 30 years ago. Really.
2) No, the military does not use Morse. Really.
3) All I was saying is that it is *not* a big deal. Really.
4) Yep, I sure did get suckered into it again :))) REALLY!

Best regards,
Jim AA2QA

--

Make Unlimited phone calls from your PC to ANY phone in the World!
http://www.eboom.com/free/
"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030310002542.09900.00002446@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <v6ntqced8eof0f@corp.supernews.com>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
> >Folks would be surprised how quickly one can learn the code. When
Vietnam
> >was hot, the Navy needed people as hospital corpsmen and radiomen. The
> >entire company ahead of me in RM A school was shipped to 'Nam. Fail and
> >sail.
>
> US amateur radio is NOT the USN or any other branch of the
> military. Really.
>
> The Southeast Asia Live Fire Exercise was 1964 to 1973, over
> thirty years ago. Lots of things have changed in the last 30
> years. Really.
>
> Have you inquired whether or not any branch of the US armed
> forces uses morse code for regular or tactical communications?
> Outside of passive ELINT operations, part of the M.I., none is
> used today. Really.
>
> But, to reiterate, US amateur radio is NOT a branch of the US
> armed forces. Really.
>
>
> >Well, I guess I got suckered into this old thread once again :)
>
> Yes, I guess you did. Really. :-)

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.459 / Virus Database: 258 - Release Date: 2/25/03

580. Re: The end of K1MAN, AARA and IARN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 21:12:29 UTC
From: 5-day deodorant pads <goofyham3s@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <3e6cffcd@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 62667
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

K1MAN is COMPLETELY out of his tree.

He can get away with this kind of goofy ham radio crap
since he allegeded inherited a couple $$$ Millions
from his relatives and is an alleged shareholder in
Baxter Medical Instruments Corp - or so the rumors go.

He is, by all sense of the word, the classic archtype eccentric millionaire
with convoluted thought patterns having no basis whatsoever
in reality. He is Ham Radio's answer to Michael Jackson - complete
with his very own "Never-NeverLand" Compound, way up there in frozen
ice-bound-7-Months-out-of the-Year Belgrade Lakes Maine.

While we are on the topic of Maine, how would you like
to have some eye-opening fun...? Call up the toll-free
Maine State Dept of Tourism and ask em' for a free Maine
travel brochure package. When U get it you'll be amazed to see that
8 out of every 10 photos of the various Hotels and
Inns and Campgrounds features a photo of an in-ground
swimming pool, complete with cute (caucasian...grin) kids
in bathing suits running around, and mom & dad on the
lounge chairs poolside getting themselves a suntan...
Yeah right!! Perhaps for 8 weeks in the "Summer" before
Maine goes back into their normal "Little Ice Age" wx pattern!
I was up there once in June and it went down one
night to 38�F - Just what I needed in my bermuda shorts and
Harley Davidson of Indy cotton tee shirt. All kidding aside
we did have a great time, but Maine's Wx is just one step above
Nome AK !

Oh well, perhaps K1MAN should start a ham radio theme
parkjust like M.J. did too ?? Can you imagine for a
minute, ferris wheels with 6L6 vacuum tube shaped gondolas
and bumper-cars shaped like R-390A's! Then he can
run the place just like Michael Jackson does his.......nah!!
Better not give him any more kooky ideas....

:) :) :) :)

"The scientist. He will spend thirty years in building up
a mountain range of facts with the intent to prove a
certain theory; then he is so happy in his achievement
that as a rule he overlooks the main chief fact
of all--that his accumulation proves an entirely different thing..."

- Mark Twain

"Lloyd/N0VFP" <lloyd_vfp@NOmsn.NOSPAMMMM.com> wrote in message
news:3e6cdb01_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com...
> It's around the corner.....
>
> http://users.adelphia.net/~k3vr/disc1_frm.htm
>
> CERTIFIED MAIL 7001 2510 0004 8162 4980
>
> Date: 8 March 2003
>
> To: Vincent F. Kajunski, District Director,
> Federal Communications Commission, Boston
>
> cc: John Ashcroft, United States Attorney General
> Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.
>
> Subjects: o Freedom of Information Act Request
>
> o Formal Request for Criminal Investigations
> (via copy to the Department of Justice)
>
> o Formal response to Commission letter dated
> 4 March 2003 (File EB-03-BS-004)
>
>
>
> Dear Mr. Kajunski:
>
> Your letter regarding amateur radio license K1MAN dated 4 March 2003
> references another Commission letter to K1MAN dated 29 January 2002. Your
4
> March 2003 letter states:
>
> "Commission monitoring information and numerous complaints filed with the
> Commission indicate that the problems outlined in January 2002 have not
been
> corrected......"
>
> This is a formal Freedom of Information Act Request for all information,
> monitoring, and communications of any kind, both internal and external,
> regarding K1MAN and including but not limited to: all notes, all
complaints,
> all letters, all E-mails, all information, notes and any transcripts or
> tapes of all telephone calls, all internal memos, and all other
information
> whatsoever regarding K1MAN.
>
> Secondly, please provide all information regarding the three FCC Notices
of

> Apparent Liability issued to K1MAN, the status of each, and specifically,
> the status and action taken on the Appeal to the full Commission, sitting
en
> banc, of the first Notice of Apparent Liability and Notice of Forfeiture
> issued to K1MAN.
>
> Third, numerous Felony Complaint Affidavits have been filed with the
>
>
>
> CERTIFIED MAIL 7001 2510 0004 8162 4980
> Date: 8 March 2003
> Page 2
>
>
>
> U.S. Attorney regarding criminal interference to K1MAN radio transmissions
> which were then forwarded to the Commission. Please supply all
> information, notes, internal memos, and other documents of every kind with
> regard to the status of these formal criminal charges
> so filed under the authority of the right to petition the government for a
> redress of grievances provision in the First Amendment to the United
States
> Constitution which states:
>
> "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or
> prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech,
> or the press; or of the right of the people to peaceably assemble, AND TO
> PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES."
>
>
> I remind you that failure to act on these formal criminal charges by any
and
> all individuals of the Commission is, itself, a felony under Sections 333
> and 501 of the 1934 Communications Act:
>
> Section 333: "No person shall willfully or maliciously interfere with or
> cause interference to any radio communications or any station licensed or
> authorized by or under this Act operated by the United States Government."
>
> Section 501: "Any person who willfully and knowingly does or causes or
> suffers to be done any act, matter or thing, in this Act prohibited or
> declared to be unlawful, or WHO WILLINGLY OR KNOWINGLY OMITS OR FAILS TO
DO
> ANY ACT MATTER OR THING IN THIS ACT REQUIRED TO BE DONE, OR WILLINGLY OR
> KNOWINGLY CAUSES OR SUFFERS SUCH OMISSION OR FAILURE, shall, upon
conviction
> thereof, be punished for such offense, for which no penalty (other than a
> forfeiture) is provided by this Act, by a fine of not more than $10,000 or
> by imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, or both."

>
>
> Also, Please advise me as to the status of my formal Complaint Affidavit
> sent to the Commission via Certified Mail 7099 3400 0015 4631 8444,
> addressed to Darryl E. Duckworth, NN0W, and dated 7 February 2003.
>
> Fourth. Since 1991, I have experienced numerous similar and very serious
> irregularities with Certified Mail sent to the Commission both in
> Washington, D.C. and Gettysburg. I am now preparing a detailed complaint
> for the Postal Inspector with regard to requesting a
>
>
>
> CERTIFIED MAIL 7001 2510 0004 8162 4980
> Date: 8 March 2003
> Page 3
>
>
>
> criminal investigation of this, and I am asking other radio amateurs
> experiencing similar examples of FCC failure to follow U.S. Postal Service
> procedures, via the K1MAN bulletin service, to come forward and join in
this
> criminal complaint.
>
> Again, I hereby give you fair WARNING, that this letter constitutes a
formal
> Freedom of Information Act Request.
>
>
> * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
>
>
> Now, to your entitled request for information as specified in your letter
of
> 4 March 2003, IT IS TOTALLY INACCURATE AND FATALLY FLAWED. Amateur Radio
> Station K1MAN has ALWAYS BEEN OPERATED IN TOTAL AND FULLCOMPLIANCE WITH
ALL
> FCC RULES, FEDERAL LAWS, STATE LAWS, AND ALL OTHERAPPLICABLE LAWS AS WELL
AS
> LEGAL AND CIVIL REQUIREMENTS:
>
> 5. There has always been a control operator at the control point.
>
> 6. To date, there has been no requirement for K1MAN to keep a log, and
> therefore, a response to a, b, and c of your letter cannot be made with
the
> legal accuracy as required by Section 308(b).
>
> 7. All transmissions have been of direct interest to the Amateur radio

> Service.
>
> 8. No transmissions have ever been made to the general public.
>
> 9. No transmissions have EVER been made to cause deliberate interference
to
> other radio signals or to prevent others from using a frequency.
>
> 10. All FCC rules, state laws, federal laws, and other legal and civil
> requirements have always been fully and completely complied with.
>
> 11. Regarding your references to my felony complaint affidavits regarding
> criminal interference to K1MAN transmissions, the First Amendment to the
> United States Constitution (see above) to petition the government
guarantees
> my right to file such documents and the
> right to freedom of speech and freedom of the press guarantees my rights
to
> publish to anyone and everyone I desire anything I want
>
>
>
> CERTIFIED MAIL 7001 2510 0004 8162 4980
> Date: 8 March 2003
> Page 4
>
>
>
> regarding same.
>
> 12. I remind you that slander is defined in Webster's New Collegiate
> Dictionary as "A false report, maliciously uttered, and tending to injure
> the reputation of another." No slander has EVER been
> transmitted over station K1MAN. Any alleged "slander" transmitted over
> K1MAN would be subject to civil litigation, of course, and is not in the
> jurisdiction of the Commission.
>
> 13. No references of a pecuniary interest have EVER been transmitted over
> K1MAN or directed to the www.K1MAN.com web site. You are reminded that
FCC
> rules allow ordering of pizza via amateur radio as
> well as "talk ins" to a ham fest where admission is charged, other than
> amateur radio equipment is sold, and yet not considered to be a pecuniary
> interest under FCC rules since such are considered to be "incidental"
> effects of routine amateur radio communications.
>
> 14. No donation requests of a pecuniary interest have ever been
transmitted
> over K1MAN.
>

> Finally, per your entitled request, weekly reports on d, e, f, g, h, i, j,
> and k will be filed by E-mail with the Commission starting with
> transmissions from K1MAN beginning 17 March 2003.
>
> Thank you in advance for you full and complete compliance with this formal
> Freedom of Information Request.
>
>
> Sincerely,
>
>
> (signed)
>
> Glenn A. Baxter, P.P., K1MAN
> Registered Professional Engineer
> --------------------
>
> I PREDICT BAXTER is not long for the ham radio.......
>
> --
> Lloyd/N0VFP
> "And that's just the way it is"
> R-75 FT-817
>
>
>
>
> ------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

581. Re: Wayne is one funny dude:Re: ARNewsline 1334 - March 7 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 21:37:55 UTC
From: 5-day deodorant pads <goofyham3s@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <3e6d05b1@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 62668

"garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:Fy6ba.30955$eG2.5876@sccrnsc03...
> I canned 73 mag after Wayne's electro purifier for AIDS patients. There
> were a lot of things that made 73 interesting including Wayne himself but
> the lymphatic stimulator-cleanser was a step too far.
>
> God Bless 73 KI3R Tom nr Pittsburgh
> >
> > Looks like I need to pick up a copy of 73 Mad Magazine.

I would LOVE to hear a Debate at the next Dayton Hamvention
on the topic of "The Future of Amateur Radio" with Glan Baxter
(K1MAN) and Wayne Green (W2NSD) on one side...and Reily
Hollingsworth (K4ZDH) and Dave Sumner (K1ZZ) on the other.

Now tell me THAT would not sell out the Banquet Hall and gop
on for Hours with 30+ cameras on tripods recording the event for
posterity...or adleast they could put the 8mm VHS-C tape in
the glass case, right next to all those old dusty old vacuum tubes
at ARRL HQ.............

582. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-10 23:38:17 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Jl9ba.98113$gf7.21664828@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 62669

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:v6pep5qftkla96@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:ni1ba.17269$gi1.6254@nwrdny02.gnilink.net...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > And for goodness sakes ... how hard is 5 words per minute.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > Re. your last question, Dan; I really don't think many of them don't
even
> > want to give it an honest try. Otherwise, the question might be...how
easy
> > is 5-wpm?
>
> Bert
> I studied code for 3 years before passing the test, but I didn't try that
> hard
> the first 2 1/2 years. The last 6 months is when I got serious and got
with
> it!
> It still wasn't "easy", but it was something that "most" anyone can do!
>
> I'm glad I went ahead and did it, instead of waiting for the ITU to drop
it.
>
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP

Kewl beans! The 5-wpm test is only an entry-level exam, not a "proof of proficiency." It's just a starting point from which one can choose many different paths. Glad to hear that you went ahead and just did it. I certainly didn't mean to imply that it's "easy" for everyone, but as you pointed out...very doable. Take it easy. :-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

583. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 00:00:30 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ofdq6vg3rb3krmk67nbc8csc8vpshrcvbo@4ax.com>
Source record: 62670

On 9 Mar 2003 20:04:42 -0800, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:

>AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<jtln6vknuh8r5rnduk2hm6uaeesk888ciq@4ax.com>...

>
>Ray, I think Larry and I have earned the right to talk about any
>damned thing we please. And we earned it for you as well. So instead
>of insulting us, you might think about thanking us.
>
>You're welcome.
>
>Brian

... and exactly what is it that makes you think I haven't "earned" the
right to vent when I've had a belly full of your petty arguing?

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

584. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 00:02:21 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <eidq6vcp4vf40taii2golsqdho24nr1mnl@4ax.com>
Source record: 62671

On 10 Mar 2003 05:01:27 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>
>Raymond:
>
>I don't consider public slander and libel to be "petty nitpicking." Such
>name-calling has serious implications, and I, for one, am not going to
>tolerate being referred to as a violent criminal. Not here, not
>anywhere. I have already received and accepted Brian's apology -- Kim's
>is forthcoming, hopefully -- I haven't finished reading the new postings on
>this thread yet. I will not interpret the "grow up" comment to have been
>directed toward me, personally, but I'd advise you to immediately clarify
>the fact that it wasn't.

I will clarify nothing. If you have a suspicion that the comment was
directed toward you, then perhaps that means that somewhere in your
own mind you feel that you deserve it to be directed toward you. My
comments stand on their own.

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

585. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 00:26:41 UTC
From: Mikeraphonium Man <YayMrulz33@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e6d2d45@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 62672
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

```
"richard" <nospam@no.spam> wrote in message
news:b4ipqq02rh6@enews1.newsguy.com...
> in misc.transport.trucking on Mon, 10 Mar 2003 15:23:29 GMT
> <R52ba.12041$wJ1.1172656@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net >
> tools had the nerve to make the following comments:
>
> t> Flash! Seems that some truck driver schools are including the ham
test
> t> with their training. Good thing.
>
> oh christ. practically anyone can pass the no code novice tech license.
> if you can pass the CDL you sure as hell can pass that test too.
> But having a novice no code license doesn't make those 10 meter rigs legal
> in your truck.
> you get caught yackin on code only frequencies even with a novice tech
> license, you're still screwed.
> even with any ham ticket, code only means just that.
> yack on it, you get fined.
> and illegal radios are still illegal with or without the license.
>
>
"M. Murr" <murrx@att.net> wrote in message news:3E6CFB33.A9F3755F@att.net...
> Yes ther is..I have a book right here for novice no-code tech license.
>
> "Meat-->Plow" wrote:
>
> > On Mon, 10 Mar 2003 13:40:50 -0600, "richard" <nospam@no.spam>,wrote:
> >
> > >in misc.transport.trucking on Mon, 10 Mar 2003 15:23:29 GMT
> > ><R52ba.12041$wJ1.1172656@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net >
> > >tools had the nerve to make the following comments:
> > >
> > > t> Flash! Seems that some truck driver schools are including the ham
test
> > > t> with their training. Good thing.
> > >
> > >oh christ. practically anyone can pass the no code novice tech license.
> > >if you can pass the CDL you sure as hell can pass that test too.
> > >But having a novice no code license doesn't make those 10 meter rigs
legal
> > >in your truck.
> > >you get caught yackin on code only frequencies even with a novice tech
> > >license, you're still screwed.
```

> > >even with any ham ticket, code only means just that.
> > >yack on it, you get fined.
> > >and illegal radios are still illegal with or without the license.
> > >
> >
> > There is no such thing as a novice tech license.
> "where's that gear at??!?!?" <greargrinderman@doubleclutchusa.com> wrote
in message news:2h0q6v0fb6ucgufc18fhhsusm9r6vgg0fs@4ax.com...
> Howdy Jerry,
>
> Glad to see you in another NG besides rec.radio.cb, I am studying to
> get my CDL-A through a local college here in the area. I got 2 weeks
> to go... I got it for free with no cost to me, I guess having A.D.D.
> came in hand for something... for once. I got it though the state.
>
> anyhow, I will more than likely be going OTR for about 2 years.
>
> Take care and "73"
>
> -Chuck in Detroit. (chuck @ chucks2way.com (or formerly known as...)
>
>
>
>
> On Mon, 10 Mar 2003 10:41:01 -0500, "Jerry Oxendine"
> <joxendi@bellsouth.net> was blabbling:
>
> ...
> ...tools <medtools@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> ...news:R52ba.12041$wJ1.1172656@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> ...> Flash! Seems that some truck driver schools are including the
> ham test
> ...> with their training. Good thing.
> ...
> ...That is a great idea!! It opens up a whole world for the lone
> trucker who
> ...can legally
> ...access the whole world with his radios.
> ...
> ...Jerry

.....and so goes another great thread into the ham radio NG's

OyVEy

586. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 01:51:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4jfe3$8c8$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62673

Sure its do-able and easy. Heck you can memorize 5 wpm for dang sakes.
The bottom line is LAZY.

And don't forget...we owe them because they didn't ask to be born.

Good grief.

Dan/W4NTI

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:Jl9ba.98113$gf7.21664828@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:v6pep5qftkla96@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:ni1ba.17269$gi1.6254@nwrdny02.gnilink.net...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > And for goodness sakes ... how hard is 5 words per minute.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > Re. your last question, Dan; I really don't think many of them don't
> even
> > > want to give it an honest try. Otherwise, the question might be...how
> easy
> > > is 5-wpm?
> >
> > Bert
> > I studied code for 3 years before passing the test, but I didn't try
that
> > hard
> > the first 2 1/2 years. The last 6 months is when I got serious and got
> with
> > it!
> > It still wasn't "easy", but it was something that "most" anyone can do!
> >
> > I'm glad I went ahead and did it, instead of waiting for the ITU to drop
> it.
> >
> > --
> > '73' From KB9TMP
>
> Kewl beans! The 5-wpm test is only an entry-level exam, not a "proof of
> proficiency." It's just a starting point from which one can choose many
> different paths. Glad to hear that you went ahead and just did it. I

> certainly didn't mean to imply that it's "easy" for everyone, but as you
> pointed out...very doable. Take it easy. :-)
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

587. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 02:22:03 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310212203.18118.00000112@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 62674

From: "Dan/W4NTI"
>Sure its do-able and easy. Heck you can memorize 5 wpm for dang sakes.
>The bottom line is LAZY.

After a certain number of words per minute encoding/decoding is automatic, a type of "motor-memory". Therefore it can be said that the 13wpm coders are lazier than the 5wpm coders since they are relying on motor-memory.

If a 13wpm coder "forgot" how to code at 5 wpm, this coder should relearn 5 wpm. Since these are two different skills, it seems a coder should learn BOTH 13wpm AND 5wpm.

588. Re: The end of K1MAN, AARA and IARN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 03:26:30 UTC
From: "Ed G." <Spectrumhog@_REMOVE_StarBand.net>
Message-ID: <Xns933AC60E4F131Frog207Junocom@148.78.248.76>
Source record: 62675
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

> K1MAN is COMPLETELY out of his tree.
>
> He is Ham Radio's answer to Michael
> Jackson - complete with his very own "Never-NeverLand" Compound,
> way up there in frozen ice-bound-7-Months-out-of the-Year
> Belgrade Lakes Maine.

Maybe so, but he doesn't have wierd stuff on the end of his
nose.....

Ed

589. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 03:27:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030310222750.23139.00001115@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62676

In article <3E6A4298.F48704@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E659A78.861C802B@att.net>...
>> > N2EY wrote:
>>
>> > > Show us some numbers, Len.....
>> >
>> > snip
>> >
>> > All Len will *ever* show is his bare backside.
>> >
>> > AVeryFineSpeciMan indeed.
>>
>> Dick,
>>
>> Why so negative?
>
> Wellllll..., Jim, you know the rules--- two negatives make one positive!

Only when multiplied.

>> Perhaps Len has some useful information about ARS
>> license numbers that he hasn't shared yet.
>
>I'm sure you said that in jest....

Not at all.

> the one thing he's never showed us
>is real
>information re ham radio. And never will.
>
Len has shared plenty of real information re ham radio. Most of it was things
we already knew, like 'the FCC regulates ALL US civilian radio services' and
such.
>
What he hasn't shared is any real info backing up his claims of growth in
various license classes.

>> For example, if he has old
>> Callbooks or CD-ROMs, he could generate a listing of license class
>> totals over various time periods and share it with the newsgroup.
>

> Yeah, Right! as if.

Just because it hasn't happened yet doesn't mean it's impossible. Just highly improbable.
>
>> Such data could either support or work against his claims. Without
>> such data, those claims are just wild speculation presented as facts.
>
> That's all he has ever had, all he ever will.
>
Well, there you have it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

590. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 04:39:39 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v6qq6m6i1jmnce@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62677
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Especially about a no-code novice test. No such thing. Novice is no longer available and they had to pass the same code test that the extras have to today ;) BTW, there are a number of truckers (I've talked to a few) that have their tickets. Glad to have 'em aboard! BTW, if you can locate one, the HTX-10 10 meter Rat Shack transceiver is on sale for $69.99. 25 watts ssb, 25 watts FM, and 7 watts am.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

--

"Mikeraphonium Man" <YayMrulz33@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:3e6d2d45@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> "richard" <nospam@no.spam> wrote in message
> news:b4ipqq02rh6@enews1.newsguy.com...
> > in misc.transport.trucking on Mon, 10 Mar 2003 15:23:29 GMT
> > <R52ba.12041$wJ1.1172656@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net >
> > tools had the nerve to make the following comments:
> >
> > t> Flash! Seems that some truck driver schools are including the ham
> test
> > t> with their training. Good thing.
> >
> > oh christ. practically anyone can pass the no code novice tech license.
> > if you can pass the CDL you sure as hell can pass that test too.
> > But having a novice no code license doesn't make those 10 meter rigs
legal
> > in your truck.
> > you get caught yackin on code only frequencies even with a novice tech
> > license, you're still screwed.
> > even with any ham ticket, code only means just that.
> > yack on it, you get fined.
> > and illegal radios are still illegal with or without the license.
> >
> >
> "M. Murr" <murrx@att.net> wrote in message
news:3E6CFB33.A9F3755F@att.net...
> > Yes ther is..I have a book right here for novice no-code tech license.
> >
> > "Meat-->Plow" wrote:
> >

> > > On Mon, 10 Mar 2003 13:40:50 -0600, "richard" <nospam@no.spam>,wrote:
> > >
> > > >in misc.transport.trucking on Mon, 10 Mar 2003 15:23:29 GMT
> > > ><R52ba.12041$wJ1.1172656@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net >
> > > >tools had the nerve to make the following comments:
> > > >
> > > > t> Flash! Seems that some truck driver schools are including the
ham
> test
> > > > t> with their training. Good thing.
> > > >
> > > >oh christ. practically anyone can pass the no code novice tech
license.
> > > >if you can pass the CDL you sure as hell can pass that test too.
> > > >But having a novice no code license doesn't make those 10 meter rigs
> legal
> > > >in your truck.
> > > >you get caught yackin on code only frequencies even with a novice
tech
> > > >license, you're still screwed.
> > > >even with any ham ticket, code only means just that.
> > > >yack on it, you get fined.
> > > >and illegal radios are still illegal with or without the license.
> > > >
> > >
> > > There is no such thing as a novice tech license.
> > "where's that gear at??!?!?" <greargrinderman@doubleclutchusa.com> wrote
> in message news:2h0q6v0fb6ucgufc18fhhsusm9r6vgg0fs@4ax.com...
> > Howdy Jerry,
> >
> > Glad to see you in another NG besides rec.radio.cb, I am studying to
> > get my CDL-A through a local college here in the area. I got 2 weeks
> > to go... I got it for free with no cost to me, I guess having A.D.D.
> > came in hand for something... for once. I got it though the state.
> >
> > anyhow, I will more than likely be going OTR for about 2 years.
> >
> > Take care and "73"
> >
> > -Chuck in Detroit. (chuck @ chucks2way.com (or formerly known as...)
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > On Mon, 10 Mar 2003 10:41:01 -0500, "Jerry Oxendine"
> > <joxendi@bellsouth.net> was blabbling:
> >
> > ...
> > ...tools <medtools@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > ...news:R52ba.12041$wJ1.1172656@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...

> > ...> Flash! Seems that some truck driver schools are including the
> > ham test
> > ...> with their training. Good thing.
> > ...
> > ...That is a great idea!! It opens up a whole world for the lone
> > trucker who
> > ...can legally
> > ...access the whole world with his radios.
> > ...
> > ...Jerry
>
> ....and so goes another great thread into the ham radio NG's
>
> OyVEy
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.459 / Virus Database: 258 - Release Date: 2/25/03

591. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 04:42:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6D691D.9376E80@att.net>
Source record: 62678

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6C418E.106B3710@att.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6B53BD.6A386679@att.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Responding from the TOP,
> > > > >
> > > > > "Very Tiny Bandwidth" is a bad thing?
> > > > >
> > > > > "Limited Data Rate" is a bad thing?
> > > > >
> > > > > Perhaps by "words per month" you are implying that these world record
> > > > > setters are NOT proficient?
> > > >
> > > > Brian, the conclusion is fast becoming inescapable that you're losing whatever
reasoning powers you
> > > > may have once had. If you can't differntiate manual Morse code from that used by
the very slow code
> > > > experimenters you're about ready for the looney bin.
> > >
> > > I think it was obvious that when you introduced your "banana boat
> > > swing" to evade machine copy that I understood the difference.
> > >
> > > Why would today be any different than then?
> >
> > Who said it would? I'm rather sure you never heard a banana boat swing. If you ever
listened much
> > to the CW bands you'd have. It's common in some parts. I didn't introduce it. But
anyone could
> > should he find some need to confuse a computer. Why should you have a problem with
that?
> > Why should I even ask? You're the epitome of confusion..
>
> Dick, you introduced the term "banana boat swing" to the newsgroup in
> a desperate and pathetic attempt to thwart machine copy by unworthy
> No-Code Techs.
>
> That is all.

No, you're an absolutely dense example, about as much so as one could imagine. THAT is all.

592. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 04:48:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6D6A7B.A458308@att.net>
Source record: 62679

me wrote:

> Well, duh... What's the hobby about? Do I need to expplain it to you?
>
> Duh?
>

Well DUH, indeed. If you believe that just because someone is an engineer he
will automatically
be an asset to ham radio you badly need someone to explain "it" to YOU.

>

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> news:3E6C4089.1B0F24CC@att.net...
> >
> >
> > me wrote:
> >
> > > Still, no answer to the question of the engineers being an addition to
> the
> > > hobby.
> > >
> >
> > What makes you think that just because someone is an engineer he would
> > automatically be
> > a valuable addition to ham radio?
> >

593. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 05:04:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6D6E5A.825D261F@att.net>
Source record: 62680

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6C46E3.F4D38512@att.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > Be glad to inform you, Slim. All it takes for most comuter programs I've seen to copy garbage is any sort of
> > > > noise in the circuit. Or code which isn't near-perfect in its timing, such as some of that sent by a bug or
> > > > some (many?) inept handkey senders.
> > >
> > > Then there is the intentional sloppy sending of some vile Extra, who
> > > bragged on here that he could evade machine copy by less than worthy
> > > no-code Techs.
> > >
> > > > Of course with your very crippled analytical abilities you have trouble putting facts together to reach a
> > > > valid conclusion, as always.
> > >
> > If you're so lame you have no way other than some worthless computer program with which to
> > copy code you'll just have to live with it, won't you? No action is needed on the part of anyone sending. Unless
> > you plan on getting together with the .02WPM boys you're a lost cause anyway.
>
> Well, DICK, I happened to have learned the code prior to ever owning a computer.

Yes, we know, you have said that before but you also said you operated in Somolia with permission.

Exactly where all the facts are is still up in the air.

>
>
> Is there anything else you'd like to add?

Yes, as a matter of fact. What I would have liked to have seen years ago would have been for
you to grow up and start acting like a man and an actual -dare I say real?-ham radio operator. Looks like it was not to
be.

594. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 05:13:22 UTC
From: me <me@here.com>
Message-ID: <b4jr83$48b$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62681

Duh Duh Dick. Do you think the engineers would be a liability??

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3E6D6A7B.A458308@att.net...
>
>
> me wrote:
>
> > Well, duh... What's the hobby about? Do I need to expplain it to you?
> >
> > Duh?
> >
>
> Well DUH, indeed. If you believe that just because someone is an engineer
he
> will automatically
> be an asset to ham radio you badly need someone to explain "it" to YOU.
>
>
> >
>
>
>
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3E6C4089.1B0F24CC@att.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > me wrote:
> > >
> > > > Still, no answer to the question of the engineers being an addition
to
> > the
> > > > hobby.
> > > >
> > >
> > > What makes you think that just because someone is an engineer he would
> > > automatically be
> > > a valuable addition to ham radio?
> > >
>

595. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 05:58:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA92E553.12BF8%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62682

"KB9TMP" wrote:
>
> The problem on the "firefighter or not" question
> is the "not"s. In this area we have enhanced 911
> that rings in to the county dispatchers. We all
> know that the 911 phone number is for "Emergencies"
> and nothing else. The problem is the non-firefighter
> group that calls 911 asking questions that should
> not be ask on a 911 call, or calling 911 to report
> a dog loose in the neighborhood and that kind of
> thing.
>
> There are people in the "real world" that aren't
> smart enough to know the difference between a
> real emergency and a non-emergency. (snip)

I agree about 911, William (or Bill?). However, two relatively recent incidents cause me to give pause when pointing a finger too hard. Police and fire departments in some towns now seem to be trying to sharply reduce or even eliminate calls to the station. As a result, some are intentionally making it difficult to find a non-emergency phone number. For example, when I attempted to contact the fire department over a concern I felt was not an emergency, I wasted almost 30 minutes tying to find their number in the phone book (it was buried under some state agency that didn't appear to have anything to do with fires, much less this town). Further, a call to directory assistance actually resulted in a recommendation to call 911.

I'd like to say this situation is isolated to just this town, but the other incident occurred across the country in Washington state. In a town there, I tried to call the police over a non-emergency situation (I witnessed an incident I felt should be reported), but simply gave up after some time looking for their number.

However, I do agree that people do call 911 over some of the most mundane matters (and even some absurd matters). But I don't see how that can be completely eliminated without the possibility of causing hesitation in those who probably should call (a seemingly minor issue could potentially have serious consequences).

And, for some people, that companion cat in the tree is a true emergency. Many police and fire personnel today don't want to deal with the mundane matters of community residents. But that was not always the case - at one time, community relations (however minor) was a important matter for most departments. Besides, handing that companion cat back to the little old lady did wonders for the image of public safety personnel in the eyes of the

community (and didn't do too badly at making the cop or fireman feel good either).

Sadly, with police now patrolling in cars more and more isolated from the community, and fire personnel rushing from incident to incident, those times are probably gone forever. It just might take some time before everyone understands that (and accepts it).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

596. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 06:07:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6D7D08.1D3B9C86@att.net>
Source record: 62683

me wrote:

> Duh Duh Dick. Do you think the engineers would be a liability??
>

Why would they automatically be an asset just because they're engineers?
Anyone who has such limited interest that they won't consider meeting the
requirements because they include one minor one they would rather not
fulfil might not be interested enough to be even involved. There are lots of
people even engineers who hold licenses but do nothing with them. Even
engineers.
That doesn't make them an asset, valuable or otherwise.
If you believe otherwise it shows your lack of familiarity with ham radio.

>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> news:3E6D6A7B.A458308@att.net...
> >
> >
> > me wrote:
> >
> > > Well, duh... What's the hobby about? Do I need to expplain it to you?
> > >
> > > Duh?
> > >
> >
> > Well DUH, indeed. If you believe that just because someone is an engineer
> he
> > will automatically
> > be an asset to ham radio you badly need someone to explain "it" to YOU.
> > >
> > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3E6C4089.1B0F24CC@att.net...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > me wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Still, no answer to the question of the engineers being an addition
> to

> > > the
> > > > > hobby.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > What makes you think that just because someone is an engineer he would
> > > > automatically be
> > > > a valuable addition to ham radio?
> > > > >
> >

597. Re: XM-Radio compatible with 2M/450?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 06:15:49 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA92E944.12BFA%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62684
Cross-posted to: rec.outdoors.rv-travel,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.trucks.chevy

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:

> My new tow vehicle ('03 Silverado 2500HD LT Duramax/Allison)
> came equipped with Bose XM Satellite radio. In the
> literature it makes some vague warning about damage from
> radio transmitters. (snip)

I can't say anything specific about satellite radio, but the warning itself appears to be on most newer vehicles (regardless of the devices installed). For example, my Explorer had the same warning, with a recommendation to have radio equipment professionally installed. Of course, in this town, I don't know of anyone I would consider a professional when it comes to installing communications equipment in a vehicle - including those who installed the local police and fire departments' communications equipment. As a result, I do it myself (and I haven't killed anything on any vehicle yet).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

598. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 06:16:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6D7F59.72FDCF57@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62685

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0303100306.3d0778f3@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E6C4089.1B0F24CC@att.net>...
> >> me wrote:
> >>
> >> > Still, no answer to the question of the engineers being an addition to the
> >> > hobby.
> >>
> >> What makes you think that just because someone is an engineer he would
> >> automatically be a valuable addition to ham radio?
> >
> >What makes you think that someone who cannot pass a 5wpm code exam
> >wouldn't be a valuable addition to HF ham radio?
>
> According to the olde tyme hamateurs in here, no-coders don't
> have the Right Attitude. They aren't valuable unless they've
> been tested at 20 WPM morse. :-)
>
> See Roll, see Heil, see Dick snarl and sneer down the hill...:-)

Folks are welcome to see me, Len but you aren't going to get away with a
false statement like the one you've posted. I've never written anything
to indicate that I believe there is a corollary between code speed and
attitude. You and Brian BOTH seem to have trouble with the truth.

Dave K8MN

599. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 12:16:00 UTC
From: wf3h@ptnospam.com
Message-ID: <3e6dd351.121966143@news.ptdprolog.net>
Source record: 62686
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Mon, 10 Mar 2003 23:39:39 -0500, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:

>Especially about a no-code novice test. No such thing. Novice is no longer
>available and they had to pass the same code test that the extras have to
>today ;) BTW, there are a number of truckers (I've talked to a few) that
>have their tickets. Glad to have 'em aboard! BTW, if you can locate one,
>the HTX-10 10 meter Rat Shack transceiver is on sale for $69.99. 25 watts
>ssb, 25 watts FM, and 7 watts am.
>
>73 from Rochester, NY
>Jim AA2QA
>

truckers usually hang out on 14302.5

600. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 12:27:16 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <EBB3755B065CC177.40207E185C4FC7D2.39C0EC3399F2B034@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62690

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030310000125.15648.00000740@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article
<3668FDE4280613BE.93AC21E217B5073C.7517EC407E0E43A7@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> If you have any doubt as to whether the thing you insinuated
> >> about me is true, I'd suggest some extremely rapid backpedaling --
> >> and sincere, thoughtful, and contrite apologies offered both in
> >> the newsgroup and in private E-mail. You have 72 hours from
> >> the date/time of this posting. After that, I will assume that you
> >> stand by your statements.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >Or, what? LOL
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> This is not a laughing matter. If someone got the idea that I was a
> violent criminal based on something that was said about me in this
> newsgroup, which is a public forum, then the damage to my
> reputation could be potentially disastrous. Therefore, you need to
> seriously reflect on that which you implied about me, and decide
> whether or not you wish to continue to be associated with that
> allegation. I respectfully suggest that you try again.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

You need check your facts, Larry. I implied nothing. I merely responded to
another post. You also need to get a grip with the idea of your
reputation...it isn't all that great to begin with.

Kim W5TIT

601. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 12:28:28 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <34FAFA8E6B09EB8A.64D877461F2EBE90.9CE3F20FEAA16C4B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62689

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030310000125.15648.00000739@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article
<3668FDE4280613BE.93AC21E217B5073C.7517EC407E0E43A7@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Or, what? LOL
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> For starters, you will have shown yourself to be willing to make
irresponsible,
> slanderous and libelous insinuations about people in this newsgroup, with
the
> potential reduction in what may be viewed as your already tenuous
credibility.
>
> Beyond that, only time can tell.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

And you've never done such a thing? What about the liberal character
assassination of many you have done here in this newsgroup?

Kim W5TIT

602. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 12:31:21 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <7441251BBCABE2E3.E5939C5D437A4A4B.AEF99E8DA9A3950E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62688

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030310000126.15648.00000741@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <f45722ac.0303090536.385a6a43@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> >> Kim showed up in this
> >> >> newsgroup sporting her demeaning, sexually-provocative call sign,
and
> >> >> literally dared someone here to make something of it. She got what
> >> >> she asked for.
> >> >>
> >> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >> >
> >> >Larry, that's rapist mentality.
> >>
> >> Brian:
> >>
> >> Cecil, is that you in there -- trying to disguise yourself as Brian?
> >>
> >> Anyway, no, Brian, it isn't. It is just an accurate description of
what
> >> Kim wanted to happen.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >And you took the bait?
>
> Brian:
>
> It isn't a question of taking the "bait." Kim came in here with her self-
> selected Vanity call sign which has been widely construed to be
> potentially damaging to the image of all radio amateurs, and YL's in
> particular. She went so far as to attempt to get Riley Hollingsworth to
> endorse it based on her "right" to select it, but instead was told, in so
> many words, that she has a perfect "right" to make a fool of herself
> to the possible detriment of the entire ham community.
>

Larry, why don't you just admit the truth? I posted to Riley and got the
exact response I knew I would, and you are pissed about it. It would be
quite obvious to most with a brain that Riley would not agree with my choice
of a callsign, BUT, would not act like you.

>
> Moreover,

> instead of correcting the situation, she has stubbornly proceeded to
> defend the indefensible.
>

You do that every day for yourself as well.

>
> I, for one, see little point in engaging her in any
> further discussion of the subject -- she knows what she has to do, and
> only she can make the decision to do the right thing. If she chooses
> not to, that will reflect poorly on her -- with the potential consequences
> so eloquently enumerated by Mr. Hollingsworth. What may seem to
> be an innocently witty joke to her could easily cause potential hams to
> decide to take up a different hobby -- and I couldn't blame them.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Nothing reflects poorly on me from anyone who actually *counts*, Larry.

Kim W5TIT

603. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 12:32:43 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <F01D51A6237C03D5.1E0CC526C54F5024.BA39E76379E09CB6@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62687

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030310000127.15648.00000742@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <jtln6vknuh8r5rnduk2hm6uaeesk888ciq@4ax.com>, AB2HR
<ab2hr@arrl.net>
> writes:
>
> >>If you have any doubt as to whether the thing you insinuated
> >>about me is true, I'd suggest some extremely rapid backpedaling --
> >>and sincere, thoughtful, and contrite apologies offered both in
> >>the newsgroup and in private E-mail. You have 72 hours from
> >>the date/time of this posting. After that, I will assume that you
> >>stand by your statements.
> >>
> >>73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >With the world on the brink of war, the global economy falling apart
> >at the seams, and terrorism making the headlines around the world on a
> >daily basis....
> >
> >IS THE THE BEST FREAKING THING YOU PEOPLE HAVE TO ARGUE ABOUT?
> >
> >For Christ's sake, GROW UP!
> >
> >I see so much petty nitpicking, name-calling, and posturing going on
> >here, we might as well rename the channel rec.radio.CBWANNABES.policy.
> >
> >Damn. You people make me ashamed to be a ham.
> >
> >Raymond Sirois AB2HR
> >SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
> >607-733-5745
> >telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000
>
> Raymond:
>
> I don't consider public slander and libel to be "petty nitpicking." Such
> name-calling has serious implications, and I, for one, am not going to
> tolerate being referred to as a violent criminal. Not here, not
> anywhere. I have already received and accepted Brian's apology -- Kim's
> is forthcoming, hopefully -- I haven't finished reading the new postings
on
> this thread yet. I will not interpret the "grow up" comment to have been
> directed toward me, personally, but I'd advise you to immediately clarify
> the fact that it wasn't.

>
> In years past, we have indulged ourselves in making some rather harsh
> statements toward each other in this newsgroup, but the comments
> currently in question have gone a bit too far. I have always been quickly
> forthcoming in my apologies whenever I've made remarks which could
> be construed to be personally offensive, and I expect no less from others
> in this newsgroup.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Mentality, Larry. That was the comment that was made--MENTALITY. I am beginning to wonder if you have any at all.

Kim W5TIT

604. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 13:14:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303110514.211937c4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62691

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E6D7F59.72FDCF57@earthlink.net>...

> Folks are welcome to see me, Len but you aren't going to get away with a
> false statement like the one you've posted. I've never written anything
> to indicate that I believe there is a corollary between code speed and
> attitude. You and Brian BOTH seem to have trouble with the truth.
>
> Dave K8MN

Interesting. You declare 5wpm as NOT proficient, yet you don't know
if 0.02wpm is proficient or not. Hmmm.

I think you're the one who waffles with the truth, and has an attitude
about the code.

73, Brian

605. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 13:21:32 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303110521.6d576d0c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62692

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6D6E5A.825D261F@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6C46E3.F4D38512@att.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > > Be glad to inform you, Slim. All it takes for most comuter programs I've seen to copy garbage is any sort of
> > > > > noise in the circuit. Or code which isn't near-perfect in its timing, such as some of that sent by a bug or
> > > > > some (many?) inept handkey senders.
> > > > >
> > > > > Then there is the intentional sloppy sending of some vile Extra, who
> > > > > bragged on here that he could evade machine copy by less than worthy
> > > > > no-code Techs.
> > > > >
> > > > > Of course with your very crippled analytical abilities you have trouble putting facts together to reach a
> > > > > valid conclusion, as always.
> > > >
> > > > If you're so lame you have no way other than some worthless computer program with which to
> > > > copy code you'll just have to live with it, won't you? No action is needed on the part of anyone sending. Unless
> > > > you plan on getting together with the .02WPM boys you're a lost cause anyway.
> > >
> > > Well, DICK, I happened to have learned the code prior to ever owning a computer.
> >
> > Yes, we know, you have said that before but you also said you operated in Somolia with permission.
> >
> > Exactly where all the facts are is still up in the air.

You said you put a ssb radio in an old car. Produce the car with the
radio in it. Until you do we must assume you have lied. There is no
evidence whatsoever that you are now capable nor ever been capable of
transmitting a signal from and source other than your house current.

> > Is there anything else you'd like to add?
> >
> > Yes, as a matter of fact. What I would have liked to have seen years ago would have been for
> > you to grow up and start acting like a man and an actual -dare I say real?-ham radio operator. Looks like it was not to
> > be.

Dick, I've not gone around spitting bile in the faces of other hams on the web. Time for you to lose your hatred for the modern and grow up yourself.

606. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 13:24:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303110524.516035b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62693

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6D691D.9376E80@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > Dick, you introduced the term "banana boat swing" to the newsgroup in
> > a desperate and pathetic attempt to thwart machine copy by unworthy
> > No-Code Techs.
> >
> > That is all.
>
> No, you're an absolutely dense example, about as much so as one could imagine. THAT is all.

DICK, I've never been a no-code anything. However, unlike you, I
don't look down on the no-code licensees. I see them as hams.

73, Brian

607. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 13:33:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030311083329.21422.00000132@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62694

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/10/03 8:22 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030310212203.18118.00000112@mb-cq.aol.com>

>After a certain number of words per minute encoding/decoding is automatic, a
>type of "motor-memory". Therefore it can be said that the 13wpm coders are
>lazier than the 5wpm coders since they are relying on motor-memory.

What BS.

At 13 and greater WPM, the code is "heard" just like a second language. I
don't "hear" the letters being sent...I "hear" the words.

>If a 13wpm coder "forgot" how to code at 5 wpm, this coder should relearn 5
>wpm. Since these are two different skills, it seems a coder should learn BOTH
>13wpm AND 5wpm.

The epitome of silly.

Steve, K4YZ

608. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 13:35:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030311083552.21422.00000133@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62695

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>Date: 3/10/03 3:08 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <v6pvpd6n048lbd@corp.supernews.com>

>2) No, the military does not use Morse. Really.

Rephrase that to say the military does not use Morse Code ROUTINELY and
you'll be OK. Morse Code IS stil taught to some branches and used both
passively (intercept) and for some covert operations.

73

Steve, K4YZ

609. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 13:40:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030311084034.21422.00000134@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62696

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/10/03 12:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303101059.610c4429@posting.google.com>

>So we can do away with the Cleveland clinic and just have people think
>themselves to wellness.

In some cases, yes. Good mental health and proper attitudes towards
wellness are documented pathologies. Sorry you find that hard to believe.

>Maybe I just have to wish harder?

You've already tried that and see what it got you...?!?!

You have to TRY harder...you know...actually DO it...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

610. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 13:56:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030311085642.21422.00000135@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62697

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/10/03 1:05 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030310140535.05048.00001062@mb-cs.aol.com>

>Tsk, tsk, tsk, the magificent marine (ex) of 18 1/2 years thinks
> the word "shit" is profanity?!?!

Yep. I do. If I wouldn't say a particular word in "mixed" company or in front of a minister, it fails the "profanity" check list.

But you are STILL a putz.

>I've purchased four downloads from the ITU.

Still waiting for the color-by-numbers version so you can really understand...?!?!

>Tsk, tsk, tsk...a colloquial phrase (that means in common use
> among the people) was NOT the subject, was it?

Doesn't matter what the subject was, Lennie...What matters is that an alleged college educated "professional" can't express himself without reverting to such profanities.

>Steam Robespierre can only wave his scatological sabre wildly
> trying to get into the act. Bad acting. [play closed in
> Chatanooga...]

Whew...guess we can't hold Lennie's feet to the fire over accuaracy anymore, eh...?!?! But of course HE will do that to us...

>> THIS is cute...Mr. "I Am A Radio Professional" trying to bail himself
>out
>>from NOT being able to specifiy facts in a radio regulation matter...
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...send out the International Literary Police!

What literary police, Your Scumminess? We are discussing radio regulations, a subject in which an alleged radio professional SHOULD be able to demonstrate SOME understanding in...Obviously you can't.

>> You've already been proven wrong and Phil Kane did a nice job of doing
>it.
>> Need another spanking, Lennie, or still stinging from the first?
>
> There's been NO "proven wrong" since there is no International
> Radio Police to enforce the ITU-R "regulations." US citizens on

> US territory are subject to US law, not some "international law."

You were wrong, Lennie...You were wrong before, you are wrong now. Don't need any "Radio Police" to prove or disprove it...Just reading your rants then refering to the actual regulations show you are wrong.

Sorry.

>If you don't understand the difference between de jure and de
> facto as applying to the discussion, then all you are doing is
> just another useless flame war Hostile Action. Tsk, tsk,.tsk.

No flame war, Lennie. You are wrong. Sorry you can't accept it.

>Firstly, personal military experience was NOT in the discussion
> thread.

So what? Wrong is wrong...

(Having chastiswed me for what is or is not part of the thread, Lennie launches into a recital of his former unit's heraldry...as if we care...)

>Secondly, what began as the 71st Signal Service Battalion, US...(SNIP)

And then he follows with...

>Third, try to stay focussed on the thread SUBJECT instead of
> nursing old, aggravated ego wounds from long ago messaging.

I see who's nursing what, Lennie.

> Now, do you have any data to share on ARS license numbers?

Do you? Any intentions on living up to your bravado on getting that Extra-lite out of the box, Your Lyingship, or just more continuous excuse-excuse-excuse...?!?!

>Remember that you must be Serious, just like Reverend Jim.

I see YOU have a problem with seriousness, Lennie.

Sheesh...PUTZ!

Steve

611. Re: Public Service and Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 15:22:51 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v6rvq9mv8kc0f7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62698

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA92E553.12BF8%stewart@say.net...
> "KB9TMP" wrote:
> >
> > The problem on the "firefighter or not" question
> > is the "not"s. In this area we have enhanced 911
> > that rings in to the county dispatchers. We all
> > know that the 911 phone number is for "Emergencies"
> > and nothing else. The problem is the non-firefighter
> > group that calls 911 asking questions that should
> > not be ask on a 911 call, or calling 911 to report
> > a dog loose in the neighborhood and that kind of
> > thing.
> >
> > There are people in the "real world" that aren't
> > smart enough to know the difference between a
> > real emergency and a non-emergency. (snip)
>
>
> I agree about 911, William (or Bill?). However, two relatively recent
> incidents cause me to give pause when pointing a finger too hard. Police
and
> fire departments in some towns now seem to be trying to sharply reduce or
> even eliminate calls to the station. As a result, some are intentionally
> making it difficult to find a non-emergency phone number. For example,
when
> I attempted to contact the fire department over a concern I felt was not
an
> emergency, I wasted almost 30 minutes tying to find their number in the
> phone book (it was buried under some state agency that didn't appear to
have
> anything to do with fires, much less this town). Further, a call to
> directory assistance actually resulted in a recommendation to call 911.

That sounds more like the fault of the phone company than the fire/police.
In our phone book all the numbers emergency and non are listed inside the
front cover and for all the communities that the directery covers.

>
> I'd like to say this situation is isolated to just this town, but the
> other incident occurred across the country in Washington state. In a town
> there, I tried to call the police over a non-emergency situation (I
> witnessed an incident I felt should be reported), but simply gave up after
> some time looking for their number.
>

The fire/police could publicize their number to help out with the poor directories.

> However, I do agree that people do call 911 over some of the most mundane
> matters (and even some absurd matters). But I don't see how that can be
> completely eliminated without the possibility of causing hesitation in those
> who probably should call (a seemingly minor issue could potentially have
> serious consequences).

Agree 100% it's better to call than not to and have something worse happen.

>
> And, for some people, that companion cat in the tree is a true emergency.
> Many police and fire personnel today don't want to deal with the mundane
> matters of community residents. But that was not always the case - at one
> time, community relations (however minor) was a important matter for most
> departments. Besides, handing that companion cat back to the little old lady
> did wonders for the image of public safety personnel in the eyes of the
> community (and didn't do too badly at making the cop or fireman feel good
> either).

With budget cuts and rising costs to run a dept it's no wonder that they refrain from running on non-emergencies.

>
> Sadly, with police now patrolling in cars more and more isolated from the
> community, and fire personnel rushing from incident to incident, those times
> are probably gone forever. It just might take some time before everyone
> understands that (and accepts it).
>

Dwight, small town America is still around, but it's on it's deathbed. We are
a small community (appx 2000) and the police and fire are all known by everyone on a first name basis. But just like Bob Dylan said, "the times they
are a changin'" it's a sad thing but something we can't stop, just remember!

--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

>
>
>
> ------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

612. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 15:54:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6E067F.AB5976F2@att.net>
Source record: 62699

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <3E6B62E9.3040504@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
> > At the risk of turning this into a productive thread and getting an
> >education, (always dangerous here in rrap!) What is the rationale for
> >such slow data rate transmissions? I certainly would expect slower than
> >normal for these initial tests, and of course the bandwidth at 136 kHz
> >is limited, but I'm curious. Seems like since computers are doing the
> >work, it would be possible to send at a more "normal" rate.
>
> Define "normal."
>
> "Education" for yourself is a personal thing and does not drive
> this newsgroup. Insults hurled by outraged, wounded egos
> drive the newsgroup. :-)
>
> Extremely compressed "education" -
>
> Time is the inverse of frequency. Bandwidth refers to the total
> amount of spectrum space necessary for reception and
> minimally adequate reproduction of orginal transmitted
> information. Noise is the random noise from all sources in the
> universe that does not carry information desired. Noise is
> expressed as a power in Watts and generally (but not always)
> assumed to have an equal average power at all frequencies
> below 100 GHz and above absolute zero (-273 degrees C). In
> most receivers the major source of noise is the input stage
> beginning with the antenna itself, the antenna coupling method
> and all components therein, the first active amplification stage.
>
> In a 1947 seminal paper on communication circuit efficiency,
> Claude E. Shannon showed the relationship between
> information rate, bandwidth, noise, and error probability of
> communication of the information. Those relationships were
> adopted worldwide by industry, academicians, theorists, and
> engineers. It is familiarly known as "Shannon's Law." [first
> printed in the monthly Bell Systems Technical Journal, copies
> were available from the University of Illinois on-line library of
> historical documents...I have one in PDF]
>
> Shannon's Law works on probabilities of correct information
> transferrence. The "better" a communication circuit, the lesser

> the number of errors. There is no such thing as "perfect copy"
> but rather an extremely low probability of errors from any
> source.
>
> Noise power in a communications circuit is proportional to the
> square-root of the bandwidth necessary to preserve the original
> transmitted information. Since that noise is assumed
> completely random, that proportionality has been shown to be
> correct. While not relating directly to Shannon's Law as applied,
> a completely random noise source power will always add to the
> noise power from another completely random noise source in a
> linear mixing device.
>
> Errors in a communication circuit are related to the signal to
> noise powers ratio. As that ratio goes lower, the error probability
> due to noise increases. Conversely, as the ratio goes higher, the
> error probability decreases. That ratio becomes a figure of merit
> for a communications circuit, familiarly known as the "signal to
> noise ratio" (sometimes "SNR" or "S:N") generally and "bit error
> rate" or BER to all those in any form of digital communications.
>
> Noise power can be reduced by narrowing the communications
> bandwidth (square-root numerical as stated). But, bandwidth is
> limited by the rate of the information to be communicated. In
> simple carrier modulation applications the necessary bandwidth
> is approximately the inverse of the information rate expressed
> in units of time. [the now-common computer modem uses both
> amplitude and phase modulation plus bit combinations to increase
> the overall information communications rate without violation of
> bandwidth necessary for a single modulation of just AM or PM]
>
> Since both noise and a desired signal are powers, statistical
> mathematics laws can be used to identify periods of time having
> just noise or the noise-plus-signal. Given enough time to do the
> averaging and other determinations of correctness, it is possible
> to detect a signal-plus-noise power that is only a small fraction
> of a decibel above just the noise power. The statistical averaging
> is generally done with some form of computer assistance for
> convenience although analogue methods could be used. Radio
> astronomers have been working regularly and successfully for
> over three decades on separating stellar radio objects where the
> signal source power was at least 20 db below natural noise power.
> The ability of such seemingly minute discrimination of noise
> versus signal-plus-noise can only be done for relatively long
> periods of time (relative to whatever minimum bandwidth is
> required).
>
> The use of statistical mathematical laws allows a communications
> circuit to redefine its bandwidth, to make it an inverse of the time
> of averaging-comparison of signal-plus-noise to noise. Increasing

> time is equivalent to a decrease of bandwidth. As bandwidth is
> reduced, so is the total noise power. As noise power is reduced,
> the probability of error is also reduced. A communications
> information rate of 100 seconds per unit (0.01 Hertz) will have an
> effective signal to noise ratio of 10 db in power versus a rate of
> 1 second per unit of information (1.0 Hz). Effective bandwidth
> reduction is 100:1 but the square-root relationship makes it a
> 10:1 change for the same probability of error. The downside is
> that information transfer rate is still at a 100:1 ratio.
>
> Digital Signal Processing or DSP uses statistical mathematics
> and several other mathematical relationships plus very fast
> digital computation to discriminate signal-plus-noise to noise
> and to extract repetitive frequency components from just signal
> amplitudes over time. Such applications have been used for
> three decades in passive sonar, seismometry, civil engineering
> analyses of building structures and deep earth strata to some
> mundane consumer electronics gadgetry such a presenting a
> frequency spectrum display of music. Most audio range
> spectrum analyzers today are basically time-to-frequency
> DSP-driven instruments rather than conventional analogue
> electronic architecture instruments.
>
> Could such a record be done using "faster" ("normal") or more
> conventional information modes? Possibly. To realize that
> requires an analysis of a proposed circuit path, available RF power,
> worst-case propagation loss at the radio frequency, narrowest
> receiving analogue bandwidth, and tolerable analogue signal to
> noise ratio plus several other more minor factors. Digital
> computation can then be applied to reduce the effective band-
> width and provide more discrimination between signal and noise.
> Utilization of error-correcting digital codes as part of the infor-
> mation transferred will reduce the error probability even further.
>
> Class over. There will be an open-book test next Wednesday.
> Dismissed. :-)
>

In attemping to "prove" himself master of SOMETHING, anything,
AVeryFinePutz
has instead shown himself to be grossly ignorant of any practical
knowledge and experience in the field of HF radio communication and
practical communications
circuits in general. There is good reason why Shannon's theories are
presented to
prospective EE's *only* after a few years of college work.

Of course they are accurate but fail to reflect the realities of real
world
communications today, particularily ham radio, where 'optimal' is a word
concerning virtually no one except theoreticians and design engineers

intent on conserving the last bit of power, space, distance, time, efficiency. It has so little to do with everyday ham radio operation as practiced by typical ham radio operators ON THE AIR that his presentation on
this venue becomes little more than a sideshow. In plaianer words, the world has never
operated at or even near the "cutting edge". Technological advances always occur over time, and lots of it. Sure, there are some modes out there now using super efficient codings. So what? Nowhere near the horizon is a ham radio using only Shannon-optimized gear and practices. In AVeryFineSpeciman's jaded outlook that only offers him more reason to criticise things that exist while his presence on this newsgroup is no more that a body slam against hobbyists and a hobby that he has always resented and could never bring himself to attempt to join. Just the transition of analog broadcast TV to all-digital HD is causing more than enough shock in a world where dollar value must be given more and more consideration, again as has happened in the past.
Of course Loose Lennie can't be expected to know that, nor much of anything else about reality.

As ham radio continues to drop demands for technical knowledge right along with
proficiency in Morse code, the idea that hams should be as adept at manipulating
Shannon as if they were design engineers is as ludicrous as the idea that we should actually pay The Louse him any serious attention. I sure wish you guys would all start ignoring him again, as that's the only way we'll ever get rid of him. Someone said "The poor will always be with us". Same with Lennie the Louse if we don't begin to again give him exactly what he deserves. You figure out that that is.

613. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 15:58:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6E078F.27ABD581@att.net>
Source record: 62700

me wrote:

> The real problem in this newsgroup is dealing with the reality that morse
> code is not even 50 percent of the average operators air time.
>
> With the thinking that I have observed, everyone should have to learn how to
> ride a horse to get a drivers license.

That's not logical, Me. One might find some logic in requiring knowledge
and
skill in a variety of the components of driving that are not always
used, which mnay never be needed,but which one may find useful or that
are a often used
part. Morse code is a longtime much used part of ham radio even today.
Few hams operate satellite comms or are VE's but the rules mandate that
the tests cover those topics.
That is a valid comparison.

614. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 15:59:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6E07B1.1D7CD5A8@att.net>
Source record: 62801

Mike Coslo wrote:

>
> To me, it boils down to: If you want it, this is how you get it. I wanted
> it, I learned Morse. These others just don't want it that much. Their loss.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

'Hi Mike and 'me'.... All this sure sounds like what many of us OT's
have been
saying for a long, long time! <g> Of course the parameters have changed
a
bit but the form and principle remains.
Looks to me like there will be people complaining about the tests until
there are NO
tests.

73, Dick

615. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 15:59:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6E07BD.30256BDA@att.net>
Source record: 62802

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6A4307.8C236F9A@att.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E65808E.3D42D926@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > I'll think about answering your question when you show some civility and
> > > > when you answer the questions N2EY and I have both asked about your
> > > > Somali "operations".
> > > >
> > > > What was that line you used with Steve? Something about not dancing to
> > > > his fiddling...
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Suit yourself. We have nothing more to talk about.
> >
> > Far as I can see you never did.
>
> Yep. Kim had it figured out long ago. Dave was just trying to jerk us off.

If that were so looks like he was a little late in your case.

616. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 15:59:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6E07DC.5BEF82FB@att.net>
Source record: 62803

Brian wrote:

> "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message news:<v6j1b2s1cjv4fe@corp.supernews.com>...
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20030307232654.10901.00001651@mb-dh.aol.com...
> > > In article <f45722ac.0303072001.136673ec@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >
> > > >Trivia Time:
> > > >
> > > >If the dit was 60 seconds long, how long is the dash?
> > >
> > > Brian:
> > >
> > > Presumably, three times longer than the "dit," or 180 seconds.
> > >
> > > >How long is the inter-character space?
> > >
> > > Good question; obviously that would depend on the software used. My
> > > guess is it would be at least the length of a "dah," or 180 seconds.
> > >
> > > >How long is the inter-word space?
> > >
> > > Should be at least three inter-character spaces in length, or 540 seconds.
> > > Again, it would depend on the software in use. At these slow speeds,
> > > standard inter-chracter and inter-word spacing would not necessarily
> > > apply. The exaggerated spacing would likely not be necessary in spite of
> > > the increased length of the actual "on" time of the separate dits and
> > dahs.
> > > I'm sure they were visually monitoring each others signals on a computer
> > > screen display that resembled an oscilloscope with a greatly expanded
> > > time base. However, I doubt that they were sending any "words" longer
> > > than each other's call signs. I'd sure like to read about the receivers
> > > in use. They must have been dealing with signal strengths in the nano-
> > > volt level.
> > >
> > > >Could Farnsworth have been substituted for Morse Code, and worked as
> > > >effectively?
> > >
> > > I dunno. Since when is Farnsworth a "substitute" for Morse code? I
> > > always thought it was just another method of sending Morse code.
> > >
> > > >Are these UK amateurs considered proficient?

> > >
> > > I'd say they were.
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> >
> >
> > Larry
> > Since they have set a record that means they must be
> > on the cutting edge of Amateur Radio. And they are
> > using good old Morse's Code to accomplish it!
> > So much for it being a "dead mode" of little use.
>
> At what speed did these proficient, cutting edge coders send their message?
>
> Remember that a single dit was one minute long.

Inspirational flash for Brian/Slim: Sometimes -often- maximum data rate
is not a pertinent part of the objective, whatever the project.

617. Re: Here's your chance

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 16:00:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6E07EC.9C3D9754@att.net>
Source record: 62804

Brian wrote:

> "Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<Epeaa.8431$wJ1.806037@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in
> >
> > :
> > : Suggestions such as "Don't publish the questions pools?"
> > :
> >
> > I don't know of any limitations on the suggestions, so you'd certainly be
> > free to suggest that. Unfortunately the QPC would not be in a position to
> > implement it however, since it would be in direct conflict with ï¿½97.523 of
> > the Commissions rules.
> >
> > With all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
>
> I wonder if that's anything like substituting a 13-15WPM Farnsworth
> Exam for the REQUIRED 5WPM Morse Exam?

You're the only person on the planet wondering. Do you by any chance
feel isolated?

618. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 16:11:24 UTC
From: BDK <kingrat@buckeye-express.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.18d7d4bbaff796e598970e@news.buckeye-express.com>
Source record: 62805
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <3e6dd351.121966143@news.ptdprolog.net>, wf3h@ptnospam.com
says...
> On Mon, 10 Mar 2003 23:39:39 -0500, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
>
> >Especially about a no-code novice test. No such thing. Novice is no longer
> >available and they had to pass the same code test that the extras have to
> >today ;) BTW, there are a number of truckers (I've talked to a few) that
> >have their tickets. Glad to have 'em aboard! BTW, if you can locate one,
> >the HTX-10 10 meter Rat Shack transceiver is on sale for $69.99. 25 watts
> >ssb, 25 watts FM, and 7 watts am.
> >
> >73 from Rochester, NY
> >Jim AA2QA
> >
>
> truckers usually hang out on 14302.5
>

The truckers that use ham rigs around here have them clipped, and run
down just below and above the legal CB band, and some run 24-25 MHZ.

The rigs of choice for them were:

Yaesu Ft-757
Kenwood 440
Icom 735,

Then it was

Kenwood ts450's
Kenwood TS 50's, but they complained about the "splash"!

Now it seems like the Icom 706X is the rig of choice. I get to hear
these guys in the background due to how close to the interstate I am.

BDK

619. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 16:13:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6E0AEE.89F98B6@att.net>
Source record: 62806

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6D6E5A.825D261F@att.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6C46E3.F4D38512@att.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > > Be glad to inform you, Slim. All it takes for most comuter programs I've seen to copy garbage is any sort of
> > > > > > noise in the circuit. Or code which isn't near-perfect in its timing, such as some of that sent by a bug or
> > > > > > some (many?) inept handkey senders.
> > > > >
> > > > > Then there is the intentional sloppy sending of some vile Extra, who
> > > > > bragged on here that he could evade machine copy by less than worthy
> > > > > no-code Techs.
> > > > >
> > > > > > Of course with your very crippled analytical abilities you have trouble putting facts together to reach a
> > > > > > valid conclusion, as always.
> > > > >
> > > > If you're so lame you have no way other than some worthless computer program with which to
> > > > copy code you'll just have to live with it, won't you? No action is needed on the part of anyone sending. Unless
> > > > you plan on getting together with the .02WPM boys you're a lost cause anyway.
> > > >
> > > Well, DICK, I happened to have learned the code prior to ever owning a computer.
> > >
> > Yes, we know, you have said that before but you also said you operated in Somolia with permission.
> >
> > Exactly where all the facts are is still up in the air.
>
> You said you put a ssb radio in an old car.

There you go with your usual garble of facts. It was a fairly new radio in a fairly new car.

> Produce the car with the
> radio in it.

Still have the old (now) radio in the junkbox, sure wish I had the car. 65 chev Malibu 2door HT

white, 283 turbo automatic. Slick. Made a great mobile installation for CW too, wasn't hard to arrange the SSB rig to work
CW. Dunno how you handle such things. Not at all, obviously.

> Until you do we must assume you have lied. There is no
> evidence whatsoever that you are now capable nor ever been capable of
> transmitting a signal from and source other than your house current.

You may just be a figment of The Putz's imagination, too. In fact there's plenty of evidence for it.

>
>
> > > Is there anything else you'd like to add?
> >
> > Yes, as a matter of fact. What I would have liked to have seen years ago would have been for
> > you to grow up and start acting like a man and an actual -dare I say real?-ham radio operator. Looks like it was not to
> > be.
>
> Dick, I've not gone around spitting bile in the faces of other hams on
> the web.

Shows what you know. That's exactly how this lil' fracas got started.

> Time for you to lose your hatred for the modern and grow up
> yourself.

Wrong again, it's far past time for you go GET REAL and get a life, both within and without ham radio. You're an absolute
idiot if you can't do better than that. CW is so small a part of it that it doesn't even register except for you and Putz insisting on keeping it a part.

Goodbye.

620. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 17:49:15 UTC
From: me <me@here.com>
Message-ID: <b4l7hh$d8u$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62807

Let's see. Would you want to learn how to ride a horse? Horseback riding was an early form of transportation. It is a tradition that was used for hundreds of years. Wouldn't you want to keep up the tradition? Just think, you can brag to your friends that you can ride a horse. In an emergency, you and the Lone Ranger can ride for help. Everybody in the newsgroup would be impressed.

What parts of the driving test would you want to delete?

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3E6E078F.27ABD581@att.net...
>
>
> me wrote:
>
> > The real problem in this newsgroup is dealing with the reality that
morse
> > code is not even 50 percent of the average operators air time.
> >
> > With the thinking that I have observed, everyone should have to learn
how to
> > ride a horse to get a drivers license.
>
> That's not logical, Me. One might find some logic in requiring knowledge
> and
> skill in a variety of the components of driving that are not always
> used, which mnay never be needed,but which one may find useful or that
> are a often used
> part. Morse code is a longtime much used part of ham radio even today.
> Few hams operate satellite comms or are VE's but the rules mandate that
> the tests cover those topics.
> That is a valid comparison.

621. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 17:55:44 UTC
From: me <me@here.com>
Message-ID: <b4l7tn$57g$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62808

You do understand that the engineers that we are discussing are Electrical Engineers?

I could see your arguement if it were Mechanical Engineers, Industrial Engineers, Civil Engineers, maybe Chemical Engineers.

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:3E6D7D08.1D3B9C86@att.net...
>
>
> me wrote:
>
> > Duh Duh Dick. Do you think the engineers would be a liability??
> >
>
> Why would they automatically be an asset just because they're engineers?
> Anyone who has such limited interest that they won't consider meeting the
> requirements because they include one minor one they would rather not
> fulfil might not be interested enough to be even involved. There are lots of
> people even engineers who hold licenses but do nothing with them. Even
> engineers.
> That doesn't make them an asset, valuable or otherwise.
> If you believe otherwise it shows your lack of familiarity with ham radio.
>
>
>
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3E6D6A7B.A458308@att.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > me wrote:
> > >
> > > > Well, duh... What's the hobby about? Do I need to expplain it to you?
> > > >
> > > > Duh?
> > > >
> > >
> > > Well DUH, indeed. If you believe that just because someone is an engineer
> > he
> > > will automatically
> > > be an asset to ham radio you badly need someone to explain "it" to

YOU.
> > >
> > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3E6C4089.1B0F24CC@att.net...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > me wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > Still, no answer to the question of the engineers being an
addition
> > to
> > > > > the
> > > > > > hobby.
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > What makes you think that just because someone is an engineer he
would
> > > > > automatically be
> > > > > a valuable addition to ham radio?
> > > > >
> > >
>

622. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 18:03:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6E24E4.98E81BE4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62809

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6D7F59.72FDCF57@earthlink.net>...
>
> > Folks are welcome to see me, Len but you aren't going to get away with a
> > false statement like the one you've posted. I've never written anything
> > to indicate that I believe there is a corollary between code speed and
> > attitude. You and Brian BOTH seem to have trouble with the truth.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Interesting. You declare 5wpm as NOT proficient, yet you don't know
> if 0.02wpm is proficient or not. Hmmm.
>
> I think you're the one who waffles with the truth, and has an attitude
> about the code.
>
> 73, Brian

Doesn't matter much to me if you are playing stupid or whether you are
actually stupid, Brian.

Someone whose maximum code speed is five words per minute is not
proficient at morse code.

Someone who uses a morse code speed of .02 wpm may or may not be
proficient at morse code. That would depend on the maximum speed at
which he is capable.

Hmm, indeed.

Dave K8MN

623. Re: Here's your chance

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 19:14:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303111114.53e299b7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62810

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6E07EC.9C3D9754@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<Epeaa.8431$wJ1.806037@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in
> > >
> > > :
> > > : Suggestions such as "Don't publish the questions pools?"
> > > :
> > >
> > > I don't know of any limitations on the suggestions, so you'd certainly be
> > > free to suggest that. Unfortunately the QPC would not be in a position to
> > > implement it however, since it would be in direct conflict with ï¿½97.523 of
> > > the Commissions rules.
> > >
> > > With all kind wishes,
> > >
> > > de Hans, K0HB
> >
> > I wonder if that's anything like substituting a 13-15WPM Farnsworth
> > Exam for the REQUIRED 5WPM Morse Exam?
>
>
> You're the only person on the planet wondering. Do you by any chance
> feel isolated?

I think at this point, the QPC can do just about anything they want,
regardless of Part 97.

624. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 19:16:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303111116.1c3a09ca@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62811

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6E07DC.5BEF82FB@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > At what speed did these proficient, cutting edge coders send their message?
> >
> > Remember that a single dit was one minute long.
>
> Inspirational flash for Brian/Slim: Sometimes -often- maximum data rate
> is not a pertinent part of the objective, whatever the project.

Dick, did you tell the truth when you said you were putting me "back
in the crapper (kill file)?"

It looks like you were less than honest/truthful.

Brian

625. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 19:20:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303111120.32abbbb1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62813

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6E07BD.30256BDA@att.net>...
>
> If that were so looks like he was a little late in your case.

DICK, what happened to your promise? Where are the promise police?
Are you related to Alec Baldwin?

626. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 19:20:50 UTC
From: Trucker Bobby Joe <Channel@truker19channel.net>
Message-ID: <b4lctn$5nq$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 62812
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

So what! Truckers aren't bothering anyone running above
and below CB or even running on 24 & 25 mhz. Only you
hams work yourselves up into a dither over it. You hams think
you own the entire radio spectrum!

Bobby Joe

"BDK" <kingrat@buckeye-express.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.18d7d4bbaff796e598970e@news.buckeye-express.com...
> In article <3e6dd351.121966143@news.ptdprolog.net>, wf3h@ptnospam.com
> says...
> > On Mon, 10 Mar 2003 23:39:39 -0500, "Jim Hampton"
> > <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
> >
> > >Especially about a no-code novice test. No such thing. Novice is no
longer
> > >available and they had to pass the same code test that the extras have
to
> > >today ;) BTW, there are a number of truckers (I've talked to a few)
that
> > >have their tickets. Glad to have 'em aboard! BTW, if you can locate
one,
> > >the HTX-10 10 meter Rat Shack transceiver is on sale for $69.99. 25
watts
> > >ssb, 25 watts FM, and 7 watts am.
> > >
> > >73 from Rochester, NY
> > >Jim AA2QA
> > >
> >
> > truckers usually hang out on 14302.5
> >
>
>
> The truckers that use ham rigs around here have them clipped, and run
> down just below and above the legal CB band, and some run 24-25 MHZ.
>
> The rigs of choice for them were:
>
> Yaesu Ft-757
> Kenwood 440
> Icom 735,
>
> Then it was

>
> Kenwood ts450's
> Kenwood TS 50's, but they complained about the "splash"!
>
> Now it seems like the Icom 706X is the rig of choice. I get to hear
> these guys in the background due to how close to the interstate I am.
>
> BDK

627. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 19:22:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303111122.2c04c98c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62814

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6E07B1.1D7CD5A8@att.net>...
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> >
> > To me, it boils down to: If you want it, this is how you get it. I wanted
> > it, I learned Morse. These others just don't want it that much. Their loss.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> 'Hi Mike and 'me'.... All this sure sounds like what many of us OT's
> have been
> saying for a long, long time! <g> Of course the parameters have changed
> a
> bit but the form and principle remains.
> Looks to me like there will be people complaining about the tests until
> there are NO
> tests.
>
> 73, Dick

Oh, please. Just make the tests relavant. You can do that, can't you?

Maybe not.

628. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 19:30:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303111130.18e1c876@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62815

AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<ofdq6vg3rb3krmk67nbc8csc8vpshrcvbo@4ax.com>...
> On 9 Mar 2003 20:04:42 -0800, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
> >AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<jtln6vknuh8r5rnduk2hm6uaeesk888ciq@4ax.com>...
>
> >
> >Ray, I think Larry and I have earned the right to talk about any
> >damned thing we please. And we earned it for you as well. So instead
> >of insulting us, you might think about thanking us.
> >
> >You're welcome.
> >
> >Brian
>
> ... and exactly what is it that makes you think I haven't "earned" the
> right to vent when I've had a belly full of your petty arguing?
>
> Raymond Sirois AB2HR
> SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
> 607-733-5745
> telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

Because you don't know turn the dial. You might want to get with Jim
and Dave and get this group moderated, to at least exclude non-hams as
was discussed before.

Then you can exclude people with zero calls and stroke 8 suffixes.

Then you can exclude people with 5 calls and any suffix with a "T."

Then you guys can slap yourselves on your back for an eternity, where
never is heard a discouraging word, and the skies are not cloudy all
day.

629. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 20:47:58 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <nUrba.3132$4%2.826@fe09.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 62816
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Trucker Bobby Joe <Channel@truker19channel.net> wrote in message
news:b4lctn$5nq$0@pita.alt.net...
> So what! Truckers aren't bothering anyone running above
> and below CB or even running on 24 & 25 mhz. Only you
> hams work yourselves up into a dither over it. You hams think
> you own the entire radio spectrum!
>
> Bobby Joe

I beg to differ. For example, USAF Auxiliary (CAP) operates on 26 MHZ.
Military and govern-
ment stations on both 25, 26, and 27 MHZ. Twenty four Megahertz from
24.930 (approx) to
24.990 is a ham band so designated by world agreement. Ten meters is also a
ham band (28-29.7
MHZ)--again by international agreement. I have to say this, but it is true:
Most CBers haven't
a clue when it comes to reasons WHY things are set up the way they are.
Except for a minority
with a bit of training, most CBers/truckers buy a rig, set up the thing to
"swang" as if that helps
anything, put in a trashy, splattering "leenyar" and start jabbering
away--completely clueless and
oblivious to the WHY the thing nor how their actions affect others. And
the BIG REDDIO boys
don't care--just as they can feel adequate or fool themselves into thinking
they are a BIG man be-
cause they can splatter over the next truck 100 yards away.

Like it or not, the regulations are set up just for this reason. To allow
everyone to just yap any one
pleases would render the spectrum useless. And the climate for enforcement
has changed (read
the rainreport for March 7th). One gentleman, and quite a few others, have
found that so-called
"freebanding" doesn't pay. Those other users that you *think* aren't being
hurt by your being out-
side frequencies allowed for CB, are complaining loudly. The enforcement
honcho at FCC has
made hams and others aware that FCC HAS received additional funding, and Mr
Hollingsworth
IS using the money to go after the truckers who are using those "export"
radios as well as users.
According to Mr. H. as recently as this last Saturday. you can count hearing

about some major
truck chains getting hit with some BIG fines. There may be some other
surprise visits by agents
at weight scales. I can't make anyone believe this, but these are just the
facts. The legitimate
users of licensed frequencies are just not going to put up with interference
from bandits.
If you have time to search the archives in the rainreport, you can the
steady increase in citations
over the last year. One driver got fired (Cheetah Transportation). This
last reporting period,
one gentleman got warned for operating on 25 MHZ. He was a ham, too. Now
he may get his
license pulled because he *thought* that he wouldn't hurt anything; after
all, those frequencies are
"empty", right? As far as the truckers operating on 10 Meters, it is not a
good idea to do that
either. Many hams, angry at the intrusions, are listening closely to trucks
and turning them in.
Usually what happens, a trucker sees an odd ham antenna and gives the ham
"ol' holler, thar".
The ham, who *may* be listening, uses a min-tape recorder, writes down the
tag numbers,
company name, and tractor info, and sends it to Mr. Hollingsworth. With the
correct info (
for which the FCC has asked hams to incliude), they WILL send a warning
letter. If you
continue to operate out-of-band, then it can get VERY expensive! Like $10,
000, seizure
of equipment, or prison time (Just ask "Rabbit Ears" in Florida who refused
to stop. In the
case of a trucker who gets such a letter, you will wonder how you got caught
because the
ham will likely not respond since voice operation is not legal below 28.300
MHZ.

As to wanting *all* the spectrum, well, we have quite bit of it. But have
you ever wondered
WHY that is and why CB has so little? Think about it. And besides, hams DO
"own" the
spectrum; they I N V E N T E D it!!

J

>
>
> "BDK" <kingrat@buckeye-express.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.18d7d4bbaff796e598970e@news.buckeye-express.com...
> > In article <3e6dd351.121966143@news.ptdprolog.net>, wf3h@ptnospam.com
> > says...
> > > On Mon, 10 Mar 2003 23:39:39 -0500, "Jim Hampton"

> > > <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > >Especially about a no-code novice test. No such thing. Novice is no
> longer
> > > >available and they had to pass the same code test that the extras
have
> to
> > > >today ;) BTW, there are a number of truckers (I've talked to a few)
> that
> > > >have their tickets. Glad to have 'em aboard! BTW, if you can locate
> one,
> > > >the HTX-10 10 meter Rat Shack transceiver is on sale for $69.99. 25
> watts
> > > >ssb, 25 watts FM, and 7 watts am.
> > > >
> > > >73 from Rochester, NY
> > > >Jim AA2QA
> > > >
> > >
> > > truckers usually hang out on 14302.5
> > >
> >
> > The truckers that use ham rigs around here have them clipped, and run
> > down just below and above the legal CB band, and some run 24-25 MHZ.
> >
> > The rigs of choice for them were:
> >
> > Yaesu Ft-757
> > Kenwood 440
> > Icom 735,
> >
> > Then it was
> >
> > Kenwood ts450's
> > Kenwood TS 50's, but they complained about the "splash"!
> >
> > Now it seems like the Icom 706X is the rig of choice. I get to hear
> > these guys in the background due to how close to the interstate I am.
> >
> > BDK
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.435 / Virus Database: 244 - Release Date: 12/31/02

630. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 21:53:02 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v6smoahsaevsf4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62817
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Not at all. We don't own all the spectrum and recognize that fact.
Unfortunately, you seem to think YOU own all the spectrum. You *don't*.
There are many avenues which are legitimate. Truckers can enjoy CB, they
can enjoy low-band VHF, high-band VHF, UHF, and amateur. Except for CB and
MURS, all require a license.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim
(and here comes another 'ding' from frontiernet for multiple postings.)

--

"Trucker Bobby Joe" <Channel@truker19channel.net> wrote in message
news:b4lctn$5nq$0@pita.alt.net...
> So what! Truckers aren't bothering anyone running above
> and below CB or even running on 24 & 25 mhz. Only you
> hams work yourselves up into a dither over it. You hams think
> you own the entire radio spectrum!
>
> Bobby Joe
>
>
> "BDK" <kingrat@buckeye-express.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.18d7d4bbaff796e598970e@news.buckeye-express.com...
> > In article <3e6dd351.121966143@news.ptdprolog.net>, wf3h@ptnospam.com
> > says...
> > > On Mon, 10 Mar 2003 23:39:39 -0500, "Jim Hampton"
> > > <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > >Especially about a no-code novice test. No such thing. Novice is no
> longer
> > > >available and they had to pass the same code test that the extras
have
> to
> > > >today ;) BTW, there are a number of truckers (I've talked to a few)
> that
> > > >have their tickets. Glad to have 'em aboard! BTW, if you can locate
> one,
> > > >the HTX-10 10 meter Rat Shack transceiver is on sale for $69.99. 25
> watts
> > > >ssb, 25 watts FM, and 7 watts am.
> > > >
> > > >73 from Rochester, NY
> > > >Jim AA2QA

> > > >
> > >
> > > truckers usually hang out on 14302.5
> > >
> >
> >
> > The truckers that use ham rigs around here have them clipped, and run
> > down just below and above the legal CB band, and some run 24-25 MHZ.
> >
> > The rigs of choice for them were:
> >
> > Yaesu Ft-757
> > Kenwood 440
> > Icom 735,
> >
> > Then it was
> >
> > Kenwood ts450's
> > Kenwood TS 50's, but they complained about the "splash"!
> >
> > Now it seems like the Icom 706X is the rig of choice. I get to hear
> > these guys in the background due to how close to the interstate I am.
> >
> > BDK
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.459 / Virus Database: 258 - Release Date: 2/25/03

631. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 21:54:25 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303111354.5d4a45ad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62818

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BA8C6C40.12028%stewart@say.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > If the 'average' ham is licensed 50 years (!) (snip)
>
>
> Wow, and you questioned my assumptions.

HAW!!!

> Actually, I like the numbers
> though. If true, that means I have about 46 more years to go - which will
> make me about 90+ years old in the end.

Works for me. Actually, I'm hoping to reach at least the 75 year mark,
Lord willing, and bust the curve.

> At that point, I guess I'll drop out
> of ham radio and go into deep sea diving or something. :)
>
> And, yes, I do know what you're trying to say. I'm just trying to lighten
> up the conversation a little (see below).

Understood.

Gotta wonder what the actual average ham "career" is, though.
>
> > If anyone actually does this calculation, I predict
> > the dropout rate will not be much different for the
> > various license classes.

> I'll take your word for it, Jim. My original comments were just a
> knee-jerk reaction to my first impression of the numbers. Because of that,
> I'm certainly not going to defend them through an in-depth study using the
> steps you've outlined.
>
Really kind of a strange bunch of rules the FCC has. They issue ham
licenses with a term of 3652 or 3653 days, but the renewal window is
only 90 days. That's....ummmm.....2.4% of the license term. Once upon
a time they'd do a renewal with an upgrade or modification if you
asked, which would save us and them some paperwork, but no more. Only
a vanity application gets you a renewal outside the 90 day window.

73 de Jim, N2EY

632. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 22:21:42 UTC
From: KW <kw@bncotsvpam.com>
Message-ID: <3E6E6176.5050006@bncotsvpam.com>
Source record: 62830
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Trucker Bobby Joe wrote:
> So what! Truckers aren't bothering anyone running above
> and below CB or even running on 24 & 25 mhz.

Yeah, right, nobody else is using those bands, sure, uh-huh . . .

> Only you
> hams work yourselves up into a dither over it. You hams think
> you own the entire radio spectrum!

You must own a CB shop (CB shop = lot lizard with a soldering iron).

633. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 22:25:36 UTC
From: KW <kw@bncotsvpam.com>
Message-ID: <3E6E6260.9070602@bncotsvpam.com>
Source record: 62831
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Jerry Oxendine wrote:

> Except for a minority
> with a bit of training, most CBers/truckers buy a rig, set up the thing to
> "swang" as if that helps
> anything, put in a trashy, splattering "leenyar" and start jabbering
> away--completely clueless and
> oblivious to the WHY the thing nor how their actions affect others. And
> the BIG REDDIO boys
> don't care--just as they can feel adequate or fool themselves into thinking
> they are a BIG man be-
> cause they can splatter over the next truck 100 yards away.

Well, sure, otherwise nobody will listen to them.

I've always been curious about the echo radios. How much extra do they
pay so that they can sound like they're shouting into a toilet bowl?

634. Unattended Packet ok?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 22:38:32 UTC
From: XYZ <XYZ@microsoft.com>
Message-ID: <lztba.34740$5l.10353770@twister.midsouth.rr.com>
Source record: 62819

Ok...got another questions.

I am trying to understand the rules for unattended APRS. I have found conflicting info.

If I want to help our local Fire/Rescue squad and install an APRS unit in a vehicle, is that legal? I understand it is as long as they are not able to hook a computer to it and it is locked out from them doing anything.

I know the APRS software has a specific setting for FireTruck, etc so I assume those issues have been thought about??

Thoughts?

635. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 22:52:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030311175248.27711.00000129@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 62820

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/11/03 1:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303111124.784b7ff9@posting.google.com>

>OK, i'll try harder to not have cancer

Veeeeery good! Now you have the idea...And since cancer awareness is now at the forefront of your conciousness (and we all know what a short trip THAT is...) remember that this includes lifestyle and dietary management.

So one thing must lead to the other. Will it GUARNTEE you will never get cancer...?!?! Of course not. But it certainly means your chances are lowered.

Now...see how EASY that was...?!?!

Steve

636. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 23:03:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4lpun$34a$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62821
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Not really, just the band of frequencies that are assigned to ham radio.

I'll make ya a deal.....stay off of 10 meters until you get your ham
license, and you can do whatever you want......Deal?

Dan/W4NTI

"Trucker Bobby Joe" <Channel@truker19channel.net> wrote in message
news:b4lctn$5nq$0@pita.alt.net...
> So what! Truckers aren't bothering anyone running above
> and below CB or even running on 24 & 25 mhz. Only you
> hams work yourselves up into a dither over it. You hams think
> you own the entire radio spectrum!
>
> Bobby Joe
>
>
> "BDK" <kingrat@buckeye-express.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.18d7d4bbaff796e598970e@news.buckeye-express.com...
> > In article <3e6dd351.121966143@news.ptdprolog.net>, wf3h@ptnospam.com
> > says...
> > > On Mon, 10 Mar 2003 23:39:39 -0500, "Jim Hampton"
> > > <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > >Especially about a no-code novice test. No such thing. Novice is no
> longer
> > > >available and they had to pass the same code test that the extras
have
> to
> > > >today ;) BTW, there are a number of truckers (I've talked to a few)
> that
> > > >have their tickets. Glad to have 'em aboard! BTW, if you can locate
> one,
> > > >the HTX-10 10 meter Rat Shack transceiver is on sale for $69.99. 25
> watts
> > > >ssb, 25 watts FM, and 7 watts am.
> > > >
> > > >73 from Rochester, NY
> > > >Jim AA2QA
> > > >
> > >
> > > truckers usually hang out on 14302.5
> > >
> >

> >
> > The truckers that use ham rigs around here have them clipped, and run
> > down just below and above the legal CB band, and some run 24-25 MHZ.
> >
> > The rigs of choice for them were:
> >
> > Yaesu Ft-757
> > Kenwood 440
> > Icom 735,
> >
> > Then it was
> >
> > Kenwood ts450's
> > Kenwood TS 50's, but they complained about the "splash"!
> >
> > Now it seems like the Icom 706X is the rig of choice. I get to hear
> > these guys in the background due to how close to the interstate I am.
> >
> > BDK
>
>

637. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 23:09:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4lqau$126$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62822

And your code speed is what?

Dan/W4NTI

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030310212203.18118.00000112@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: "Dan/W4NTI"
> >Sure its do-able and easy. Heck you can memorize 5 wpm for dang sakes.
> >The bottom line is LAZY.
>
> After a certain number of words per minute encoding/decoding is automatic,
a
> type of "motor-memory". Therefore it can be said that the 13wpm coders are
> lazier than the 5wpm coders since they are relying on motor-memory.
>
> If a 13wpm coder "forgot" how to code at 5 wpm, this coder should relearn
5
> wpm. Since these are two different skills, it seems a coder should learn
BOTH
> 13wpm AND 5wpm.
>
>

638. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 23:10:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030311181041.14887.00000728@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 62823

In article <ofdq6vg3rb3krmk67nbc8csc8vpshrcvbo@4ax.com>, AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
writes:

>>Brian
>
>... and exactly what is it that makes you think I haven't "earned" the
>right to vent when I've had a belly full of your petty arguing?
>
>Raymond Sirois AB2HR
>SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
>607-733-5745
>telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

You're a sysop and you're okay... :-)

639. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 23:10:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030311181043.14887.00000729@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 62827

In article <20030311085642.21422.00000135@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Tsk, tsk, tsk, the magificent marine (ex) of 18 1/2 years thinks
>> the word "shit" is profanity?!?!
>
> Yep. I do. If I wouldn't say a particular word in "mixed" company or in
>front of a minister, it fails the "profanity" check list.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...no wonder you were kicked out of the corpse with a medical. Overgrown prissy puritanism. :-)

> But you are STILL a putz.

PROFANITY!!!! You shouldn't use such a word in front of a rabbi!

>>I've purchased four downloads from the ITU.
>
> Still waiting for the color-by-numbers version so you can really
>understand...?!?!

No, you prissy profane ex-corpseman, ITU doesn't have any "color-by-numbers" documents.

The other three were for other radio services than amateur.

> Doesn't matter what the subject was, Lennie...What matters is that an
>alleged college educated "professional" can't express himself without
>reverting to such profanities.

Awwww...your prissy puritanism is offended again? :-)

>>Steam Robespierre can only wave his scatological sabre wildly
>> trying to get into the act. Bad acting. [play closed in
>> Chatanooga...]
>
> Whew...guess we can't hold Lennie's feet to the fire over accuaracy
>anymore, eh...?!?! But of course HE will do that to us...

Tsk, tsk, tsk...rage-induced typographical errors again... :-)

> What literary police, Your Scumminess? We are discussing radio
>regulations, a subject in which an alleged radio professional SHOULD be able
>to demonstrate SOME understanding in...Obviously you can't.

Poor baby...confused as to Word Titles Being More Important Than Word Content again?

"Regulations" to me are codified laws or orders which are enforced
by lawful parties.

"Recommendations" are just that...what is recommended as a
working standard for the benefit of all participants. The only
"enforcement" is on an honor system. No "police" will come and
take one away or issue fines for use of some method other than
what was recommended.

> You were wrong, Lennie...You were wrong before, you are wrong now. Don't
>need any "Radio Police" to prove or disprove it...Just reading your rants then
>refering to the actual regulations show you are wrong.

Prissy puritanical regulation-waiving confrontationalism doesn't
take away anything that I said, corpseman.

If the ITU wants to make final voted issues "regulations," they
can write it all they want. They are still just Recommendations,
working standards upheld on an honor system.

> (Having chastiswed me for what is or is not part of the thread, Lennie
>launches into a recital of his former unit's heraldry...as if we care...)

Poor baby...you got "chastiswed?" You married a chaste ?
Your charles got twisted?

"Heraldry?" Coats of arms? Pretty flags, ribbons, symbols to
make it easy for illiterate peasants to worship mighty knights?
Poor baby...all image you are, no substance.

I just repeated what I wrote before on the HISTORY of my US
Army Battalion and its evolution from 1946 to today. No
"embellishment" there but rather a condensation of 57 years
of specific history of a single unit.

> Do you? Any intentions on living up to your bravado on getting that
>Extra-lite out of the box, Your Lyingship, or just more continuous
>excuse-excuse-excuse...?!?!

You are hardly a role model for becoming an extra anything,
prissy puritanical yet profane corpseman.

> I see YOU have a problem with seriousness, Lennie.
>
> Sheesh...PUTZ!

Call a rabbi that, Sgt Putzman...see how "serious" you are.

Using a Jewish-ethnic middle-european pejorative doesn't
make it any less profane. "Putz" is synonymous with the
American pejorative "dickhead."

The word "putz" is also middle-European, a colloquialism
referring to "polish" (as in polishing silver, not to Poland).
The etymology leading to putz-as-a-pejorative refers to
someone constantly polishing their male organ as if to show

how mighty and macho they are...(their brains are in their penis, hence the anglo form "dickhead").

Once again Sgt Putzman shows a reflection of himself in trying to attempt intellectual discourse. He has to learn which side of the mirror to hold up... :-)

640. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 23:10:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030311181045.14887.00000730@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 62828

In article <20030310142733.29016.00000704@mb-fy.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>We're at the 'Len Over 21 made an error and won't admit it' level.

Sorry, bubeleh, Leonard H. Anderson (screen name of LenOver21) made a statement about RECOMMENDATION versus Regulation before and still holds to that.

Hello? I keep saying RECOMMENDATION because that is all what the ITU-R "Radio Regulations" are...a common-agreement, honored set of standards. Not binding in law as we citizens of a country are bound...there is no enforcement arm of the ITU...just agreements.

>> One, I'm NOT buying anything from ITU if I can get away from paying
>> for a download...that won't make their documents any less or more.
>
>Irrelevant.

Your remark is irrelevant and confrontational.

>> Second, I call them RECOMMENDATIONS because that's what
>> ITU-R calls them.
>
>No, ITU-R calls them 'regulations'.

They are RECOMMENDATIONS until voted during a WRC. After that they are "Radio Regulations." Those "regulations" are still nothing more than RECOMMENDATIONS. There is no crime committed if a country goes against those "regulations" because those RECOMMENDATIONS (called "regulations") are not law of any country.

>> Third, there are no, repeat NO International Radio
>> Police to enforce "regulations."
>
>So?

>Is a regulation not a regulation if there are no 'police' around?

The ITU-R "regulations" are NOT law.

>(expletive deleted)

Tsk, tsk, tsk, another Priscilla Goodbody, prim, proper, and prissy pedantic victorian. Like an ex-marine corpseman in here.

Oh, excuse me, you wouldn't know about such things as never
having served your country...

>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Japan got away with a "violation" of S25.5, didn't
>> it?
>
>No.

Poor baby...Reverend Jim thinks he is one of the Supremes.

There is NO "violation" of a non-law. If Japan could do what it did,
so can the United States or any other member nation of the ITU.

Perhaps the only reasons the USA hasn't done the same is the
political pandering by olde farte morsemen...and that amateur radio
is not a vital asset to the USA. It isn't worth the effort.

>Do you think the USA should adopt Japan's type of no-code-test HF amateur
>license?

Reverend Jim, I think you should quit snorting the cheap stuff
and not become such confrontational pedant with these
subject misdirections.

>Phil Kane has told us here that ITU-R is a treaty and is ratified by the
>Senate. IS Phil Kane mistaken about that?

Phil Kane is an attorney but he is NOT a Judge of the ITU Court
or even any Supreme Court.

Membership in the United Nations by administrative and legislative
processes signifies that the United States honors the UN bodies'
purposes, goals, and member obligations. Has the Congress of
the United States "ratifiied" anything specific about the Radio part
of the International Telecommunications Union? I don't think so.
Has Congress of the US specifically "ratified" obeyance of S25.5?
No.

Go kiss my yes.

>Who else?

You don't have a need to know. Go kiss my yes.

>>>> Japan has waived Recommendation S25.5 for a certain class of
>>>> their amateur license which does have HF privileges.
>
>No, they did not.

Yes they did. For a few decades at that. While S25.5 doesn't
say much, it is quite specific about testing for International
Morse Code with reception by ear and sending by hand for ANY
amateur radio license having below-30-MHz privileges.

The Japanese have an amateur radio license for below-30-MHz
privileges that does not require testing for morse code. You

cannot say they don't because they do. S25.5 is specific enough
in what it says.

Go kiss my yes.

>Thus, Japan says it is not in violation of the treaty, because its measures re
>4th class licenses meet the goals of the treaty. You may or may not agree with
>Japan's reasoning, but to my knowledge no other country has challenged Japan
on
>it in at least the past 35 years.

Miccolis is NOT on some Supreme Court of the ITU or the USA
despite trying to act like a member of same. Your black robes
are invisible. [the little barrister wig IS helpful...]

>> No idea? I didn't see any different kinds of pepper there in
>> the three years I was stationed there. Times change, though.
>
>Where there no-code-test Japanese hams back then? ;-)

Doesn't the renowned amateur radio Historian KNOW?!?

Who cares? You weren't alive yet at that time. I was busy
doing military communications for Far East Command Hq.
That's professional radio work. My battalion got two Presidential
Unit Citations for signal work while I was assigned to it.

>The correct way to dispose of an American flag is by burning.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, not a LAW about that. The only LAW passed
was a code of etiquette on display and handling of the USA
flag. I know that law cite. Do you? Are you a USA citizen?

>What does any of that have to do with ITU-R regulations?

What does all your pedantic, prissy confrontationism have
to do with morse code testing?

>No smiley?

Go kiss my yes.

>And FCC has repeatedly said the remaining code test would NOT be eliminated as
>long as the treaty remains as-is. Is FCC "wrong"?

No. Tsk,tsk,tsk...the prissy little pedant tried to explain GOALS
before and cannot understand the GOALS of the FCC. The FCC
has a GOAL to ELIMINATE THE MORSE CODE TEST.

It can't because of something else. Does it WANT to eliminate the
code test? YES. Go kiss my yes.

>> Sorry, it does NOT "conform completely." We've been over that
>> in another set of messages.
>

>How?

Go google, Alexander Dumass.

>What do you suggest?

Reverend Jim should get a better quality toke.

Then go kiss my yes.

>WHY? Would that make any difference to anyone?

NO morse code test makes any difference to anyone already
tested for morse code and licensed in amateur radio.

Take your confrontational misdirection and kiss my yes.

>So? What difference would it make?

Absolutely nothing to you.

641. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 23:10:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030311181046.14887.00000731@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 62826

In article <20030311083552.21422.00000133@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>2) No, the military does not use Morse. Really.
>
> Rephrase that to say the military does not use Morse Code ROUTINELY and
>you'll be OK. Morse Code IS stil taught to some branches and used both
>passively (intercept) and for some covert operations.

Poor baby. 18 1/2 years and "seven hostile actions" later and
all Sgt Putzman learned was The ARRL Way. :-)

Military Intelligence operations and procedures require interception
of ALL opposition communications. Fort Huachuca is the M.I.
center for ALL US military intelligence training and their school
courses are made public by the US government...including some
images of classrooms and facilities. As part of communications
interception, morse code cognition is taught using computer
programs...and transcribing of interceptions to data/paper.

Some examination of public information will also reveal training in
various kinds of recording equipment for preserving the content of
intercepts. This is useful in review and checking of intercepts,
particularly with encrypted information; perfect five-character
"code groups" (encryption) copying can only be done by machine.
Interceptions of morse codings may range from very slow to as
high as 300 WPM equivalent (using "burst-coders" circa 1950).
No human being has ever been able to "copy" 300 WPM morse
by ear. :-)

In the descriptions of 200+ Military Occupation Specialties of the
US Army of today and the special requirements related to rank,
only certain M.I. MOSs and special operations communications
sergeants MOS are required to TRAIN for morse code. This is in
NO way indicative of tactical or strategic USE. In fact, doctrine
of special operations, any branch of the armed forces is NOT
public knowledge.

FOR REGULAR, ROUTINE, TACTICAL, OR STRATEGIC
COMMUNICATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES MILITARY, THE
MODES USED ARE VOICE AND DIGITAL DATA WHETHER
ON RADIO OR THE DEFENSE SWITCHED NETWORK.

642. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 23:10:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030311181047.14887.00000733@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 62824

In article <3E6D7D08.1D3B9C86@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>me wrote:
>
>> Duh Duh Dick. Do you think the engineers would be a liability??
>
> Why would they automatically be an asset just because they're engineers?
>Anyone who has such limited interest that they won't consider meeting the
>requirements because they include one minor one they would rather not
>fulfil might not be interested enough to be even involved. There are lots of
>people even engineers who hold licenses but do nothing with them. Even
>engineers.
>That doesn't make them an asset, valuable or otherwise.
>If you believe otherwise it shows your lack of familiarity with ham radio.

Big Dick, you are an ass-et to radio amateurism.

643. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 23:10:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030311181047.14887.00000732@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 62825

In article <3E6D7F59.72FDCF57@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> See Roll, see Heil, see Dick snarl and sneer down the hill...:-)
>
>Folks are welcome to see me, Len but you aren't going to get away with a
>false statement like the one you've posted. I've never written anything
>to indicate that I believe there is a corollary between code speed and
>attitude. You and Brian BOTH seem to have trouble with the truth.

Danke, Colonel Jessup. :-)

["You can't see the truth!" - memorable line from "A Few Good
Men" motion picture with Jack Nicholson as Col. Jessup}

Read...and parse...the line I wrote and you quoted. In context
if you wish, or out of context as you usually do.

Commas have meanings, Herr Robust. Read it again. Try it
out loud if your finger stutters down the screen.

"See Roll" can be a separate sentence. "See Heil" can be
a separate sentence. Or they can be just separated by
commas as part of a single sentence. References.

That the dickiebird snarls and sneers down the hill is fairly
evident in todays bunch of newsgroup messages. Snarling
and sneering, certainly. Down the hill it must be as a result
of provincial ageism there and absolute refusal to accept
amateur restructuring.

Remember that public messages are accessible to all, not
just royal eyes-only, Herr Robust. Don't be so vain as to
think a reply to your message is meant just for You.

Now you get busy on learning practical diplomacy, oh
mighty veteran of the foreign service. You too can change
to being an asset instead of just a confrontational ass. :-)

644. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-11 23:10:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030311181051.14887.00000734@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 62829

In article <3E6E067F.AB5976F2@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> In article <3E6B62E9.3040504@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> > At the risk of turning this into a productive thread and getting an
>> >education, (always dangerous here in rrap!) What is the rationale for
>> >such slow data rate transmissions? I certainly would expect slower than
>> >normal for these initial tests, and of course the bandwidth at 136 kHz
>> >is limited, but I'm curious. Seems like since computers are doing the
>> >work, it would be possible to send at a more "normal" rate.
>>
>> Define "normal."
>>
>> "Education" for yourself is a personal thing and does not drive
>> this newsgroup. Insults hurled by outraged, wounded egos
>> drive the newsgroup. :-)
>>
>> Extremely compressed "education" -
>>
>> Time is the inverse of frequency. Bandwidth refers to the total
>> amount of spectrum space necessary for reception and
>> minimally adequate reproduction of orginal transmitted
>> information. Noise is the random noise from all sources in the
>> universe that does not carry information desired. Noise is
>> expressed as a power in Watts and generally (but not always)
>> assumed to have an equal average power at all frequencies
>> below 100 GHz and above absolute zero (-273 degrees C). In
>> most receivers the major source of noise is the input stage
>> beginning with the antenna itself, the antenna coupling method
>> and all components therein, the first active amplification stage.
>>
>> In a 1947 seminal paper on communication circuit efficiency,
>> Claude E. Shannon showed the relationship between
>> information rate, bandwidth, noise, and error probability of
>> communication of the information. Those relationships were
>> adopted worldwide by industry, academicians, theorists, and
>> engineers. It is familiarly known as "Shannon's Law." [first
>> printed in the monthly Bell Systems Technical Journal, copies
>> were available from the University of Illinois on-line library of
>> historical documents...I have one in PDF]

>>
>> Shannon's Law works on probabilities of correct information
>> transferrence. The "better" a communication circuit, the lesser
>> the number of errors. There is no such thing as "perfect copy"
>> but rather an extremely low probability of errors from any
>> source.
>>
>> Noise power in a communications circuit is proportional to the
>> square-root of the bandwidth necessary to preserve the original
>> transmitted information. Since that noise is assumed
>> completely random, that proportionality has been shown to be
>> correct. While not relating directly to Shannon's Law as applied,
>> a completely random noise source power will always add to the
>> noise power from another completely random noise source in a
>> linear mixing device.
>>
>> Errors in a communication circuit are related to the signal to
>> noise powers ratio. As that ratio goes lower, the error probability
>> due to noise increases. Conversely, as the ratio goes higher, the
>> error probability decreases. That ratio becomes a figure of merit
>> for a communications circuit, familiarly known as the "signal to
>> noise ratio" (sometimes "SNR" or "S:N") generally and "bit error
>> rate" or BER to all those in any form of digital communications.
>>
>> Noise power can be reduced by narrowing the communications
>> bandwidth (square-root numerical as stated). But, bandwidth is
>> limited by the rate of the information to be communicated. In
>> simple carrier modulation applications the necessary bandwidth
>> is approximately the inverse of the information rate expressed
>> in units of time. [the now-common computer modem uses both
>> amplitude and phase modulation plus bit combinations to increase
>> the overall information communications rate without violation of
>> bandwidth necessary for a single modulation of just AM or PM]
>>
>> Since both noise and a desired signal are powers, statistical
>> mathematics laws can be used to identify periods of time having
>> just noise or the noise-plus-signal. Given enough time to do the
>> averaging and other determinations of correctness, it is possible
>> to detect a signal-plus-noise power that is only a small fraction
>> of a decibel above just the noise power. The statistical averaging
>> is generally done with some form of computer assistance for
>> convenience although analogue methods could be used. Radio
>> astronomers have been working regularly and successfully for
>> over three decades on separating stellar radio objects where the
>> signal source power was at least 20 db below natural noise power.
>> The ability of such seemingly minute discrimination of noise
>> versus signal-plus-noise can only be done for relatively long
>> periods of time (relative to whatever minimum bandwidth is
>> required).
>>

>> The use of statistical mathematical laws allows a communications
>> circuit to redefine its bandwidth, to make it an inverse of the time
>> of averaging-comparison of signal-plus-noise to noise. Increasing
>> time is equivalent to a decrease of bandwidth. As bandwidth is
>> reduced, so is the total noise power. As noise power is reduced,
>> the probability of error is also reduced. A communications
>> information rate of 100 seconds per unit (0.01 Hertz) will have an
>> effective signal to noise ratio of 10 db in power versus a rate of
>> 1 second per unit of information (1.0 Hz). Effective bandwidth
>> reduction is 100:1 but the square-root relationship makes it a
>> 10:1 change for the same probability of error. The downside is
>> that information transfer rate is still at a 100:1 ratio.
>>
>> Digital Signal Processing or DSP uses statistical mathematics
>> and several other mathematical relationships plus very fast
>> digital computation to discriminate signal-plus-noise to noise
>> and to extract repetitive frequency components from just signal
>> amplitudes over time. Such applications have been used for
>> three decades in passive sonar, seismometry, civil engineering
>> analyses of building structures and deep earth strata to some
>> mundane consumer electronics gadgetry such a presenting a
>> frequency spectrum display of music. Most audio range
>> spectrum analyzers today are basically time-to-frequency
>> DSP-driven instruments rather than conventional analogue
>> electronic architecture instruments.
>>
>> Could such a record be done using "faster" ("normal") or more
>> conventional information modes? Possibly. To realize that
>> requires an analysis of a proposed circuit path, available RF power,
>> worst-case propagation loss at the radio frequency, narrowest
>> receiving analogue bandwidth, and tolerable analogue signal to
>> noise ratio plus several other more minor factors. Digital
>> computation can then be applied to reduce the effective band-
>> width and provide more discrimination between signal and noise.
>> Utilization of error-correcting digital codes as part of the infor-
>> mation transferred will reduce the error probability even further.
>>
>> Class over. There will be an open-book test next Wednesday.
>> Dismissed. :-)
>
> In attemping to "prove" himself master of SOMETHING, anything,
>AVeryFinePutz
>has instead shown himself to be grossly ignorant of any practical
>knowledge and experience in the field of HF radio communication and
>practical communications
>circuits in general.

Oh, my, Big Dick cut hisself and vented his spleen again...phew!

Poor lil guy...never worked in the Big Leagues of HF comm, only
thumping brass as an amateur.

>There is good reason why Shannon's theories are
>presented to
>prospective EE's *only* after a few years of college work.

And what are those "reasons" Big Dick?

The rest of the radio world accepts Shannon's Law as is,
not just students but scientists, engineers, and technicians
all. Well, all the technicians who've bothered to learn things
beyond changing boxes.

> Of course they are accurate but fail to reflect the realities of real world
>communications today, particularily ham radio, where 'optimal' is a word
>concerning virtually no one except theoreticians and design engineers
>intent on conserving the last bit of power, space, distance, time,
>efficiency.

Poor baby, didn't understand it so he "rules on admissability!" :-)

>It has so little to do with everyday ham radio operation as
>practiced by typical ham radio operators ON THE AIR that his
>presentation on
>this venue becomes little more than a sideshow.

Ooooo...amateur radio works on "different" physics than the
rest of the radio world?!? Weird science, Big Dick.

>In plaianer words, the
>world has never
>operated at or even near the "cutting edge".

No? :-) Not even in PLAINER words instead of "plaianer words?"

If you want less QRN while copying code, you switch to a
narrower bandpass filter? If so, you follow Shannon's Law.

>Technological advances
>always occur over time, and lots of it.

No kidding? :-)

>Sure, there are some modes out
>there now using super efficient codings. So what?

Big Dick used one of those through his computer modem.
Just think...56 Kilobits per Second on a 3 KHz bandwidth
plain old telephone line. :-)

>Nowhere near the
>horizon is a ham radio using only Shannon-optimized gear and practices.

No? :-) Okay, in Big Dick's universe there is no Pactor, no Amtor,
no PSK31, no RTTY, no slow-scan ATV, no fancy facsimile, no
DSP add-ons, no DSP built into amateur radio gear, and no EME
(which the rest of the radio world calls "moonbounce")...not any
ultra-slow on-off codings to set records over long distances with very

little power. :-)

Every single amateur radio practice and procedure HAS followed
Shannon's Law whether the amateurs realized it or not. :-)

>In AVeryFineSpeciman's jaded outlook that only offers him more
>reason to criticise things that exist while his presence on this
>newsgroup is no more that a body slam against hobbyists and a hobby that
>he has always resented and could never bring himself to attempt to join.

Who is this "AVeryFineSpeciman" in here, Big Dick?

I criticize only the little big men, the mental olde fartes who
managed to get amateur radio licenses and now think they
are amateur PhD equivalents. I criticize the credentialists,
the conservative traditionalists who think that tradition and
pretty certificates are EVERYTHING. I criticize the fantasy
role-players who conjure up non-existant "service" and then
demand instant obediance to their own mental myths.

I've said before that amateur radio is a fine hobby, can be
technically challenging, a learning experience as an enjoyable
recreation.

> Just the transition of analog broadcast TV to all-digital HD is causing
>more than enough shock in a world where dollar value must be given more
>and more consideration, again as has happened in the past.

Oh? DTV sets getting too expensive for you, olde-tymer?
Didn't prepare for retirement enough now that you are on
Social Security and Medicare? :-)

I know some of US DTV having done some work towards some
broadcast and cable test equipment on contract. Neat stuff,
really. MPEG picture coding (on two levels, actually) is not
intuitive but no problem, a single 40-pin VLSI chip can handle
both mod and demod. MPEG standards were derived inter-
nationally by an industry group. MPEG standards are behind
the DVD which is sweeping the TV-watching world...its a
digital system, not analog. DTV does some extra goodies
in packing an essentially 16 MHz bandwidth signal into 6 MHz
plus tossing in digital four-channel wideband audio and some
other data like simulcasting in other languages, etc.

> Of course Loose Lennie can't be expected to know that, nor much of
>anything else about reality.

Gosh, senior, I've lived in reality all my life...where you been? :-)

Worked in it too. In the last couple of years I got involved in
real-life DTV and broadcast TV...I believe that all TV stations
in the Los Angeles service area have converted now and are
doing the "double channel" thing. Not positive on that since
I've seen only two stations last year and we have a dozen.

> As ham radio continues to drop demands for technical knowledge right
>along with
>proficiency in Morse code, the idea that hams should be as adept at
>manipulating
>Shannon as if they were design engineers is as ludicrous as the idea
>that we should actually pay The Louse him any serious attention.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, nobody was saying things about "manipulating
Shannon ['s Law]." Claude Elwood, bless his soul, died early
last year. The relationship of information rate, bandwidth, noise
power, and information transfer error first published in 1947
remains today common to every single radio application world-
wide. Everyone accepts it...well, everyone but a few ascerbic,
bile-heavy traditionalists mired in the fashions of the 30s and 40s
who cannot understand basic concepts.

>I sure
>wish you guys would all start ignoring him again, as that's the only way
>we'll ever get rid of him.

No problem, Big Dick. I will go from here when the morse code
test is gone. I might leave earlier, tiring of all the profanity and
juvenility of all the amateur extras. :-)

>Someone said "The poor will always be with
>us". Same with Lennie the Louse if we don't begin to again give him
>exactly what he deserves. You figure out that that is.

Go kiss my yes, Big Dick. :-)

645. Re: Unattended Packet ok?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 00:16:19 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <n%uba.15950$gF3.1405781@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 62832

"XYZ" <XYZ@microsoft.com> wrote

:
: If I want to help our local Fire/Rescue squad and install an APRS unit in
a
: vehicle, is that legal? I understand it is as long as they are not able
to
: hook a computer to it and it is locked out from them doing anything.
:

Neat idea, but I think 97.109(e) rules it out.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
I am not a communications lawyer, nor do I play one on TV.

646. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 00:18:04 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3B0DF7386924E189.D575EB15B93B6659.78BC94882D253100@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62833

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0303100306.3d0778f3@posting.google.com...
> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6C4089.1B0F24CC@att.net>...
> > me wrote:
> >
> > > Still, no answer to the question of the engineers being an addition to
the
> > > hobby.
> > >
> >
> > What makes you think that just because someone is an engineer he would
> > automatically be
> > a valuable addition to ham radio?
>
> What makes you think that someone who cannot pass a 5wpm code exam
> wouldn't be a valuable addition to HF ham radio?

^5, Brian.

Kim W5TIT

647. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 00:21:38 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <6C61366FA6FD721B.B7EF36F655DE68DE.FE1F138F7A205C42@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62834

"AB2HR" <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:ofdq6vg3rb3krmk67nbc8csc8vpshrcvbo@4ax.com...
> On 9 Mar 2003 20:04:42 -0800, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
> >AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<jtln6vknuh8r5rnduk2hm6uaeesk888ciq@4ax.com>...
>
> >
> >Ray, I think Larry and I have earned the right to talk about any
> >damned thing we please. And we earned it for you as well. So instead
> >of insulting us, you might think about thanking us.
> >
> >You're welcome.
> >
> >Brian
>
> ... and exactly what is it that makes you think I haven't "earned" the
> right to vent when I've had a belly full of your petty arguing?
>
> Raymond Sirois AB2HR
> SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
> 607-733-5745
> telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

BUT, you didn't see anyone complaining about your venting, did you? Yet,
your complaint is as though you want others' venting stopped...

Think about it...

Kim W5TIT

648. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 00:49:05 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E6E8401.4010003@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 62848
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Trucker Bobby Joe wrote:
> So what! Truckers aren't bothering anyone running above
> and below CB or even running on 24 & 25 mhz. Only you
> hams work yourselves up into a dither over it. You hams think
> you own the entire radio spectrum!
>
> Bobby Joe

No, it is idiots like you who think you own the entire radio spectrum and can purchase a radio and operate anywhere you please with total disregard for any rules or any other service you may be interfering with. The hams aren't the only ones in a dither over it, the FCC is too, as evident by the stepped up enforcement that is causing a lot of headaches for some of your trucking 10-4 gud buddies, and you are going to see more.

649. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 01:22:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E6E8BD3.6030308@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62835

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> And don't forget...we owe them because they didn't ask to be born.

And probably a good thing!

- Mike KB3EIA -

650. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 01:27:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030311202740.14527.00000795@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 62837

In article <3E6E24E4.98E81BE4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Someone who uses a morse code speed of .02 wpm may or may not be
>proficient at morse code. That would depend on the maximum speed at
>which he is capable.

Dave,

I don't think those hams are actually listening to the 136 kHz received
signals. Betcha both encoding and decoding are being done by computers.

Then there's the matter of ID'ing every 10 minutes....

73 de Jim, N2EY

651. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 01:58:09 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030311205809.22999.00000141@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 62840

From K4YZ

I said:
>>After a certain number of words per minute encoding/decoding is automatic, a
>>type of "motor-memory". Therefore it can be said that the 13wpm coders are
>>lazier than the 5wpm coders since they are relying on motor-memory.
Then K4YZ said:
>At 13 and greater WPM, the code is "heard" just like a second language.
>I
>don't "hear" the letters being sent...I "hear" the words.

So, you basically agree with my statement. By the way, how do you hear words,
not letters? The only way to hear words is if the letters are transmitted at
the same time. To learn addtional words, you must learn each word individually?

I said:
>>If a 13wpm coder "forgot" how to code at 5 wpm, this coder should relearn 5
>>wpm. Since these are two different skills, it seems a coder should learn
>BOTH
>>13wpm AND 5wpm.
Then K4YZ said:
> The epitome of silly.

Not silly if you want to learn addtional words.

From Dan/W4NTI:
>And your code speed is what?

I do not <Morse>* code, nor have an interest in <Morse> code.

From knowing someone that knows <a> code, I know that once you learn 13wpm, you
forget 5 wpm. It seems important to not "lose" your 5 wpm code skill <(if you
want to code at all, that is)>, don't you agree?

---
*You can read the paragraph without the bracketed words!

652. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:02:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E6E951E.1090309@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62841

me wrote:

> Let's see. Would you want to learn how to ride a horse? Horseback riding was
> an early form of transportation. It is a tradition that was used for
> hundreds of years. Wouldn't you want to keep up the tradition? Just think,
> you can brag to your friends that you can ride a horse. In an emergency, you
> and the Lone Ranger can ride for help. Everybody in the newsgroup would be
> impressed.
>
> What parts of the driving test would you want to delete?

You convinced me! I'm now working on my second million dollars in the
bank, because the first million was too hard!

And I do know how to ride and take care of a horse. I also keep myself
fit so I can hike out of the woods if my car breaks down.

AND... if riding a horse was a requirement of getting a license ro drive,
I would do it in a minute.

- Mike KB3EIA -

653. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:08:27 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0303111808.19257387@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62842
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Trucker Bobby Joe" <Channel@truker19channel.net> wrote in message
news:<b4lctn$5nq$0@pita.alt.net>...
> So what! Truckers aren't bothering anyone running above
> and below CB or even running on 24 & 25 mhz. Only you
> hams work yourselves up into a dither over it. You hams think
> you own the entire radio spectrum!
>
> Bobby Joe
>
Don't lump some hams with all hams, the vast majority of us could care
less what you people do with your radios. If you're operating
illegally it's 100% between you and the FCC. UNTIL you jump into a ham
band. Then it is our business we will "get involved".

w3rv

654. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:15:42 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <NOwba.9888$Yg1.5354@fe08.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 62844
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:v6smoahsaevsf4@corp.supernews.com...
> Not at all. We don't own all the spectrum and recognize that fact.
> Unfortunately, you seem to think YOU own all the spectrum. You *don't*.
> There are many avenues which are legitimate. Truckers can enjoy CB, they
> can enjoy low-band VHF, high-band VHF, UHF, and amateur. Except for CB
and
> MURS, all require a license.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim
> (and here comes another 'ding' from frontiernet for multiple postings.)

And THAT is exactly, Jim, as you know, why the regs are set up the way they
are.
Instead of it being the hams causing most of the interference to adjacent
bands, it is
usually the militant CBers who want everything, "'Far in the war'" (fire
in the wire).
Loud 'n Proud, Treetop Tall thar, mercy me thar, gre't day'. Thank goodness
some
sanity exists somewhere!

Jerry
> --
>
>
> "Trucker Bobby Joe" <Channel@truker19channel.net> wrote in message
> news:b4lctn$5nq$0@pita.alt.net...
> > So what! Truckers aren't bothering anyone running above
> > and below CB or even running on 24 & 25 mhz. Only you
> > hams work yourselves up into a dither over it. You hams think
> > you own the entire radio spectrum!
> >
> > Bobby Joe
> >
> >
> > "BDK" <kingrat@buckeye-express.com> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.18d7d4bbaff796e598970e@news.buckeye-express.com...
> > > In article <3e6dd351.121966143@news.ptdprolog.net>, wf3h@ptnospam.com
> > > says...
> > > > On Mon, 10 Mar 2003 23:39:39 -0500, "Jim Hampton"
> > > > <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
> > > >

> > > > >Especially about a no-code novice test. No such thing. Novice is
no
> > longer
> > > > > >available and they had to pass the same code test that the extras
> have
> > to
> > > > > >today ;) BTW, there are a number of truckers (I've talked to a
few)
> > that
> > > > > >have their tickets. Glad to have 'em aboard! BTW, if you can
locate
> > one,
> > > > > >the HTX-10 10 meter Rat Shack transceiver is on sale for $69.99.
25
> > watts
> > > > > >ssb, 25 watts FM, and 7 watts am.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >73 from Rochester, NY
> > > > > >Jim AA2QA
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > truckers usually hang out on 14302.5
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > The truckers that use ham rigs around here have them clipped, and run
> > > > down just below and above the legal CB band, and some run 24-25 MHZ.
> > > >
> > > > The rigs of choice for them were:
> > > >
> > > > Yaesu Ft-757
> > > > Kenwood 440
> > > > Icom 735,
> > > >
> > > > Then it was
> > > >
> > > > Kenwood ts450's
> > > > Kenwood TS 50's, but they complained about the "splash"!
> > > >
> > > > Now it seems like the Icom 706X is the rig of choice. I get to hear
> > > > these guys in the background due to how close to the interstate I am.
> > > >
> > > > BDK
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
> > ---
> > Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> > Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).

> Version: 6.0.459 / Virus Database: 258 - Release Date: 2/25/03
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.435 / Virus Database: 244 - Release Date: 12/31/02

655. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:18:25 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030311211825.22999.00000142@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 62843

>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net

me wrote:
>> Duh Duh Dick. Do you think the engineers would be a liability??

Then Dick Carroll wrote:
> Why would they automatically be an asset just because they're engineers?
Noone would <automatically> be an asset. They would not be an asset, for example, if all they did is just attend meetings. They would be an asset if they used their knowledge and lead new <radio related> projects, homebrewing, troubleshooting, tuning, etc.

>Anyone who has such limited interest that they won't consider meeting the
>requirements because they include one minor one they would rather not
>fulfil might not be interested enough to be even involved.

Not true. One can get a technician class license and not have to learn code. They would have access to most of the same bands. You seem to be saying one must learn code to be interested in amateur radio. There are some interested in amateur radio, but not code.

>There are lots of
>people even engineers who hold licenses but do nothing with them. Even
>engineers.
>That doesn't make them an asset, valuable or otherwise.

True.

However, Ham Radio clubs don't want EEs in their hobby. Most clubs are interested in operating, contesting, Morse code, ragchewing, and other non technical pursuits, with the exception of antennas (many Hams are interested in that and quite good at that).

This non-interest at clubs tends to drive away the EEs and they don't join. The solution to this is to have clubs for these interests. Even if a <most> Hams are not interested in these aspects, activity and achievements in these areas would help the hobby as a whole.

656. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:22:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E6E99DE.3000008@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62845

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>> To me, it boils down to: If you want it, this is how you get it. I
>> wanted it, I learned Morse. These others just don't want it that
>> much. Their loss.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
> 'Hi Mike and 'me'.... All this sure sounds like what many of us OT's
have been
> saying for a long, long time! <g> Of course the parameters have
> changed a bit but the form and principle remains.
> Looks to me like there will be people complaining about the tests
> until there are NO tests.

Strange how one little requirement can elict such hatred!

Hard? who cares! It was "hard" to get my lifesaving certification. It was
"hard" to learn how to skate well. So what?

hint: sometimes something that takes a little effort is appreciated more
than something that is essentially "bought".

- Mike KB3EIA -

657. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:23:15 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <nSwba.6484$se1.3719456@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62836

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030311083552.21422.00000133@mb-da.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
> >Date: 3/10/03 3:08 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <v6pvpd6n048lbd@corp.supernews.com>
>
> >2) No, the military does not use Morse. Really.
>
> Rephrase that to say the military does not use Morse Code ROUTINELY
and
> you'll be OK. Morse Code IS stil taught to some branches and used both
> passively (intercept) and for some covert operations.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I've also heard that the military is thinking of bringing more of it back
in.

Anyway do you have a reference for the current use of Morse Code in the
military that I could cite when the topic comes up for debate?

Dee Flint, N8UZE

658. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:28:46 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <yXwba.6488$se1.3720605@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62838

"me" <me@here.com> wrote in message
news:b4l7tn$57g$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> You do understand that the engineers that we are discussing are Electrical
> Engineers?
>
> I could see your arguement if it were Mechanical Engineers, Industrial
> Engineers, Civil Engineers, maybe Chemical Engineers.
>
>
>

Electrical Engineers would not automatically be either an asset or a liability. Like anyone else, they should have to pass the same tests and not get a free ride on an element they don't like. Like anyone else, whether they will be an asset or liability will depend on their particular personalities.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

659. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:29:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E6E9BA1.6010702@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62846

me wrote:

> You do understand that the engineers that we are discussing are
> Electrical Engineers?
>
> I could see your arguement if it were Mechanical Engineers,
> Industrial Engineers, Civil Engineers, maybe Chemical Engineers.
>

What makes a good ham is not the level of education or a person's qualifications.

I hope you realize that you are using the same logic as people who believe that 30+wpm Morse code is what makes a good ham.

It has a lot more to do with what the person is behind the ticket than their education or mechanical prowess.

But I *would* have to say that anyone who is too lazy to get a ticket because they don't "like" a part of the testing process isn't going to make a very good ham. Not in my book. If they don't want to do Morse, they can get a Tech ticket. So no barrier!

- Mike KB3EIA -

660. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:34:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E6E9CA6.1000507@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62847

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6E07B1.1D7CD5A8@att.net>...
>
>>Mike Coslo wrote:
>>
>>
>>> To me, it boils down to: If you want it, this is how you get it. I wanted
>>>it, I learned Morse. These others just don't want it that much. Their loss.
>>>
>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>'Hi Mike and 'me'.... All this sure sounds like what many of us OT's
>>have been
>>saying for a long, long time! <g> Of course the parameters have changed
>>a
>>bit but the form and principle remains.
>>Looks to me like there will be people complaining about the tests until
>>there are NO
>>tests.
>>
>>73, Dick
>>
>
> Oh, please. Just make the tests relavant. You can do that, can't you?

Can't be done! When I say that there are parts of the test that I don't
like, I'm serious. CW could be eliminated tomorrow, but that wouldn't
solve the relevancy problem. Whatever test question, there is someone
out there that doesn't like it, and thinks it should be gone.

- Mike KB3EIA -

661. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:38:11 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <n4xba.6491$se1.3722727@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62839

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3B0DF7386924E189.D575EB15B93B6659.78BC94882D253100@lp.airnews.net...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > What makes you think that someone who cannot pass a 5wpm code exam
> > wouldn't be a valuable addition to HF ham radio?
>
>
> ^5, Brian.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Of the people that I have met that could not pass the 5wpm code exam, it all came down to the fact that they just weren't willing to study. They unrealistically think they should be able to get it in a few hours and then give up when it doesn't happen.

We all have to study things in our lives that we may or may not have a use for later on. They are included because they are considered to be part of a well rounded basic education. Geometry is an example. How many of us have used it since high school? But we were required to study it even though the people designing the curricula knew that most will never use it.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

662. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:52:09 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v6t8931gta8nd4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62849
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Jerry, I'll grant that the frequencies near 10 meters are not the most popular and are not heavily used. The rules exist for a reason - obviously, we drive on the right side of the road. Now and again we read in the paper of kids that were racing (or whatever) on what appeared to be a deserted road at night (no one is using it) and an accident happens. Of course this is different than 'borrowing' frequencies, but the rules exist so we can all enjoy sharing the spectrum. Folks forget that it is far more than CB, amateur, and a few frequencies between 25 and 30 MHz. Television, radio, cellphones, heart monitors, and much much more depend upon rational sharing of the spectrum. That is what it is truly about.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim
(I can hear the moans from my ISP about cross-posting).

--

-----------------------------------"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
wrote in message news:NOwba.9888$Yg1.5354@fe08.atl2.webusenet.com...
>
> And THAT is exactly, Jim, as you know, why the regs are set up the way
they
> are.
> Instead of it being the hams causing most of the interference to adjacent
> bands, it is
> *usually* the militant CBers who want everything, "'Far in the war'" (fire
> in the wire).
> Loud 'n Proud, Treetop Tall thar, mercy me thar, gre't day'. Thank
goodness
> some
> sanity exists somewhere!
>
> Jerry

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.459 / Virus Database: 258 - Release Date: 2/25/03

663. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:52:16 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E6EA0E0.2050707@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 62859

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <3E6C0612.8010000@mailcity.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.com>
> writes:
>
>
>>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Brian:
>>> What may seem to
>>>be an innocently witty joke to her could easily cause potential hams to
>>>decide to take up a different hobby -- and I couldn't blame them.
>>
>>As Charlie Brown would say, "good grief!". Get a grip Roll, I am
>>not defending her choice of a call sign by any means, it is in
>>poor taste, but if someone is so weak minded as to be put off of
>>ham radio because of it, then they don't need to be in ham radio.
>>
>
>
> JJ:
>
> Don't look now, but the point about Kim's call sign being potentially
> off-putting to prospective hams wasn't originally made by me. It was
> made by Riley Hollingsworth. Perhaps you should tell him to "get
> a grip" as well.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

And just how many prospective hams do you or Riley think will ever
even hear of Kim's call?

664. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:57:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030311215714.09900.00002613@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 62853

In article <3E6C0612.8010000@mailcity.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.com>
writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>> Brian:
>> What may seem to
>> be an innocently witty joke to her could easily cause potential hams to
>> decide to take up a different hobby -- and I couldn't blame them.
>
>As Charlie Brown would say, "good grief!". Get a grip Roll, I am
>not defending her choice of a call sign by any means, it is in
>poor taste, but if someone is so weak minded as to be put off of
>ham radio because of it, then they don't need to be in ham radio.
>

JJ:

Don't look now, but the point about Kim's call sign being potentially
off-putting to prospective hams wasn't originally made by me. It was
made by Riley Hollingsworth. Perhaps you should tell him to "get
a grip" as well.

73 de Larry, K3LT

665. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:57:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030311215715.09900.00002614@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 62854

In article <ofdq6vg3rb3krmk67nbc8csc8vpshrcvbo@4ax.com>, AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
writes:

>>AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote in message
>news:<jtln6vknuh8r5rnduk2hm6uaeesk888ciq@4ax.com>...
>
>>
>>Ray, I think Larry and I have earned the right to talk about any
>>damned thing we please. And we earned it for you as well. So instead
>>of insulting us, you might think about thanking us.
>>
>>You're welcome.
>>
>>Brian
>
>... and exactly what is it that makes you think I haven't "earned" the
>right to vent when I've had a belly full of your petty arguing?

Raymond:

For one thing, the "petty arguing" you vented about is a virtually
universal feature of most Usenet Newsgroups, and this one, in
particular, was designed to give such squabbles a place to live
in order to spare rec.radio.amateur.misc from the code/no-code
static. So your complaints serve to show your ignorance of the
history of this newsgroup and Usenet in general. If you don't like
it here, why don't you concentrate your efforts to your own BBS
and leave us be?

BTW, Brian and I have "earned" our right to express our opinions
in this newsgroup, and elsewhere, by sacrificing the best years of
our adult lives in military service in order to defend your right to do
the same. If you disagree with anything we or anyone else has to
say here, then, by all means, you get to state your own position.
However, what you don't get to do is shut us up! Whether you like
it or not, this newsgroup is a democracy, and Brian and I intend to
keep it that way!

73 de Larry, K3LT

666. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:57:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030311215716.09900.00002616@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 62851

In article <34FAFA8E6B09EB8A.64D877461F2EBE90.9CE3F20FEAA16C4B@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Kim:
>>
>> For starters, you will have shown yourself to be willing to make
>irresponsible,
>> slanderous and libelous insinuations about people in this newsgroup, with
>the
>> potential reduction in what may be viewed as your already tenuous
>credibility.
>>
>> Beyond that, only time can tell.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>And you've never done such a thing? What about the liberal character
>assassination of many you have done here in this newsgroup?
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Whose character have I assassinated? Provide direct quotes including
dates and times. Remember, Kim -- YOU directly accused ME personally
of having a "rapist mentality." That was no wild generalization; it was
a directed insult. It was slander and libel. Have you looked those words
up in the dictionary yet?

73 de Larry, K3LT

667. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:57:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030311215716.09900.00002615@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 62855

In article <eidq6vcp4vf40taii2golsqdho24nr1mnl@4ax.com>, AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
writes:

>>Raymond:
>>
>>I don't consider public slander and libel to be "petty nitpicking." Such
>>name-calling has serious implications, and I, for one, am not going to
>>tolerate being referred to as a violent criminal. Not here, not
>>anywhere. I have already received and accepted Brian's apology -- Kim's
>>is forthcoming, hopefully -- I haven't finished reading the new postings on
>>this thread yet. I will not interpret the "grow up" comment to have been
>>directed toward me, personally, but I'd advise you to immediately clarify
>>the fact that it wasn't.
>
>I will clarify nothing. If you have a suspicion that the comment was
>directed toward you, then perhaps that means that somewhere in your
>own mind you feel that you deserve it to be directed toward you. My
>comments stand on their own.

Raymond, meet Kim. Kim, meet Raymond. The two of you definitely
have a lot in common!

73 de Larry, K3LT

668. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:57:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030311215717.09900.00002617@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 62850

In article <EBB3755B065CC177.40207E185C4FC7D2.39C0EC3399F2B034@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Kim:
>>
>> This is not a laughing matter. If someone got the idea that I was a
>> violent criminal based on something that was said about me in this
>> newsgroup, which is a public forum, then the damage to my
>> reputation could be potentially disastrous. Therefore, you need to
>> seriously reflect on that which you implied about me, and decide
>> whether or not you wish to continue to be associated with that
>> allegation. I respectfully suggest that you try again.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>>
>
>You need check your facts, Larry. I implied nothing. I merely responded to
>another post. You also need to get a grip with the idea of your
>reputation...it isn't all that great to begin with.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Hmmm -- so, your first insult is compounded by yet another! This is
not looking good at all...

73 de Larry, K3LT

669. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:57:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030311215718.09900.00002618@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 62852

In article <F01D51A6237C03D5.1E0CC526C54F5024.BA39E76379E09CB6@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> In years past, we have indulged ourselves in making some rather harsh
>> statements toward each other in this newsgroup, but the comments
>> currently in question have gone a bit too far. I have always been quickly
>> forthcoming in my apologies whenever I've made remarks which could
>> be construed to be personally offensive, and I expect no less from others
>> in this newsgroup.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Mentality, Larry. That was the comment that was made--MENTALITY. I am
>beginning to wonder if you have any at all.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Correct. I was accused of having a "rapist mentality." I take keen
offense at such an accusation. It is just as bad as having been accused of
the actual crime. That you can say such a thing about me is an affront
the likes of which I simply cannot tolerate. So, the question is -- what
are YOU going to do about it?

73 de Larry, K3LT

670. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 02:58:29 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030311215829.22999.00000143@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 62856

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>Geometry is an example. How many of us have
>used it since high school? But we were required to study it even though the
>people designing the curricula knew that most will never use it.

No, the people designing the curricula DONT know most people will never use it. Bureaucrats, who use vague guidelines such as "general education" requirements or "diversity" requirements, design the curriculum. The implementation is poor, but on the surface, the curriculum seems to meet the guidelines. The courses are often crude rationales to fit those guidelines.

Also, some truly relevant courses are not in the curriculum because of the narrow view of what one should learn in school. As a result "well educated" people can do differential calculus, but cannot change a flat tire.

Similarly, the SATs or MCAS tests make no sense in that they test largely irrelevant information that you must study hard for. The politicians use this and say they are for "standards". Standards, in reality, go down, because the irrelevant knowledge displaces useful skills the student can be learning. The standards would only go up if the information learned were RELAVANT.

>We all have to study things in our lives that we may or may not have a use
>for later on. They are included because they are considered to be part of a
>well rounded basic education.

Your analogy does not apply here. This is not a group of elements, this is just one element - code. And, we know that this element is irrelevant and uninteresting - so why learn it?

The <technical> General license class is tied to an irrelevant <non-technical, audiomotor skill> metric known as code.

671. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 03:07:15 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030311220715.22999.00000144@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 62857

From Mike KB3EIA
>Can't be done! When I say that there are parts of the test that I don't
>like, I'm serious. CW could be eliminated tomorrow, but that wouldn't
>solve the relevancy problem.

The tests have a question pool format, and so it is very easy to pass it, often without learning the material. However, the written tests seem relevant and well balanced to me- IF one learned the material. Which part of the test do you find irrelevant. What relevant sections need to be added?

672. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 03:31:18 UTC
From: Dave Holford <holford@sympatico.ca>
Message-ID: <3E6EAA06.9EC54B3A@sympatico.ca>
Source record: 62858
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> Not really, just the band of frequencies that are assigned to ham radio.
>
> I'll make ya a deal.....stay off of 10 meters until you get your ham
> license, and you can do whatever you want......Deal?
>
> Dan/W4NTI

I hope not. I have heard some of these turkeys on HF aviation
frequencies and even on Search and Rescue frequencies. So don't
encourage them to do whatever they want, one of these days someone will
die because of them.

Dave
VE3HLU

673. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 05:23:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6EC42A.27F1F85@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62860

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3E6E24E4.98E81BE4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Someone who uses a morse code speed of .02 wpm may or may not be
> >proficient at morse code. That would depend on the maximum speed at
> >which he is capable.
>
> Dave,
>
> I don't think those hams are actually listening to the 136 kHz received
> signals. Betcha both encoding and decoding are being done by computers.
>
> Then there's the matter of ID'ing every 10 minutes....

I don't believe they're listening to the stuff either, Jim, but somehow
we have at least two individuals here who both confuse the words
"proficiency" and "efficiency" and who seem to believe these two guys
are plodding along at .02 wpm as if that's the best they can do.

Dave K8MN

674. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 05:32:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6EC661.97166179@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62861

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>
> me wrote:
> >> Duh Duh Dick. Do you think the engineers would be a liability??
>
> Then Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Why would they automatically be an asset just because they're engineers?
> Noone would <automatically> be an asset. They would not be an asset, for
> example, if all they did is just attend meetings. They would be an asset if
> they used their knowledge and lead new <radio related> projects, homebrewing,
> troubleshooting, tuning, etc.
>
> >Anyone who has such limited interest that they won't consider meeting the
> >requirements because they include one minor one they would rather not
> >fulfil might not be interested enough to be even involved.
>
> Not true. One can get a technician class license and not have to learn code.
> They would have access to most of the same bands. You seem to be saying one
> must learn code to be interested in amateur radio. There are some interested in
> amateur radio, but not code.

If you are satisfied with with the privileges afforded by a Technician
class license, your premise could be true. If you aspire to more, it
doesn't work at all.

> >There are lots of
> >people even engineers who hold licenses but do nothing with them. Even
> >engineers.
> >That doesn't make them an asset, valuable or otherwise.
>
> True.
>
> However, Ham Radio clubs don't want EEs in their hobby.

You keep writing these wild statements which have no basis in fact.
Your premise is just plain wrong.

> Most clubs are
> interested in operating, contesting, Morse code, ragchewing, and other non
> technical pursuits, with the exception of antennas (many Hams are interested > in that
and quite good at that).

Most clubs are interested in these things because most radio amateurs
are interested in these things. You can build all you want with no

license whatever. Your licenses permits you to operate.

> This non-interest at clubs tends to drive away the EEs and they don't join.

On the contrary, most engineers I know aren't interested much in just doing technical things at an amateur radio club. They go to club meetings to socialize--to chat with their fellow hams, have a couple of beers, compare notes on what they've done with their stations and to swap tall tales. Your claim has no basis in fact.

> The
> solution to this is to have clubs for these interests. Even if a <most> Hams
> are not interested in these aspects, activity and achievements in these areas
> would help the hobby as a whole.

I'm sure you have a lot of, what seem like to you, good ideas. After you've introduced your ideas at a club meeting and you see that no one expresses much interest, do you ever get the feeling that you're the odd man at the meeting?
Why not announce the formation of your very own club with emphasis on doing whatever it is that you believe hams should be doing? Let us know who shows up.

Dave K8MN

675. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 05:38:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6EC7B6.16A6BD8A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62862

Vshah101 wrote:

> Your analogy does not apply here. This is not a group of elements, this is just
> one element - code. And, we know that this element is irrelevant and
> uninteresting - so why learn it?
>
> The <technical> General license class is tied to an irrelevant <non-technical,
> audiomotor skill> metric known as code.

Nice rant, Vipul, except for the fact that there are a great many people
who don't view morse code testing as irrelevant. In addition, there are
those who don't find the morse code element uninteresting so "we" don't
know what you've claimed at all.

Dave K8MN

676. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 05:47:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6EC9E9.BAC3DF46@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62863

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E6D7F59.72FDCF57@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:

Len's snippage of his own words reinserted for relevancy:

quote
According to the olde tyme hamateurs in here, no-coders don't
have the Right Attitude. They aren't valuable unless they've
been tested at 20 WPM morse. :-) unquote

> >> See Roll, see Heil, see Dick snarl and sneer down the hill...:-)
> >
> >Folks are welcome to see me, Len but you aren't going to get away with a
> >false statement like the one you've posted. I've never written anything
> >to indicate that I believe there is a corollary between code speed and
> >attitude. You and Brian BOTH seem to have trouble with the truth.
>
> Danke, Colonel Jessup. :-)

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> ["You can't see the truth!" - memorable line from "A Few Good
> Men" motion picture with Jack Nicholson as Col. Jessup}
>
> Read...and parse...the line I wrote and you quoted. In context
> if you wish, or out of context as you usually do.

You snipped the context yourself, Len. I've done you a favor and
reinserted your statement.

> Commas have meanings, Herr Robust. Read it again. Try it
> out loud if your finger stutters down the screen.

Paragraphs have meaning too. I reinserted your paragraph for clarity.

> "See Roll" can be a separate sentence. "See Heil" can be
> a separate sentence. Or they can be just separated by
> commas as part of a single sentence. References.
>

> That the dickiebird snarls and sneers down the hill is fairly
> evident in todays bunch of newsgroup messages. Snarling
> and sneering, certainly. Down the hill it must be as a result
> of provincial ageism there and absolute refusal to accept
> amateur restructuring.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> Remember that public messages are accessible to all, not
> just royal eyes-only, Herr Robust. Don't be so vain as to
> think a reply to your message is meant just for You.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> Now you get busy on learning practical diplomacy, oh
> mighty veteran of the foreign service. You too can change
> to being an asset instead of just a confrontational ass. :-)

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Your dilemma remains. You can't post in your usual manner without
fulfilling Jim's profile of your likely actions.

Dave K8MN

677. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 05:48:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6ECA0A.22B398A5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62864

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Big Dick, you are an ass-et to radio amateurism.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

678. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 05:55:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E6ECBC4.43F038B4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62865

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030310142733.29016.00000704@mb-fy.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>

> >> One, I'm NOT buying anything from ITU if I can get away from paying
> >> for a download...that won't make their documents any less or more.
> > >
> >Irrelevant.
>
> Your remark is irrelevant and confrontational.

Gee, Len, that holds for 95% of your postings here.

> >(expletive deleted)
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, another Priscilla Goodbody, prim, proper, and
> prissy pedantic victorian. Like an ex-marine corpseman in
> here.
>
> Oh, excuse me, you wouldn't know about such things as never
> having served your country...

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Japan got away with a "violation" of S25.5, didn't
> >> it?
> > >
> >No.
>
> Poor baby...Reverend Jim thinks he is one of the Supremes.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> Go kiss my yes.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> Miccolis is NOT on some Supreme Court of the ITU or the USA
> despite trying to act like a member of same. Your black robes
> are invisible. [the little barrister wig IS helpful...]

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>
> Who cares? You weren't alive yet at that time. I was busy
> doing military communications for Far East Command Hq.
> That's professional radio work. My battalion got two Presidential
> Unit Citations for signal work while I was assigned to it.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> Go google, Alexander Dumass.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >What do you suggest?
>
> Reverend Jim should get a better quality toke.
>
> Then go kiss my yes.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio

amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

You're a small, rude man, Leonard.

Dave K8MN

679. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 06:10:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6ECF4F.674D7019@att.net>
Source record: 62866

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6E07DC.5BEF82FB@att.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > At what speed did these proficient, cutting edge coders send their message?
> > >
> > > Remember that a single dit was one minute long.
> >
> > Inspirational flash for Brian/Slim: Sometimes -often- maximum data rate
> > is not a pertinent part of the objective, whatever the project.
>
> Dick, did you tell the truth when you said you were putting me "back
> in the crapper (kill file)?"
>
> It looks like you were less than honest/truthful.
>
> Brian

I just hadn't got around to pulling the handle yet....

FLUSH!!!

680. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 06:20:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6ED19E.AA27DC1C@att.net>
Source record: 62867

Dave Heil wrote:

> . I've never written anything
> > >to indicate that I believe there is a corollary between code speed and
> > >attitude.

Chances are that I have :))), and if the attitudes of Len AVeryFineSpeciMan and
Slim Burke
don't lean VERY heavily in favor of proving it one couldn't imagine what it might
take.

681. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 06:25:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E6ED2A2.2C309800@att.net>
Source record: 62869

me wrote:

> You do understand that the engineers that we are discussing are Electrical
> Engineers?
>

So what??? Very many electrical engineers have no interest whatever in ham
radio. To automatically
assume that one who "would get a ham radio license if not for the 5wpm code
test" would
automatically be an asset to the Service is too much of stretch of credibility.
Too many electrical engineers who really have no interest in Morse code have
learned and taken all the tests without
complaint or comment. Anyone who declines in advance isn't really intreresting
enough for it to
really matter whether or not he ever gets a license.

>
> I could see your arguement if it were Mechanical Engineers, Industrial
> Engineers, Civil Engineers, maybe Chemical Engineers.
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> news:3E6D7D08.1D3B9C86@att.net...
> >
> >
> > me wrote:
> >
> > > Duh Duh Dick. Do you think the engineers would be a liability??
> > >
> >
> > Why would they automatically be an asset just because they're engineers?
> > Anyone who has such limited interest that they won't consider meeting the
> > requirements because they include one minor one they would rather not
> > fulfil might not be interested enough to be even involved. There are lots
> of
> > people even engineers who hold licenses but do nothing with them. Even
> > engineers.
> > That doesn't make them an asset, valuable or otherwise.
> > If you believe otherwise it shows your lack of familiarity with ham radio.
> >
> >
> >
> > >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3E6D6A7B.A458308@att.net...

> > > >
> > > >
> > > > me wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Well, duh... What's the hobby about? Do I need to expplain it to
> you?
> > > > >
> > > > > Duh?
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Well DUH, indeed. If you believe that just because someone is an
> engineer
> > > he
> > > > will automatically
> > > > be an asset to ham radio you badly need someone to explain "it" to
> YOU.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3E6C4089.1B0F24CC@att.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > me wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Still, no answer to the question of the engineers being an
> addition
> > > to
> > > > > the
> > > > > > hobby.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > What makes you think that just because someone is an engineer he
> would
> > > > automatically be
> > > > > a valuable addition to ham radio?
> > > > > >
> > > >
> > > >

682. Re: XM-Radio compatible with 2M/450?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 06:27:30 UTC
From: Wade <n5cs@tyler.net>
Message-ID: <v6tkfids1hnv06@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62868
Cross-posted to: rec.outdoors.rv-travel,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.trucks.chevy

I've run ham radios in my vehicles for many years and haven't "smoked" anything yet and don't expect I ever will. I've never run XM and there's another thing: I don't want/won't run XM!

I just have the lowly 2003 1500 2WD Silverado 5.3L LS extended cab with only the 3.42 rear gears and so far like it better than any pu I've ever owned.

N5CS - Clarence Stewart
"K�HB" <k�hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:ho6ba.12487$wJ1.1204101@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> My new tow vehicle ('03 Silverado 2500HD LT Duramax/Allison) came equipped
> with Bose XM Satellite radio. In the literature it makes some vague
warning
> about damage from radio transmitters. I suspect this might just be some
> lawyers CYA boilerplate, but wonder if any of the gathered multitude have
> run XM radio and UHF/VHF ham radio in their vehicles?
>
> ��� 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
>
>
>

683. Re: Unattended Packet ok?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 06:35:10 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0303112235.70404e2c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62870

"XYZ" <XYZ@microsoft.com> wrote in message
news:<Iztba.34740$5l.10353770@twister.midsouth.rr.com>...
> Ok...got another questions.
>
> I am trying to understand the rules for unattended APRS. I have found
> conflicting info.
>
> If I want to help our local Fire/Rescue squad and install an APRS unit in a
> vehicle, is that legal?

Of course it is.

> I understand it is as long as they are not able to
> hook a computer to it and it is locked out from them doing anything.

That would be best.

> I know the APRS software has a specific setting for FireTruck, etc so I
> assume those issues have been thought about??

Just because there is an APRS icon for FireTruck, I wouldn't say THAT
much time has been spent on thinking about it (it only took about 15
minutes to design those cheesy DOS-era APRS icons).

> Thoughts?

Do it! If enough anti-digital types start giving you guff about
running this setup on the ARS, then set it up as a MURS station - we
would be GLAD to have you! (MURS is an unlicensed VHF radio service
allowing 2W TPO, external gain antennas, and digital communications).

- Stewart (N0MHS)
For more information on MURS:
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

684. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 06:50:13 UTC
From: me <me@here.com>
Message-ID: <b4mlb8$k9j$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62871

If the gas prices keep going up, you may need that horse.

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3E6E951E.1090309@adelphia.net...
> me wrote:
>
> > Let's see. Would you want to learn how to ride a horse? Horseback riding
was
> > an early form of transportation. It is a tradition that was used for
> > hundreds of years. Wouldn't you want to keep up the tradition? Just
think,
> > you can brag to your friends that you can ride a horse. In an emergency,
you
> > and the Lone Ranger can ride for help. Everybody in the newsgroup would
be
> > impressed.
> >
> > What parts of the driving test would you want to delete?
>
>
> You convinced me! I'm now working on my second million dollars in the
> bank, because the first million was too hard!
>
> And I do know how to ride and take care of a horse. I also keep myself
> fit so I can hike out of the woods if my car breaks down.
>
> AND... if riding a horse was a requirement of getting a license ro drive,
> I would do it in a minute.
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

685. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 06:53:27 UTC
From: me <me@here.com>
Message-ID: <b4mlg6$q3g$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62872

I am not avocating changing anything.

Someone else was trying to give the EEs a free pass. I just said that they were smart enought to know that morse code was a waste of time. That is way they didn't go and get their license.

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message news:yXwba.6488$se1.3720605@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "me" <me@here.com> wrote in message
> news:b4l7tn$57g$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> > You do understand that the engineers that we are discussing are Electrical
> > Engineers?
> >
> > I could see your arguement if it were Mechanical Engineers, Industrial
> > Engineers, Civil Engineers, maybe Chemical Engineers.
> >
> >
> >
>
> Electrical Engineers would not automatically be either an asset or a
> liability. Like anyone else, they should have to pass the same tests and
> not get a free ride on an element they don't like. Like anyone else,
> whether they will be an asset or liability will depend on their particular
> personalities.
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
>

686. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 06:55:05 UTC
From: me <me@here.com>
Message-ID: <b4mlj7rkt1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62873

The point of my question, does anyone in the group want to bring someone with a background in electronics into the hobby. Or, are we better off without them?

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:3E6E9BA1.6010702@adelphia.net...
> me wrote:
>
> > You do understand that the engineers that we are discussing are
> > Electrical Engineers?
> >
> > I could see your arguement if it were Mechanical Engineers,
> > Industrial Engineers, Civil Engineers, maybe Chemical Engineers.
> >
>
> What makes a good ham is not the level of education or a person's
> qualifications.
>
> I hope you realize that you are using the same logic as people who
> believe that 30+wpm Morse code is what makes a good ham.
>
> It has a lot more to do with what the person is behind the ticket than
> their education or mechanical prowess.
>
> But I *would* have to say that anyone who is too lazy to get a ticket
> because they don't "like" a part of the testing process isn't going to
> make a very good ham. Not in my book. If they don't want to do Morse,
> they can get a Tech ticket. So no barrier!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

687. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 07:16:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312021609.02688.00000137@mb-fq.aol.com>
Source record: 62879

In article <nSwba.6484$se1.3719456@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>> >From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>> >Date: 3/10/03 3:08 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <v6pvpd6n048lbd@corp.supernews.com>
>>
>> >2) No, the military does not use Morse. Really.
>>
>> Rephrase that to say the military does not use Morse Code ROUTINELY
>and
>> you'll be OK. Morse Code IS stil taught to some branches and used both
>> passively (intercept) and for some covert operations.
>>
>> 73
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>I've also heard that the military is thinking of bringing more of it back
>in.

That would be unsupported rumor. That's so unlikely in the new
millennium that it isn't worth supporting. Really. :-)

>Anyway do you have a reference for the current use of Morse Code in the
>military that I could cite when the topic comes up for debate?

For the United States Army, go to

http://www.goarmy.com/jobs/index.htm

There you can look up (via word search) any MOS (Military
Occupation Specialty) with a short description. If you search
for "morse," you will bring up MOSs 98C, 98H, 98K (all of
them Military Intelligence intercept and analysis jobs) and
18E, Special Operations Communications Sergeant. An 18E
must know morse as well as satellite communications but
there is no specific, public doctrine for Special Operations.

Next, a good site for downloading whole Field Manuals
(released for public viewing) is the General Dennis J. Reimer
Army Doctrine and Training Library. To reach that -

http://155.217.58.58/atdls.htm

Click on "Library" button. This reveals a search-selection menu with two choices. Choose "Official Departmental Publications." Then select "Signal" and "Field Manual" from each column of the next menu presented. In there, FM 24-24 is a somewhat dated (1994) virtual catalog of signal equipment with illustrations and full specifications. Note: It is linked from a few amateur radio websites, specifically for those interested in military radio equipment.

There are several other FMs (Field Manuals in mil-speak) which might be of interest, but there are several to choose from. Some older than 1990 may mention morse code use but that is primarily for reference. Don't worry about any violations of classified materials...if you can't get it, you aren't authorized... :-)

For Military Intelligence ELINT/Intercept operations, you can view the course syllabi at Fort Huachuca's M.I. school. Go -

http://huachuca-www.army.mil

That's harder to wade through, but start with Military Intelligence School and follow through on subsequent pages. That is training for MOSs numbered "98." From the home page here is an interesting and well-done History of Military Intelligence (all branches) and notables, with some biographical material.

The Signal Center at Fort Gordon, GA, is the harder to navigate

http://www.gordon.army.mil

but again go to the signal schools, not the kiddies' schools listed under assistance for servicemembers and families. If lost, try to locate the 15th Signal Brigade which is the military school head for radio operation. "31-Charlies" train there (MOS 31C). Most Army signal communications MOSs are "31" numbers.

Fort Gordon website may be under some revision right now. They had several computer programs available for downloading, each on separate radio systems operation and field maintenance. Now there is only one such training program available. Gordon has two programs for the SINCGARS common small-unit radio, one done by the USMC. The SINCGARS family has been the common US military small-unit tactical radio since early 1990 and, so far, ITT Industries, Fort Wayne, IN, has produced and fielded over 240 Thousand SINCGARS sets. Voice and data on VHF, it can operate clear or encrypted via internal communications security as well as frequency-hopping. For more on that common family of nearly a quarter million sets -

http://www.acd.itt.com/singars.htm

ITT developed the "SIP" or Sincgars ImProved unit, now a half-size unit much better for individual manpack versions. ITT has

four nice PDF files on the original, SIP, airborne version, and a handheld compatible unit, the latter is a product not yet sold to the government for production. SINCGARS was never intended to operate by any manual or automatic on-off morse keying.

For competition to ITT, Harris RF Communications is trying to get a slice of the SINCGARS pie with their own prototype called the Falcon series. Harris is producing SINCGARS-compatible radios for the United Kingdom under the UK's "Bowman" family. For Harris information - http://www.harris.com

Harris also makes the HF transmitters used at the W1AW station. :-)

For general information on Army electronics, the Central Electronics COMmand at Fort Monmouth, NJ, website is -

http://www.monmouth.army.mil/cecom/

Not a great deal of information there since Monmouth is now a headquarters for production liason with contractors. If you know a specific product or a known contractor, you might get more detailed information (without registering) by navigating up to the home page and going from there.

For general searching of military communications, try search words of "Force XXI" (Force 21) or "Digital Battlefield." Both terms have existed since before 1994, should be well-known to defense contractors. Try to look in URLs that have "mil" in them since civilian/personal sites have older information that may no longer apply. The Foundation of American Scientists or FAS is an interesting place - http://www.fas.org and is a vast collection of both old and near-new information. FAS has had drawings of the radio room equipment of the USN submarines for several years, both boomers and the fast-attack boats, plus lengthy descriptions of radio types and their tactical use. No morse used on those subs except maybe for someone with a light blinker on the sail.

Neither the USN nor the USAF have explained as much as the US Army on radio equipment, but they seem to be working on it. General details have always been known to defense contractors and the electronics industry about all US military branches. USAF is slightly ahead of USN in websites... :-)

Searches for "morse code" will only come up with historical data on military doctrine. Some training is required by M.I. in the overall task of intercepting and evaluating ALL comm from an opposing side. For "behind enemy lines" romantic adventure, the US Army used available voice and data sets on the military UHF band in 1990-1991 Gulf War. Data was encrypted, sent at 1200 Baud to either satellite or JSTARS aircraft using the AN/PSC-2 set. Military now has such units

up to AN/PSC-5 models. Raytheon make one of the newer
ones.

Some source of information is from the industrial-strength
electronic publications such as EDN, Electronic Design,
RF Design, Microwaves & RF magazines and military
service magazines such as Signal about Army Signal Corps.
You can even access the National Security Agency and the
Central Intelligence Agency on-line. Both have snippets of
information from their rather private museums. :-)

A number of myths still abound, some of them overt fakery.
One such is the reported "morse key tucked away in the
space shuttle for 'just in case' situations." Pure fabrication
by a writer since such "tuck-away" places don't exist in
the basic STS and shuttle has enough back-ups on comm
and radionav if they manage to get back to the atmosphere
safely.

However, if you WANT to believe in morse codes, feel free to
read what you want, exaggerate what you want, and engage
in flights of fancy on the subject. It's a free country. As far
as the US military using morse codes for ANY communications
you are out of luck. Communications via the DSN can now be
encrypted on-line and at high speed.

Len Anderson, GCM
Veteran, US Army 1952-1960
retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

688. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 07:16:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312021610.02688.00000138@mb-fq.aol.com>
Source record: 62874

In article <3E6ECA0A.22B398A5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

689. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 07:16:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312021611.02688.00000140@mb-fq.aol.com>
Source record: 62876

In article <3E6EC9E9.BAC3DF46@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

[third one, same message...]

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

690. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 07:16:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312021611.02688.00000139@mb-fq.aol.com>
Source record: 62877

In article <3E6EC9E9.BAC3DF46@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

[fourth one, same message...]

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>

691. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 07:16:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312021612.02688.00000142@mb-fq.aol.com>
Source record: 62875

In article <3E6EC9E9.BAC3DF46@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

[first one, same message]

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

692. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 07:16:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312021612.02688.00000141@mb-fq.aol.com>
Source record: 62878

In article <3E6EC9E9.BAC3DF46@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

[second one, same message...]

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

693. Re: Unattended Packet ok?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 07:17:42 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b4ne3d32o6s@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 62895

"XYZ" <XYZ@microsoft.com> wrote in message
news:Iztba.34740$5l.10353770@twister.midsouth.rr.com...
> Ok...got another questions.
>
> I am trying to understand the rules for unattended APRS. I have found
> conflicting info.
>
> If I want to help our local Fire/Rescue squad and install an APRS unit in
a
> vehicle, is that legal? I understand it is as long as they are not able
to
> hook a computer to it and it is locked out from them doing anything.

My guess on this one would be that when the APRS unit and whatever transciever that it had would have to have a firefighter that is also a ham within the "control point" (range of ability to control transciever that is). Another question would be, are they "tracking" the firetruck for purposes of falling under the "business" of the department or just for notoriety???

As far as being "locked out" I do not believe that is a huge issue, as I am working on installing a rig at our fire station as well. (for ARES/RACES) I am the only licensed person on the department but I am working on changing that as soon as possible. Now here's a question.... if a firefighter is also a licensee as well as a ARES/RACES person, and working at the communications (radio room) of the fire department, can he do both if he is working a "disaster?" (something like a weather watch/SKYWARN or an actual disaster such as tornado?) I ask this in regards passing info back and forth between fire radios and the ham radios. Or would there have to be a ham who is NOT a firefighter doing that? (technicalities.....)

>
> I know the APRS software has a specific setting for FireTruck, etc so I
> assume those issues have been thought about??
>
> Thoughts?

If you are asking in regards to vehicle location, there is equipment already out there for that. It is called AVL. If you are asking more for having this stuff in a fire truck for "notoriety" purposes, then things would be a little different.... I am sure others have better insight towards this....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

694. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 07:23:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312022347.10322.00000005@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 62881

In article <3E6ECBC4.43F038B4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

[sixth one from same message...]

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

695. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 07:23:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312022347.10322.00000006@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 62883

In article <3E6ECBC4.43F038B4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

[fifth one from same message...]

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

696. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 07:23:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312022347.10322.00000004@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 62886

In article <3E6ECBC4.43F038B4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

[seventh one from same message...!]

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

697. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 07:23:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312022348.10322.00000008@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 62882

In article <3E6ECBC4.43F038B4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

[third one from same message...]

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

698. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 07:23:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312022348.10322.00000007@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 62885

In article <3E6ECBC4.43F038B4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

[fourth one from same message...]

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

699. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 07:23:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312022349.10322.00000010@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 62880

In article <3E6ECBC4.43F038B4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

[first one from same message...]

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

700. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 07:23:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312022349.10322.00000009@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 62884

In article <3E6ECBC4.43F038B4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

[second one from same message...]

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

701. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 07:40:01 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87zno1xcby.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62887

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>In article <3E6ECBC4.43F038B4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>writes:
>
> [second one from same message...]
>
>>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>>
>>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Well, I notice you've gotten rid of the "excessive emoticons".

Good thing, that could do a lot of damage to the world. ;-)

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

702. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 11:57:36 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <42721B765EA80468.94D272EDE5F693BB.BB2E882BDED7D46A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62888

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:3E6EA0E0.2050707@mailcity.moc...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > In article <3E6C0612.8010000@mailcity.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.com>
> > writes:
> >
> >
> >>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Brian:
> >>> What may seem to
> >>>be an innocently witty joke to her could easily cause potential hams to
> >>>decide to take up a different hobby -- and I couldn't blame them.
> >>
> >>As Charlie Brown would say, "good grief!". Get a grip Roll, I am
> >>not defending her choice of a call sign by any means, it is in
> >>poor taste, but if someone is so weak minded as to be put off of
> >>ham radio because of it, then they don't need to be in ham radio.
> >>
> >
> >
> > JJ:
> >
> > Don't look now, but the point about Kim's call sign being potentially
> > off-putting to prospective hams wasn't originally made by me. It was
> > made by Riley Hollingsworth. Perhaps you should tell him to "get
> > a grip" as well.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> And just how many prospective hams do you or Riley think will ever
> even hear of Kim's call?
>

It wasn't originally made by Riley, either. Riley was "brought into" the
debate well after Larry lambasted me when I first posted to the newsgroup.
I contacted Riley about my callsign because I had dared Larry to and he
would not. He would not because he knew that, while Riley was most likely
not going to "like" my callsign, Riley would confirm that there was nothing
the FCC would do about it (as Larry had been threatening). Larry, I think,
also knew that Riley would be a gentleman about it, unlike Larry had been.

Kim W5TIT -- all I'm going to say about my callsign

703. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 12:00:30 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <786CC02DAF9FF31B.9590998C542BC8BE.07F65DDA669F62D2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62889

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030311215716.09900.00002616@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article
<34FAFA8E6B09EB8A.64D877461F2EBE90.9CE3F20FEAA16C4B@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> Kim:
> >>
> >> For starters, you will have shown yourself to be willing to make
> >irresponsible,
> >> slanderous and libelous insinuations about people in this newsgroup,
with
> >the
> >> potential reduction in what may be viewed as your already tenuous
> >credibility.
> >>
> >> Beyond that, only time can tell.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >And you've never done such a thing? What about the liberal character
> >assassination of many you have done here in this newsgroup?
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Whose character have I assassinated? Provide direct quotes including
> dates and times. Remember, Kim -- YOU directly accused ME personally
> of having a "rapist mentality." That was no wild generalization; it was
> a directed insult. It was slander and libel. Have you looked those words
> up in the dictionary yet?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry, if you feel that I directly accused you of having a "rapist
mentality," you are welcome to feel that way. It isn't the first time I've
ever seen that posted here about you and I doubt it's the last. So, if your
life is so miserably lacking at this point and you're happy to wander around
and be upset about this all day, far be it from me to take your pleasure
away.

Kim W5TIT

704. Re: XM-Radio compatible with 2M/450?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 12:59:38 UTC
From: W1QE <w1qe@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4nb07mfv1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62890
Cross-posted to: rec.outdoors.rv-travel,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.trucks.chevy

"K�HB" <k�hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:ho6ba.12487$wJ1.1204101@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> My new tow vehicle ('03 Silverado 2500HD LT Duramax/Allison) came equipped
> with Bose XM Satellite radio. In the literature it makes some vague
warning
> about damage from radio transmitters. I suspect this might just be some
> lawyers CYA boilerplate, but wonder if any of the gathered multitude have
> run XM radio and UHF/VHF ham radio in their vehicles?
>
> ��� 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --

I have a 5/25W 144Mhz ICOM transciever in our motorhome along with a Pioneer XM radio. When I key the mic the digital radio gets confused and stops playing Waiting a while or a power off/on cycle brings the XM radio back to life. Since it's difficult to listen to both at the same time I have not tried to find a cure. The two antennas are about three feet apart and the radios about a foot and a half apart. Both are on the same 12V source.

Al
W1QE

705. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 13:10:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303120510.64efceeb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62891

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3E6E9CA6.1000507@adelphia.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > Oh, please. Just make the tests relavant. You can do that, can't you?
>
>
> Can't be done!

CW used to be a relavant exam requirement across the radio services.
The rest of the world moved on, "we" just want a riff-raff filter.

706. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 13:23:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303120523.73c80146@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62892

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030311202740.14527.00000795@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> In article <3E6E24E4.98E81BE4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Someone who uses a morse code speed of .02 wpm may or may not be
> >proficient at morse code. That would depend on the maximum speed at
> >which he is capable.
>
> Dave,
>
> I don't think those hams are actually listening to the 136 kHz received
> signals. Betcha both encoding and decoding are being done by computers.
>
> Then there's the matter of ID'ing every 10 minutes....
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

It was a one-way transmission on 136 KHz.

The amateur on the receiving end (USA) has no requirement to ID, and
isn't even required to be licensed.

The transmitter wasn't in the USA. Are you saying that you know what
all of the radio regulations are in the country where the transmission
originated?

This is the part where Heil says it isn't your responsibility to know
anything about the rules of the person on the other side of the
circuit. So quit worrying about the 10 minute thing. It's none of
your business.

707. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 13:27:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312082734.23598.00000789@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 62893

In article <20030311181045.14887.00000730@mb-mu.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030310142733.29016.00000704@mb-fy.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>We're at the 'Len Over 21 made an error and won't admit it' level.
>
> Sorry, bubeleh, Leonard H. Anderson (screen name of LenOver21)

You signed it "Len Over 21".

> made a statement about RECOMMENDATION versus Regulation
> before and still holds to that.

IOW, you persist in clinging to your error even after it has been pointed out
by others.
>
> Hello?

Goodbye.

> I keep saying RECOMMENDATION because that is all
> what the ITU-R "Radio Regulations" are

You're mistaken. They're regulations. There are IYU-R Recommendations, but the
code test is a regulation.

And that's a plain, simple fact. Live with it.

> ...a common-agreement,
> honored set of standards. Not binding in law as we citizens of a
> country are bound...there is no enforcement arm of the ITU...just
> agreements.

So? S25.5 is a regulation, not a law. Guess what - FCC has incorporated those
regulations (including S25.5) into its rules. And those rules are binding. Live
with it.
>
>>> One, I'm NOT buying anything from ITU if I can get away from paying
>>> for a download...that won't make their documents any less or more.
>>
>>Irrelevant.
>
> Your remark is irrelevant and confrontational.
>
So?

>>> Second, I call them RECOMMENDATIONS because that's what
>>> ITU-R calls them.
>>
>>No, ITU-R calls them 'regulations'.
>
> They are RECOMMENDATIONS until voted during a WRC. After
> that they are "Radio Regulations."

Here's your pepper pot. Have fun.

> Those "regulations" are still
> nothing more than RECOMMENDATIONS.

Nope.

> There is no crime
> committed if a country goes against those "regulations" because
> those RECOMMENDATIONS (called "regulations") are not law
> of any country.

You're simply mistaken, Len.
>
>>> Third, there are no, repeat NO International Radio
>>> Police to enforce "regulations."
>>
>>So?
>
>>Is a regulation not a regulation if there are no 'police' around?
>
> The ITU-R "regulations" are NOT law.

You're avoiding the question. Typical.

>>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Japan got away with a "violation" of S25.5, didn't
>>> it?
>>
>>No.
>
> Poor baby...Reverend Jim thinks he is one of the Supremes.

No. I don't. You seem to - but you're not even a lawyer.
>
> There is NO "violation" of a non-law.

Nonsense.

> If Japan could do what it did,
> so can the United States or any other member nation of the ITU.

Maybe. Japan is an island nation, and its closest neigbors have few if any
hams. The USA and European countries aren't like that.

Perhaps the USA could do what Japan did - have an HF ham license that allows
QRP on a few bands. Would that satisfy you, Len?

>>Do you think the USA should adopt Japan's type of no-code-test HF amateur
>>license?
>
> Reverend Jim, I think you should quit snorting the cheap stuff
> and not become such confrontational pedant with these
> subject misdirections.

Yes or no?
>
>>Phil Kane has told us here that ITU-R is a treaty and is ratified by the
>>Senate. IS Phil Kane mistaken about that?
>
> Phil Kane is an attorney but he is NOT a Judge of the ITU Court
> or even any Supreme Court.

Neither are you, Len.
>
> Membership in the United Nations by administrative and legislative
> processes signifies that the United States honors the UN bodies'
> purposes, goals, and member obligations. Has the Congress of
> the United States "ratifiied" anything specific about the Radio part
> of the International Telecommunications Union? I don't think so.
> Has Congress of the US specifically "ratified" obeyance of S25.5?
> No.

You're mistaken.
>
> Go kiss my yes.
>
Kiss it yourself. I wouldn't get near it.

>>>>> Japan has waived Recommendation S25.5 for a certain class of
>>>>> their amateur license which does have HF privileges.
>>
>>No, they did not.
>
> Yes they did.

No, they did not. Live with it.

>>Where there no-code-test Japanese hams back then? ;-)
>
> Doesn't the renowned amateur radio Historian KNOW?!?

Yes I do. You obviously don't.
>
> Who cares?

Can't answer the question, huh?

> You weren't alive yet at that time.

So?

>>And FCC has repeatedly said the remaining code test would NOT be eliminated
>as
>>long as the treaty remains as-is. Is FCC "wrong"?
>
> No.

Then what's your complaint?

708. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 13:33:49 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303120533.2d394637@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62894

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6E0AEE.89F98B6@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6D6E5A.825D261F@att.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6C46E3.F4D38512@att.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > > Be glad to inform you, Slim. All it takes for most comuter programs I've seen
to copy garbage is any sort of
> > > > > > > noise in the circuit. Or code which isn't near-perfect in its timing, such as
some of that sent by a bug or
> > > > > > > some (many?) inept handkey senders.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Then there is the intentional sloppy sending of some vile Extra, who
> > > > > > > bragged on here that he could evade machine copy by less than worthy
> > > > > > > no-code Techs.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Of course with your very crippled analytical abilities you have trouble
putting facts together to reach a
> > > > > > > valid conclusion, as always.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > If you're so lame you have no way other than some worthless computer program with
which to
> > > > > > copy code you'll just have to live with it, won't you? No action is needed on the
part of anyone sending. Unless
> > > > > > you plan on getting together with the .02WPM boys you're a lost cause anyway.
> > > > >
> > > > > Well, DICK, I happened to have learned the code prior to ever owning a computer.
> > > >
> > > > Yes, we know, you have said that before but you also said you operated in Somolia
with permission.
> > > >
> > > Exactly where all the facts are is still up in the air.
> > >
> > You said you put a ssb radio in an old car.
>
>
> There you go with your usual garble of facts. It was a fairly new radio in a fairly new
car.

There you go living in the past.

> > Produce the car with the
> > radio in it.
>
> Still have the old (now) radio in the junkbox, sure wish I had the car. 65 chev Malibu 2door HT
> white, 283 turbo automatic. Slick. Made a great mobile installation for CW too, wasn't hard to arrange the SSB rig to work
> CW. Dunno how you handle such things. Not at all, obviously.

I wasn't an amateur when I handled my 65 Impala Supersport
convertible, 283V8 and on-the floor powerglide transmission.

I don't have my OLD car anymore.

> > Until you do we must assume you have lied. There is no
> > evidence whatsoever that you are now capable nor ever been capable of
> > transmitting a signal from and source other than your house current.
>
> You may just be a figment of The Putz's imagination, too. In fact there's plenty of evidence for it.

Do you know what "figment" is?

> > > > Is there anything else you'd like to add?
> > >
> > > Yes, as a matter of fact. What I would have liked to have seen years ago would have been for
> > > you to grow up and start acting like a man and an actual -dare I say real?-ham radio operator. Looks like it was not to
> > > be.
> > >
> > Dick, I've not gone around spitting bile in the faces of other hams on
> > the web.
>
> Shows what you know. That's exactly how this lil' fracas got started.

It got started when you couldn't give a cogent reason for the
retention of the Morse Code exam requirement in 1998. So your mind
imploded and you started spitting bile.

> > Time for you to lose your hatred for the modern and grow up
> > yourself.
>
> Wrong again, it's far past time for you go GET REAL and get a life, both within and without ham radio. You're an absolute
> idiot if you can't do better than that. CW is so small a part of it that it doesn't
> even register except for you and Putz insisting on keeping it a part.
>
> Goodbye.

DICK, I know CW is a small part, that's why I don't miss it. Had I
never learned it I still wouldn't miss it. Get it? Its not even
worth testing for anymore.

Sayonara.

709. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12 15:09:47 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v6ujdnh2loitb8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62896

"me" <me@here.com> wrote in message
news:b4mlj7rkt1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> The point of my question, does anyone in the group want to bring someone
> with a background in electronics into the hobby. Or, are we better off
> without them?
>

Yes! Bring them in, but not with a get in free card. Pass the same tests
that everyone else has to pass. If that person is going to be an asset
to the ARS they WILL be able to pass the required tests! If they can't
they won't be much of an asset then will they?
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/

>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3E6E9BA1.6010702@adelphia.net...
> > me wrote:
> >
> > > You do understand that the engineers that we are discussing are
> > > Electrical Engineers?
> > >
> > > I could see your arguement if it were Mechanical Engineers,
> > > Industrial Engineers, Civil Engineers, maybe Chemical Engineers.
> > >
> >
> > What makes a good ham is not the level of education or a person's
> > qualifications.
> >
> > I hope you realize that you are using the same logic as people who
> > believe that 30+wpm Morse code is what makes a good ham.
> >
> > It has a lot more to do with what the person is behind the ticket than
> > their education or mechanical prowess.
> >
> > But I *would* have to say that anyone who is too lazy to get a ticket
> > because they don't "like" a part of the testing process isn't going to
> > make a very good ham. Not in my book. If they don't want to do Morse,
> > they can get a Tech ticket. So no barrier!
> >

> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
>

710. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 15:16:04 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v6ujpg71qhio84@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62897

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030311211825.22999.00000142@mb-bk.aol.com...
> >From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>
> me wrote:
> >> Duh Duh Dick. Do you think the engineers would be a liability??
>
> Then Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Why would they automatically be an asset just because they're
engineers?
> Noone would <automatically> be an asset. They would not be an asset, for
> example, if all they did is just attend meetings. They would be an asset
if
> they used their knowledge and lead new <radio related> projects,
homebrewing,
> troubleshooting, tuning, etc.
>
> >Anyone who has such limited interest that they won't consider meeting the
> >requirements because they include one minor one they would rather not
> >fulfil might not be interested enough to be even involved.
>
> Not true. One can get a technician class license and not have to learn
code.
> They would have access to most of the same bands. You seem to be saying
one
> must learn code to be interested in amateur radio. There are some
interested in
> amateur radio, but not code.
>

That is exactly what a lot of people in here have been saying all along. If
ANYONE wants to be a ham and NOT learn Morse Code the Tech
license is available to them!

> >There are lots of
> >people even engineers who hold licenses but do nothing with them. Even
> >engineers.
> >That doesn't make them an asset, valuable or otherwise.
>
> True.
>
> However, Ham Radio clubs don't want EEs in their hobby. Most clubs are
> interested in operating, contesting, Morse code, ragchewing, and other non
> technical pursuits, with the exception of antennas (many Hams are
interested in

> that and quite good at that).
>
> This non-interest at clubs tends to drive away the EEs and they don't join. The
> solution to this is to have clubs for these interests. Even if a <most> Hams
> are not interested in these aspects, activity and achievements in these areas
> would help the hobby as a whole.

Then why don't you start an EE Amateur Radio Club in your area? The idea might spread and more spring up. We have been talking about being an asset to the ARS, here's YOUR chance to be an asset for once!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/

711. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 16:52:56 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4nok7$q58$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62898
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Of course you know that they will do whatever they want anyway...eh? Now
if they go trash up some public service bands the federals will actually do
something.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dave Holford" <holford@sympatico.ca> wrote in message
news:3E6EAA06.9EC54B3A@sympatico.ca...
>
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > Not really, just the band of frequencies that are assigned to ham
radio.
> >
> > I'll make ya a deal.....stay off of 10 meters until you get your ham
> > license, and you can do whatever you want......Deal?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
>
> I hope not. I have heard some of these turkeys on HF aviation
> frequencies and even on Search and Rescue frequencies. So don't
> encourage them to do whatever they want, one of these days someone will
> die because of them.
>
> Dave
> VE3HLU

712. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 16:57:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4not8$fm5$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62899

When you have some actual knowledge and experience at Morse code we will have a discussion. Until then I wont waste my time on you.

Dan/W4NTI

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030311205809.22999.00000141@mb-bk.aol.com...
> From K4YZ
>
> I said:
> >>After a certain number of words per minute encoding/decoding is automatic, a
> >>type of "motor-memory". Therefore it can be said that the 13wpm coders are
> >>lazier than the 5wpm coders since they are relying on motor-memory.
> Then K4YZ said:
> >At 13 and greater WPM, the code is "heard" just like a second language.
> >I
> >don't "hear" the letters being sent...I "hear" the words.
>
> So, you basically agree with my statement. By the way, how do you hear words,
> not letters? The only way to hear words is if the letters are transmitted at
> the same time. To learn addtional words, you must learn each word individually?
>
> I said:
> >>If a 13wpm coder "forgot" how to code at 5 wpm, this coder should relearn 5
> >>wpm. Since these are two different skills, it seems a coder should learn
> >BOTH
> >>13wpm AND 5wpm.
> Then K4YZ said:
> > The epitome of silly.
>
> Not silly if you want to learn addtional words.
>
> From Dan/W4NTI:
> >And your code speed is what?
>
> I do not <Morse>* code, nor have an interest in <Morse> code.
>
> From knowing someone that knows <a> code, I know that once you learn 13wpm, you

> forget 5 wpm. It seems important to not "lose" your 5 wpm code skill <(if
you
> want to code at all, that is)>, don't you agree?
>
> ---
> -------
> *You can read the paragraph without the bracketed words!

713. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 17:55:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303120955.253d7503@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62900

Darn it, Len. When are you going to stop posting facts? Its screwing
up their wildest dreams. You some kind of spoil sport?

(Of course, "Morse Code" just might be some super secret project being
developed to thwart terrs and tyrants, so maybe that's why it isn't on
public access websites.)

bb

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030312021609.02688.00000137@mb-fq.aol.com>...
> In article <nSwba.6484$se1.3719456@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >> >From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
> >> >Date: 3/10/03 3:08 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <v6pvpd6n048lbd@corp.supernews.com>
>
> >> >2) No, the military does not use Morse. Really.
> >>
> >> Rephrase that to say the military does not use Morse Code ROUTINELY
> and
> >> you'll be OK. Morse Code IS stil taught to some branches and used both
> >> passively (intercept) and for some covert operations.
> >>
> >> 73
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >I've also heard that the military is thinking of bringing more of it back
> >in.
>
> That would be unsupported rumor. That's so unlikely in the new
> millennium that it isn't worth supporting. Really. :-)
>
> >Anyway do you have a reference for the current use of Morse Code in the
> >military that I could cite when the topic comes up for debate?
>
> For the United States Army, go to
>
> http://www.goarmy.com/jobs/index.htm
>
> There you can look up (via word search) any MOS (Military
> Occupation Specialty) with a short description. If you search

> for "morse," you will bring up MOSs 98C, 98H, 98K (all of
> them Military Intelligence intercept and analysis jobs) and
> 18E, Special Operations Communications Sergeant. An 18E
> must know morse as well as satellite communications but
> there is no specific, public doctrine for Special Operations.
>
> Next, a good site for downloading whole Field Manuals
> (released for public viewing) is the General Dennis J. Reimer
> Army Doctrine and Training Library. To reach that -
>
> http://155.217.58.58/atdls.htm
>
> Click on "Library" button. This reveals a search-selection
> menu with two choices. Choose "Official Departmental
> Publications." Then select "Signal" and "Field Manual" from
> each column of the next menu presented. In there, FM 24-24
> is a somewhat dated (1994) virtual catalog of signal
> equipment with illustrations and full specifications. Note: It is
> linked from a few amateur radio websites, specifically for those
> interested in military radio equipment.
>
> There are several other FMs (Field Manuals in mil-speak)
> which might be of interest, but there are several to choose
> from. Some older than 1990 may mention morse code use
> but that is primarily for reference. Don't worry about any
> violations of classified materials...if you can't get it, you
> aren't authorized... :-)
>
> For Military Intelligence ELINT/Intercept operations, you can
> view the course syllabi at Fort Huachuca's M.I. school. Go -
>
> http://huachuca-www.army.mil
>
> That's harder to wade through, but start with Military Intelligence
> School and follow through on subsequent pages. That is
> training for MOSs numbered "98." From the home page here is
> an interesting and well-done History of Military Intelligence (all
> branches) and notables, with some biographical material.
>
> The Signal Center at Fort Gordon, GA, is the harder to navigate
>
> http://www.gordon.army.mil
>
> but again go to the signal schools, not the kiddies' schools listed
> under assistance for servicemembers and families. If lost, try to
> locate the 15th Signal Brigade which is the military school head
> for radio operation. "31-Charlies" train there (MOS 31C). Most
> Army signal communications MOSs are "31" numbers.
>
> Fort Gordon website may be under some revision right now. They

> had several computer programs available for downloading, each on
> separate radio systems operation and field maintenance. Now
> there is only one such training program available. Gordon has two
> programs for the SINCGARS common small-unit radio, one done
> by the USMC. The SINCGARS family has been the common US
> military small-unit tactical radio since early 1990 and, so far, ITT
> Industries, Fort Wayne, IN, has produced and fielded over 240
> Thousand SINCGARS sets. Voice and data on VHF, it can
> operate clear or encrypted via internal communications security
> as well as frequency-hopping. For more on that common family
> of nearly a quarter million sets -
>
> http://www.acd.itt.com/singars.htm
>
> ITT developed the "SIP" or Sincgars ImProved unit, now a half-
> size unit much better for individual manpack versions. ITT has
> four nice PDF files on the original, SIP, airborne version, and a
> handheld compatible unit, the latter is a product not yet sold to
> the government for production. SINCGARS was never intended
> to operate by any manual or automatic on-off morse keying.
>
> For competition to ITT, Harris RF Communications is trying to
> get a slice of the SINCGARS pie with their own prototype called
> the Falcon series. Harris is producing SINCGARS-compatible
> radios for the United Kingdom under the UK's "Bowman" family.
> For Harris information - http://www.harris.com
>
> Harris also makes the HF transmitters used at the W1AW
> station. :-)
>
> For general information on Army electronics, the Central
> Electronics COMmand at Fort Monmouth, NJ, website is -
>
> http://www.monmouth.army.mil/cecom/
>
> Not a great deal of information there since Monmouth is now a
> headquarters for production liason with contractors. If you know
> a specific product or a known contractor, you might get more
> detailed information (without registering) by navigating up to the
> home page and going from there.
>
> For general searching of military communications, try search
> words of "Force XXI" (Force 21) or "Digital Battlefield." Both
> terms have existed since before 1994, should be well-known
> to defense contractors. Try to look in URLs that have "mil"
> in them since civilian/personal sites have older information
> that may no longer apply. The Foundation of American
> Scientists or FAS is an interesting place - http://www.fas.org
> and is a vast collection of both old and near-new information.
> FAS has had drawings of the radio room equipment of the

> USN submarines for several years, both boomers and the
> fast-attack boats, plus lengthy descriptions of radio types and
> their tactical use. No morse used on those subs except
> maybe for someone with a light blinker on the sail.
>
> Neither the USN nor the USAF have explained as much as the
> US Army on radio equipment, but they seem to be working on
> it. General details have always been known to defense
> contractors and the electronics industry about all US military
> branches. USAF is slightly ahead of USN in websites... :-)
>
> Searches for "morse code" will only come up with historical
> data on military doctrine. Some training is required by M.I.
> in the overall task of intercepting and evaluating ALL comm
> from an opposing side. For "behind enemy lines" romantic
> adventure, the US Army used available voice and data sets
> on the military UHF band in 1990-1991 Gulf War. Data was
> encrypted, sent at 1200 Baud to either satellite or JSTARS
> aircraft using the AN/PSC-2 set. Military now has such units
> up to AN/PSC-5 models. Raytheon make one of the newer
> ones.
>
> Some source of information is from the industrial-strength
> electronic publications such as EDN, Electronic Design,
> RF Design, Microwaves & RF magazines and military
> service magazines such as Signal about Army Signal Corps.
> You can even access the National Security Agency and the
> Central Intelligence Agency on-line. Both have snippets of
> information from their rather private museums. :-)
>
> A number of myths still abound, some of them overt fakery.
> One such is the reported "morse key tucked away in the
> space shuttle for 'just in case' situations." Pure fabrication
> by a writer since such "tuck-away" places don't exist in
> the basic STS and shuttle has enough back-ups on comm
> and radionav if they manage to get back to the atmosphere
> safely.
>
> However, if you WANT to believe in morse codes, feel free to
> read what you want, exaggerate what you want, and engage
> in flights of fancy on the subject. It's a free country. As far
> as the US military using morse codes for ANY communications
> you are out of luck. Communications via the DSN can now be
> encrypted on-line and at high speed.
>
> Len Anderson, GCM
> Veteran, US Army 1952-1960
> retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

714. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 17:58:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303120958.9dd8dd6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62951

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6ED19E.AA27DC1C@att.net>...
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > . I've never written anything
> > > >to indicate that I believe there is a corollary between code speed and
> > > >attitude.
>
>
>
> Chances are that I have :))), and if the attitudes of Len AVeryFineSpeciMan and
> Slim Burke
> don't lean VERY heavily in favor of proving it one couldn't imagine what it might
> take.

DICK, you might want to work on your "English as a First Language."
Dave might be able to Elmer you, I don't have that much time.

715. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 18:03:12 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303121003.64d2a760@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62952

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E6EC42A.27F1F85@earthlink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > In article <3E6E24E4.98E81BE4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >Someone who uses a morse code speed of .02 wpm may or may not be
> > >proficient at morse code. That would depend on the maximum speed at
> > >which he is capable.
> >
> > Dave,
> >
> > I don't think those hams are actually listening to the 136 kHz received
> > signals. Betcha both encoding and decoding are being done by computers.
> >
> > Then there's the matter of ID'ing every 10 minutes....
>
> I don't believe they're listening to the stuff either, Jim, but somehow
> we have at least two individuals here who both confuse the words
> "proficiency" and "efficiency" and who seem to believe these two guys
> are plodding along at .02 wpm as if that's the best they can do.
>
> Dave K8MN

Why would we believe anything you say?

You say that if the message is 100% copy every time at 5wpm, that is not proficient.

All of Amateur Radio is about Fast CW on HF.

716. Re: Slow-Coders do good

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 18:05:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303121005.57afa019@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62953

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6ECF4F.674D7019@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6E07DC.5BEF82FB@att.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > At what speed did these proficient, cutting edge coders send their message?
> > > >
> > > > Remember that a single dit was one minute long.
> > >
> > > Inspirational flash for Brian/Slim: Sometimes -often- maximum data rate
> > > is not a pertinent part of the objective, whatever the project.
> >
> > Dick, did you tell the truth when you said you were putting me "back
> > in the crapper (kill file)?"
> >
> > It looks like you were less than honest/truthful.
> >
> > Brian
>
> I just hadn't got around to pulling the handle yet....
>
>
> FLUSH!!!

I'll bet you've got one of those doo-hickies wired up to your
microphone, don't you?

Welp, since you pulled the handle, I guess you'll never be able to see
another one of my posts and will never respond to me again.

Thankyew!

Now keep your promise this time.

717. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 18:21:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312132154.09900.00002633@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 62955

In article <b4not8$fm5$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>When you have some actual knowledge and experience at Morse code we will
>have a discussion. Until then I wont waste my time on you.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Goodbye, Dan...don't forget your apostrophes...

718. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 18:21:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312132154.09900.00002632@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 62956

In article <20030312082734.23598.00000789@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030311181045.14887.00000730@mb-mu.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20030310142733.29016.00000704@mb-fy.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>>
>>>We're at the 'Len Over 21 made an error and won't admit it' level.
>>
>> Sorry, bubeleh, Leonard H. Anderson (screen name of LenOver21)
>
>You signed it "Len Over 21".

Nope. It is NOT "signed." These messages don't allow handwriting.

You are seeing things again, Reverend Jim.

>> made a statement about RECOMMENDATION versus Regulation
>> before and still holds to that.
>
>IOW, you persist in clinging to your error even after it has been pointed out
>by others.

What "error" you pedant? I gave an OPINION.

You don't like certain opinions. Hand me your TS card and I
will punch it.

>> I keep saying RECOMMENDATION because that is all
>> what the ITU-R "Radio Regulations" are
>
>You're mistaken. They're regulations. There are IYU-R Recommendations, but
>the code test is a regulation.

YOU are mistaken...we aren't discussing the "IYR."

You must have BYOB to the party, Reverend Jim.

>And that's a plain, simple fact. Live with it.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...learn to LIVE with OPINIONS. :-)

>So? S25.5 is a regulation, not a law. Guess what - FCC has incorporated those
>regulations (including S25.5) into its rules. And those rules are binding.
>Live with it.

INCORRECT! If you are going to play-act the pedant all the
time, go thee to Part 97 and analyze to your little cold heart's
content.

FCC regulations (they are regulations, law, not "rules") bind
only RF radiation originating within boundaries of USA territory.
USA law applies to USA territory.

There are NO ITU "laws" binding. If you violate ITU "regulations"
there will be no ITU marshals to come knocking on your door,
there will be only USA marshals.

>> Your remark is irrelevant and confrontational.
>>
>So?

So...little prissy pedant, remember you are not a god of radio
by virtue of morsemanship and aren't always correct in every-
thing you write in here.

You appear to want everything EXACT down to the smallest
detail, then you go and make all those ERRORS so far in this
one posting. You can't have it both ways.

>> There is no crime
>> committed if a country goes against those "regulations" because
>> those RECOMMENDATIONS (called "regulations") are not law
>> of any country.
>
>You're simply mistaken, Len.

Just send the ITU Police to my door with a World Court Warrant.
INTERPOL can come along, too, for funsies.

My "crime" appears to be ruffling of your pristine feathers even
though you knew your job was dangerous when you took it...

>> The ITU-R "regulations" are NOT law.
>
>You're avoiding the question. Typical.

No, superchicken, nothing was "avoided." My OPINION was
explained to you and you could not see it, accept it, or abide
with anything different from your glorious self-defined self-
righteousness.

>> Poor baby...Reverend Jim thinks he is one of the Supremes.
>
>No. I don't. You seem to - but you're not even a lawyer.

I'm not a lawyer but I seem to be playing a construction worker
in here, chipping away at the concrete blockheadedness of
prissy pedanticsm you've molded yourself into. Too many
rocks in that morseman's concrete, doesn't have enough
strength to support magnificent morsemanship medallions.

>> There is NO "violation" of a non-law.
>
>Nonsense.

When I am on USA soil, only USA laws apply to me. Since
you recognize only this concept of "international law," I'll put
you down as NOT a USA citizen...an ALIEN.

The question now is, were you carded or were you saucered?

>> If Japan could do what it did,
>> so can the United States or any other member nation of the ITU.
>
>Maybe. Japan is an island nation, and its closest neigbors have few if any
>hams. The USA and European countries aren't like that.

Poor baby...a demonstrated anglophile and another European-
oriented easterner, all wrapped up in some weird territorial
superiority concept of Yurp Rulz!

Where is it written in any UNITED NATIONS bylaws about those
"exceptions due to isolation of any nation?" The International
Telecommunications Union is a UN body. Live with it.

>Perhaps the USA could do what Japan did - have an HF ham license that allows
>QRP on a few bands. Would that satisfy you, Len?

My only "satisfaction" would come from the destruction of those
clay pedestals you mighty macho amateur morsemen stuck
together out of ancient, crumbly play-doh.

Now don't you go crying in the corner about somebody making
fun of your opinions. Grow up and face reality, don't face New
England for kneeling at regular devotions on an official league
prayer rug. Don't trot out any territorial superiority bullshit about
"European centrism." I'm closer to Europe than most in ancestry
in here but am grown up enough to live in the entire world, not in
some yurp fantasyland of olde tymes. One planet, so far alone
in the universe.

Grow up and face the fact that YOU and YOUR OPINIONS aren't
"law" and that you are NOT a supreme god in amateur radio
where morsemanship is the epitome of amateurism. The rest of
the radio world has given up on morse and its "champions" are
now predominantly middle-aged white males who think they are
some kind of chieftans...while they vainly put off the inevitability
of newcomers with new ideas, new concepts not accepting the
ways of the Ancient Radiotelegraphy Service.

>> Go kiss my yes.
>>
>Kiss it yourself. I wouldn't get near it.

Poor baby...you only take "no" for an answer?

>Then what's your complaint?

You.

719. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 18:22:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA94E4FD.12E15%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62954

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Really kind of a strange bunch of rules the
> FCC has. They issue ham licenses with a term
> of 3652 or 3653 days, but the renewal window
> is only 90 days. That's....ummmm.....2.4%
> of the license term. (snip)

Shame on you, Jim. If rounded off properly, it is a little closer to 2.5% (2.46%). Don't expect to get away with sloppy math like that in this newsgroup. ;)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

720. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 18:34:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312133443.23981.00000155@mb-fv.aol.com>
Source record: 62957

In article <f45722ac.0303121003.64d2a760@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Dave K8MN
>
>Why would we believe anything you say?

He is an Extra with a 1x2, a veteran of serving his country in
embassies of middle African countries, and knows what is
best for everyone. He is God! :-)

>You say that if the message is 100% copy every time at 5wpm, that is not
>proficient.
>
>All of Amateur Radio is about Fast CW on HF.

Don't forget working DX...with French stations... :-)

721. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 18:34:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312133444.23981.00000156@mb-fv.aol.com>
Source record: 62958

In article <f45722ac.0303120955.253d7503@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Darn it, Len. When are you going to stop posting facts? Its screwing
>up their wildest dreams. You some kind of spoil sport?

Sorry, Brian, I guess I just don't have the "Right Attitude."

:-)

>(Of course, "Morse Code" just might be some super secret project being
>developed to thwart terrs and tyrants, so maybe that's why it isn't on
>public access websites.)
>
>bb

We could be in secret planning to thwart an Alien Invasion!

Secrecy was almost violated when the science-fantasy film
"Independence Day" was released.

Extraterrestrials who conquered space flight and gravity can't
be expected to know enough to decode morse code, could
they? After all, none of them know a damn thing about ham
radio since they are (are you ready?)...NOT LICENSED AS
RADIO AMATEURS!!!

:-)

722. Re: XM-Radio compatible with 2M/450?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 18:38:18 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <u8Lba.2172$nJ5.197097@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 62959
Cross-posted to: rec.outdoors.rv-travel,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.trucks.chevy

"Wade" <n5cs@tyler.net> wrote

:
: I just have the lowly 2003 1500 2WD Silverado 5.3L LS extended cab with
: only the 3.42 rear gears and so far like it better than any pu I've ever
: owned.
:

That's a sweet truck! I had the 2001 equivalent, and it broke my heart to
trade but it was just too light to handle our 5th-wheel RV.

&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; 73, de Hans, K0HB
--
Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
http://www.mnyarc.org
http://www.k0bsa.org

723. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 19:23:44 UTC
From: "George M." <georgem191@aol.com>
Message-ID: <o82v6v00e3057hf7evfnchcvieuftjr19q@4ax.com>
Source record: 62960
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I only use my so-called export radio on the 40 CB channels. What is
the harm in that?

On Tue, 11 Mar 2003 14:20:50 -0500, "Trucker Bobby Joe"
<Channel@truker19channel.net> wrote:

> So what! Truckers aren't bothering anyone running above
>and below CB or even running on 24 & 25 mhz. Only you
>hams work yourselves up into a dither over it. You hams think
>you own the entire radio spectrum!
>
> Bobby Joe

724. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 19:24:28 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v6v2b8hbdfocd9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62961

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030312133444.23981.00000156@mb-fv.aol.com...
> In article <f45722ac.0303120955.253d7503@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Darn it, Len. When are you going to stop posting facts? Its screwing
> >up their wildest dreams. You some kind of spoil sport?
>
> Sorry, Brian, I guess I just don't have the "Right Attitude."
>
> :-)
>
> >(Of course, "Morse Code" just might be some super secret project being
> >developed to thwart terrs and tyrants, so maybe that's why it isn't on
> >public access websites.)
> >
> >bb
>
> We could be in secret planning to thwart an Alien Invasion!
>
> Secrecy was almost violated when the science-fantasy film
> "Independence Day" was released.
>
> Extraterrestrials who conquered space flight and gravity can't
> be expected to know enough to decode morse code, could
> they? After all, none of them know a damn thing about ham
> radio since they are (are you ready?)...NOT LICENSED AS
> RADIO AMATEURS!!!
>
> :-)

And they got beat by a "computer virus" not by Morse Code,
they just used code to tell everyone "how" to beat them.

Now what operating system was that code programmed to run
on and how convenient was it that it would run on the alien's
operating system. And being able to upload it to the alien's
computer without being on their "network" and without a
LAN connection.

That movie seems like a poor example for everyone to use!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."

-Groucho Marx

http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/

725. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 20:31:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312153108.11936.00000211@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 62962

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/11/03 7:58 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030311205809.22999.00000141@mb-bk.aol.com>

>So, you basically agree with my statement.

No, I do not. You said one becomes "lazy" as thier code speed increases.
I say you don't know what youa re talking about.

>By the way, how do you hear words,
>not letters?

The say way you look at the words infornt of you right now and see
"words", not individual letters.

I

D

I

O

T

There you have several letters, when each taken by themselves have no
meaning.

Put those words together, ie: "IDIOT", and you have a concept one can
understand.

Or do you?

>The only way to hear words is if the letters are transmitted at
>the same time. To learn addtional words, you must learn each word
>individually?

Nope.

>From knowing someone that knows code, I know that once you learn 13wpm, you
>forget 5 wpm. It seems important to not "lose" your 5 wpm code skill <(if you
>want to code at all, that is)>, don't you agree?

Absolutely not. No more so than if I slow down what I am saying in the
spoken word in order to speak to a non-English (as a primary language) speaker,
or to emphasize a point to a child.

More silliness, Vipul. More silliness.

Steve, K4YZ

726. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 20:36:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312153626.11936.00000212@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 62963

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/11/03 8:58 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030311215829.22999.00000143@mb-bk.aol.com>

>The <technical> General license class is tied to an irrelevant
><non-technical,
>audiomotor skill> metric known as code.

Wrong.

The United States is and remains a signatory to treaties that recognize
the ITU standards as law and the basis upon which our own radio licensing
infrastructure exists.

Until such time as the ITU regulations are changed and ratified by the
Congress of the United States (or otherwise recognized as final by them), then
the Morse Code test for the Amateur General Class license in the United States
IS relevent.

Unless, of course, you suggest that the United States not honor it's
treaty obligations? (ie: break international law?) Do you suggest that,
Vipul?

Steve, K4YZ

727. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 20:45:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312154555.11936.00000213@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 62964

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/11/03 8:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030311211825.22999.00000142@mb-bk.aol.com>
>
>>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>
>me wrote:
>>> Duh Duh Dick. Do you think the engineers would be a liability??
>
>Then Dick Carroll wrote:
>> Why would they automatically be an asset just because they're engineers?
>Noone would <automatically> be an asset. They would not be an asset, for
>example, if all they did is just attend meetings. They would be an asset if
>they used their knowledge and lead new <radio related> projects, homebrewing,
>troubleshooting, tuning, etc.
>
>>Anyone who has such limited interest that they won't consider meeting the
>>requirements because they include one minor one they would rather not
>>fulfil might not be interested enough to be even involved.
>
>Not true. One can get a technician class license and not have to learn code.
>They would have access to most of the same bands. You seem to be saying one
>must learn code to be interested in amateur radio. There are some interested
>in
>amateur radio, but not code.

Vipul, would you please show me where Dick said a SINGLE WORD about having
to learn Morse Code for ANY class of Amateur license?

And please answer the question...NOT attempt to put words into another's
posts...

>However, Ham Radio clubs don't want EEs in their hobby.

How assinine! Completely idiotic!

>This non-interest at clubs tends to drive away the EEs and they don't join.

And you base this on what poll or survey? Your OWN experience? I STILL
contend your disatisfaction is based upon your OWN conduct at the various clubs
you've approached, and your "My Way Or The Highway" attitude has landed you
right there...out on the highway!

>The solution to this is to have clubs for these interests

Then shut up and get busy! You continue to harrangue Amateurs for not meeting your expectations, but I do not see any ACTION by you to fill the niche you seem to think needs filling.

>Even if a <most> Hams
>are not interested in these aspects, activity and achievements in these areas
>would help the hobby as a whole.

What would? Forcing topics at club meetings that the general membership is not interested in? Go ahead, Vipul...Start demanding lectures and presentations at club meetings that only a small percentage of members or potential members might be interested in, and then see how long THOSE clubs last.....

However, judging from what I read from your posts, you've already DONE that, hence your spiteful and insulting treatment of Amateur Radio in THIS forum.

Steve, K4YZ

728. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 20:57:31 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <%aNba.5730$68.1502@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 62965

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030312153108.11936.00000211@mb-fz.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 3/11/03 7:58 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030311205809.22999.00000141@mb-bk.aol.com>
> >By the way, how do you hear words,
> >not letters?
>
> The say way you look at the words infornt of you right now and see
> "words", not individual letters.
>
> I
>
> D
>
> I
>
> O
>
> T
>
> There you have several letters, when each taken by themselves have no
> meaning.
>
> Put those words together, ie: "IDIOT", and you have a concept one can
> understand.

Game, set, and match.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

729. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 20:58:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312155833.11936.00000214@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 62966

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/11/03 5:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030311181043.14887.00000729@mb-mu.aol.com>

>Tsk, tsk, tsk...no wonder you were kicked out of the corpse
> with a medical. Overgrown prissy puritanism.

Uh huh...

>> But you are STILL a putz.
>
> PROFANITY!!!! You shouldn't use such a word in front of a
> rabbi!

Is there a Rabbi here?

And if you WEREN'T a putz, it might make a difference. But you ARE a
putz, and therefore makes NO difference.

>No, you prissy profane ex-corpseman, ITU doesn't have any
> "color-by-numbers" documents.

Oh...I see...So you HAVE been looking for one...

>"Regulations" to me are codified laws or orders which are enforced
> by lawful parties.

Hmmmm... I see...Then you are alleging that the FCC has NO enforcement
powers and is NOT a "lawful partiy"..?!?!

>If the ITU wants to make final voted issues "regulations," they
> can write it all they want. They are still just Recommendations,
> working standards upheld on an honor system.

And in the United States, we have accepted those "recommendations" as law.
Call them what you will, Lennie, they ARE codified into American radio laws.

>I just repeated what I wrote before on the HISTORY of my US
> Army Battalion and its evolution from 1946 to today. No
> "embellishment" there but rather a condensation of 57 years
> of specific history of a single unit.

None of which is germane to a single line of Amateur Radio regulation,
policy, nor supports any rant you have made year-to-date.

An "obfuscation"...A smoke cloud behind which to hide yet another
irrelevent ranting of a man for whom lying and tale-telling are routine.

>You are hardly a role model for becoming an extra anything,
> prissy puritanical yet profane corpseman.

What ever, Lennie....Talk to the hand....

>Call a rabbi that, Sgt Putzman...see how "serious" you are.

Why would I call a Rabbi that, Lennie? Are you a Rabbi? If not, you are yet again hiding behind yet another irrelevent rant.

>Using a Jewish-ethnic middle-european pejorative doesn't
> make it any less profane. "Putz" is synonymous with the
> American pejorative "dickhead."

Thanks again for yet another revelation as to the ethnic definition as to "putz".

What I DON'T see is any attempt by you to argue it. I guess if the shoe fits....Ya PUTZ!

Steve, K4YZ

730. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 21:26:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E6FA610.9060103@psu.edu>
Source record: 62967

Vshah101 wrote:
>>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net

> However, Ham Radio clubs don't want EEs in their hobby. Most clubs are
> interested in operating, contesting, Morse code, ragchewing, and other non
> technical pursuits, with the exception of antennas (many Hams are interested in
> that and quite good at that).

Sheesh, My club is probably half Electrical engineers... Where do you
get your reference material?

- Mike KB3EIA -

731. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12 21:32:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312163231.11936.00000215@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 62968

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/11/03 5:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030311181045.14887.00000730@mb-mu.aol.com>

>In article <20030310142733.29016.00000704@mb-fy.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>writes:
>
>
>>We're at the 'Len Over 21 made an error and won't admit it' level.
>
> Sorry, bubeleh, Leonard H. Anderson (screen name of LenOver21)
> made a statement about RECOMMENDATION versus Regulation
> before and still holds to that.

I see he made ANOTHER error while trying to disclaim the original error.
I love it!

>Hello? I keep saying RECOMMENDATION because that is all
> what the ITU-R "Radio Regulations" are...a common-agreement,
> honored set of standards. Not binding in law as we citizens of a
> country are bound...there is no enforcement arm of the ITU...just
> agreements

The go ahead and operate a radio station contrary to ITU S25(et al),
Lennie, and see how fast the Federal Communications Commission enforces those
laws you claim aren't there.

>>Irrelevant.
>
> Your remark is irrelevant and confrontational

Whew! More POT/KETTLE/BLACK, eh, Lennie?

>Oh, excuse me, you wouldn't know about such things as never
> having served your country.

Lennie, the "Hide Behind KIA's For My Own Gratification War Hero"
admonishing someone for "not serving (thier) country" when same was not
mandated by law...

>There is NO "violation" of a non-law. If Japan could do what it did,
> so can the United States or any other member nation of the ITU.

That was Japan...A country that "rationalized" racial superiority to
justify genocide and has continued it's seperate-but-not-quite-equal policies
to this day.

>Perhaps the only reasons the USA hasn't done the same is the
> political pandering by olde farte morsemen...and that amateur radio
> is not a vital asset to the USA. It isn't worth the effort.

And perhaps it's because there was no popular support for it...Or perhaps
because they are a soverign nation with their own laws to follow.

>Reverend Jim, I think you should quit snorting the cheap stuff
> and not become such confrontational pedant with these
> subject misdirections.

Whew...even MORE "pot/kettle/black"...

>>Phil Kane has told us here that ITU-R is a treaty and is ratified by the
>>Senate. IS Phil Kane mistaken about that?
>
> Phil Kane is an attorney but he is NOT a Judge of the ITU Court
> or even any Supreme Court.

So...Phil must be a Judge in order to properly cite the law...?!?!

You can PROVE that his definitions and explanations are wrong?

>Membership in the United Nations by administrative and legislative
> processes signifies that the United States honors the UN bodies'
> purposes, goals, and member obligations

Yep.

>Has the Congress of
> the United States "ratifiied" anything specific about the Radio part
> of the International Telecommunications Union? I don't think so.

They proxy that power to the Federal Communications Commission.

Ergo they HAVE 'ratified" ITU.

>Has Congress of the US specifically "ratified" obeyance of S25.5?
> No.

By empowering the Federal Communications Commission to have authority over
telecommunicaitons matters, yes, they have...Unless, of course, you can prove
otherwise...?!?! (Citeable case law would be acceptable here, Lennie...)

>>Who else?
>
> You don't have a need to know. Go kiss my yes.

Now there's a professional and meaningful answer.

> Who cares? You weren't alive yet at that time. I was busy
> doing military communications for Far East Command Hq.
> That's professional radio work. My battalion got two Presidential
> Unit Citations for signal work while I was assigned to it.

It received those awards DESPITE your assingment to it, not because of it,
Lennie.

>>The correct way to dispose of an American flag is by burning.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, not a LAW about that.

Sure there is.

>Are you a USA citizen?

Are you? How is it germane to the proper disposal of the United States flag? A Russian citizen can't read American law and then not understand what American law requires for proper disposal of an American flag?

>What does all your pedantic, prissy confrontationism have
> to do with morse code testing?

What do yours?

>>No smiley?
>
> Go kiss my yes.

Yet again?

>>What do you suggest?
>
> Reverend Jim should get a better quality toke.
>
> Then go kiss my yes.

And yet again...?!?!

>>WHY? Would that make any difference to anyone?
>
> NO morse code test makes any difference to anyone already
> tested for morse code and licensed in amateur radio.
>
> Take your confrontational misdirection and kiss my yes.

Yes, it DOES make a difference to those of us already licensed as those joining the ranks WILL have an impact on Amateur Radio TODAY.

>>So? What difference would it make?
>
> Absolutely nothing to you.

Wrong...EVERY new licensee has a potential impact on those already licensed.

Even YOU, Your Putziness....

Steve, K4YZ

732. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 21:37:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312163729.11936.00000218@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 62969

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 3/11/03 11:55 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E6ECBC4.43F038B4@earthlink.net>

>You're a small, rude man, Leonard.

I think you're giving him more credit than he deserves, Dave!

Steve

733. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 21:46:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E6FAAB4.4050709@psu.edu>
Source record: 62970

Vshah101 wrote:
> From Mike KB3EIA
>
>>Can't be done! When I say that there are parts of the test that I don't
>>like, I'm serious. CW could be eliminated tomorrow, but that wouldn't
>>solve the relevancy problem.
>
>
> The tests have a question pool format, and so it is very easy to pass it, often
> without learning the material. However, the written tests seem relevant and
> well balanced to me- IF one learned the material. Which part of the test do you
> find irrelevant. What relevant sections need to be added?
>

I don't care for the satellite coms, and I think that knowing band
edges is a waste of a question and time. I'm not suggesting that these
questions be eliminated. It would be silly. Imagine that you wouldn't
take the General or Extra tests because you didn't want to bother with
the questions I don't like. But that is exactly what people are doing if
the won't take the tests because they don't like Morse code.

I fell sorry for them. They are missing out because of stubbornness.

- Mike KB3EIA -

734. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 21:50:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312165058.11936.00000219@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 62971

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/12/03 7:36 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303120536.5c54a71f@posting.google.com>

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
>news:<20030311175248.27711.00000129@mb-mb.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >Date: 3/11/03 1:24 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303111124.784b7ff9@posting.google.com>

>> >OK, i'll try harder to not have cancer
>>
>> Veeeeery good! Now you have the idea...And since cancer awareness is
>now
>> at the forefront of your conciousness (and we all know what a short trip
>THAT
>> is...) remember that this includes lifestyle and dietary management.
>>
>> So one thing must lead to the other. Will it GUARNTEE you will never
>get
>> cancer...?!?! Of course not. But it certainly means your chances are
>lowered.
>>
>> Now...see how EASY that was...?!?!
>>
>> Steve
>
>
>Nope. You said just wishing it will make it true. Why didn't you
>tell me the whole truth when you had the opportunity?

OK, Brain, now YOU get to cite the post wherein I said "just wishing it
will make it true"

I did no such thing.

In as much as I have to assume you took a minute to hit the "reply" button
and then draft those words, you did it intentionally. To intentionally
misspeak in such a way as to misprepresent another's comments is lying.

Are you a liar, Brain? Or was this, like Lennie the Lame, a "messaging
error"...?!?!

Personally, I think you were lying. I specifically said above nothing is guaranteed. You even quoted me. So...Which way was it?

Steve

735. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 21:51:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E6FABF3.2050809@psu.edu>
Source record: 62972

Dave Heil wrote:

>
> I'm sure you have a lot of, what seem like to you, good ideas.

Can I steal this one for a tagline, Dave? I like it!

> After
> you've introduced your ideas at a club meeting and you see that no one
> expresses much interest, do you ever get the feeling that you're the odd
> man at the meeting?
> Why not announce the formation of your very own club with emphasis on
> doing whatever it is that you believe hams should be doing? Let us know
> who shows up.

HAR! I think that club would consist of people whining about the
cruelty of Morse Code! 8^)

I wonder if what we've seen here might have something to do with his
poor experience with hams in his area? (hint, hint)

- Mike KB3EIA -

736. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 21:53:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E6FAC68.8090100@psu.edu>
Source record: 62973

Our club has around half EE's. So we don't ave a problem there.

- mike KB3EIA -

me wrote:
> The point of my question, does anyone in the group want to bring someone
> with a background in electronics into the hobby. Or, are we better off
> without them?
>
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3E6E9BA1.6010702@adelphia.net...
>
>>me wrote:
>>
>> > You do understand that the engineers that we are discussing are
>> > Electrical Engineers?
>> >
>> > I could see your arguement if it were Mechanical Engineers,
>> > Industrial Engineers, Civil Engineers, maybe Chemical Engineers.
>> >
>>
>>What makes a good ham is not the level of education or a person's
>>qualifications.
>>
>>I hope you realize that you are using the same logic as people who
>>believe that 30+wpm Morse code is what makes a good ham.
>>
>>It has a lot more to do with what the person is behind the ticket than
>>their education or mechanical prowess.
>>
>>But I *would* have to say that anyone who is too lazy to get a ticket
>>because they don't "like" a part of the testing process isn't going to
>>make a very good ham. Not in my book. If they don't want to do Morse,
>>they can get a Tech ticket. So no barrier!
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
>

737. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 22:07:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4ob1g$31h$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62974
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

No harm at a George. Were not discussing those of you that use your CB radio on the CB channels. The problem is those of you that DONT.

Dan/W4NTI

"George M." <georgem191@aol.com> wrote in message news:o82v6v00e3057hf7evfnchcvieuftjr19q@4ax.com...
> I only use my so-called export radio on the 40 CB channels. What is
> the harm in that?
>
>
> On Tue, 11 Mar 2003 14:20:50 -0500, "Trucker Bobby Joe"
> <Channel@truker19channel.net> wrote:
>
> > So what! Truckers aren't bothering anyone running above
> >and below CB or even running on 24 & 25 mhz. Only you
> >hams work yourselves up into a dither over it. You hams think
> >you own the entire radio spectrum!
> >
> > Bobby Joe
>

738. Listen To The QSB Song

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-12 22:32:02 UTC
From: k3pi@arrl.net
Message-ID: <53da5b99.0303121432.2f9bfc2c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62975
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

A couple of radio guys write a song about a radio operator. Take a listen.

http://www.acidplanet.com/artist.asp?PID=250466&T=7835

739. Re: Listen To The QSB Song

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 00:08:18 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v6vj24rcrnjkfb@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62976
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Thanks for the URL. I'm involved in a computer group where one of the moderators *loves* to take a swipe at the radio operators. We also have a Name That Tune contest. I've sent the URL to the group owner. This should be good for a chuckle or two :)

Thanks again,
Jim

--

"radiok3pi" <k3pi@arrl.net> wrote in message news:53da5b99.0303121432.2f9bfc2c@posting.google.com...
> A couple of radio guys write a song about a radio operator. Take a listen.
>
> http://www.acidplanet.com/artist.asp?PID=250466&T=7835

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.461 / Virus Database: 260 - Release Date: 3/10/03

740. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 00:09:53 UTC
From: "David S." <noway@dude.com>
Message-ID: <I%Pba.17654$gF3.1559352@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 62977
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Wow... are you ever clueless.

David

** APRS is cool stuff **

"Trucker Bobby Joe" <Channel@truker19channel.net> wrote in message
news:b4lctn$5nq$0@pita.alt.net...
> So what! Truckers aren't bothering anyone running above
> and below CB or even running on 24 & 25 mhz. Only you
> hams work yourselves up into a dither over it. You hams think
> you own the entire radio spectrum!
>
> Bobby Joe
>
>
> "BDK" <kingrat@buckeye-express.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.18d7d4bbaff796e598970e@news.buckeye-express.com...
> > In article <3e6dd351.121966143@news.ptdprolog.net>, wf3h@ptnospam.com
> > says...
> > > On Mon, 10 Mar 2003 23:39:39 -0500, "Jim Hampton"
> > > <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > >Especially about a no-code novice test. No such thing. Novice is no
> longer
> > > >available and they had to pass the same code test that the extras
have
> to
> > > >today ;) BTW, there are a number of truckers (I've talked to a few)
> that
> > > >have their tickets. Glad to have 'em aboard! BTW, if you can locate
> one,
> > > >the HTX-10 10 meter Rat Shack transceiver is on sale for $69.99. 25
> watts
> > > >ssb, 25 watts FM, and 7 watts am.
> > > >
> > > >73 from Rochester, NY
> > > >Jim AA2QA
> > > >
> > >
> > > truckers usually hang out on 14302.5
> > >
> >
> >

> > The truckers that use ham rigs around here have them clipped, and run
> > down just below and above the legal CB band, and some run 24-25 MHZ.
> >
> > The rigs of choice for them were:
> >
> > Yaesu Ft-757
> > Kenwood 440
> > Icom 735,
> >
> > Then it was
> >
> > Kenwood ts450's
> > Kenwood TS 50's, but they complained about the "splash"!
> >
> > Now it seems like the Icom 706X is the rig of choice. I get to hear
> > these guys in the background due to how close to the interstate I am.
> >
> > BDK
>
>
>

741. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 00:48:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4okfcllm1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62978
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

```
One thing about it.....Ya just cain't fix stupid!!

Dan/W4NTI

"David S." <noway@dude.com> wrote in message
news:l%Pba.17654$gF3.1559352@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Wow... are you ever clueless.
>
> David
>
> ** APRS is cool stuff **
>
> "Trucker Bobby Joe" <Channel@truker19channel.net> wrote in message
> news:b4lctn$5nq$0@pita.alt.net...
> > So what! Truckers aren't bothering anyone running above
> > and below CB or even running on 24 & 25 mhz. Only you
> > hams work yourselves up into a dither over it. You hams think
> > you own the entire radio spectrum!
> >
> > Bobby Joe
> >
> >
> > "BDK" <kingrat@buckeye-express.com> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.18d7d4bbaff796e598970e@news.buckeye-express.com...
> > > In article <3e6dd351.121966143@news.ptdprolog.net>, wf3h@ptnospam.com
> > > says...
> > > > On Mon, 10 Mar 2003 23:39:39 -0500, "Jim Hampton"
> > > > <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >Especially about a no-code novice test. No such thing. Novice is
no
> > longer
> > > > >available and they had to pass the same code test that the extras
> have
> > to
> > > > >today ;) BTW, there are a number of truckers (I've talked to a
few)
> > that
> > > > >have their tickets. Glad to have 'em aboard! BTW, if you can
locate
> > one,
> > > > >the HTX-10 10 meter Rat Shack transceiver is on sale for $69.99.
25
> > watts
```

> > > > >ssb, 25 watts FM, and 7 watts am.
> > > > >
> > > > >73 from Rochester, NY
> > > > >Jim AA2QA
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > truckers usually hang out on 14302.5
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> > > The truckers that use ham rigs around here have them clipped, and run
> > > down just below and above the legal CB band, and some run 24-25 MHZ.
> > >
> > > The rigs of choice for them were:
> > >
> > > Yaesu Ft-757
> > > Kenwood 440
> > > Icom 735,
> > >
> > > Then it was
> > >
> > > Kenwood ts450's
> > > Kenwood TS 50's, but they complained about the "splash"!
> > >
> > > Now it seems like the Icom 706X is the rig of choice. I get to hear
> > > these guys in the background due to how close to the interstate I am.
> > >
> > > BDK
> >
> >
> >
>
>

742. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 01:35:42 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <OfRba.56802$eG2.8927@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 62979

"Radio Funtimes" <stinkyhamops444@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3e6a0ac8@snipnews.snip.net...
> Bill, I know 4 good Electrical Engineers who would
> get their ham ticket tomorrow if they did not have
> to learn the stupid arcane archaic code. These people
> would be an asset to the hobby

snipppp

blah blah blah ...here we go again with this idiotic argument that I put in the same class as "CW gets through all the time". Where are all the "techno-advances" some tauted on the group regarding lowering the code to 5 WPM and the hordes of engineers it would bring in ???

If those engineers in their 9 hours days can't spend 10 minutes a night for 4 to 6 weeks to learn a new radio skill then perhaps they need to go on FRS or CB where they can be a true asset.

God Bless and 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Port Vue Pa

743. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 01:55:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4oofjvkc1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62980

Ive heard the same arguement for 40 years. I think Ive found 10 engineers during that period. All on CW.

Dan/W4NTI

"garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message news:OfRba.56802$eG2.8927@sccrnsc03...
>
> "Radio Funtimes" <stinkyhamops444@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:3e6a0ac8@snipnews.snip.net...
> > Bill, I know 4 good Electrical Engineers who would
> > get their ham ticket tomorrow if they did not have
> > to learn the stupid arcane archaic code. These people
> > would be an asset to the hobby
>
> snipppp
>
> blah blah blah ...here we go again with this idiotic argument that I put in
> the same class as "CW gets through all the time". Where are all the
> "techno-advances" some tauted on the group regarding lowering the code to 5
> WPM and the hordes of engineers it would bring in ???
>
> If those engineers in their 9 hours days can't spend 10 minutes a night for
> 4 to 6 weeks to learn a new radio skill then perhaps they need to go on FRS
> or CB where they can be a true asset.
>
> God Bless and 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Port Vue Pa
>
>

744. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 01:59:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312205919.08691.00000171@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 62981

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: "garigue" garigue@attbi.com
>Date: 3/12/03 7:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <OfRba.56802$eG2.8927@sccrnsc03>

>> Bill, I know 4 good Electrical Engineers who would
>> get their ham ticket tomorrow if they did not have
>> to learn the stupid arcane archaic code. These people
>> would be an asset to the hobby
>
>snipppp
>
>blah blah blah ...here we go again with this idiotic argument that I put in
>the same class as "CW gets through all the time". Where are all the
>"techno-advances" some tauted on the group regarding lowering the code to 5
>WPM and the hordes of engineers it would bring in ???

They are still wondering why thier OTHER "initiatives", ie: The Novice License, Incentive Licensing, Novice Enhancement and The No Code Tech didn't bring in all the techno-nerds they insisted would be knocking down our doors.

Latest version: "Restructuring". The only "big changes" were those who took advantage of the "upgrade" potential to General and Extra. The front door, the No Code Tech, has been unchanged since February 1991 and STILL offers access to 97% of all Amateur allocations...No code required.

>If those engineers in their 9 hours days can't spend 10 minutes a night for
>4 to 6 weeks to learn a new radio skill then perhaps they need to go on FRS
>or CB where they can be a true asset.

Exactly. Other than Amateur-specific regulations and "practice" questions, what do they have to learn? If they can't hack that...there's always GMRS.

73 Steve, K4YZ

745. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 03:09:12 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312220912.16131.00000138@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 62982

From Steve, K4YZ
> More silliness, Vipul. More silliness.
Yes, I guess its a silly comment.

746. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 03:11:26 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312221126.16131.00000139@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 62983

From Dave K8MN
>I don't believe they're listening to the stuff either, Jim, but somehow
>we have at least two individuals here who both confuse the words
>"proficiency" and "efficiency" and who seem to believe these two guys
>are plodding along at .02 wpm as if that's the best they can do.

Couldn't they use that low freq stuff for underwater applications?

747. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 03:14:05 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312221405.16131.00000140@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 62984

> Unless, of course, you suggest that the United States not honor it's
>treaty obligations? (ie: break international law?) Do you suggest that,
>Vipul?
>
>>Steve, K4YZ

You just love pointing that out, K4YZ, don't you?

748. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 03:24:53 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312222453.16131.00000141@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 62985

Dave Heil wrote:
>> After
>> you've introduced your ideas at a club meeting and you see that no one
>> expresses much interest, do you ever get the feeling that you're the odd
>> man at the meeting?

Yes, no one else interested in projects, homebrew.

From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>HAR! I think that club would consist of people whining about the
>cruelty of Morse Code! 8^)

Very funny. The club could cover such topics as tuning, calibrating,
homebrewing, troubleshooting, antenna setups(common overlap with traditional
Hams here).

>I wonder if what we've seen here might have something to do with his
>poor experience with hams in his area? (hint, hint)

I don't get it. Whats the hint?

749. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 03:28:59 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312222859.16131.00000142@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 62987

From: "KB9TMP"
>Then why don't you start an EE Amateur Radio Club in your area? The idea
>might spread and more spring up.

I would like to do that. I know some EEs that would be interested in this type of club. I need to take care of some other things before I can go ahead with it.

750. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 03:34:07 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312223407.16131.00000143@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 62989

>Sheesh, My club is probably half Electrical engineers... Where do you
>get your reference material?
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Thats nice. Where would I find that? In my area, I have been to four closest clubs and hamfests (some in other states) and most are not EEs.

751. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 03:36:53 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312223653.16131.00000144@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 62991

>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)

>(Of course, "Morse Code" just might be some super secret project being
>developed to thwart terrs and tyrants, so maybe that's why it isn't on
>public access websites.)

Once you learn it, you CANNOT forget it. Its a torture device!

752. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 03:44:03 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312224403.16131.00000145@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 62993

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> We could be in secret planning to thwart an Alien Invasion!
>
> Secrecy was almost violated when the science-fantasy film
> "Independence Day" was released.
>
> Extraterrestrials who conquered space flight and gravity can't
> be expected to know enough to decode morse code, could
> they? After all, none of them know a damn thing about ham
> radio since they are (are you ready?)...NOT LICENSED AS
> RADIO AMATEURS!!!

Sorry, couldn't resist.
How about the movie, Godzilla? All modes of communication were cut off. The only hope of saving the city from Godzilla was to send a message through some taxi cab freqs. The only thing that could send for help was radio contact. Although not mentioned, person that knows how to do that must have been a Ham. (I, myself would agree with that). Ham Radio saves the world!

753. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 04:03:49 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312230349.16131.00000146@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 62995

From: "garigue" garigue@attbi.com
>If those engineers in their 9 hours days can't spend 10 minutes a night for
>4 to 6 weeks to learn a new radio skill then perhaps they need to go on FRS
>or CB where they can be a true asset.

By "a new radio skill", you mean Morse code. They would "learn a new radio skill" (just not the Morse code skill) by attending seminars, reading, or experimenting (if possible) .

Many spend alot of "free" time reading about the field, staying current in their jobs, and updating with courses/seminars.

Why should an EE spend the extra time to learn an outdated skill (code)? Especially, if they do not particularly enjoy that skill (code). This would take away from the time they are staying current and they would risk falling behind.

Also, EEs can be in a variety of areas such as digital, firmware, VLSI, controls, software, or other non-radio fields and may not be interested in amateur radio.

754. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 04:09:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E700483.6040302@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62996

Vshah101 wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
>
>>> After
>>>you've introduced your ideas at a club meeting and you see that no one
>>>expresses much interest, do you ever get the feeling that you're the odd
>>>man at the meeting?
>>>
>
> Yes, no one else interested in projects, homebrew.
>
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> >HAR! I think that club would consist of people whining about the
>
>>cruelty of Morse Code! 8^)
>>
>
> Very funny. The club could cover such topics as tuning, calibrating,
> homebrewing, troubleshooting, antenna setups(common overlap with traditional
> Hams here).
>
>
>>I wonder if what we've seen here might have something to do with his
>>poor experience with hams in his area? (hint, hint)
>>
>
> I don't get it. Whats the hint?

I guess my hinting is too subtle, so I'll put it another way.

Your postings indicate that you might have some trouble getting along
with people who don't share your views. You post about the obese hams at
hamfests, you dislike Morse code, and make some pretty outrageous
statements here in this group. You call Hams a cult, and refer to the
silly but harmless old Wouff Hong as a torture device.

Yet you expect hams to embrace you when you trot in with this sort of
attitude?

- Mike KB3EIA -

755. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 04:12:42 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v701cf20iohl91@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62997
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

```
Dan, ignorance is curable, stupid is not.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

--

/
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b4okfc$1lm$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> One thing about it.....Ya just cain't fix stupid!!
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "David S." <noway@dude.com> wrote in message
> news:l%Pba.17654$gF3.1559352@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > Wow... are you ever clueless.
> >
> > David
> >
> > ** APRS is cool stuff **
> >
> > "Trucker Bobby Joe" <Channel@truker19channel.net> wrote in message
> > news:b4lctn$5nq$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > So what! Truckers aren't bothering anyone running above
> > > and below CB or even running on 24 & 25 mhz. Only you
> > > hams work yourselves up into a dither over it. You hams think
> > > you own the entire radio spectrum!
> > >
> > > Bobby Joe
> > >
> > >
> > > "BDK" <kingrat@buckeye-express.com> wrote in message
> > > news:MPG.18d7d4bbaff796e598970e@news.buckeye-express.com...
> > > > In article <3e6dd351.121966143@news.ptdprolog.net>,
wf3h@ptnospam.com
> > > > says...
> > > > > On Mon, 10 Mar 2003 23:39:39 -0500, "Jim Hampton"
> > > > > <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > >Especially about a no-code novice test. No such thing. Novice
is
> no
> > > longer
```

> > > > > >available and they had to pass the same code test that the extras
> > have
> > > > to
> > > > > > >today ;) BTW, there are a number of truckers (I've talked to a
> few)
> > > that
> > > > > > >have their tickets. Glad to have 'em aboard! BTW, if you can
> locate
> > > one,
> > > > > > >the HTX-10 10 meter Rat Shack transceiver is on sale for $69.99.
> 25
> > > watts
> > > > > > >ssb, 25 watts FM, and 7 watts am.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >73 from Rochester, NY
> > > > > > >Jim AA2QA
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > truckers usually hang out on 14302.5
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > The truckers that use ham rigs around here have them clipped, and
run
> > > > > down just below and above the legal CB band, and some run 24-25 MHZ.
> > > > >
> > > > > The rigs of choice for them were:
> > > > >
> > > > > Yaesu Ft-757
> > > > > Kenwood 440
> > > > > Icom 735,
> > > > >
> > > > > Then it was
> > > > >
> > > > > Kenwood ts450's
> > > > > Kenwood TS 50's, but they complained about the "splash"!
> > > > >
> > > > > Now it seems like the Icom 706X is the rig of choice. I get to hear
> > > > > these guys in the background due to how close to the interstate I
am.
> > > > >
> > > > > BDK
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.461 / Virus Database: 260 - Release Date: 3/10/03

756. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 04:15:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E7005B7.7070600@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62998

Vshah101 wrote:

>>Sheesh, My club is probably half Electrical engineers... Where do you
>>get your reference material?
>>
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
> Thats nice. Where would I find that? In my area, I have been to four closest
> clubs and hamfests (some in other states) and most are not EEs.
>

I live in the middle of Pennsylvania, in a University town. How did you know that the people at hamfests aren't EE's, do they carry signs or wear special shoes or something? Last time I checked EE's looked just like other people.

- Mike KB3EIA -

757. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 04:23:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <yJTba.6879$se1.4024424@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62986

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030311205809.22999.00000141@mb-bk.aol.com...
> From K4YZ
>
> I do not <Morse>* code, nor have an interest in <Morse> code.
>
> From knowing someone that knows <a> code, I know that once you learn
13wpm, you
> forget 5 wpm. It seems important to not "lose" your 5 wpm code skill <(if
you
> want to code at all, that is)>, don't you agree?

Nonsense. Everyone that I know who does code has no problem with operating at any speed from their own personal maximum on down. Of course it is stressful to operate at a speed different than one's own preference but that is a different story. The only problem with 5wpm when you are used to faster code is staying awake because the slow speed will put you to sleep!

Dee Flint, N8UZE

758. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 04:27:12 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030312232712.16131.00000147@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 62999

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>Since they have no experience in operating in the HF realm and no experience
>in morse code, they are not knowledgeable enough to determine if morse code
>is a waste of time. I have found it to be most useful

This is a ridiculous statement! Yes, some can be smart enough to know it is a waste of time. You do not have to know Morse code to know it is a waste of time, OKAY?

Those that are familiar with the Shannon bound and where the various modulation schemes lie relative to this bound DO have the knowledge of the capabilities of the various modulation schemes and can access the performance benefits/tradeoffs of Morse code on HF. (Sorry for long sentence).

The people in this specialization DO have the experience in HF and ARE very knowledgeable enough to access the tradeoffs. You do not have to integrate the encoding/decoding scheme into your being to know these tradeoffs.

I suspect 16-QAM or some other modes beat out Morse code. I'm curious where Morse code stands. Anyone wants to make the <mathematically supported> claims? I would like to know. I don't care if Morse code "wins". I would acknowledge that. However, I still wouldn't want to learn it.

VS, KB1HMW

759. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 04:30:16 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <sPTba.6881$se1.4025767@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62988

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030311220715.22999.00000144@mb-bk.aol.com...
> From Mike KB3EIA
> >Can't be done! When I say that there are parts of the test that I don't
> >like, I'm serious. CW could be eliminated tomorrow, but that wouldn't
> >solve the relevancy problem.
>
> The tests have a question pool format, and so it is very easy to pass it,
often
> without learning the material. However, the written tests seem relevant
and
> well balanced to me- IF one learned the material. Which part of the test
do you
> find irrelevant. What relevant sections need to be added?
>

All digital modes requiring a computer (RTTY, PSK31,packet, etc) are
irrelevant. They don't require any particularly relevant radio knowledge
and should be eliminated.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

760. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 04:34:08 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <4TTba.6883$se1.4026088@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62990

"me" <me@here.com> wrote in message
news:b4mlg6$q3g$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> I am not avocating changing anything.
>
> Someone else was trying to give the EEs a free pass. I just said that they
> were smart enought to know that morse code was a waste of time. That is
way
> they didn't go and get their license.
>

Since they have no experience in operating in the HF realm and no experience
in morse code, they are not knowledgeable enough to determine if morse code
is a waste of time. I have found it to be most useful.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

761. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 04:35:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <fUTba.6884$se1.4026355@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62992

"me" <me@here.com> wrote in message
news:b4mlj7rkt1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> The point of my question, does anyone in the group want to bring someone
> with a background in electronics into the hobby. Or, are we better off
> without them?
>

So long as they pass the tests (no special favors), they are a potential
asset. Whether that ability is realized is entirely up to them.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

762. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 04:38:25 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <5b207v0dnknpdb9bf7ickgmqsq03ee73c9@4ax.com>
Source record: 63000

On 12 Mar 2003 02:57:15 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:
>>>
>>>Brian
>>
>>... and exactly what is it that makes you think I haven't "earned" the
>>right to vent when I've had a belly full of your petty arguing?
>
>Raymond:
>
>For one thing, the "petty arguing" you vented about is a virtually
>universal feature of most Usenet Newsgroups, and this one, in
>particular, was designed to give such squabbles a place to live
>in order to spare rec.radio.amateur.misc from the code/no-code
>static. So your complaints serve to show your ignorance of the
>history of this newsgroup and Usenet in general. If you don't like
>it here, why don't you concentrate your efforts to your own BBS
>and leave us be?

My complaints serve to show that there are those of us who have been
reading these newsgroups for years, and are tired of the incessant
bickering going on between the factions headed by Larry and Kim. You
are both mistakenly possessed of a sense of self-superiority. The
fact of the matter is that are vastly more important things to discuss
than "your callsign is offensive" or "you don't do code, therefore
you're not a REAL ham." There are topics that can be discussed that
might actually result in an INTELLIGENT exchange of information,
rather that insults. Of course, if you're respective camps would
rather trade insults and insinuation, then so be it. Like I said,
might as well change the name of the channel to
rec.radio.CBWANNABE.policy.

>BTW, Brian and I have "earned" our right to express our opinions
>in this newsgroup, and elsewhere, by sacrificing the best years of
>our adult lives in military service in order to defend your right to do
>the same. If you disagree with anything we or anyone else has to
>say here, then, by all means, you get to state your own position.
>However, what you don't get to do is shut us up! Whether you like
>it or not, this newsgroup is a democracy, and Brian and I intend to
>keep it that way!

Gee, I'm impressed by your record of military service. Okay, so I'm
not. Guess that's because for some reason I get the impression you
feel that I haven't done my part in the service and protection of this
country. Well.... I can show you my 813 so I guess that I've also

"earned" the right to shoot off MY mouth as I see fit. I also didn't say anyone should "shut up." My assertion is that there sure are a hell of a lot more important things to discuss than someone's hurt feelings.

Doesn't matter... You're obviously not going to change. Neither is the other faction.. Carry on with your petty bickering... Those of us with "real" lives will pity you as we see fit.

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

763. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 04:55:15 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <TaUba.6886$se1.4029665@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62994

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030311215829.22999.00000143@mb-bk.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
> >Geometry is an example. How many of us have
> >used it since high school? But we were required to study it even though
the
> >people designing the curricula knew that most will never use it.
>
> No, the people designing the curricula DONT know most people will never
use it.
> Bureaucrats, who use vague guidelines such as "general education"
requirements
> or "diversity" requirements, design the curriculum. The implementation is
poor,
> but on the surface, the curriculum seems to meet the guidelines. The
courses
> are often crude rationales to fit those guidelines.

Actually they do know these things. The object is to teach basics in a broad group of fields so that the students have some basis to decide what direction they want to pursue when they go on to college. If the only math you've ever had is just enough to enable you to balance your checkbook, you won't have enough background to see if you might want to explore it further.

>
> Also, some truly relevant courses are not in the curriculum because of the
> narrow view of what one should learn in school. As a result "well
educated"
> people can do differential calculus, but cannot change a flat tire.

Calculus is not a fundamental in high school. It is an elective IF your school is big enough to offer it. In college, it is only required if you are going into fields like engineering, math, etc. English majors don't have to take it.

Changing a flat tire should be covered in Driver's Education if it is designed correctly. Granted some courses omit it but it should be included.

>
> Similarly, the SATs or MCAS tests make no sense in that they test largely
> irrelevant information that you must study hard for. The politicians use
this
> and say they are for "standards". Standards, in reality, go down, because
the
> irrelevant knowledge displaces useful skills the student can be learning.
The

> standards would only go up if the information learned were RELAVANT.

Weird that you can spell irrelevant but not relevant. The SATs, etc really only apply to college bound students. These days, the tests are more important than ever in determining whether the student is ready to tackle college level material or will need remedial work since too many schools just give grades away.

>
> >We all have to study things in our lives that we may or may not have a use
> >for later on. They are included because they are considered to be part of a
> >well rounded basic education.
>
> Your analogy does not apply here. This is not a group of elements, this is just
> one element - code. And, we know that this element is irrelevant and
> uninteresting - so why learn it?

Yes my analogy does apply. Something we must study equates to an element. There may be one or there may be more than one.

>
> The <technical> General license class is tied to an irrelevant <non-technical,
> audiomotor skill> metric known as code.

Sorry but it hasn't yet been proven to be irrelevant.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

764. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 04:58:27 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b4q4ca0e12@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 62926

Now c'mon Dwight..... Hams aren't anal rententive!!!! (sarc.) Just because half of them were probably the type that reminded the teachers that they forgot to assign homework..... or were the one's that were always tattling on others doesn't mean they would nit-pick about a small error like that! :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-. .. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:BA94E4FD.12E15%stewart@say.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > Really kind of a strange bunch of rules the
> > FCC has. They issue ham licenses with a term
> > of 3652 or 3653 days, but the renewal window
> > is only 90 days. That's....ummmm.....2.4%
> > of the license term. (snip)
>
>
> Shame on you, Jim. If rounded off properly, it is a little closer to 2.5%
> (2.46%). Don't expect to get away with sloppy math like that in this
> newsgroup. ;)
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>
> ----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

765. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 05:12:45 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b4q4cb1e12@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 62927

Geometry??? I use it alot! It is used as a positive asset in playing pool.
(aka billiards)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> We all have to study things in our lives that we may or may not have a use
> for later on. They are included because they are considered to be part of
a
> well rounded basic education. Geometry is an example. How many of us
have
> used it since high school? But we were required to study it even though
the
> people designing the curricula knew that most will never use it.
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
>

766. pro-American editorial

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 05:31:38 UTC
From: #8 <#8@smell.com>
Message-ID: <HcacnSzMwqZXiu2jXTWcpw@comcast.com>
Source record: 62901

Good reading, from a Toronto newspaper's editorial page! 1999
------- ------------ ------------- ------- ---------- -----------------
Widespread, but only partial news coverage was given recently to a
remarkable editorial broadcast from Toronto by Gordon Sinclair, a Canadian
television commentator. What follows is the full text of his trenchant
remarks as printed in the Congressional Record:

This Canadian thinks it is time to speak up for the Americans as most
generous and possibly the least appreciated people on all the earth.

Germany, Japan and, to a lesser extent, Britain and Italy were lifted out of
the debris of war by the Americans who poured in billions of dollars and
forgave other billions in debts. None of these countries is today paying
even the interest on its remaining debts to the United States.

When the franc was in danger of collapsing in 1956, it was the Americans who
propped it up, and their reward was to be insulted and swindled on the
streets of Paris. I was there. I saw it. When distant cities are hit by
earthquakes, it is the United States that hurries in to help. This spring,
59 American communities were flattened by tornadoes. Nobody helped.

The Marshall Plan and the Truman Policy pumped billions of dollars into
discouraged countries. Now newspapers in those countries are writing about
the decadent, warmongering Americans. I'd like to see just one of those
countries that is gloating over the erosion of the United States Dollar
build its own airplane. Does any other country in the world have a plane to
equal the Boeing Jumbo Jet, the Lockheed Tristar, or the Douglas 10? If so,
why don't they fly them? Why do all the International lines except Russia
fly American planes?

Why does no other land on earth even consider putting a man or woman on the
moon? You talk about Japanese technocracy, and you get radios. You talk
about German technocracy, and you get automobiles. You talk about American
technocracy, and you find men on the moon - - not once, but several times -
and safely home again.

You talk about scandals, and the Americans put theirs right in the store
window for everybody to look at. Even their draft-dodgers are not pursued
and hounded. They are here on our streets, and most of them, unless they are
breaking Canadian laws, are getting American dollars from ma and pa at home
to spend here.

When the railways of France, Germany and India were breaking down through
age, it was the American who rebuilt them. When the Pennsylvania Railroad
and the New York Central went broke, nobody loaned them an old caboose. Both
are still broke.

I can name you 5,000 times when the Americans raced to the help of other people in trouble. Can you name me even one time when someone else raced to the Americans in trouble? I don't think there was outside help even during the San Francisco earthquake.

Our neighbors have faced it alone, and I'm one Canadian who is damned tired of hearing them get kicked around. They will come out of this thing with their flag high. And when they do, they are entitled to thumb their nose at the lands that are gloating over their present troubles. I hope Canada is not one of those.

767. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 05:51:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E701CC3.AE018FAF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62902

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E6EC9E9.BAC3DF46@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> [third one, same message...]

If you provide us with multiple examples, you'll see it multiple times.
>
> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

You can't help yourself, Leonard.

Dave K8MN

768. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 06:07:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E70201C.D257E876@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62903

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E6EC42A.27F1F85@earthlink.net>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3E6E24E4.98E81BE4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >Someone who uses a morse code speed of .02 wpm may or may not be
> > > >proficient at morse code. That would depend on the maximum speed at
> > > >which he is capable.
> > >
> > > Dave,
> > >
> > > I don't think those hams are actually listening to the 136 kHz received
> > > signals. Betcha both encoding and decoding are being done by computers.
> > >
> > > Then there's the matter of ID'ing every 10 minutes....
> >
> > I don't believe they're listening to the stuff either, Jim, but somehow
> > we have at least two individuals here who both confuse the words
> > "proficiency" and "efficiency" and who seem to believe these two guys
> > are plodding along at .02 wpm as if that's the best they can do.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Why would we believe anything you say?

I didn't ask you to believe. All you need to do is look up two words and
learn their definitions.

> You say that if the message is 100% copy every time at 5wpm, that is not proficient.

No, that is not what I wrote. Your reading comprehension sucks.

> All of Amateur Radio is about Fast CW on HF.

Is it? I operate SSB, FM and RTTY. I do some quite slow CW on 160m, 2m
and 70cm. You're starting to sound like Mini-Len once again.

Dave K8MN

769. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 06:21:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E70235C.3E8A6D49@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62904

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >
> > I'm sure you have a lot of, what seem like to you, good ideas.
>
> Can I steal this one for a tagline, Dave? I like it!

Permission granted.

> > After
> > you've introduced your ideas at a club meeting and you see that no one
> > expresses much interest, do you ever get the feeling that you're the odd
> > man at the meeting?
> > Why not announce the formation of your very own club with emphasis on
> > doing whatever it is that you believe hams should be doing? Let us know
> > who shows up.
>
> HAR! I think that club would consist of people whining about the
> cruelty of Morse Code! 8^)

My guess would be ONE person whining about the inequities of morse.

> I wonder if what we've seen here might have something to do with his
> poor experience with hams in his area? (hint, hint)

I've seen fellows like Vipul show up at several general interest clubs.
The expound upon their grand ideas and promise a new age of
enlightenment. After a few meetings where no one demonstrates any
enthusiasm for their plans, they simply go away.

Dave K8MN

770. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 06:23:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7023E1.F43C4718@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62905

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From Dave K8MN
> >I don't believe they're listening to the stuff either, Jim, but somehow
> >we have at least two individuals here who both confuse the words
> >"proficiency" and "efficiency" and who seem to believe these two guys
> >are plodding along at .02 wpm as if that's the best they can do.
>
> Couldn't they use that low freq stuff for underwater applications?

Could be but I don't think they can hold their breath long enough at .02
wpm.

Dave K8MN

771. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 06:26:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E70246F.B1DB0AC3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62906

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> >Sheesh, My club is probably half Electrical engineers... Where do you
> >get your reference material?
> >
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Thats nice. Where would I find that? In my area, I have been to four closest
> clubs and hamfests (some in other states) and most are not EEs.

Vipul, Most hams are not EE's. Most hams will never be EE's. Amateur
radio wasn't set up to be a playground for EE's.

Dave K8MN

772. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 06:31:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E70259B.9BA17226@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62907

Vshah101 wrote:

> Many spend alot of "free" time reading about the field, staying current in
> their jobs, and updating with courses/seminars.

Quite a number of people who are not electrical engineers spend some of
their free time reading about their fields, staying current in their
jobs and updating with courses and seminars.

> Why should an EE spend the extra time to learn an outdated skill (code)?
> Especially, if they do not particularly enjoy that skill (code).

Answer: Because they have their sights set on obtaining an amateur radio
license granting HF privileges.

> This would
> take away from the time they are staying current and they would risk falling
> behind.

Falling behind in what?

> Also, EEs can be in a variety of areas such as digital, firmware, VLSI,
> controls, software, or other non-radio fields and may not be interested in
> amateur radio.

Great! Believe it or not, no one is going to force amateur radio on
those who have no interest.

Dave K8MN

773. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 06:37:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E70270B.793E0B96@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62908

AB2HR wrote:
>
> On 12 Mar 2003 02:57:15 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
> >>>
> >>>Brian
> >>

> My complaints serve to show that there are those of us who have been
> reading these newsgroups for years, and are tired of the incessant
> bickering going on between the factions headed by Larry and Kim. You
> are both mistakenly possessed of a sense of self-superiority. The
> fact of the matter is that are vastly more important things to discuss
> than "your callsign is offensive" or "you don't do code, therefore
> you're not a REAL ham." There are topics that can be discussed that
> might actually result in an INTELLIGENT exchange of information,
> rather that insults. Of course, if you're respective camps would
> rather trade insults and insinuation, then so be it. Like I said,
> might as well change the name of the channel to
> rec.radio.CBWANNABE.policy.

Uhhhh, Raymond? This isn't a "channel". Feel free to start a few
threads about the things you think are important to amateur radio.
After starting them, don't forget to be a frequent contributor to assist
in keeping the flow of ideas going.

> >BTW, Brian and I have "earned" our right to express our opinions
> >in this newsgroup, and elsewhere, by sacrificing the best years of
> >our adult lives in military service in order to defend your right to do
> >the same. If you disagree with anything we or anyone else has to
> >say here, then, by all means, you get to state your own position.
> >However, what you don't get to do is shut us up! Whether you like
> >it or not, this newsgroup is a democracy, and Brian and I intend to
> >keep it that way!
>
> Gee, I'm impressed by your record of military service. Okay, so I'm
> not. Guess that's because for some reason I get the impression you
> feel that I haven't done my part in the service and protection of this
> country. Well.... I can show you my 813 so I guess that I've also
> "earned" the right to shoot off MY mouth as I see fit. I also didn't
> say anyone should "shut up." My assertion is that there sure are a
> hell of a lot more important things to discuss than someone's hurt
> feelings.

I have a whole box of 813's. They make nice linear amps but performance
falls off a bit on ten meters.

> Doesn't matter... You're obviously not going to change. Neither is
> the other faction.. Carry on with your petty bickering... Those of
> us with "real" lives will pity you as we see fit.

You won't be offended if a few of us decide to pity you, will you?

Dave K8MN

774. Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 07:17:12 UTC
From: kf6vyh@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313021712.00418.00000121@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 62909

I do not know if this has been brought up in the NG in the past, but here goes.

My girl freind is studying for her Tech test. Some of the questions are in regards to band plans. After talking to some fellow hams, my question as well as theirs is.

Why does the ARRL include band plan questions, the band plans are NOT FCC regulations. In that regard, they should not be part of a test.

73
John
KF6VYH

775. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 10:03:36 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA95C1A7.12EBF%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62910
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
> "George M." <georgem191@aol.com> wrote:
>>
>> I only use my so-called export radio on the
>> 40 CB channels. What is the harm in that?
>
> No harm at all George. Were not discussing those of you that
> use your CB radio on the CB channels. The problem is those
> of you that DONT.

An "export" radio is not a CB radio, Dan. And there is often potential harm in it - these highly modified radios are notorious for causing interference to neighborhood televisions, telephones, other radio equipment, and other electronics. And every instance of interference has the potential to directly impact ham radio operators - it creates another person opposed to radios (all radios) in the neighborhood.

I certainly do not want people using unauthorized equipment in my neighborhood. In addition to the potential interference with items in my home, the use (or acceptance of use) of unauthorized equipment says a lot about the character of the individual - perhaps illustrated by the "outlaw" mentality so pervasive in the CB community today. Whatever the case, "bad boys" in one thing are likely to be "bad boys" in other aspects of life (work, social activities, relationships, the neighborhood, etc).

Further, these highly modified radios often interfere with other CB'ers on nearby frequencies (channels) - reducing the number of usable CB frequencies, which encourages still more to move their communications outside the allocated CB frequencies to frequencies perhaps assigned to other radio services.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

776. Re: pro-American editorial

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 10:41:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA95CAA6.12EC1%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62911

"#8" wrote:
>
> Good reading, from a Toronto newspaper's editorial
> page! 1999
>
> Widespread, but only partial news coverage was given
> recently to a remarkable editorial broadcast from
> Toronto by Gordon Sinclair, a Canadian television
> commentator. What follows is the full text of his
> trenchant remarks as printed in the Congressional
> Record:
>
> This Canadian thinks it is (snip)

This is not exactly "recent" - I first saw it many years ago and it has been repeated many times since (every time some person wants us to feel justified in whatever is happening at the moment involving Canada). What I've never seen is the name of the newspaper, the date it appeared in that newspaper, the name of the television station Sinclair appeared on, or the date it aired. A Congressman can read anything into the Congressional Record (if it does indeed actually appear in the Record). That doesn't prove authenticity.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

777. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 10:59:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA95CEDE.12ECA%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62912

"Kf6vyh" wrote:
>
> (snip) My girlfriend is studying for her Tech test.
> Some of the questions are in regards to band plans.
> After talking to some fellow hams, my question as
> well as theirs is.
>
> Why does the ARRL include band plan questions, the
> band plans are NOT FCC regulations. In that regard,
> they should not be part of a test.

The band plans below 50MHz are indeed backed by FCC regulation. The band plans above 50MHz are voluntary at the moment, but may one day also be backed by regulation. Furthermore, compliance with the voluntary band plans above 50MHz is considered "good operator practice," reducing potential for interference and/or conflict. For those reasons, everyone needs to be aware of the band plans, which is why they appear on the exam.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

778. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 11:56:42 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <42D6EB742BE07D98.F7321648E555453F.96841378206F0F24@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62914

"AB2HR" <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:5b207v0dnknpdb9bf7ickgmqsq03ee73c9@4ax.com...
> On 12 Mar 2003 02:57:15 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
> >>>
> >>>Brian
> >>
> >>... and exactly what is it that makes you think I haven't "earned" the
> >>right to vent when I've had a belly full of your petty arguing?
> >
> >Raymond:
> >
> >For one thing, the "petty arguing" you vented about is a virtually
> >universal feature of most Usenet Newsgroups, and this one, in
> >particular, was designed to give such squabbles a place to live
> >in order to spare rec.radio.amateur.misc from the code/no-code
> >static. So your complaints serve to show your ignorance of the
> >history of this newsgroup and Usenet in general. If you don't like
> >it here, why don't you concentrate your efforts to your own BBS
> >and leave us be?
>
> My complaints serve to show that there are those of us who have been
> reading these newsgroups for years, and are tired of the incessant
> bickering going on between the factions headed by Larry and Kim. You
> are both mistakenly possessed of a sense of self-superiority. The
> fact of the matter is that are vastly more important things to discuss
> than "your callsign is offensive" or "you don't do code, therefore
> you're not a REAL ham." There are topics that can be discussed that
> might actually result in an INTELLIGENT exchange of information,
> rather that insults. Of course, if you're respective camps would
> rather trade insults and insinuation, then so be it. Like I said,
> might as well change the name of the channel to
> rec.radio.CBWANNABE.policy.
>

It sounds to me like you are *exactly* as one of those "factions" you speak
of. You are complaining, above. Granted, it's about your own issues, but
could you define the difference between yours, Dave Heil's, Larry Roll's,
mine, or anyone else's methods? I daresay while you accuse others of having
a sense of self-superiority, you've acted on that very thing yourself.

> >
> >BTW, Brian and I have "earned" our right to express our opinions
> >in this newsgroup, and elsewhere, by sacrificing the best years of
> >our adult lives in military service in order to defend your right to do

> >the same. If you disagree with anything we or anyone else has to
> >say here, then, by all means, you get to state your own position.
> >However, what you don't get to do is shut us up! Whether you like
> >it or not, this newsgroup is a democracy, and Brian and I intend to
> >keep it that way!
>
> Gee, I'm impressed by your record of military service. Okay, so I'm
> not. Guess that's because for some reason I get the impression you
> feel that I haven't done my part in the service and protection of this
> country. Well.... I can show you my 813 so I guess that I've also
> "earned" the right to shoot off MY mouth as I see fit. I also didn't
> say anyone should "shut up." My assertion is that there sure are a
> hell of a lot more important things to discuss than someone's hurt
> feelings.
>
> Doesn't matter... You're obviously not going to change. Neither is
> the other faction.. Carry on with your petty bickering... Those of
> us with "real" lives will pity you as we see fit.
>
> Raymond Sirois AB2HR
> SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
> 607-733-5745
> telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

"Doesn't matter"? Yet another display of the same things the rest of us do. It *doesn't matter* but you have posted at least twice/three times on this very issue--nothing else and certainly nothing of extreme import--and you say "doesn't matter." I caution you to get out while you still can :) This newsgroup is nothing but the same thing day in and day out; it's a text version of a good rowdy, violent, bloody, shoot 'em game, and nothing more. The same sickness that draws individuals to playing the graphic versions of them (the games) is the same sickness that draws most of us are here day in and day out. And, it's great fun. I can't think of anywhere else where I can spend 5-10 minutes, picking random or specific items to read and maybe respond to--get the angst from the day out, then settle down with a nice cup of coffee and a good show. Of course, it took me a while to learn that. I'd like to see a really good ham radio newsgroup--but I haven't seen one yet. This, *.misc, *.XXX are all the same--although this one is prone to *more* of the same...LOL

Kim W5TIT

779. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 12:00:45 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <6C1487A2351CBDA8.321BE4BCB2F65A88.620099A7F066F4A6@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62918

> "Kf6vyh" <kf6vyh@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030313021712.00418.00000121@mb-ma.aol.com...
> I do not know if this has been brought up in the NG in the past, but here
> goes.
>
>
> My girl freind is studying for her Tech test. Some of the questions are in
> regards to band plans. After talking to some fellow hams, my question as
> well
> as theirs is.
>
> Why does the ARRL include band plan questions, the band plans are NOT FCC
> regulations. In that regard, they should not be part of a test.
>
> 73
> John
> KF6VYH
>

Well, the bandplans are supported by the FCC. Not a good way to explain that, but it's the closest I can come right now. And, isn't a good idea to include those items that are considered "good operating practice" since that is a part of the spirit of amateur radio (in the Amateur Code).

Kim W5TIT

780. Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 12:21:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313072143.11573.00000003@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 62916

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/12/03 9:14 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030312221405.16131.00000140@mb-mk.aol.com>

>> Unless, of course, you suggest that the United States not honor it's
>>treaty obligations? (ie: break international law?) Do you suggest that,
>>Vipul?
>>
>>>Steve, K4YZ
>
>You just love pointing that out, K4YZ, don't you?

Yes, KB1HMW, I do.

Does compling with the law bother you? Do facts bother you? Are you an anarchist? Do you suggest we break the laws just because you think this is a law worth breaking?

Do I need to ask the question again?

Do you, Vipul Shaw, recommend that we, The United States, NOT honor our treaty obligations?

Steve, K4YZ

781. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 12:24:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313072405.11573.00000004@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 62917

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/12/03 9:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030312222453.16131.00000141@mb-mk.aol.com>

>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>>I wonder if what we've seen here might have something to do with his
>>poor experience with hams in his area? (hint, hint)

>I don't get it. Whats the hint?

Why am I not surprised?

Steve, K4YZ

782. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 12:28:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313072811.11573.00000005@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 62919

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/12/03 9:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030312222859.16131.00000142@mb-mk.aol.com>

>I need to take care of some other things before I can go ahead with
>it.

For all the time YOU spend in THIS forum griping and whining, denigratiing and humiliating (including rec.radio.cb), you could invest the effort to put this "program" into effect.

The evidence indicates that you'd RATHER gripe and whine, denigrate and humiliate, though.

Steve, K4YZ

783. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 12:32:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313073220.11573.00000006@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 62920

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/12/03 9:36 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030312223653.16131.00000144@mb-mk.aol.com>

>Once you learn it, you CANNOT forget it. Its a torture device!

Only for wimps and EE's, Vipul. It was designed that way.

Steve, K4YZ

784. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 12:42:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313074239.11573.00000008@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 62921

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/12/03 10:03 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030312230349.16131.00000146@mb-mk.aol.com>

>From: "garigue" garigue@attbi.com
>>If those engineers in their 9 hours days can't spend 10 minutes a night for
>>4 to 6 weeks to learn a new radio skill then perhaps they need to go on FRS
>>or CB where they can be a true asset.
>
>By "a new radio skill", you mean Morse code. They would "learn a new radio
>skill" (just not the Morse code skill) by attending seminars, reading, or
>experimenting (if possible)

Still doesn't change a thing...If they can't invest a few minutes a day,
then it's obviously not important enough to get the license.

And since almost all "experimenting and homebrewing" (you're favorite pet
subjects) are in the higher frequencies anyway, Vippy, why aren't these guys
getting a No Code Tech anyway?

>Many spend alot of "free" time reading about the field, staying current in
>their jobs, and updating with courses/seminars.

So what? I am an ER Nurse. I spend a LOT of time in continuing education,
seminars and "updating" my knowledge in my field.

I STILL have time for volunteer woork AND Amateur Radio.

>Why should an EE spend the extra time to learn an outdated skill (code)?

For the same reasons mere mortals do it, Vippy. To get an Amateur Radio
license that bestows HF operating privileges IAW federal and international law.

>Especially, if they do not particularly enjoy that skill (code).

I ahd to learn how to give bed baths and trim toe nails inorder to get a
license to practice Nursing eventhough we don't do bed baths and trim toe nails
in the Emergency Department. Sucks, but I sucked it up, got through it and did
what I had to do in order to get through it.

Lifes full of that kind of stuff.

>This would
>take away from the time they are staying current and they would risk falling
>behind.
BBBBWWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
AHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! !

>Also, EEs can be in a variety of areas such as digital, firmware, VLSI,
>controls, software, or other non-radio fields and may not be interested in
>amateur radio.

Since YOU don't seem to be interested in Amateur Radio either, Vipul, why
don't you join them...????

Steve, K4YZ

785. Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 12:45:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313074552.11573.00000009@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 62922

>Subject: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 3/13/03 6:21 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030313072143.11573.00000003@mb-fy.aol.com>

>Do you, Vipul Shaw...(SNIP)

My apologies for mispelling your last name, which is Shah, not Shaw...

Steve, K4YZ

786. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 13:16:25 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Jw%ba.6913$se1.4069988@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62913

"Kf6vyh" <kf6vyh@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030313021712.00418.00000121@mb-ma.aol.com...
> I do not know if this has been brought up in the NG in the past, but here
goes.
>
>
> My girl freind is studying for her Tech test. Some of the questions are in
> regards to band plans. After talking to some fellow hams, my question as
well
> as theirs is.
>
> Why does the ARRL include band plan questions, the band plans are NOT FCC
> regulations. In that regard, they should not be part of a test.
>
> 73
> John
> KF6VYH

Some of it is mandated rules. i.e. The morse code only segment of 6 meters and 2 meters. There is the mandated part by the FCC and then layered on top is the band plans. While band plans are voluntary, it is considered good amateur practice to adhere to them. The person who is not adhering often be considered the one at fault if there is an interference program. For example if you operate simplex on a frequency that is used for a repeater in your area, you are at fault if you interfere.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

787. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 13:19:04 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <cz%ba.6914$se1.4070647@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 62915

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA95CEDE.12ECA%stewart@say.net...
> "Kf6vyh" wrote:
>
> The band plans below 50MHz are indeed backed by FCC regulation. The band
> plans above 50MHz are voluntary at the moment, but may one day also be
> backed by regulation.

Don't forget that the morse code only segment at the bottom of 6 meters and
2 meters IS backed by FCC regulation. Also I think there are regulations on
what areas satellites can operate but would have to double check.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

788. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 13:27:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313082710.25154.00000732@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 62925

In article <3E70259B.9BA17226@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:
>
>> Many spend alot of "free" time reading about the field, staying current in
>> their jobs, and updating with courses/seminars.
>
>Quite a number of people who are not electrical engineers spend some of
>their free time reading about their fields, staying current in their
>jobs and updating with courses and seminars.

All true. Also, radio communication is only a small part of electrical
engineering. I know plenty of EEs who would fail thewritten tests for a ham
license unless they studied for them, because their branch of EE has nothing to
do with radio.
>
>> Why should an EE spend the extra time to learn an outdated skill (code)?

Answer: It's not outdated. Hams all over the world use it. In some cases, if
you want to work a particular ham, you have to use code, because it's what that
ham uses.

Another answer: Because many find it to be fun to use, once a person has the
necessary skills.

Still another answer: Because it permits the use of simple, inexpensive
equipment .

Yet another answer: Because it offers certain advantages over other modes.

>> Especially, if they do not particularly enjoy that skill (code).
>
>Answer: Because they have their sights set on obtaining an amateur radio
>license granting HF privileges.
>
>> This would
>> take away from the time they are staying current and they would risk
>> falling
>> behind.
>
>Falling behind in what?

Newsgroup postings.
>
>> Also, EEs can be in a variety of areas such as digital, firmware, VLSI,
>> controls, software, or other non-radio fields and may not be interested in

>> amateur radio.
>
>Great! Believe it or not, no one is going to force amateur radio on
>those who have no interest.
>
What's more, if those folks want to be hams, they're going to have to invest the time and effort in learning enough to pass the written exams, just like everyone else.

73 de Jim, N2EY

789. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 13:27:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313082711.25154.00000733@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 62923

In article <3E70246F.B1DB0AC3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:
>>
>> >Sheesh, My club is probably half Electrical engineers... Where do you
>> >get your reference material?
>> >
>> >
>> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>> Thats nice. Where would I find that? In my area, I have been to four
>closest
>> clubs and hamfests (some in other states) and most are not EEs.
>
>Vipul, Most hams are not EE's. Most hams will never be EE's. Amateur
>radio wasn't set up to be a playground for EE's.
>
I agree 100% - and I'm an EE. Funny thing - it was ham radio that got me
interested in becoming an EE.

Another funny thing - I've been welcomed and recruited to join every ham radio
club whose meetings I've attended.

Perhaps it's the way you approach other hams, Vipul.

73 de Jim, N2EY

790. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 13:27:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313082712.25154.00000734@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 62924

In article <20030312232712.16131.00000147@mb-mk.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>>Since they have no experience in operating in the HF realm and no experience
>>in morse code, they are not knowledgeable enough to determine if morse code
>>is a waste of time. I have found it to be most useful
>
>This is a ridiculous statement!

No, it makes perfect sense.

>Yes, some can be smart enough to know it is a
>waste of time. You do not have to know Morse code to know it is a waste of
>time, OKAY?

NO. NOT OKAY.

Try actually listening to the HF amateur bands for once, Vipul. Hear what's actually going on. All sorts of modes in use by hams - and Morse is one of the most popular, right behind SSB voice.
>
>Those that are familiar with the Shannon bound and where the various
>modulation
>schemes lie relative to this bound DO have the knowledge of the capabilities
>of
>the various modulation schemes and can access the performance
>benefits/tradeoffs of Morse code on HF. (Sorry for long sentence).

Sure. Guess what - on-off keyed Morse presents one set of tradeoffs and benefits. In some ways it is optimum and others it is not optimum.
>
>The people in this specialization DO have the experience in HF and ARE very
>knowledgeable enough to access the tradeoffs.

Does that include you?

>You do not have to integrate the
>encoding/decoding scheme into your being to know these tradeoffs. >

>I suspect 16-QAM or some other modes beat out Morse code.

You mean you don't know?

>I'm curious where
>Morse code stands. Anyone wants to make the <mathematically supported>
>claims?
>I would like to know.

Then figure it out. You're an EE, you say you're into homebrewing and technical stuff. It should be easy.

Here's a clue: You have to include ALL the various factors in the evaluation. For example, what the noise environment is like, stability of the equipment and propagation, complexity of receivers and transmitters, performance in a chaotic environment, etc.

>I don't care if Morse code "wins". I would acknowledge
>that. However, I still wouldn't want to learn it.

So what's the point of doing the exercise? You've already told us that no matter what evidence is presented, you'd be against learning the mode.

Jim, N2EY

791. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 14:55:00 UTC
From: tools <medtools@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <8Z0ca.18629$gF3.1642527@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 62928
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Care for some whine with your cheese?
"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA95C1A7.12EBF%stewart@say.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
> >
> > "George M." <georgem191@aol.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> I only use my so-called export radio on the
> >> 40 CB channels. What is the harm in that?
> >
> > No harm at all George. Were not discussing those of you that
> > use your CB radio on the CB channels. The problem is those
> > of you that DONT.
>
>
> An "export" radio is not a CB radio, Dan. And there is often potential
> harm in it - these highly modified radios are notorious for causing
> interference to neighborhood televisions, telephones, other radio
equipment,
> and other electronics. And every instance of interference has the
potential
> to directly impact ham radio operators - it creates another person opposed
> to radios (all radios) in the neighborhood.
>
> I certainly do not want people using unauthorized equipment in my
> neighborhood. In addition to the potential interference with items in my
> home, the use (or acceptance of use) of unauthorized equipment says a lot
> about the character of the individual - perhaps illustrated by the
"outlaw"
> mentality so pervasive in the CB community today. Whatever the case, "bad
> boys" in one thing are likely to be "bad boys" in other aspects of life
> (work, social activities, relationships, the neighborhood, etc).
>
> Further, these highly modified radios often interfere with other CB'ers
on
> nearby frequencies (channels) - reducing the number of usable CB
> frequencies, which encourages still more to move their communications
> outside the allocated CB frequencies to frequencies perhaps assigned to
> other radio services.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>
> ----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----
>

792. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 15:00:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303130700.19596bd6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62929

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E70201C.D257E876@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > You say that if the message is 100% copy every time at 5wpm, that is not proficient.
>
> No, that is not what I wrote. Your reading comprehension sucks.
>
> > All of Amateur Radio is about Fast CW on HF.
>
> Is it? I operate SSB, FM and RTTY. I do some quite slow CW on 160m, 2m
> and 70cm. You're starting to sound like Mini-Len once again.
>
> Dave K8MN

Good. How fast do you talk on FM? I'm going to judge if you are proficient.

793. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 15:23:19 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4q7o9bls1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62930
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Ain't tat jest wat I said?

Dan/W4NTI

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:v701cf20iohl91@corp.supernews.com...
> Dan, ignorance is curable, stupid is not.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim
>
> --
>
>
> /
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b4okfcllm1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > One thing about it.....Ya just cain't fix stupid!!
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "David S." <noway@dude.com> wrote in message
> > news:l%Pba.17654$gF3.1559352@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > > Wow... are you ever clueless.
> > >
> > > David
> > >
> > > ** APRS is cool stuff **
> > >
> > > "Trucker Bobby Joe" <Channel@truker19channel.net> wrote in message
> > > news:b4lctn$5nq$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > So what! Truckers aren't bothering anyone running above
> > > > and below CB or even running on 24 & 25 mhz. Only you
> > > > hams work yourselves up into a dither over it. You hams think
> > > > you own the entire radio spectrum!
> > > >
> > > > Bobby Joe
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > "BDK" <kingrat@buckeye-express.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:MPG.18d7d4bbaff796e598970e@news.buckeye-express.com...
> > > > > In article <3e6dd351.121966143@news.ptdprolog.net>,
> wf3h@ptnospam.com
> > > > > says...

> > > > > > On Mon, 10 Mar 2003 23:39:39 -0500, "Jim Hampton"
> > > > > > <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >Especially about a no-code novice test. No such thing. Novice
> is
> > no
> > > > > longer
> > > > > > > >available and they had to pass the same code test that the
extras
> > > have
> > > > > to
> > > > > > > > >today ;) BTW, there are a number of truckers (I've talked to a
> > few)
> > > > > that
> > > > > > > > > >have their tickets. Glad to have 'em aboard! BTW, if you can
> > locate
> > > > > one,
> > > > > > > > > > >the HTX-10 10 meter Rat Shack transceiver is on sale for
$69.99.
> > 25
> > > > > watts
> > > > > > > > > > > >ssb, 25 watts FM, and 7 watts am.
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > >73 from Rochester, NY
> > > > > > > > > > > >Jim AA2QA
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > truckers usually hang out on 14302.5
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > The truckers that use ham rigs around here have them clipped, and
> run
> > > > > > > > > down just below and above the legal CB band, and some run 24-25
MHZ.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > The rigs of choice for them were:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Yaesu Ft-757
> > > > > > > > > Kenwood 440
> > > > > > > > > Icom 735,
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Then it was
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Kenwood ts450's
> > > > > > > > > Kenwood TS 50's, but they complained about the "splash"!
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Now it seems like the Icom 706X is the rig of choice. I get to
hear
> > > > > > > > these guys in the background due to how close to the interstate I

> am.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > BDK
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.461 / Virus Database: 260 - Release Date: 3/10/03
>
>

794. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 15:24:56 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4q7sgnap1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62931
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Point taken.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA95C1A7.12EBF%stewart@say.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
> >
> > "George M." <georgem191@aol.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> I only use my so-called export radio on the
> >> 40 CB channels. What is the harm in that?
> >
> > No harm at all George. Were not discussing those of you that
> > use your CB radio on the CB channels. The problem is those
> > of you that DONT.
>
>
> An "export" radio is not a CB radio, Dan. And there is often potential
> harm in it - these highly modified radios are notorious for causing
> interference to neighborhood televisions, telephones, other radio
equipment,
> and other electronics. And every instance of interference has the
potential
> to directly impact ham radio operators - it creates another person opposed
> to radios (all radios) in the neighborhood.
>
> I certainly do not want people using unauthorized equipment in my
> neighborhood. In addition to the potential interference with items in my
> home, the use (or acceptance of use) of unauthorized equipment says a lot
> about the character of the individual - perhaps illustrated by the
"outlaw"
> mentality so pervasive in the CB community today. Whatever the case, "bad
> boys" in one thing are likely to be "bad boys" in other aspects of life
> (work, social activities, relationships, the neighborhood, etc).
>
> Further, these highly modified radios often interfere with other CB'ers
on
> nearby frequencies (channels) - reducing the number of usable CB
> frequencies, which encourages still more to move their communications
> outside the allocated CB frequencies to frequencies perhaps assigned to
> other radio services.
>
>

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>
> ----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

795. Re: XM-Radio compatible with 2M/450?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 15:29:01 UTC
From: kf6vyh@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313102901.07680.00000008@mb-cp.aol.com>
Source record: 62932

When I bought my 2002 Nissan fronteir then manuel mentioned not placing amateur radio transmitters within 8 inches of the gas peddal because they could damage the truck computer. The truck has a place for a CD changed behind the passenger seat that my FT 100D fit into, then I placed my 2M 440 radio under the pasenger seat. This truck even has a spot below the bradcast radio that had room for both control heads. Makes for a nice set up.

796. Re: The end of K1MAN, AARA and IARN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 16:10:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4qah6sfi1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62933
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

If he is so rich....then why don't he have a signal? ANYONE and I mean
ANYONE can take him out ANYWHERE in the world.

Dan/W4NTI

"5-day deodorant pads" <goofyham3s@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:3e6cffcd@snipnews.snip.net...
> K1MAN is COMPLETELY out of his tree.
>
> He can get away with this kind of goofy ham radio crap
> since he allegeded inherited a couple $$$ Millions
> from his relatives and is an alleged shareholder in
> Baxter Medical Instruments Corp - or so the rumors go.
>
> He is, by all sense of the word, the classic archtype eccentric
millionaire
> with convoluted thought patterns having no basis whatsoever
> in reality. He is Ham Radio's answer to Michael Jackson - complete
> with his very own "Never-NeverLand" Compound, way up there in frozen
> ice-bound-7-Months-out-of the-Year Belgrade Lakes Maine.
>
> While we are on the topic of Maine, how would you like
> to have some eye-opening fun...? Call up the toll-free
> Maine State Dept of Tourism and ask em' for a free Maine
> travel brochure package. When U get it you'll be amazed to see that
> 8 out of every 10 photos of the various Hotels and
> Inns and Campgrounds features a photo of an in-ground
> swimming pool, complete with cute (caucasian...grin) kids
> in bathing suits running around, and mom & dad on the
> lounge chairs poolside getting themselves a suntan...
> Yeah right!! Perhaps for 8 weeks in the "Summer" before
> Maine goes back into their normal "Little Ice Age" wx pattern!
> I was up there once in June and it went down one
> night to 38�F - Just what I needed in my bermuda shorts and
> Harley Davidson of Indy cotton tee shirt. All kidding aside
> we did have a great time, but Maine's Wx is just one step above
> Nome AK !
>
> Oh well, perhaps K1MAN should start a ham radio theme
> parkjust like M.J. did too ?? Can you imagine for a
> minute, ferris wheels with 6L6 vacuum tube shaped gondolas
> and bumper-cars shaped like R-390A's! Then he can
> run the place just like Michael Jackson does his.....nah!!

> Better not give him any more kooky ideas....
>
> :) :) :) :)
>
> "The scientist. He will spend thirty years in building up
> a mountain range of facts with the intent to prove a
> certain theory; then he is so happy in his achievement
> that as a rule he overlooks the main chief fact
> of all--that his accumulation proves an entirely different thing..."
>
> - Mark Twain
>
>
> "Lloyd/N0VFP" <lloyd_vfp@NOmsn.NOSPAMMMM.com> wrote in message
> news:3e6cdb01_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com...
> > It's around the corner.....
> >
> > http://users.adelphia.net/~k3vr/disc1_frm.htm
> >
> > CERTIFIED MAIL 7001 2510 0004 8162 4980
> >
> > Date: 8 March 2003
> >
> > To: Vincent F. Kajunski, District Director,
> > Federal Communications Commission, Boston
> >
> > cc: John Ashcroft, United States Attorney General
> > Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.
> >
> > Subjects: o Freedom of Information Act Request
> >
> > o Formal Request for Criminal Investigations
> > (via copy to the Department of Justice)
> >
> > o Formal response to Commission letter dated
> > 4 March 2003 (File EB-03-BS-004)
> >
> >
> >
> > Dear Mr. Kajunski:
> >
> > Your letter regarding amateur radio license K1MAN dated 4 March 2003
> > references another Commission letter to K1MAN dated 29 January 2002.
Your
> 4
> > March 2003 letter states:
> >
> > "Commission monitoring information and numerous complaints filed with
the

> > Commission indicate that the problems outlined in January 2002 have not
> been
> > corrected....."
> >
> > This is a formal Freedom of Information Act Request for all information,
> > monitoring, and communications of any kind, both internal and external,
> > regarding K1MAN and including but not limited to: all notes, all
> complaints,
> > all letters, all E-mails, all information, notes and any transcripts or
> > tapes of all telephone calls, all internal memos, and all other
> information
> > whatsoever regarding K1MAN.
> >
> > Secondly, please provide all information regarding the three FCC Notices
> of
> > Apparent Liability issued to K1MAN, the status of each, and
specifically,
> > the status and action taken on the Appeal to the full Commission,
sitting
> en
> > banc, of the first Notice of Apparent Liability and Notice of Forfeiture
> > issued to K1MAN.
> >
> > Third, numerous Felony Complaint Affidavits have been filed with the
> >
> >
> >
> > CERTIFIED MAIL 7001 2510 0004 8162 4980
> > Date: 8 March 2003
> > Page 2
> >
> >
> >
> > U.S. Attorney regarding criminal interference to K1MAN radio
transmissions
> > which were then forwarded to the Commission. Please supply all
> > information, notes, internal memos, and other documents of every kind
with
> > regard to the status of these formal criminal charges
> > so filed under the authority of the right to petition the government for
a
> > redress of grievances provision in the First Amendment to the United
> States
> > Constitution which states:
> >
> > "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or
> > prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of
speech,
> > or the press; or of the right of the people to peaceably assemble, AND

TO
> > PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES."
> >
> >
> > I remind you that failure to act on these formal criminal charges by any
> and
> > all individuals of the Commission is, itself, a felony under Sections
333
> > and 501 of the 1934 Communications Act:
> >
> > Section 333: "No person shall willfully or maliciously interfere with
or
> > cause interference to any radio communications or any station licensed
or
> > authorized by or under this Act operated by the United States
Government."
> >
> > Section 501: "Any person who willfully and knowingly does or causes or
> > suffers to be done any act, matter or thing, in this Act prohibited or
> > declared to be unlawful, or WHO WILLINGLY OR KNOWINGLY OMITS OR FAILS TO
> DO
> > ANY ACT MATTER OR THING IN THIS ACT REQUIRED TO BE DONE, OR WILLINGLY
OR
> > KNOWINGLY CAUSES OR SUFFERS SUCH OMISSION OR FAILURE, shall, upon
> conviction
> > thereof, be punished for such offense, for which no penalty (other than
a
> > forfeiture) is provided by this Act, by a fine of not more than $10,000
or
> > by imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, or both."
> >
> >
> > Also, Please advise me as to the status of my formal Complaint Affidavit
> > sent to the Commission via Certified Mail 7099 3400 0015 4631 8444,
> > addressed to Darryl E. Duckworth, NN0W, and dated 7 February 2003.
> >
> > Fourth. Since 1991, I have experienced numerous similar and very
serious
> > irregularities with Certified Mail sent to the Commission both in
> > Washington, D.C. and Gettysburg. I am now preparing a detailed
complaint
> > for the Postal Inspector with regard to requesting a
> >
> >
> >
> > CERTIFIED MAIL 7001 2510 0004 8162 4980
> > Date: 8 March 2003
> > Page 3
> >

> >
> >
> > criminal investigation of this, and I am asking other radio amateurs
> > experiencing similar examples of FCC failure to follow U.S. Postal
Service
> > procedures, via the K1MAN bulletin service, to come forward and join in
> this
> > criminal complaint.
> >
> > Again, I hereby give you fair WARNING, that this letter constitutes a
> formal
> > Freedom of Information Act Request.
> >
> >
> > * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
> >
> >
> > Now, to your entitled request for information as specified in your
letter
> of
> > 4 March 2003, IT IS TOTALLY INACCURATE AND FATALLY FLAWED. Amateur Radio
> > Station K1MAN has ALWAYS BEEN OPERATED IN TOTAL AND FULLCOMPLIANCE WITH
> ALL
> > FCC RULES, FEDERAL LAWS, STATE LAWS, AND ALL OTHERAPPLICABLE LAWS AS
WELL
> AS
> > LEGAL AND CIVIL REQUIREMENTS:
> >
> > 5. There has always been a control operator at the control point.
> >
> > 6. To date, there has been no requirement for K1MAN to keep a log, and
> > therefore, a response to a, b, and c of your letter cannot be made with
> the
> > legal accuracy as required by Section 308(b).
> >
> > 7. All transmissions have been of direct interest to the Amateur radio
> > Service.
> >
> > 8. No transmissions have ever been made to the general public.
> >
> > 9. No transmissions have EVER been made to cause deliberate
interference
> to
> > other radio signals or to prevent others from using a frequency.
> >
> > 10. All FCC rules, state laws, federal laws, and other legal and civil
> > requirements have always been fully and completely complied with.
> >
> > 11. Regarding your references to my felony complaint affidavits

regarding
> > criminal interference to K1MAN transmissions, the First Amendment to the
> > United States Constitution (see above) to petition the government
> guarantees
> > my right to file such documents and the
> > right to freedom of speech and freedom of the press guarantees my rights
> to
> > publish to anyone and everyone I desire anything I want
> >
> >
> >
> > CERTIFIED MAIL 7001 2510 0004 8162 4980
> > Date: 8 March 2003
> > Page 4
> >
> >
> >
> > regarding same.
> >
> > 12. I remind you that slander is defined in Webster's New Collegiate
> > Dictionary as "A false report, maliciously uttered, and tending to
injure
> > the reputation of another." No slander has EVER been
> > transmitted over station K1MAN. Any alleged "slander" transmitted over
> > K1MAN would be subject to civil litigation, of course, and is not in the
> > jurisdiction of the Commission.
> >
> > 13. No references of a pecuniary interest have EVER been transmitted
over
> > K1MAN or directed to the www.K1MAN.com web site. You are reminded that
> FCC
> > rules allow ordering of pizza via amateur radio as
> > well as "talk ins" to a ham fest where admission is charged, other than
> > amateur radio equipment is sold, and yet not considered to be a
pecuniary
> > interest under FCC rules since such are considered to be "incidental"
> > effects of routine amateur radio communications.
> >
> > 14. No donation requests of a pecuniary interest have ever been
> transmitted
> > over K1MAN.
> >
> > Finally, per your entitled request, weekly reports on d, e, f, g, h, i,
j,
> > and k will be filed by E-mail with the Commission starting with
> > transmissions from K1MAN beginning 17 March 2003.
> >
> > Thank you in advance for you full and complete compliance with this
formal

> > Freedom of Information Request.
> >
> >
> > Sincerely,
> >
> >
> > (signed)
> >
> > Glenn A. Baxter, P.P., K1MAN
> > Registered Professional Engineer
> > ----------
> >
> > I PREDICT BAXTER is not long for the ham radio.....
> >
> > --
> > Lloyd/N0VFP
> > "And that's just the way it is"
> > R-75 FT-817
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > ----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
> ==----------
> > http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> > -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
> =-----
>
>

797. Re: pro-American editorial

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 17:03:53 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303130903.22f131c4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62934

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BA95CAA6.12EC1%stewart@say.net>...
> "#8" wrote:
> >
> > Good reading, from a Toronto newspaper's editorial
> > page! 1999
> >
> > Widespread, but only partial news coverage was given
> > recently to a remarkable editorial broadcast from
> > Toronto by Gordon Sinclair, a Canadian television
> > commentator. What follows is the full text of his
> > trenchant remarks as printed in the Congressional
> > Record:
> >
> > This Canadian thinks it is (snip)
>
>
> This is not exactly "recent" - I first saw it many years ago and it has
> been repeated many times since (every time some person wants us to feel
> justified in whatever is happening at the moment involving Canada).

Would you believe it's almost thirty years old? It was first aired by
Sinclair on June 5, 1973.

> What
> I've never seen is the name of the newspaper, the date it appeared in that
> newspaper, the name of the television station Sinclair appeared on, or the
> date it aired. A Congressman can read anything into the Congressional Record
> (if it does indeed actually appear in the Record). That doesn't prove
> authenticity.
>
http://www.snopes.com//quotes/sinclair.htm

has lots of info and links. It's genuine, all right, but from another
era.

The 'snopes' urban-legend site is a good one for getting to the bottom
of such stories fast.

73 de Jim, N2EY

798. Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 18:47:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303131047.47f7b88@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62935

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030313072143.11573.00000003@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 3/12/03 9:14 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030312221405.16131.00000140@mb-mk.aol.com>
>
> >> Unless, of course, you suggest that the United States not honor it's
> >>treaty obligations? (ie: break international law?) Do you suggest that,
> >>Vipul?
> >>
> >>>Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >You just love pointing that out, K4YZ, don't you?
>
> Yes, KB1HMW, I do.
>
> Does compling with the law bother you? Do facts bother you? Are you an
> anarchist? Do you suggest we break the laws just because you think this is a
> law worth breaking?
>
> Do I need to ask the question again?
>
> Do you, Vipul Shaw, recommend that we, The United States, NOT honor our
> treaty obligations?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Like during the Falklands War and our treaty with other American
states?

Or like the START treaty with Russia and the SDI system?

Nooo, you don't mean like those treaties. You choose something
insignificant and meaningless to latch on to.

799. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 19:17:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E70D928.5CEA29E7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62936

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70201C.D257E876@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > You say that if the message is 100% copy every time at 5wpm, that is not proficient.
> >
> > No, that is not what I wrote. Your reading comprehension sucks.

Decide to bypass this one in hopes that no one noticed?

> > > All of Amateur Radio is about Fast CW on HF.
> >
> > Is it? I operate SSB, FM and RTTY. I do some quite slow CW on 160m, 2m
> > and 70cm. You're starting to sound like Mini-Len once again.

> Good. How fast do you talk on FM? I'm going to judge if you are proficient.

I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.

Dave K8MN

800. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 21:40:22 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA9664F6.12F05%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62937

"KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> Now c'mon Dwight..... Hams aren't anal rententive!!!!
> (sarc.) Just because half of them were probably the
> type that reminded the teachers that they forgot to
> assign homework..... or were the one's that were
> always tattling on others doesn't mean they would
> nit-pick about a small error like that! :)

Hey, watch it, Bud - I'm the one who actually did nit-pick about a small error like that. And I never reminded teachers they forgot to assign homework. Honestly. REALLY!!! :)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

801. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 21:43:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303131343.124eac01@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62938

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E70D928.5CEA29E7@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70201C.D257E876@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > You say that if the message is 100% copy every time at 5wpm, that is not
proficient.
> > >
> > > No, that is not what I wrote. Your reading comprehension sucks.
>
> Decide to bypass this one in hopes that no one noticed?
>
> > > > All of Amateur Radio is about Fast CW on HF.
> > >
> > > Is it? I operate SSB, FM and RTTY. I do some quite slow CW on 160m, 2m
> > > and 70cm. You're starting to sound like Mini-Len once again.
>
> > Good. How fast do you talk on FM? I'm going to judge if you are proficient.
>
> I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
>
> Dave K8MN

I've spoken to you on SSB, and you're not fast enough.

You're just not proficient. Sorry.

802. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 21:47:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303131347.2b89388a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62939

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030312133444.23981.00000156@mb-fv.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0303120955.253d7503@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Darn it, Len. When are you going to stop posting facts? Its screwing
> >up their wildest dreams. You some kind of spoil sport?
>
> Sorry, Brian, I guess I just don't have the "Right Attitude."
>
> :-)

You need to get a bad attitude about people, then you'll finally fit in.

> >(Of course, "Morse Code" just might be some super secret project being
> >developed to thwart terrs and tyrants, so maybe that's why it isn't on
> >public access websites.)
> >
> >bb
>
> We could be in secret planning to thwart an Alien Invasion!
>
> Secrecy was almost violated when the science-fantasy film
> "Independence Day" was released.
>
> Extraterrestrials who conquered space flight and gravity can't
> be expected to know enough to decode morse code, could
> they? After all, none of them know a damn thing about ham
> radio since they are (are you ready?)...NOT LICENSED AS
> RADIO AMATEURS!!!
>
> :-)

And that's a good thing. I feel safer already.

Or maybe that paradigm won't work - then we're all screwed.

Gosh, which way is it?

803. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-13 23:54:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E711A3B.60903@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62940

Dave Heil wrote:

> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>>Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>>
>>>I'm sure you have a lot of, what seem like to you, good ideas.
>>>
>> Can I steal this one for a tagline, Dave? I like it!
>>
>
> Permission granted.
>
>
>>> After
>>>you've introduced your ideas at a club meeting and you see that no one
>>>expresses much interest, do you ever get the feeling that you're the odd
>>>man at the meeting?
>>>Why not announce the formation of your very own club with emphasis on
>>>doing whatever it is that you believe hams should be doing? Let us know
>>>who shows up.
>>>
>> HAR! I think that club would consist of people whining about the
>>cruelty of Morse Code! 8^)
>>
>
> My guess would be ONE person whining about the inequities of morse.
>
>
>> I wonder if what we've seen here might have something to do with his
>>poor experience with hams in his area? (hint, hint)
>>
>
> I've seen fellows like Vipul show up at several general interest clubs.
> The expound upon their grand ideas and promise a new age of
> enlightenment. After a few meetings where no one demonstrates any
> enthusiasm for their plans, they simply go away.

The sad thing is, it is the exact opposite of what actually works. Seems to me, a person should show up for some meetings, acquaint themselves with the regulars, and be respectful of the shakers and movers in the club. Then if it works, great, if not, time to move on.

go figure!

- Mike KB3EIA -

804. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 00:03:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313190315.01153.00000441@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 62943

In article <f45722ac.0303130704.4425defd@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Steve, you can take this opportunity to fully explain how people can
>"think" themselves well. Don't try expanding the scope of the process
>to doing anything other than using their minds, like you just tried to
>do, then calling me a liar. It's not working.

Holy Holistics, Brian, you can't tell the Caped Crusader what is
"truth" and "lying!" He already told us he thought hisself to be
IMMORTAL!!! :-)

805. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 00:03:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313190316.01153.00000442@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 62941

In article <f45722ac.0303130700.19596bd6@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Is it? I operate SSB, FM and RTTY. I do some quite slow CW on 160m, 2m
>> and 70cm. You're starting to sound like Mini-Len once again.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>Good. How fast do you talk on FM? I'm going to judge if you are proficient.

I'd like to hear ham radio's answer to John Moscitta. :-)

806. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 00:03:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313190316.01153.00000443@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 62942

In article <20030313082712.25154.00000734@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>So what's the point of doing the exercise? You've already told us that no
>matter what evidence is presented, you'd be against learning the mode.

Yup, the ONLY "authorized attitude" in here is that of a
code lover! :-)

807. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 00:03:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313190316.01153.00000444@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 62944

In article <20030313082710.25154.00000732@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>What's more, if those folks want to be hams, they're going to have to invest
>the time and effort in learning enough to pass the written exams, just like
>everyone else.

Yup, the ONLY "authorized interest" allowed is being granted
an amateur radio license!

The ONLY "authorized postings" allowed in here is from hams
with the Right Attitude! :-)

808. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 00:03:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313190317.01153.00000445@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 62948

In article <20030313082711.25154.00000733@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>> Thats nice. Where would I find that? In my area, I have been to four closest
>>> clubs and hamfests (some in other states) and most are not EEs.
>>
>>Vipul, Most hams are not EE's. Most hams will never be EE's. Amateur
>>radio wasn't set up to be a playground for EE's.
>>
>I agree 100% - and I'm an EE. Funny thing - it was ham radio that got me
>interested in becoming an EE.

Funny thing - it was professional radio communications and
professional electronics work that got me interested in changing
majors to engineering. :-)

>Another funny thing - I've been welcomed and recruited to join every ham radio
>club whose meetings I've attended.

Another funny thing - the same thing happened to me at the
only two ham radio club meetings I've attended.

>Perhaps it's the way you approach other hams, Vipul.

Perhaps those two clubs didn't have the proper approach to
newcomers. Members at one of them were almost hostile
on knowing I'd already worked at a major military HF radio
station. The other one had too many bigots who took a KKK
stance against CB radio (in 1962). Members of the latter
also got into a physical confrontation with a ham who refused
to clear 3995 KHz for other members' mobile SSB fun in a
local area.

Yup...definitely a problem on "right attitudes." :-)

809. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 00:03:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313190318.01153.00000447@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 62945

In article <TaUba.6886$se1.4029665@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>> The <technical> General license class is tied to an irrelevant
><non-technical,
>> audiomotor skill> metric known as code.
>
>Sorry but it hasn't yet been proven to be irrelevant.

Yes it is...for the purposes of the only US agency granting amateur radio licenses determining if an applicant should be licensed. See FCC 90-53 and 99-412. The FCC doesn't think that morsemanship is relevant to proving an amateur's worthiness to be granted a license.

The only reason that US amateur test element 1 exists today is bureaucratic and an "international agreement." A paper-tiger irrelevancy.

810. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 00:03:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313190318.01153.00000446@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 62947

In article <3E700483.6040302@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

> I guess my hinting is too subtle, so I'll put it another way.
>
> Your postings indicate that you might have some trouble getting along
>with people who don't share your views. You post about the obese hams at
>hamfests, you dislike Morse code, and make some pretty outrageous
>statements here in this group. You call Hams a cult, and refer to the
>silly but harmless old Wouff Hong as a torture device.
>
> Yet you expect hams to embrace you when you trot in with this sort of
>attitude?

Your postings indicate that you have some trouble getting along
with other radio people who don't share your views. You post old
mythology and urban legends about some nebulous superiority
of amateur radio over all other radio services. You've made some
outrageous statements in here.

Yet...you expect non-hams to embrace your hobby as some kind
of noble service to the nation with that fictional attitude? :-)

Now go off and show the world by working DX on HF with CW.
Keep up the Right Attitude. :-)

811. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 00:03:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313190319.01153.00000448@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 62950

In article <20030312224403.16131.00000145@mb-mk.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

[about a mention of the movie "Independence Day"]

>Sorry, couldn't resist.
>How about the movie, Godzilla? All modes of communication were cut off. The
>only hope of saving the city from Godzilla was to send a message through some
>taxi cab freqs. The only thing that could send for help was radio contact.
>Although not mentioned, person that knows how to do that must have been a
>Ham.
>(I, myself would agree with that). Ham Radio saves the world!

Heh heh heh...:-)

It's amazing how some cling to fantasies of fiction as "reality" if it "proves" their opinion!

I reside in an urban area where fictional entertainment is a major industry (Greater Los Angeles). The creators of fictional entertainment literally bank on the gullibility of the audiences accepting their fiction as reality if it is presented with a believable image. Feed the audiences fiction and they go into a "feel good" mood and come back for more emotional satisfaction.

I don't and didn't work in the entertainment industry other than some brief forays into broadcasting and voice-over audio work long ago. In the electronics industry everyone soon finds out that electrons, fields and waves to behave to fantasy ideas or emotional thoughts. Electrons and their laws of physics exist in reality. They don't work on emotional images, dreams of glory, majesty, titles or pipedreams of a hobby activity.

812. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 00:03:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313190320.01153.00000449@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 62949

In article <sPTba.6881$se1.4025767@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>All digital modes requiring a computer (RTTY, PSK31,packet, etc) are
>irrelevant. They don't require any particularly relevant radio knowledge
>and should be eliminated.

All those "digital modes" are "irrelevant?!?" :-)

"Digital" is on-off, binary state signalling. Morse codes require an on-off binary state signalling using a CW carrier. Ergo, morse code is irrelevant ! :-)

TTY doesn't "require" any "computer" to operate. Teleprinters were doing written communications just fine at the turn of the preceding century (1900). So much so that they were beginning to displace landline manual telegraphers.

The "computers aren't radio-relevant" deux ex machina attitude is curious. Hardly any of the modern amateur radio HF transceivers and receivers will work without the aid of at least one internal microprocessor or microcontroller. Note: A microprocessor is a little computer on a single chip in an IC; a microcontroller is a microprocessor with some added electronic functions.

Morse code itself is NOT "radio knowledge." It is just on-off signalling that was first used in hard-wired land communications beginning in the year 1844. Absolutely NO "radio knowledge" needed to be a manual telegrapher before 1896. That's 52 years of NO radio whatsoever!

Early primitive radio technology of 1896 and for about next two decades used on-off "modulation" because that was the only practical means to communicate anything at all. Audio modulation of any "radio" at the beginning of the previous century was extremely rare. Early radio used only the LF and VLF portions of the EM spectrum...therefore, by early radio standards and practices, MF, HF, VHF, UHF, and up were "irrelevant to radio!" :-)

By extension of that illogic, early radio using vacuum tubes worked just fine without any semiconductors...therefore all the solid-state devices used today are "irrelevant radio knowledge!"

Dee, you are chronologically younger than I am and I do NOT belong in the "spark transmitter and crystal set receiver" set of brass-pounding olde tymers (I was operating RTTY trans-

mitters on HF professionally a half century ago without any computer assistance of any kind). If you want to hold everyone back to a bygone era, a time when none of this group's participants were even born, go work up a demand to make US amateur radio the "Ancient Radiotelegraphy Service."

Keep on recreating the past in all its mythological glory and wonderment. Keep everything primitive because it is too difficult to embrace any new knowledge. Keep the state of the amateur radio art as it was when the world was young (to you). Old ways are simple, secure, known, with plenty of literature references. That way is stability, no stress, and time is frozen without danger of tomorrow. Nirvana.

813. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 00:03:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313190321.01153.00000450@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 62946

In article <20030312221126.16131.00000139@mb-mk.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From Dave K8MN
>>I don't believe they're listening to the stuff either, Jim, but somehow
>>we have at least two individuals here who both confuse the words
>>"proficiency" and "efficiency" and who seem to believe these two guys
>>are plodding along at .02 wpm as if that's the best they can do.
>
>Couldn't they use that low freq stuff for underwater applications?

The USN does use "low freq stuff" on ELF...but it isn't morse.
Submarine alert messages are in encrypted data form using
a towed antenna under water. The receiver and signal processor
are essentially automatic, only partly attended in attack sub
and missle sub radio rooms.*

If an alert signal is received and decoded, the submarines might
go near the surface to use higher-than-ELF radio bands for more
details.

Days of "Fox Scheds" long since disappeared in the USN
submarine force.

* Nobody here has any need to know more...unless they want the
final label of "SK." :-)

814. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 00:12:47 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <9k727vctdklb250t7aam1kj4aipmd7egfn@4ax.com>
Source record: 63002

On Thu, 13 Mar 2003 04:38:25 GMT, AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote:

>On 12 Mar 2003 02:57:15 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Gee, I'm impressed by your record of military service. Okay, so I'm
>not. Guess that's because for some reason I get the impression you
>feel that I haven't done my part in the service and protection of this
>country. Well.... I can show you my 813 so I guess that I've also
>"earned" the right to shoot off MY mouth as I see fit. I also didn't
>say anyone should "shut up." My assertion is that there sure are a
>hell of a lot more important things to discuss than someone's hurt
>feelings.

Ooopsss.. Brain fart... I mean my DD 214... 813.... guess that's
what happens when talking tubes on one hand and discharge papers on
the other...

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

815. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 00:12:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E711E73.5010000@adelphia.net>
Source record: 63001

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <3E700483.6040302@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
>
>> I guess my hinting is too subtle, so I'll put it another way.
>>
>> Your postings indicate that you might have some trouble getting along
>>with people who don't share your views. You post about the obese hams at
>>hamfests, you dislike Morse code, and make some pretty outrageous
>>statements here in this group. You call Hams a cult, and refer to the
>>silly but harmless old Wouff Hong as a torture device.
>>
>> Yet you expect hams to embrace you when you trot in with this sort of
>>attitude?
>>
>
> Your postings indicate that you have some trouble getting along
> with other radio people who don't share your views. You post old
> mythology and urban legends about some nebulous superiority
> of amateur radio over all other radio services. You've made some
> outrageous statements in here.
>
> Yet...you expect non-hams to embrace your hobby as some kind
> of noble service to the nation with that fictional attitude? :-)

Nope, I don't care a whole lot what non-hams think. Just trying to point
out to Vipul why he may be having a bit of troublr getting along. Even
if he doesn't get along, that is okay. But his postings indicate boo-boo
feelings about the whole thing

> Now go off and show the world by working DX on HF with CW.
> Keep up the Right Attitude. :-)

I do PSK31. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

816. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 01:40:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313204009.23598.00000829@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63004

In article <BA94E4FD.12E15%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> Really kind of a strange bunch of rules the
>> FCC has. They issue ham licenses with a term
>> of 3652 or 3653 days, but the renewal window
>> is only 90 days. That's....ummmm.....2.4%
>> of the license term. (snip)
>
>
> Shame on you, Jim. If rounded off properly, it is a little closer to 2.5%
>(2.46%).

MY BAD!!!

> Don't expect to get away with sloppy math like that in this
>newsgroup. ;)
>
That's what I get for doing the calculation in my head.

2.46% it is.

73 de Jim, N2EY

817. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 01:53:13 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <dCaca.7039$se1.4159127@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 63003

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030313190320.01153.00000449@mb-mn.aol.com...
> In article <sPTba.6881$se1.4025767@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >All digital modes requiring a computer (RTTY, PSK31,packet, etc) are
> >irrelevant. They don't require any particularly relevant radio knowledge
> >and should be eliminated.
>
> All those "digital modes" are "irrelevant?!?" :-)
>
> "Digital" is on-off, binary state signalling. Morse codes require
> an on-off binary state signalling using a CW carrier. Ergo, morse
> code is irrelevant ! :-)
>

I was attempting to make the point that those who tout the supposed wonder and superiority of the computer aided digital modes are espousing are off base. If CW is irrelevant so are all other digital modes.

> [big snip]
> Old ways are simple, secure, known, with plenty of literature
> references. That way is stability, no stress, and time is
> frozen without danger of tomorrow. Nirvana.

After your long and tedious non-sequiter that had nothing to do with my point, I will address this point. Any activity needs to keep a blend of old and new. To automatically throw out the old or refuse the new are both equally foolish. Sometimes new works better, sometimes old works better. New isn't always better, old isn't always secure.

Your long ramble was a far departure from the point and generally irrelevant.

818. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 02:02:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030313210239.00831.00002059@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 63006

In article <3E6EA0E0.2050707@mailcity.moc>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>> JJ:
>>
>> Don't look now, but the point about Kim's call sign being potentially
>> off-putting to prospective hams wasn't originally made by me. It was
>> made by Riley Hollingsworth. Perhaps you should tell him to "get
>> a grip" as well.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>And just how many prospective hams do you or Riley think will ever
>even hear of Kim's call?

JJ:

I have no idea, but it would only take one for the damage to be done.
Is there anything about your callsign that would make a parent,
grandparent, uncle, aunt, brother, sister, teacher, or clergyman to
consider amateur radio to be an inappropriate activity for young people?

73 de Larry, K3LT

819. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 02:02:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030313210240.00831.00002060@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 63005

In article <42721B765EA80468.94D272EDE5F693BB.BB2E882BDED7D46A@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>>
>
>It wasn't originally made by Riley, either. Riley was "brought into" the
>debate well after Larry lambasted me when I first posted to the newsgroup.
>I contacted Riley about my callsign because I had dared Larry to and he
>would not. He would not because he knew that, while Riley was most likely
>not going to "like" my callsign, Riley would confirm that there was nothing
>the FCC would do about it (as Larry had been threatening). Larry, I think,
>also knew that Riley would be a gentleman about it, unlike Larry had been.
>
>Kim W5TIT -- all I'm going to say about my callsign

Kim:

When did I EVER say that I was going to "complain" to the FCC about
your call sign? Please provide the usual proof.

I have always stated clearly that YOU are the only one who can do
anything about your call sign, and your lack of willingness to do so
only proves your obstinate, defensive attitude toward it. As a
result, I shall no longer suggest that you change your call sign. You
have proved quite clearly that you are not capable of doing the
right thing, and persist with your child-like, hold-your-breath-until-
you're-blue, stamping-your-feet-on-the-floor temper tantrum. You
no longer deserve, nor shall you receive, the benefit of the doubt.

You obviously do not possess the intellectual or emotional maturity
necessary to have whatever you say taken seriously. Therefore,
your continued participation in this newsgroup will serve only to act
as an annoyance to your intellectual and moral superiors.

73 de Larry, K3LT

820. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 02:43:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030313214354.00831.00002062@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 63007

In article <20030313021712.00418.00000121@mb-ma.aol.com>, kf6vyh@aol.com (Kf6vyh) writes:

>
>I do not know if this has been brought up in the NG in the past, but here
>goes.
>
>
>My girl freind is studying for her Tech test. Some of the questions are in
>regards to band plans. After talking to some fellow hams, my question as well
>as theirs is.
>
>Why does the ARRL include band plan questions, the band plans are NOT FCC
>regulations. In that regard, they should not be part of a test.
>
>73
>John
>KF6VYH

The bandplans, particularly those that apply to the HF bands, do consist of restrictions stated in Part 97 FCC regulations. A Technician who has not passed the 5 WPM code test would need to know this before he/she attempted to operate in the 10-meter phone segment, as an example. Therefore, bandplans are necessary information to cover in the question pools.

73 de Larry, K3LT

821. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 02:43:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030313214355.00831.00002064@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 63008

In article <9k727vctdklb250t7aam1kj4aipmd7egfn@4ax.com>, AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
writes:

>On Thu, 13 Mar 2003 04:38:25 GMT, AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote:
>
>>On 12 Mar 2003 02:57:15 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
>>Gee, I'm impressed by your record of military service. Okay, so I'm
>>not. Guess that's because for some reason I get the impression you
>>feel that I haven't done my part in the service and protection of this
>>country. Well.... I can show you my 813 so I guess that I've also
>>"earned" the right to shoot off MY mouth as I see fit. I also didn't
>>say anyone should "shut up." My assertion is that there sure are a
>>hell of a lot more important things to discuss than someone's hurt
>>feelings.
>
>Ooopsss.. Brain fart... I mean my DD 214... 813.... guess that's
>what happens when talking tubes on one hand and discharge papers on
>the other...
>

Ray:

Just for the record, it wasn't *me* who said you hadn't served.

73 de Larry, K3LT

822. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 02:43:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030313214355.00831.00002063@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 63009

In article <5b207v0dnknpdb9bf7ickgmqsq03ee73c9@4ax.com>, AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
writes:

>>Raymond:
>>
>>For one thing, the "petty arguing" you vented about is a virtually
>>universal feature of most Usenet Newsgroups, and this one, in
>>particular, was designed to give such squabbles a place to live
>>in order to spare rec.radio.amateur.misc from the code/no-code
>>static. So your complaints serve to show your ignorance of the
>>history of this newsgroup and Usenet in general. If you don't like
>>it here, why don't you concentrate your efforts to your own BBS
>>and leave us be?
>
>My complaints serve to show that there are those of us who have been
>reading these newsgroups for years, and are tired of the incessant
>bickering going on between the factions headed by Larry and Kim.

Ray:

The existence of "lurkers" is well-known to most of us; I receive fairly
frequent via E-mail from them, usually in support of points I've made
in recent posts. Then there have been the ones, such as your own,
who have basically told me to take a long walk off a short pier! So
stop trying to flatter yourself.

> You are both mistakenly possessed of a sense of self-superiority.

Well, Kim certainly is! My claims of being things like "morally and
intellectually superior" are made strictly in comparison to Kim, and
don't encompass anyone else in the newsgroup -- at the moment.

> The
>fact of the matter is that are vastly more important things to discuss
>than "your callsign is offensive" or "you don't do code, therefore
>you're not a REAL ham."

And I don't disagree with either of those points. However, THIS
particular newsgroup is where the code/no-code debate lives, it was
created to give the code/no-code debate a home where it would not
contaminate other newsgroups. Get a grasp of that concept, and
you will then understand why your objections are only serving to make
yourself a target of typical newsgroup denouncement.

>There are topics that can be discussed that
>might actually result in an INTELLIGENT exchange of information,
>rather that insults.

Again, I vehemently agree! And with literally thousands of other newsgroups to find such intelligent exchange of information, why do you feel the need to waste your time upbraiding us for not meeting your own BBS Sysop's standards of behaviour?

>Of course, if you're respective camps would
>rather trade insults and insinuation, then so be it.

That's exactly right. So be it. Now either get off your pulpit, or just go away. YOU are not going to alter the nature of this newsgroup even if you post ten megabytes of reprimands each and every day! YOU have no power here, Ray -- and we're not about to give you any!

>Like I said,
>might as well change the name of the channel to
>rec.radio.CBWANNABE.policy.

Hey, if you want a newsgroup by that name, by all means, go ahead and create it. However, you won't have any power there, either!

---some snippage---

>Doesn't matter... You're obviously not going to change. Neither is
>the other faction.. Carry on with your petty bickering... Those of
>us with "real" lives will pity you as we see fit.

Hey, now THERE's the spirit! Resign yourself to the fact that we're not going to change at your demand, and toss in a parting insult in the same breath! I think you're finally getting the hang of this newsgroup thing!

73 de Larry, K3LT

823. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 02:51:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313215123.13081.00000009@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 63010

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/13/03 9:04 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303130704.4425defd@posting.google.com>

>Steve, you can take this opportunity to fully explain how people can
>"think" themselves well. Don't try expanding the scope of the process
>to doing anything other than using their minds, like you just tried to
>do, then calling me a liar. It's not working.

Well, Brian, then don't put quotation marks over some set of words when
citning something I was alleged to say when you know in fact I didn't say it.

Doing it again will just result in dispensing with any amenities.

As for "think(ing)" themselves well, I didn't say it.

If you insist I did, then I will insist you are lying. The difference
being I can cite the posts where you have put quotations over statements of
things I never said, and THEN requote the posts of what I DID say.

Manufacturing "quotes" is lying.

Now, do need to explain it to you in another language?

Steve

824. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 02:58:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313215840.13081.00000010@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 63011

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/13/03 6:03 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030313190318.01153.00000446@mb-mn.aol.com>

>In article <3E700483.6040302@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>writes:

>>Yet you expect hams to embrace you when you trot in with this sort of
>>attitude?
>
> Your postings indicate that you have some trouble getting along
> with other radio people who don't share your views. You post old
> mythology and urban legends about some nebulous superiority
> of amateur radio over all other radio services. You've made some
> outrageous statements in here.

He's done nothing of the sort.

Once again Leonard H. Anderson resorts to lying in a public forum.

Leonard H Anderson IS a pathological liar.

Why are WE not surprised?

Steve, K4YZ

825. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 03:18:15 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313221815.27721.00000011@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 63012

From: Dave Heil
>Vipul, Most hams are not EE's. Most hams will never be EE's.

Okay, thats demographics. Fine.

>Amateur
>radio wasn't set up to be a playground for EE's.

Why not? With the license you get band priveleges. Its what you can do with the license. An amateur radio organization of those with the same interests makes accomplishing this easier. It seems like the perfect setup for "a playground for EE's".

826. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 03:27:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313222705.29016.00000763@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 63013

In article <42D6EB742BE07D98.F7321648E555453F.96841378206F0F24@lp.airnews.net>,
"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>This
>newsgroup is nothing but the same thing day in and day out; it's a text
>version of a good rowdy, violent, bloody, shoot 'em game, and nothing more.

I once heard rrap described as "the cyberspace version of a barfight"...

While it's not all like that, this IS the right newsgroup for an argument.

>I'd like to see a really good ham radio newsgroup--but I haven't seen one
>yet.

I have found that rec.radio.amateur.homebrew and rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors
are usually very well behaved. If you ignore the endless "fractal" and
"cross-field" debates on rec.radio.amateur.antennas, it's pretty decent, too.

Where I've found real gold is in the email reflectors, like the Elecraft, CW,
HBR, and glowbug reflectors. Part of that is because folks cannot post
anonymously, and part is due to the presence or implied presence of a
moderator.

73 de Jim, N2EY

827. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 03:38:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030313223850.13081.00000015@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 63014

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/13/03 9:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030313221815.27721.00000011@mb-df.aol.com>

>>Amateur
>>radio wasn't set up to be a playground for EE's.
>
>Why not?

Because most of the worlds most famous and prolific inventors contributors
to science and technology were NOT college educated, let alone engineers.

>With the license you get band priveleges. Its what you can do with the
>license.

Yep. A whole lot of shaking going on, huh? So why DON'T your EE buddies
get licenses, Vipul? Ninety-seven percent of all Amateur allocations can be
had for a 35 question test and NO Morse Code examination. That's a whole lot
of RF for a very small investment.

Or are you going to try and convince us that the couple of hours they
spend studying Amateur regulations (all they SHOULD have to study, since the
principles of RF are the same) will send them into a screaming fury...?!?!

>An amateur radio organization of those with the same interests makes
>accomplishing this easier. It seems like the perfect setup for "a playground
>for EE's".

Sure it does. And the only thing keeping "them" from being one of "us" is
a few minutes at a VE session. Afterall, it IS you that keeps telling us how
easy the tests are, Vipul...

Steve, K4YZ

828. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 04:20:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E715866.6060908@adelphia.net>
Source record: 63015

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 3/13/03 6:03 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030313190318.01153.00000446@mb-mn.aol.com>
>>
>
>>In article <3E700483.6040302@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>>writes:
>>
>
>>>Yet you expect hams to embrace you when you trot in with this sort of
>>>attitude?
>>>
>> Your postings indicate that you have some trouble getting along
>> with other radio people who don't share your views. You post old
>> mythology and urban legends about some nebulous superiority
>> of amateur radio over all other radio services. You've made some
>> outrageous statements in here.
>>
>
> He's done nothing of the sort.

Was that me he was writing about? I'm beginning to think he doesn't like me!

Thanks for replying, Steve. For some reason my newsreader didn't pick up
his post. Otherwise I would have missed it.

- Mike KB3EIA -

829. Re: pro-American editorial

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 04:25:07 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E7159A3.603D40F5@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 63016

N2EY wrote:

> It's genuine, all right, but from another
> era.
>

Someone recorded a version as a 45 RPM record back about when
the Watergate scandal was hitting the fan. And it got played
on the radio fairly often.

830. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 05:03:03 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b4st0u52pmp@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 63034

I know.... it was an uneventful attempt at a little bit of humor! I guess a majority of the other half would be comparative to the characters Archie Bunker or Frank Burns (M*A*S*H*) from what I have witnessed.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

>
>
> Hey, watch it, Bud - I'm the one who actually did nit-pick about a small
> error like that. And I never reminded teachers they forgot to assign
> homework. Honestly. REALLY!!! :)
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>
> ------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

831. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 05:14:49 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b4st0v62pmp@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 63035

Possibly only if they knew of what has been allegedly said here in this newsgroup. Had I never seen Kim in here at all, and just merely stumbled on the callsign, not knowing it was a vanity call, I wouldn't be bothered much. Nor would my father, he is a former priest. I have even gone as far as to ask some people locally around here about this whole situation to get a different perspective. The majority did not seem to be overly concerned about it. For all they knew, it could have been a sequentially issued call....

It may draw a chuckle out of some, but overall, if the word TIT is the worst a person has ever heard, they have lived a way too sheltered life. Only here in R.R.A.P. and in her own local area might they know the story behind the call. As far as "bringing amateur radio one step closer to extinction," I would have to say it is one small step on the stairwell of a 100-story building.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> >And just how many prospective hams do you or Riley think will ever
> >even hear of Kim's call?
>
> JJ:
>
> I have no idea, but it would only take one for the damage to be done.
> Is there anything about your callsign that would make a parent,
> grandparent, uncle, aunt, brother, sister, teacher, or clergyman to
> consider amateur radio to be an inappropriate activity for young people?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

832. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 05:19:39 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b4st1072pmp@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 63037

Thanks to Dow and Dow Corning, my area is flooded with Chemical Engineers..... Surprisingly there is alot of hams that are also the same here..... Some are morse fans, some are not. It's a personal choice issue. (some are long-timers, some are new as well....)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030312223407.16131.00000143@mb-mk.aol.com...
> >Sheesh, My club is probably half Electrical engineers... Where do you
> >get your reference material?
> >
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Thats nice. Where would I find that? In my area, I have been to four
closest
> clubs and hamfests (some in other states) and most are not EEs.

833. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 05:20:29 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b4st1182pmp@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 63036

Pocket protectors and horned-rimmed glasses???

Just kidding.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> I live in the middle of Pennsylvania, in a University town. How did you
> know that the people at hamfests aren't EE's, do they carry signs or
> wear special shoes or something? Last time I checked EE's looked just
> like other people.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

834. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 05:26:30 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b4st1292pmp@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 63032

Seems like the opposite would be more truer than that.... Seems like an Electrical Engineer would make a better (at least slightly) due to the idea that they should already be good at the electronics theory and may actually be receptive to the radio theory. I can't say this as a fact, it's more of an opinion..... or viewpoint.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> > Thats nice. Where would I find that? In my area, I have been to four closest
> > clubs and hamfests (some in other states) and most are not EEs.
>
> Vipul, Most hams are not EE's. Most hams will never be EE's. Amateur
> radio wasn't set up to be a playground for EE's.
>
> Dave K8MN

835. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 05:29:35 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b4st1302pmp@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 63033

Agree with you there. Med protocols change from time to time, as well as new processes and equipment come into play, and keeping up is extremely important, as well as review of the concepts that are more "static" in nature.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> >Many spend alot of "free" time reading about the field, staying current in
> >their jobs, and updating with courses/seminars.
>
> So what? I am an ER Nurse. I spend a LOT of time in continuing education,
> seminars and "updating" my knowledge in my field.
>
> I STILL have time for volunteer woork AND Amateur Radio.

836. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 05:30:33 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b4st1412pmp@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 63030

Wow..... bet that one is gonna get flamed!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

>
>
> All digital modes requiring a computer (RTTY, PSK31,packet, etc) are
> irrelevant. They don't require any particularly relevant radio knowledge
> and should be eliminated.
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
>

837. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 05:38:18 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b4st1522pmp@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 63031

Here's a question for y'all.... I hear there is going to be a change in the question pools, which license class?
I am interested because I want to get the "Now Your Talking" book for a friend as a gift, and if there is a change in information, I would rather get them the up-to-date version. If it affects the Tech class, my decision to wait to purchase the text for them may have to wait.

Thanks,

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA95CEDE.12ECA%stewart@say.net...
> "Kf6vyh" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) My girlfriend is studying for her Tech test.
> > Some of the questions are in regards to band plans.
> > After talking to some fellow hams, my question as
> > well as theirs is.
> >
> > Why does the ARRL include band plan questions, the
> > band plans are NOT FCC regulations. In that regard,
> > they should not be part of a test.
>
>
> The band plans below 50MHz are indeed backed by FCC regulation. The band
> plans above 50MHz are voluntary at the moment, but may one day also be
> backed by regulation. Furthermore, compliance with the voluntary band
plans
> above 50MHz is considered "good operator practice," reducing potential for
> interference and/or conflict. For those reasons, everyone needs to be
aware
> of the band plans, which is why they appear on the exam.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

>
> ----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

838. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 06:08:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7155DF.52EF1E92@att.net>
Source record: 63017

Dave Heil wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70201C.D257E876@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > You say that if the message is 100% copy every time at 5wpm, that is not
proficient.
> > >
> > > No, that is not what I wrote. Your reading comprehension sucks.
>
> Decide to bypass this one in hopes that no one noticed?
>
> > > > All of Amateur Radio is about Fast CW on HF.
> > >
> > > Is it? I operate SSB, FM and RTTY. I do some quite slow CW on 160m, 2m
> > > and 70cm. You're starting to sound like Mini-Len once again.
>
> > Good. How fast do you talk on FM? I'm going to judge if you are proficient.
>
> I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
>
> Dave K8MN

He needs a whole lot more thast just good luck.

839. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 06:26:11 UTC
From: me <me@here.com>
Message-ID: <b4rsnj$b3a$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63018

John, which question(s) in the Tech test are you questioning?

I only see questions about frequency limits of different bands and the definition of band plan.

"Kf6vyh" <kf6vyh@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030313021712.00418.00000121@mb-ma.aol.com...
> I do not know if this has been brought up in the NG in the past, but here goes.
>
>
> My girl freind is studying for her Tech test. Some of the questions are in
> regards to band plans. After talking to some fellow hams, my question as well
> as theirs is.
>
> Why does the ARRL include band plan questions, the band plans are NOT FCC
> regulations. In that regard, they should not be part of a test.
>
> 73
> John
> KF6VYH

840. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 07:16:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030314021614.11736.00000121@mb-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 63020

In article <9k727vctdklb250t7aam1kj4aipmd7egfn@4ax.com>, AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
writes:

>Ooopsss.. Brain fart... I mean my DD 214... 813.... guess that's
>what happens when talking tubes on one hand and discharge papers on
>the other...

A DD-214 is a Release From Active Duty, not a "discharge paper."

An 813 is a nice power amplifier tube. An 833 is even better. :-)

A 4CX10,000 is even more powerful! :-) :-) :-)

841. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 07:16:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030314021615.11736.00000122@mb-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 63021

In article <dCaca.7039$se1.4159127@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030313190320.01153.00000449@mb-mn.aol.com...
>> In article <sPTba.6881$se1.4025767@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint"
>> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>> >All digital modes requiring a computer (RTTY, PSK31,packet, etc) are
>> >irrelevant. They don't require any particularly relevant radio knowledge
>> >and should be eliminated.
>>
>> All those "digital modes" are "irrelevant?!?" :-)
>>
>> "Digital" is on-off, binary state signalling. Morse codes require
>> an on-off binary state signalling using a CW carrier. Ergo, morse
>> code is irrelevant ! :-)
>
>I was attempting to make the point that those who tout the supposed wonder
>and superiority of the computer aided digital modes are espousing are off
>base. If CW is irrelevant so are all other digital modes.

Oh? So...on what do you base this new revelation on?

Most of the cellular telephones are definitely digital. About one out
of three Americans have a cell phone subscription, either their own
or from work. That's about 100 million or so, give or take... Cell
phones may be "irrelevant" to you but certainly not to millions of
Americans.

>> [big snip]
>> Old ways are simple, secure, known, with plenty of literature
>> references. That way is stability, no stress, and time is
>> frozen without danger of tomorrow. Nirvana.
>
>After your long and tedious non-sequiter that had nothing to do with my
>point, I will address this point. Any activity needs to keep a blend of old
>and new. To automatically throw out the old or refuse the new are both
>equally foolish. Sometimes new works better, sometimes old works better.
>New isn't always better, old isn't always secure.

Who was "automatically throwing out anything old?"

Spark is definitely old...the first RF generation source in radio.
It got made illegal to use in the USA years ago. Not an

"automatic" process.

There's still a morse code test required for a US amateur radio license exam for any license having below-30-MHz privileges. A morse code test has been required since the first US radio regulating agency started in 1912.

Other than some commercial maritime applications, the rest of the radio world either dropped morse code or never considered it in the first place.

Half a century ago I was operating HF transmitters running RTTY trans-Pacific, not a single one of them using any on-off keying morse coding. Maybe that's "irrelevant" to you but not to the US Army and the Far East Command Headquarters during the Korean War.

>Your long ramble was a far departure from the point and generally
>irrelevant.

"Irrelevant!" :-)

Yes, I don't have the "Right Attitude" for the Ancient Radiotelegraph Society (ARS).

The only "relevancy" for this ARS is worship, reverence, and love of manual telegraphy. :-)

842. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 07:16:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030314021616.11736.00000123@mb-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 63019

In article <3E711E73.5010000@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> In article <3E700483.6040302@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>> writes:
>>
>>> I guess my hinting is too subtle, so I'll put it another way.
>>>
>>> Your postings indicate that you might have some trouble getting along
>>>with people who don't share your views. You post about the obese hams at
>>>hamfests, you dislike Morse code, and make some pretty outrageous
>>>statements here in this group. You call Hams a cult, and refer to the
>>>silly but harmless old Wouff Hong as a torture device.
>>>
>>> Yet you expect hams to embrace you when you trot in with this sort of
>>>attitude?
>>
>> Your postings indicate that you have some trouble getting along
>> with other radio people who don't share your views. You post old
>> mythology and urban legends about some nebulous superiority
>> of amateur radio over all other radio services. You've made some
>> outrageous statements in here.
>>
>> Yet...you expect non-hams to embrace your hobby as some kind
>> of noble service to the nation with that fictional attitude? :-)
>
> Nope, I don't care a whole lot what non-hams think.

Well, we'll see after you encounter the first TVI from a non-ham
neighbor.

Most of the folks working for the FCC are non-hams.

>Just trying to point
>out to Vipul why he may be having a bit of troublr getting along. Even
>if he doesn't get along, that is okay. But his postings indicate boo-boo
>feelings about the whole thing

Noooo...you're just being obstinate and confrontational.

Aren't you one of those "Right Attitude" maintainers? :-)

> I do PSK31. 8^)

You want some kind of RSGB award for that? Peter Martinez innovated that mode and he has written in Radio Communication, the membership magazine of the RSGB, for at least 30 years. Name some American amateurs who've done true innovation in radio over the last 30 years.

843. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 11:43:34 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <D77EDF047E195FE9.757E4E8C906841F5.C982DBDB624EB189@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 63022

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030313210240.00831.00002060@mb-fh.aol.com...
> In article
<42721B765EA80468.94D272EDE5F693BB.BB2E882BDED7D46A@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >>
> > >It wasn't originally made by Riley, either. Riley was "brought into" the
> > >debate well after Larry lambasted me when I first posted to the
newsgroup.
> > >I contacted Riley about my callsign because I had dared Larry to and he
> > >would not. He would not because he knew that, while Riley was most
likely
> > >not going to "like" my callsign, Riley would confirm that there was
nothing
> > >the FCC would do about it (as Larry had been threatening). Larry, I
think,
> > >also knew that Riley would be a gentleman about it, unlike Larry had
been.
> > >
> > >Kim W5TIT -- all I'm going to say about my callsign
>
> Kim:
>
> When did I EVER say that I was going to "complain" to the FCC about
> your call sign? Please provide the usual proof.
>
> I have always stated clearly that YOU are the only one who can do
> anything about your call sign, and your lack of willingness to do so
> only proves your obstinate, defensive attitude toward it. As a
> result, I shall no longer suggest that you change your call sign.
>

I'll believe that when I see it...

>
> You
> have proved quite clearly that you are not capable of doing the
> right thing, and persist with your child-like, hold-your-breath-until-
> you're-blue, stamping-your-feet-on-the-floor temper tantrum. You
> no longer deserve, nor shall you receive, the benefit of the doubt.
>
> You obviously do not possess the intellectual or emotional maturity
> necessary to have whatever you say taken seriously. Therefore,

> your continued participation in this newsgroup will serve only to act
> as an annoyance to your intellectual and moral superiors.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

You're cracking me up...ROFLMAO

Kim W5TIT

844. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 13:12:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303140512.21f10847@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63023

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E7155DF.52EF1E92@att.net>...
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> He needs a whole lot more thast just good luck.

He who? You promised not to read anymore of my stuff, DICK.

845. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 13:15:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303140515.4ecfe59b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63024

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030314021614.11736.00000121@mb-mi.aol.com>...
> In article <9k727vctdklb250t7aam1kj4aipmd7egfn@4ax.com>, AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
> writes:
>
> >Ooopsss.. Brain fart... I mean my DD 214... 813.... guess that's
> >what happens when talking tubes on one hand and discharge papers on
> >the other...
>
> A DD-214 is a Release From Active Duty, not a "discharge paper."
>
> An 813 is a nice power amplifier tube. An 833 is even better. :-)
>
> A 4CX10,000 is even more powerful! :-) :-) :-)

I like 807's, preferably in a pale ale.

846. Re: pro-American editorial

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 13:27:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030314082714.10890.00000238@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 63025

In article <3E7159A3.603D40F5@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> It's genuine, all right, but from another
>> era.
>>
>
>Someone recorded a version as a 45 RPM record back about when
>the Watergate scandal was hitting the fan.

There were actually two versions, one by Sinclair and another by someone seeking to cash in on the editorial. Sinclair donated all of the proceeds to the Red Cross, and his imitator agreed to do the same to avoid a lawsuit.

Yes, it fits the Watergate time frame quite well. Also the withdrawal from Vietnam, the first energy crisis, stagflation, etc.

http://www.snopes.com

73 de Jim, N2EY

And it got played
>on the radio fairly often.
>

847. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 14:28:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E71E6E4.92385194@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63026

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70D928.5CEA29E7@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70201C.D257E876@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > > You say that if the message is 100% copy every time at 5wpm, that is not
proficient.
> > > >
> > > > No, that is not what I wrote. Your reading comprehension sucks.
> >
> > Decide to bypass this one in hopes that no one noticed?
> >
> > > > > All of Amateur Radio is about Fast CW on HF.
> > > >
> > > > Is it? I operate SSB, FM and RTTY. I do some quite slow CW on 160m, 2m
> > > > and 70cm. You're starting to sound like Mini-Len once again.
> >
> > > Good. How fast do you talk on FM? I'm going to judge if you are proficient.

> > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.

> I've spoken to you on SSB, and you're not fast enough.

I have documentation which proves that I talk fast enough to make three
hundred QSOs per hour on SSB. Your sampling just wasn't sufficient.

> You're just not proficient. Sorry.

It would seem that you don't have enough information to make a sound
judgement.

Dave K8MN

848. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 14:35:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E71E928.B031F4FA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63027

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil
> >Vipul, Most hams are not EE's. Most hams will never be EE's.
>
> Okay, thats demographics. Fine.

It is demographics and it does away with one of your supposed points.

> >Amateur
> >radio wasn't set up to be a playground for EE's.
>
> Why not? With the license you get band priveleges. Its what you can do with the
> license. An amateur radio organization of those with the same interests makes
> accomplishing this easier. It seems like the perfect setup for "a playground
> for EE's".

As to why not, read Part 97 then check with the FCC if you have further
questions. EE's can and do participate but they do so on the same basis
as anyone else who passes an exam.

Dave K8MN

849. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 14:41:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E71EA62.37975171@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63028

Brian wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E7155DF.52EF1E92@att.net>...
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > He needs a whole lot more thast just good luck.
>
> He who? You promised not to read anymore of my stuff, DICK.

Sheesh, Brian. He responded to something I wrote which quoted you. Get
a grip.

Dave K8MN

850. Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 16:03:35 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0303140803.cac2b19@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63029

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote

> Do you, Vipul Shaw, recommend that we, The United States, NOT honor our
> treaty obligations?

The US almost routinely abrogates treaty terms when the mood strikes
us. Ignoring S25.5 wouldn't even be noticed in the diplomatic
community. Do you see any protesters in front of the Japanese
embassies around the world for their lack of compliance with S25.5?
Should we break diplomatic relations with England over their new
code-free HF license class?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

851. Re: pro-American editorial

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 16:09:20 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA9768DF.12F44%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63038

"N2EY" wrote:

> (snip) has lots of info and links. It's genuine,
> all right, but from another era.
>
> The 'snopes' urban-legend site is a good one for
> getting to the bottom of such stories fast.

Thanks, Jim. I knew I first heard that years ago, but wasn't sure when. Now I know it could have been anytime over the last twenty-five to thirty years (and, no, I didn't realize it was that old). Perhaps it is time to retire that thing - and find something a little more recent.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

852. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 16:13:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA9769C7.12F46%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63039

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> Don't forget that the morse code only segment
> at the bottom of 6 meters and 2 meters IS
> backed by FCC regulation.

You're right, Dee. I was speaking too generally and should have specified
the exceptions.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

853. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 20:40:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303141240.7eaf7218@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63040

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E71EA62.37975171@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E7155DF.52EF1E92@att.net>...
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > He needs a whole lot more thast just good luck.
> >
> > He who? You promised not to read anymore of my stuff, DICK.
>
> Sheesh, Brian. He responded to something I wrote which quoted you. Get
> a grip.
>
> Dave K8MN

DICK can't get enough. He'll be back just like Alec Baldwin. You can
induct him into the club.

854. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 20:42:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303141242.2533e9c4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63041

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E71E6E4.92385194@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70D928.5CEA29E7@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70201C.D257E876@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > You say that if the message is 100% copy every time at 5wpm, that is not
proficient.
> > > > >
> > > > > No, that is not what I wrote. Your reading comprehension sucks.
> > > >
> > > Decide to bypass this one in hopes that no one noticed?
> > >
> > > > > > All of Amateur Radio is about Fast CW on HF.
> > > > >
> > > > > Is it? I operate SSB, FM and RTTY. I do some quite slow CW on 160m, 2m
> > > > > and 70cm. You're starting to sound like Mini-Len once again.
>
> > > > Good. How fast do you talk on FM? I'm going to judge if you are proficient.
>
> > > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
>
> > I've spoken to you on SSB, and you're not fast enough.
>
> I have documentation which proves that I talk fast enough to make three
> hundred QSOs per hour on SSB. Your sampling just wasn't sufficient.
>
> > You're just not proficient. Sorry.
>
> It would seem that you don't have enough information to make a sound
> judgement.
>
> Dave K8MN

Someone had to make the call and I did. You're just not proficient.

Too bad.

855. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 21:32:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E724A77.F48AF1E1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63042

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E71E6E4.92385194@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70D928.5CEA29E7@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70201C.D257E876@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > > > > You say that if the message is 100% copy every time at 5wpm, that is not
proficient.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > No, that is not what I wrote. Your reading comprehension sucks.
> > > > >
> > > > Decide to bypass this one in hopes that no one noticed?
> > > >
> > > > > > > > All of Amateur Radio is about Fast CW on HF.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Is it? I operate SSB, FM and RTTY. I do some quite slow CW on 160m, 2m
> > > > > > > and 70cm. You're starting to sound like Mini-Len once again.
> > >
> > > > > Good. How fast do you talk on FM? I'm going to judge if you are proficient.
> > >
> > > > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
> > >
> > > I've spoken to you on SSB, and you're not fast enough.
> > >
> > I have documentation which proves that I talk fast enough to make three
> > hundred QSOs per hour on SSB. Your sampling just wasn't sufficient.
> >
> > > You're just not proficient. Sorry.
> >
> > It would seem that you don't have enough information to make a sound
> > judgement.

> Someone had to make the call and I did. You're just not proficient.

> Too bad.

Facts don't lie, Brian. In the CQ Worldwide SSB DX Contest of '91, my average hourly rate (which includes time spent listening, sleeping, bathroom breaks, CQing and eating) was 135.43 QSOs per hour. My highest hourly rate was over 300 contacts per hour. My score, as published in CQ, put me in the top ten worldwide. I'm proficient in the use of morse; I'm proficient in speaking. Aside from morse code proficiency, one area in which you and I differ is that I'm also proficient in the comprehension of the written and spoken word.

You just don't have enough information to make a judgement. Get back to me when you have enough experience to make such a call.

Dave K8MN

856. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 23:26:58 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v74p9pkk72kk06@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 63047

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:mXtca.7384$se1.4313109@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030312232712.16131.00000147@mb-mk.aol.com...
> > From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
> > >Since they have no experience in operating in the HF realm and no
> experience
> > >in morse code, they are not knowledgeable enough to determine if morse
> code
> > >is a waste of time. I have found it to be most useful
> >
> > This is a ridiculous statement! Yes, some can be smart enough to know it
> is a
> > waste of time. You do not have to know Morse code to know it is a waste
of
> > time, OKAY?
>
> My statement is not at all ridiculous. Of the people that I personally
know
> who didn't like Morse code but did it anyway to get their licenses, the
> majority of them decided after they had some experience that it was
valuable
> and they were glad that they were required to learn it as they would not
> have explored it on their own. This is by their own statements.
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
>

Dee
I'm not one of those people that you know personally, but I am
one of those who are glad that we were required to learn code.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/

857. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 23:37:38 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <6Jtca.7379$se1.4311178@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 63043

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b4st1522pmp@enews4.newsguy.com...
> Here's a question for y'all.... I hear there is going to be a change in
the
> question pools, which license class?
> I am interested because I want to get the "Now Your Talking" book for a
> friend as a gift, and if there is a change in information, I would rather
> get them the up-to-date version. If it affects the Tech class, my
decision
> to wait to purchase the text for them may have to wait.
>

New pool for technicians takes place this summer and the new "Now You're
Talking" is already available. Just make sure you check the info that says
what question pool it is for as some places may still have the old one on
the shelf.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

858. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 23:45:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <nQtca.7382$se1.4312179@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 63044

Since you persist in jumping to conclusions that are not inherent in any of my statements and then digress to unrelated material, it is meaningless to even attempt to hold any conversation with you.

Although I've allowed myself to be drawn in from time to time, I shall continue to resist the urge to respond to your nonsense.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030314021615.11736.00000122@mb-mi.aol.com...
> In article <dCaca.7039$se1.4159127@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030313190320.01153.00000449@mb-mn.aol.com...
> >> In article <sPTba.6881$se1.4025767@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> >Flint"
> >> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >All digital modes requiring a computer (RTTY, PSK31,packet, etc) are
> >> >irrelevant. They don't require any particularly relevant radio knowledge
> >> >and should be eliminated.
> >>
> >> All those "digital modes" are "irrelevant?!?" :-)
> >>
> >> "Digital" is on-off, binary state signalling. Morse codes require
> >> an on-off binary state signalling using a CW carrier. Ergo, morse
> >> code is irrelevant ! :-)
> >
> >I was attempting to make the point that those who tout the supposed wonder
> >and superiority of the computer aided digital modes are espousing are off
> >base. If CW is irrelevant so are all other digital modes.
>
> Oh? So...on what do you base this new revelation on?
>
> Most of the cellular telephones are definitely digital. About one out
> of three Americans have a cell phone subscription, either their own
> or from work. That's about 100 million or so, give or take... Cell
> phones may be "irrelevant" to you but certainly not to millions of
> Americans.
>

> >> [big snip]
> >> Old ways are simple, secure, known, with plenty of literature
> >> references. That way is stability, no stress, and time is
> >> frozen without danger of tomorrow. Nirvana.
> >
> >After your long and tedious non-sequiter that had nothing to do with my
> >point, I will address this point. Any activity needs to keep a blend of
old
> >and new. To automatically throw out the old or refuse the new are both
> >equally foolish. Sometimes new works better, sometimes old works better.
> >New isn't always better, old isn't always secure.
>
> Who was "automatically throwing out anything old?"
>
> Spark is definitely old...the first RF generation source in radio.
> It got made illegal to use in the USA years ago. Not an
> "automatic" process.
>
> There's still a morse code test required for a US amateur radio
> license exam for any license having below-30-MHz privileges.
> A morse code test has been required since the first US radio
> regulating agency started in 1912.
>
> Other than some commercial maritime applications, the rest of
> the radio world either dropped morse code or never considered
> it in the first place.
>
> Half a century ago I was operating HF transmitters running RTTY
> trans-Pacific, not a single one of them using any on-off keying
> morse coding. Maybe that's "irrelevant" to you but not to the
> US Army and the Far East Command Headquarters during the
> Korean War.
>
> >Your long ramble was a far departure from the point and generally
> >irrelevant.
>
> "Irrelevant!" :-)
>
> Yes, I don't have the "Right Attitude" for the Ancient Radiotelegraph
> Society (ARS).
>
> The only "relevancy" for this ARS is worship, reverence, and love
> of manual telegraphy. :-)

859. Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 23:48:03 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <TStca.7383$se1.4312633@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 63045

"K0HB" <k0hb@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:e79dbd9b.0303140803.cac2b19@posting.google.com...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote
>
> Should we break diplomatic relations with England over their new
> code-free HF license class?

Technically speaking England's is not code free. They have to demonstrate some knowledge of it. However they have chosen to put a spin on it that doesn't require receiving or sending.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

860. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-14 23:52:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <mXtca.7384$se1.4313109@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 63046

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030312232712.16131.00000147@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
> >Since they have no experience in operating in the HF realm and no
experience
> >in morse code, they are not knowledgeable enough to determine if morse
code
> >is a waste of time. I have found it to be most useful
>
> This is a ridiculous statement! Yes, some can be smart enough to know it
is a
> waste of time. You do not have to know Morse code to know it is a waste of
> time, OKAY?

My statement is not at all ridiculous. Of the people that I personally know who didn't like Morse code but did it anyway to get their licenses, the majority of them decided after they had some experience that it was valuable and they were glad that they were required to learn it as they would not have explored it on their own. This is by their own statements.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

861. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 00:44:37 UTC
From: Hambone the Magnificent <feitctaj@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e727778@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 63048
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

This is *exactly* what you said Dan.

Also...is it not just "so grand" when proof of your
prior statements is so cordially provided...?

:) :) :) :) :)

ps: What is Donnie doing for a living?
He is on 14.313 every single day. This boy ain't working.
I was home with a flu last week and set up an old IC-735 in the bedroom
with an extension cable to the antenna tap
downstairs to listen-in. I mean 14.313 anymore is
almost like going to an Agway Sales Presentation or
Seventh Day Adventist meeting anymore...
It's CULT-ISH ! sheesh, listenin to it gave me the heebie-jeebees!

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b4q7o9bls1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> Ain't tat jest wat I said?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:v701cf20iohl91@corp.supernews.com...
> > Dan, ignorance is curable, stupid is not.
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim

862. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 01:25:39 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030314202539.16466.00000031@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 63049

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

>Ninety-seven percent of all Amateur allocations can be
>had for a 35 question test and NO Morse Code examination. That's a whole lot
>of RF for a very small investment.

I would say thats a pretty good deal.

863. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 01:34:59 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030314203459.16466.00000032@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 63050

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>> >Vipul, Most hams are not EE's. Most hams will never be EE's.
>>
>> Okay, thats demographics. Fine.
>
>It is demographics and it does away with one of your supposed points.

How does that do away with one of my points? I have always said that there are few Hams interested in the electronics aspects. I do know that there are <some> EEs in my local "Amateur Radio Society" clubs.

>> Why not? With the license you get band priveleges. Its what you can do with
>the
>> license. An amateur radio organization of those with the same interests
>makes
>> accomplishing this easier. It seems like the perfect setup for "a
>playground
>> for EE's".
>
>As to why not, read Part 97 then check with the FCC if you have further
>questions. EE's can and do participate but they do so on the same basis
>as anyone else who passes an exam.

So, it is only a Ham radio playground for contesting, etc.? You said "As to why not", so this must mean its not allowed. How does Part 97 forbid experimenting and building circuits on those frequencies?

864. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 01:36:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030314203656.18361.00000005@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63051

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/14/03 7:17 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303140517.3780b71d@posting.google.com>

>Steve, you got a long way to go to 'splain yourself out of this one.

BBBBWWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! !

Suuuuuuuuuure I do, Brain...SURE I do!

>Start from the beginning and tell us how people think themselves well.

No...YOU provide the quote where I said it, Brian.

Since you keep insisting I said it, repost it.

Otherwise you are a liar. You've gone too far to just be confused.

Steve

865. Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 01:41:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030314204116.18361.00000006@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63052

>Subject: Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101
>From: k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB)
>Date: 3/14/03 10:03 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <e79dbd9b.0303140803.cac2b19@posting.google.com>

>> Do you, Vipul Shaw, recommend that we, The United States, NOT honor our
>> treaty obligations?
>
>The US almost routinely abrogates treaty terms when the mood strikes
>us.

I agree that it does, Hans.

But does it make it right?

>Ignoring S25.5 wouldn't even be noticed in the diplomatic
>community.

I agree.

>Do you see any protesters in front of the Japanese
>embassies around the world for their lack of compliance with S25.5?
>Should we break diplomatic relations with England over their new
>code-free HF license class?

Nope. But then I am neither Japanese nor am I British. I am an American.
And unless my government can show me where a matter of national or economic
security is at stake, I expect them to keep the treaties we sign unless they
negotiate some acceptable deviation from it or NOT sign at all.

73

Steve, K4YZ

866. Re: pro-American editorial

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 01:59:41 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0303141759.7ace1ace@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63053

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote

> Perhaps it is time to retire that thing - and
> find something a little more recent.

Some truths just don't go out of date. Deal with it.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

867. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 02:24:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b4u2rc$hd8$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63054
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Donnie is a piece of crap. But thats my opinion. He claims he has a lawn mowing biz. Reality is he lives with his mother and that started after he was busted for stealing Mary Jane from a federal reserve....Really.

He is a world class trouble maker and thats his total life. I may be wrong, but that is what he has said in the past.

Dan/W4NTI

"Hambone the Magnificent" <feitctaj@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:3e727778@snipnews.snip.net...
> This is *exactly* what you said Dan.
>
> Also...is it not just "so grand" when proof of your
> prior statements is so cordially provided...?
>
> :) :) :) :) :)
>
> ps: What is Donnie doing for a living?
> He is on 14.313 every single day. This boy ain't working.
> I was home with a flu last week and set up an old IC-735 in the bedroom
> with an extension cable to the antenna tap
> downstairs to listen-in. I mean 14.313 anymore is
> almost like going to an Agway Sales Presentation or
> Seventh Day Adventist meeting anymore...
> It's CULT-ISH ! sheesh, listenin to it gave me the heebie-jeebees!
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b4q7o9bls1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> > Ain't tat jest wat I said?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > news:v701cf20iohl91@corp.supernews.com...
> > > Dan, ignorance is curable, stupid is not.
> > >
> > > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > > Jim
>
>
>

868. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 03:25:09 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030314222509.01930.00001144@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 63056

In article <6C1487A2351CBDA8.321BE4BCB2F65A88.620099A7F066F4A6@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>Well, the bandplans are supported by the FCC. Not a good way to explain
>that, but it's the closest I can come right now. And, isn't a good idea to
>include those items that are considered "good operating practice" since that
>is a part of the spirit of amateur radio (in the Amateur Code).
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Is selecting a Vanity Call Sign that is demeaning to YL hams and incites
prurient interest something that is in "good amateur practice?" Is it in
the "spirit of amateur radio" and in keeping with the Amateur Code? If
you say "yes" to any of the above, then get 25 other licensed hams
to agree with you, have them post their agreement in this newsgroup,
identified by name and call sign, and I'll never make another posting
about your call sign. None of them can be current regular participants
in this newsgroup.

Failure to meet the above standard of proof will be construed that even
YOU don't think you made the proper choice of call sign, since you won't
take action to defend it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

869. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 03:25:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030314222510.01930.00001145@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 63055

In article <D77EDF047E195FE9.757E4E8C906841F5.C982DBDB624EB189@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> You obviously do not possess the intellectual or emotional maturity
>> necessary to have whatever you say taken seriously. Therefore,
>> your continued participation in this newsgroup will serve only to act
>> as an annoyance to your intellectual and moral superiors.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>You're cracking me up...ROFLMAO
>
>Kim W5TIT

Ah, the classic Kim Walker response! Some things never change --
even if they *should* be changing for the better.

73 de Larry, K3LT

870. Re: pro-American editorial

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 04:01:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA980FD2.1313C%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63057

"K0HB" wrote:

> Some truths just don't go out of date. Deal with it.

But opinions do. Regardless, do we (Americans) really have to depend on something said 20 plus years ago to stroke our egos? In the end, our allies have probably shown about as much respect and appreciation for this country's contribution to WWII as we have shown for their country's contributions to our many wars then and since.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

871. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 04:11:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E72A7C7.4040901@adelphia.net>
Source record: 63058

KC8PMX wrote:

> Pocket protectors and horned-rimmed glasses???
>
> Just kidding.....

Well, not so many with the glasses, but the Pocket protectors are out in force.

I mean since slide rules went out of style - there has to be some geek fashion statement! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>
>
>>I live in the middle of Pennsylvania, in a University town. How did you
>>know that the people at hamfests aren't EE's, do they carry signs or
>>wear special shoes or something? Last time I checked EE's looked just
>>like other people.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>
>

872. Re: pro-American editorial

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 04:54:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030314235417.27873.00001158@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63059

In article <BA9768DF.12F44%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>
>> (snip) has lots of info and links. It's genuine,
>> all right, but from another era.
>>
>> The 'snopes' urban-legend site is a good one for
>> getting to the bottom of such stories fast.
>
>
> Thanks, Jim. I knew I first heard that years ago, but wasn't sure when.
>Now I know it could have been anytime over the last twenty-five to thirty
>years (and, no, I didn't realize it was that old). Perhaps it is time to
>retire that thing - and find something a little more recent.
>
Looking back over the 30 years since it was written, I'd say it's even more
accurate today.

The reason I pointed out the snopes site and the link was simply to give
accurate information about it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

873. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 04:54:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030314235419.27873.00001159@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63060

In article <20030312132154.09900.00002632@mb-fc.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>>>We're at the 'Len Over 21 made an error and won't admit it' level.
>>>
>>> Sorry, bubeleh, Leonard H. Anderson (screen name of LenOver21)
>>
>>You signed it "Len Over 21".
>
> Nope. It is NOT "signed."

Yes, it is. But your name doesn't appear in that post.
>
>>> made a statement about RECOMMENDATION versus Regulation
>>> before and still holds to that.
>>
>>IOW, you persist in clinging to your error even after it has been pointed
>>out by others.
>
> What "error" you pedant? I gave an OPINION.

No, you referred to a Regulation as a Recommendation. That's a mistake, plain and simple. S25.5 is part of the Regulations. Recommendations are a different section.

You can say that it's your OPINION that black is white, up is down, etc., but you'll still be mistaken.
>
> You don't like certain opinions.

Why should I "like" opinions that are based on untruths?

You don't like any opinion or fact that proves you wrong. You can't take strong opposition to your cherished mistakes.

>>> I keep saying RECOMMENDATION because that is all
>>> what the ITU-R "Radio Regulations" are
>>
>>You're mistaken. They're regulations. There are IYU-R Recommendations, but
>>the code test is a regulation.
>
> YOU are mistaken...we aren't discussing the "IYR."

Just a typo. Do you never make typos?

>>And that's a plain, simple fact. Live with it.
>

> Tsk, tsk, tsk...learn to LIVE with OPINIONS. :-)

You sure have difficulty doing that. Practice what you preach.
>
>>So? S25.5 is a regulation, not a law. Guess what - FCC has incorporated
>>those regulations (including S25.5) into its rules. And those rules are
binding.
>>Live with it.
>
> INCORRECT!

How? FCC still requires a code test for HF amateur licenses, specifically
because S25.5 requires it. That's incorporation of S25.5 in US rules, regs,
laws, whatever you want to call them.
>
> FCC regulations (they are regulations, law, not "rules") bind
> only RF radiation originating within boundaries of USA territory.
> USA law applies to USA territory.

And your point is?
>
> There are NO ITU "laws" binding. If you violate ITU "regulations"
> there will be no ITU marshals to come knocking on your door,
> there will be only USA marshals.
>
So the FCC and US marshals enforce S25.5. Works for me.

>>> Your remark is irrelevant and confrontational.
>>>
>>So?
>
> So...little prissy pedant, remember you are not a god of radio
> by virtue of morsemanship and aren't always correct in every-
> thing you write in here.

Guess what, Len - you are not a god of radio and aren't always correct in
every-
thing you write here, or elsewhere.

>>> Poor baby...Reverend Jim thinks he is one of the Supremes.
>>
>>No. I don't. You seem to - but you're not even a lawyer.
>
> I'm not a lawyer but I seem to be playing a construction worker
> in here, chipping away at the concrete blockheadedness of
> prissy pedanticsm you've molded yourself into. Too many
> rocks in that morseman's concrete, doesn't have enough
> strength to support magnificent morsemanship medallions.

You're still not a lawyer, Len. And you're still mistaken.
>
>>> There is NO "violation" of a non-law.

>>
>>Nonsense.
>
> When I am on USA soil, only USA laws apply to me.

So?

> Since
> you recognize only this concept of "international law," I'll put
> you down as NOT a USA citizen...an ALIEN.

Where have I used the phrase "international law"? It's a treaty. Do you think
the USA should violate that treaty?

>>> If Japan could do what it did,
>>> so can the United States or any other member nation of the ITU.
>>
>>Maybe. Japan is an island nation, and its closest neigbors have few if any
>>hams. The USA and European countries aren't like that.
>
> Poor baby...a demonstrated anglophile and another European-
> oriented easterner, all wrapped up in some weird territorial
> superiority concept of Yurp Rulz!

I have no idea what that is supposed to mean.

The fact is that FCC has specifically said it will NOT violate S25.5. FCC makes
the rules and enforces them, not you. Live with it.
>
> Where is it written in any UNITED NATIONS bylaws about those
> "exceptions due to isolation of any nation?" The International
> Telecommunications Union is a UN body. Live with it.

So what's your suggestion to the FCC? Violate the treaty?
>
>>Perhaps the USA could do what Japan did - have an HF ham license that
>>allows
>>QRP on a few bands. Would that satisfy you, Len?
>
> My only "satisfaction" would come from the destruction of those
> clay pedestals you mighty macho amateur morsemen stuck
> together out of ancient, crumbly play-doh.

I'll take that as a "no".

Len, it's clear your whole purpose here is tossing insults and wasting time.
With every post, you make it more clear that:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior.

Your hobby is wasting time. Others' time. But not my time.

N2EY

874. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 05:50:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030315005003.17392.00000055@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63061

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 3/14/03 10:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030314235419.27873.00001159@mb-mj.aol.com>

>> Too many
>> rocks in that morseman's concrete, doesn't have enough
>> strength to support magnificent morsemanship medallions.
>
>You're still not a lawyer, Len. And you're still mistaken.

Seems that the rocks in the concrete under "the mighty morsemen" have
worked pretty well for almost 90 years...

>> Poor baby...a demonstrated anglophile and another European-
>> oriented easterner, all wrapped up in some weird territorial
>> superiority concept of Yurp Rulz!
>
>I have no idea what that is supposed to mean.

You're not alone, Jim. I doubt he understands any of it either.

>> My only "satisfaction" would come from the destruction of those
>> clay pedestals you mighty macho amateur morsemen stuck
>> together out of ancient, crumbly play-doh.
>
>I'll take that as a "no".

Again...seems to me that "play-doh" has held together pretty well for
almost 90 years.

>Len, it's clear your whole purpose here is tossing insults and wasting time.
>With every post, you make it more clear that:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior.

"Pathological Liar" sums it up a lot more abruptly.

Putz is a bit more descriptive.

73

Steve, K4YZ

875. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 06:06:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E72A6CC.7A001022@att.net>
Source record: 63062

Dave Heil wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70D928.5CEA29E7@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70201C.D257E876@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > > You say that if the message is 100% copy every time at 5wpm, that is not
proficient.
> > > > >
> > > > > No, that is not what I wrote. Your reading comprehension sucks.
> > > >
> > > Decide to bypass this one in hopes that no one noticed?
> > >
> > > > > > All of Amateur Radio is about Fast CW on HF.
> > > > >
> > > > > Is it? I operate SSB, FM and RTTY. I do some quite slow CW on 160m, 2m
> > > > > and 70cm. You're starting to sound like Mini-Len once again.
> > >
> > > Good. How fast do you talk on FM? I'm going to judge if you are proficient.
>
> > > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
>
> > I've spoken to you on SSB, and you're not fast enough.
>
> I have documentation which proves that I talk fast enough to make three
> hundred QSOs per hour on SSB. Your sampling just wasn't sufficient.
>
> > You're just not proficient. Sorry.
>
> It would seem that you don't have enough information to make a sound
> judgement.

No one is surprised.

876. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 06:14:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E72A8C0.C0E94877@att.net>
Source record: 63063

Dave Heil wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E71E6E4.92385194@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70D928.5CEA29E7@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70201C.D257E876@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > > > > You say that if the message is 100% copy every time at 5wpm, that is not
proficient.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > No, that is not what I wrote. Your reading comprehension sucks.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Decide to bypass this one in hopes that no one noticed?
> > > > >
> > > > > > > > > All of Amateur Radio is about Fast CW on HF.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Is it? I operate SSB, FM and RTTY. I do some quite slow CW on 160m, 2m
> > > > > > > > > and 70cm. You're starting to sound like Mini-Len once again.
> > > >
> > > > > > Good. How fast do you talk on FM? I'm going to judge if you are proficient.
> > > >
> > > > > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
> > >
> > > I've spoken to you on SSB, and you're not fast enough.
> > >
> > I have documentation which proves that I talk fast enough to make three
> > hundred QSOs per hour on SSB. Your sampling just wasn't sufficient.
> >
> > You're just not proficient. Sorry.
> >
> > It would seem that you don't have enough information to make a sound
> > judgement.
>
> Someone had to make the call and I did. You're just not proficient.
>

> > Too bad.
>
> Facts don't lie, Brian. In the CQ Worldwide SSB DX Contest of '91, my
> average hourly rate (which includes time spent listening, sleeping,
> bathroom breaks, CQing and eating) was 135.43 QSOs per hour. My highest
> hourly rate was over 300 contacts per hour. My score, as published in
> CQ, put me in the top ten worldwide. I'm proficient in the use of morse;
> I'm proficient in speaking. Aside from morse code proficiency, one area
> in which you and I differ is that I'm also proficient in the
> comprehension of the written and spoken word.
>
> You just don't have enough information to make a judgement. Get back to
> me when you have enough experience to make such a call.

That would be the twelth of never.

877. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 12:48:54 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <31D97BFC6FA4060F.E29B5CD8550D8AE1.1FCEF492B4C5F036@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 63065

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030314222509.01930.00001144@mb-mq.aol.com...
> In article
<6C1487A2351CBDA8.321BE4BCB2F65A88.620099A7F066F4A6@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Well, the bandplans are supported by the FCC. Not a good way to explain
> >that, but it's the closest I can come right now. And, isn't a good idea
to
> >include those items that are considered "good operating practice" since
that
> >is a part of the spirit of amateur radio (in the Amateur Code).
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Is selecting a Vanity Call Sign that is demeaning to YL hams and incites
> prurient interest something that is in "good amateur practice?"
>

Absolutely not. I don't know of anyone who's done that. Is acting the way
you do in the spirit of good amateur practice?

>
> Is it in
> the "spirit of amateur radio" and in keeping with the Amateur Code? If
> you say "yes" to any of the above, then get 25 other licensed hams
> to agree with you, have them post their agreement in this newsgroup,
> identified by name and call sign, and I'll never make another posting
> about your call sign. None of them can be current regular participants
> in this newsgroup.
>

Well, let's see. First, how could anyone say "yes" to the above? I don't
know of anyone who'd agree that selecting a Vanity Call Sign that's
"demeaning to YL hams and incites prurient interest" would be good amateur
practice. Nor, do I know anyone who's done so. Secondly, why would your
statement "and I'll never make another posting about your callsign" be
something that interests me, Larry? Or, were you directing that to me?
You're free to post anything you wish and as much as you wish about my
callsign--or anyone else's for that matter. Why would you think otherwise?

>
> Failure to meet the above standard of proof will be construed that even
> YOU don't think you made the proper choice of call sign, since you won't
> take action to defend it.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Well, whatever. Like I said above, you live in a free country, Larry. You think however it is you wish to think--about anything you wish. Is it that I respond to you that you think your statements about my callsign bug me? OK, I'll stop responding.

Kim W5TIT

878. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 12:50:03 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <FA2E6F19D71B8EFA.02253178E8F4FD15.578D7F18BCBC2C0A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 63064

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0303140512.21f10847@posting.google.com...
> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:<3E7155DF.52EF1E92@att.net>...
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > He needs a whole lot more thast just good luck.
>
> He who? You promised not to read anymore of my stuff, DICK.

Wow, you won first place on the list today, Brian (first post listed). Oh,
did Dick make another promise to killfile someone then not? LOL

Kim W5TIT

879. N5QXX/R: The New Orleans linked repeater that isn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 14:00:53 UTC
From: sparkr@pavillage.net
Message-ID: <577654515751.135A729F38A@pavillage.net>
Source record: 63066
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,neworleans.general

Down there in New Orleans, they brag about N5QXX as the longest echo linked repeater. The real truth is that it isn't.

Oh yes, if you take a look in the repeater section of Echolink, you'll find N5QXX all right, but you won't be able to link to it. Instead, you'll get an "access denied" message, because only a small number of people are allowed to use it.

So why is it on Echolink at all? Your guess is as good as mine, although I tend to lean toward the explanation that the club wants bragging rights without having to actually perform as do other linked repeaters.

What a bunch of morons. They should be cut off from Echolink.

880. Re: N5QXX/R: The New Orleans linked repeater that isn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 14:24:51 UTC
From: Jock <jock_shaw@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3e7337af$1@news.nb.nu>
Source record: 63067
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,neworleans.general

"Stu Parker" <sparkr@pavillage.net> schreef in bericht
news:577654515751.135A729F38A@pavillage.net...
> Down there in New Orleans, they brag about N5QXX as the longest echo
> linked repeater. The real truth is that it isn't.
>
> Oh yes, if you take a look in the repeater section of Echolink, you'll
> find N5QXX all right, but you won't be able to link to it. Instead,
> you'll get an "access denied" message, because only a small number of
> people are allowed to use it.
>
> So why is it on Echolink at all? Your guess is as good as mine,
> although I tend to lean toward the explanation that the club wants
> bragging rights without having to actually perform as do other linked
> repeaters.
>
> What a bunch of morons. They should be cut off from Echolink.

I prefer mine with mayonaise.............

--
Posted by news://news.nb.nu

881. Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 14:42:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303150642.68f4bf3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63068

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030314204116.18361.00000006@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101
> >From: k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB)
> >Date: 3/14/03 10:03 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <e79dbd9b.0303140803.cac2b19@posting.google.com>
>
> >> Do you, Vipul Shaw, recommend that we, The United States, NOT honor our
> >> treaty obligations?
> >
> >The US almost routinely abrogates treaty terms when the mood strikes
> >us.
>
> I agree that it does, Hans.
>
> But does it make it right?
>
> >Ignoring S25.5 wouldn't even be noticed in the diplomatic
> >community.
>
> I agree.
>
> >Do you see any protesters in front of the Japanese
> >embassies around the world for their lack of compliance with S25.5?
> >Should we break diplomatic relations with England over their new
> >code-free HF license class?
>
> Nope. But then I am neither Japanese nor am I British. I am an American.
> And unless my government can show me where a matter of national or economic
> security is at stake, I expect them to keep the treaties we sign unless they
> negotiate some acceptable deviation from it or NOT sign at all.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Welp, Steve, the way some PCTA's talk, the code IS a matter national
security. Be prepared to join your 8th hostile action in Japan.
We've got to bring them around to your way of thinking.

882. Re: N5QXX/R: The New Orleans linked repeater that isn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 14:57:23 UTC
From: LRod@removethispartpobox.com
Message-ID: <3e733e57.378551970@netnews.att.net>
Source record: 63069
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,neworleans.general

On 15 Mar 2003 14:00:53 GMT, sparkr@pavillage.net (Stu Parker) wrote:

>Down there in New Orleans, they brag about N5QXX as the longest echo
>linked repeater. The real truth is that it isn't.
>
>Oh yes, if you take a look in the repeater section of Echolink, you'll
>find N5QXX all right, but you won't be able to link to it. Instead,
>you'll get an "access denied" message, because only a small number of
>people are allowed to use it.
>
>So why is it on Echolink at all? Your guess is as good as mine,
>although I tend to lean toward the explanation that the club wants
>bragging rights without having to actually perform as do other linked
>repeaters.
>
>What a bunch of morons. They should be cut off from Echolink.

So, you were kicked out of the club. Is that why you've posted this
twice? What did you do to get kicked out? Would you like some cheese
with that whine?

LRod

Master Woodbutcher and seasoned termite

Shamelessly whoring my website since 1999

http://www.woodbutcher.net

883. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 14:59:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303150659.4ee8a0e7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63070

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E724A77.F48AF1E1@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E71E6E4.92385194@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70D928.5CEA29E7@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70201C.D257E876@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > > > You say that if the message is 100% copy every time at 5wpm, that is not
proficient.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > No, that is not what I wrote. Your reading comprehension sucks.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Decide to bypass this one in hopes that no one noticed?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > All of Amateur Radio is about Fast CW on HF.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Is it? I operate SSB, FM and RTTY. I do some quite slow CW on 160m, 2m
> > > > > > > > and 70cm. You're starting to sound like Mini-Len once again.
>
> > > > > > > Good. How fast do you talk on FM? I'm going to judge if you are proficient.
>
> > > > > > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
>
> > > > > I've spoken to you on SSB, and you're not fast enough.
> > > >
> > > > I have documentation which proves that I talk fast enough to make three
> > > > hundred QSOs per hour on SSB. Your sampling just wasn't sufficient.
> > > >
> > > > You're just not proficient. Sorry.
> > >
> > > It would seem that you don't have enough information to make a sound
> > > judgement.
>
> > Someone had to make the call and I did. You're just not proficient.
>
> > Too bad.

>
> Facts don't lie, Brian. In the CQ Worldwide SSB DX Contest of '91, my
> average hourly rate (which includes time spent listening, sleeping,
> bathroom breaks, CQing and eating) was 135.43 QSOs per hour. My highest
> hourly rate was over 300 contacts per hour. My score, as published in
> CQ, put me in the top ten worldwide. I'm proficient in the use of morse;
> I'm proficient in speaking. Aside from morse code proficiency, one area
> in which you and I differ is that I'm also proficient in the
> comprehension of the written and spoken word.
>
> You just don't have enough information to make a judgement. Get back to
> me when you have enough experience to make such a call.
>
> Dave K8MN

No, Dave, that's not it. 0.02wpm sets a world record, and that's a fact.
I can make just as many arbitrary claims as you can, re: 5wpm not proficient.

Sorry.

884. Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 15:03:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030315100338.12210.00000066@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63071

>Subject: Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/15/03 8:42 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303150642.68f4bf3@posting.google.com>

>Welp, Steve, the way some PCTA's talk, the code IS a matter national
>security. Be prepared to join your 8th hostile action in Japan.
>We've got to bring them around to your way of thinking.

"(My) way of thinking", Brain?

I've not stated how it SHOULD be... I have pointed out how it IS. Taht Japan or anyone else should decide to not adhere to the letter of the law is their business. I am not Japanese. I am American, and I expect MY country to adhere to it's treaties and agreements it signs.

Unless, of course, you can prove otherwise...?!?!

Steve

885. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 15:13:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030315101350.12210.00000067@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63072

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/15/03 8:44 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303150644.71181c41@posting.google.com>

>> Otherwise you are a liar. You've gone too far to just be confused.
>
>No Steve. Here's a challenge for you. Think yourself well.

First of all I am already in pretty good health. In as much as I had been told on prior occassions that I would suffer permanent injury from accidents serious acidents sustained, yet am at the level of functionality that I am at, I would have to say that proper mental attitude contributed to my successful recovery.

Again..I said contributed. As I did in the original post.

But having repeatedly insisted that I said something that I did not, and then insisting that I "prove" the validity of the correctness of what I did not say, Brain joins the ranks of Lennie (The Lame) Anderson and Markie (I Am A Gay Draftee Pagan Officer In The Army) Morgan.

Whew...some company there, Brian. Proud of yourself? I gave you all week to either let it drop or "prove" your assertions, but you insisted. Now you are in the bag with the other idiots, right where you belong.

Don't worry...I forsee another joining you soon unless HE realizes that lying and making up things others did not say is foolhearty too!

Too bad for you.

Steve

886. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 16:18:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E735231.2BE70EBD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63073

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >> >Vipul, Most hams are not EE's. Most hams will never be EE's.
> >>
> >> Okay, thats demographics. Fine.
> >
> >It is demographics and it does away with one of your supposed points.
>
> How does that do away with one of my points?

Go back and read what you've written.

> I have always said that there are
> few Hams interested in the electronics aspects. I do know that there are <some>
> EEs in my local "Amateur Radio Society" clubs.

There are some EE's in your local clubs? What about the rest of the
hamr radio world not wanting them? You told us that was the case.

> >> Why not? With the license you get band priveleges. Its what you can do with
> >the
> >> license. An amateur radio organization of those with the same interests
> >makes
> >> accomplishing this easier. It seems like the perfect setup for "a
> >playground
> >> for EE's".
> >
> >As to why not, read Part 97 then check with the FCC if you have further
> >questions. EE's can and do participate but they do so on the same basis
> >as anyone else who passes an exam.
>
> So, it is only a Ham radio playground for contesting, etc.?

I didn't write that. Part 97 will tell what amateur radio is. I am
amazed that you actually obtained a license without finding out what
amateur radio is.

> You said "As to why
> not", so this must mean its not allowed.

"As to why not" referred to amateur radio's not being set up as simply a
playground for EE's.

> How does Part 97 forbid experimenting
> and building circuits on those frequencies?

One doesn't build anything "on those frequencies". Part 97 does not forbid building or experimenting by any radio amateur. No EE degree is required for doing so. For that matter, you can build all you want without any amateur radio license.

Dave K8MN

887. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 16:28:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E735497.B878D89B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63074

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E724A77.F48AF1E1@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E71E6E4.92385194@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70D928.5CEA29E7@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70201C.D257E876@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > > > > > > You say that if the message is 100% copy every time at 5wpm, that is not
proficient.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > No, that is not what I wrote. Your reading comprehension sucks.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Decide to bypass this one in hopes that no one noticed?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > All of Amateur Radio is about Fast CW on HF.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Is it? I operate SSB, FM and RTTY. I do some quite slow CW on 160m, 2m
> > > > > > > > > and 70cm. You're starting to sound like Mini-Len once again.
> > >
> > > > > > > > Good. How fast do you talk on FM? I'm going to judge if you are proficient.
> > >
> > > > > > > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
> > >
> > > > > > I've spoken to you on SSB, and you're not fast enough.
> > > > > >
> > > > > I have documentation which proves that I talk fast enough to make three
> > > > > hundred QSOs per hour on SSB. Your sampling just wasn't sufficient.
> > > > >
> > > > > You're just not proficient. Sorry.
> > > > >
> > > > It would seem that you don't have enough information to make a sound
> > > > judgement.
> >

> > > Someone had to make the call and I did. You're just not proficient.
> >
> > > Too bad.
> >
> > Facts don't lie, Brian. In the CQ Worldwide SSB DX Contest of '91, my
> > average hourly rate (which includes time spent listening, sleeping,
> > bathroom breaks, CQing and eating) was 135.43 QSOs per hour. My highest
> > hourly rate was over 300 contacts per hour. My score, as published in
> > CQ, put me in the top ten worldwide. I'm proficient in the use of morse;
> > I'm proficient in speaking. Aside from morse code proficiency, one area
> > in which you and I differ is that I'm also proficient in the
> > comprehension of the written and spoken word.
> >
> > You just don't have enough information to make a judgement. Get back to
> > me when you have enough experience to make such a call.

> No, Dave, that's not it. 0.02wpm sets a world record, and that's a fact.

It certainly is. It is one which has nothing to do with the code
proficiency of either ham.

> I can make just as many arbitrary claims as you can, re: 5wpm not proficient.

The big difference I see between us is that I use pertinent facts to
make a point while you misinterpret the facts you've seen. You still
seem to confuse the words "proficient" and "efficient".

> Sorry.

No need to apologize. Just get your act together.

Dave K8MN

888. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 19:09:50 UTC
From: Mike Herry's <iguessso@isguesssoo.org>
Message-ID: <b4vtof$3g6$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 63075
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> cried and whined the
following:

> An "export" radio is not a CB radio, Dan. And there is often potential
> harm in it - these highly modified radios are notorious for causing
> interference to neighborhood televisions, telephones, other radio
equipment,
> and other electronics. And every instance of interference has the
potential
> to directly impact ham radio operators - it creates another person opposed
> to radios (all radios) in the neighborhood.
>
> I certainly do not want people using unauthorized equipment in my
> neighborhood. In addition to the potential interference with items in my
> home, the use (or acceptance of use) of unauthorized equipment says a lot
> about the character of the individual - perhaps illustrated by the
"outlaw"
> mentality so pervasive in the CB community today. Whatever the case, "bad
> boys" in one thing are likely to be "bad boys" in other aspects of life
> (work, social activities, relationships, the neighborhood, etc).
>
> Further, these highly modified radios often interfere with other CB'ers
on
> nearby frequencies (channels) - reducing the number of usable CB
> frequencies, which encourages still more to move their communications
> outside the allocated CB frequencies to frequencies perhaps assigned to
> other radio services.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Now, everyone together: BWAHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHH!!!!!
BWAHHHHHHHHHHHHHH
BWAHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHH

889. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 19:57:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030315145725.11134.00000037@mb-mp.aol.com>
Source record: 63079

In article <nQtca.7382$se1.4312179@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<Our Gal Flint> writes:

>Since you persist in jumping to conclusions that are not inherent in any of
>my statements and then digress to unrelated material, it is meaningless to
>even attempt to hold any conversation with you.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Public newsgroup messaging is not "conversation."
Never was.

Everyone's writing is ALL that anyone else can see. Whatever you
feel "inherently" must be stated in textual form. The most anyone
else can divine from text (that all see in same form) is the similarity
to a certain group's previous statements.

If I detect a strong similarity to old PCTA smug arrogant
sacramental statements, I won't hesitate to comment on such.

>Although I've allowed myself to be drawn in from time to time, I shall
>continue to resist the urge to respond to your nonsense.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...use of the word "nonsense" in the above sentence
is clear personal loading of a statement to reflect your viewpoint.
No telepathy necessary to "read" it in context.

Since many cannot take strong opposition to their self-righteous
opinions (such opposition is a "mistake" or "error"), at least one
has come up with a standard boilerplate response for roaring
back when all else fails:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

See how simple that is? No straining of originality neurons,
no need to argue the substance of any subject, just reject an
opposing opinion with a little rubber-stamp-like macro. :-)

Just attack the messenger, not the substance of the message.
"If thine eye offend thee, cast it out..."

Beep, beep.

890. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 19:57:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030315145728.11134.00000038@mb-mp.aol.com>
Source record: 63080

In article <20030314235419.27873.00001159@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030312132154.09900.00002632@mb-fc.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>>>>We're at the 'Len Over 21 made an error and won't admit it' level.
>>>>
>>>> Sorry, bubeleh, Leonard H. Anderson (screen name of LenOver21)
>>>
>>>You signed it "Len Over 21".
>>
>> Nope. It is NOT "signed."
>
>Yes, it is. But your name doesn't appear in that post.

"Signing" in a US document requires HANDWRITING.

Newsgroup posts are NOT signed.

>No, you referred to a Regulation as a Recommendation. That's a mistake, plain
>and simple. S25.5 is part of the Regulations. Recommendations are a different
>section.
>
>You can say that it's your OPINION that black is white, up is down, etc., but
>you'll still be mistaken.

Nope. No "mistake." A regulation is codified law. International
Telecommunications Union is a voluntary group of the world's
administrations in regard to telecommunications activity. There
is no international police force to enforce recommendations or
anything else written by the ITU. There is no "court" to try anyone
breaking statements written by ITU.

There is NO "international law" the same as national laws set by
nations' administrations or legislations.

>Why should I "like" opinions that are based on untruths?

You just don't like contrary opinions...so much so that you, like
typical PCTAs, feel so arrogant and smug in your self-
righteousness of your own opinion.

No problem on defining that. All can see it except for other
PCTAs.

>You don't like any opinion or fact that proves you wrong. You can't take
>strong opposition to your cherished mistakes.

No problem with me "taking" things. :-) Done that for a
lifetime...surrounded sometimes by smug, arrogant, single-
viewpoint self-righteous zealots who demand others obeying
their cherished opinions.

What seems to bother the smug, arrogant, single-viewpoint
inflexible self-righteous zealots of a minority group is a stronger
opposite-view response based on the larger reality of the world.
Minority groups are a minority and old-fashioned, inappropriate
regulations are still old-fashioned and inappropriate to the
majority.

You, James N2EY Miccolis, cherish and love the old-
fashioned ways and regulations, probably because you met
them long ago. Now you demand your personal achievements
be considered as good examples for others to emulate.

>> YOU are mistaken...we aren't discussing the "IYR."
>
>Just a typo. Do you never make typos?

I make typographical errors once in a while. Others, such as
yourself, make them too...and then bristle with mighty irritation
and hard responses when their proficiency is popped. :-)

>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...learn to LIVE with OPINIONS. :-)
>
>You sure have difficulty doing that. Practice what you preach.

I'm not a self-ordained clergyman like you, Reverend Jim. :-)

The FCC allows amateur radio beacons...not radio deacons.

>How? FCC still requires a code test for HF amateur licenses, specifically
>because S25.5 requires it. That's incorporation of S25.5 in US rules, regs,
>laws, whatever you want to call them.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. ITU-R S25.5 specifically says "receive by ear,
send by hand." The FCC violated that specific years ago on
making the US morse code test "send by hand" optional.

Violation, pure and simple.

>Guess what, Len - you are not a god of radio and aren't always correct in
>every-
>thing you write here, or elsewhere.

I don't pretend to be a "god of radio." Neither do I sit timidly on
the sidelines while some smug, arrogant, self-righteous control
freaks posture, preach, and patooey about their sanctimonious
sacraments.

>> I'm not a lawyer but I seem to be playing a construction worker
>> in here, chipping away at the concrete blockheadedness of
>> prissy pedanticsm you've molded yourself into. Too many
>> rocks in that morseman's concrete, doesn't have enough
>> strength to support magnificent morsemanship medallions.
>
>You're still not a lawyer, Len. And you're still mistaken.

I'm a retired (from regular hours) electronics engineer who first
operated on HF a half century ago...and not timid about arguing
for the elimination of morse code tests.

James N2EY Miccolis is a prissy pedant who demands obeyance
to his self-righteous opinions and dismisses anything contrary to
his sacred opinions as "mistaken" or "wrong."

>Where have I used the phrase "international law"? It's a treaty. Do you think
>the USA should violate that treaty?

The USA has already violated parts of the voted-in statements of
WARC and WRC resolutions.

>So what's your suggestion to the FCC? Violate the treaty?

That suggestion was already made years ago.

CHANGE ITU-R S25.5.

>Len, it's clear your whole purpose here is tossing insults and wasting time.
>With every post, you make it more clear that:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior.

Poor baby. Someone dared step on the long train of your
mighty vestments this morning as you led divine worship
at the Church of St. Hiram?

>Your hobby is wasting time. Others' time. But not my time.

Noooo, Reverend Jim, you spend an inordinate amount of time
in making smug, arrogant, self-righteous opinions (of the ancient
league origin) and then stating that opinions opposite to yours
are "mistakes" or "errors."

Have you taken up evangelism, Reverend Jim? You are starting
up with small-scale fire and brimstone flicking. The old prissy
pedantic Sermons on the Antenna Mount were too gentle? :-)

891. Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 19:57:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030315145729.11134.00000039@mb-mp.aol.com>
Source record: 63077

In article <20030315100338.12210.00000066@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steam Outadaears) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101
>>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>Date: 3/15/03 8:42 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303150642.68f4bf3@posting.google.com>
>
>>Welp, Steve, the way some PCTA's talk, the code IS a matter national
>>security. Be prepared to join your 8th hostile action in Japan.
>>We've got to bring them around to your way of thinking.
>
> "(My) way of thinking", Brain?
>
> I've not stated how it SHOULD be... I have pointed out how it IS. Taht
>Japan or anyone else should decide to not adhere to the letter of the law is
>their business. I am not Japanese. I am American, and I expect MY country
>to adhere to it's treaties and agreements it signs.
>
> Unless, of course, you can prove otherwise...?!?!

"Arf, arf, arf" yipped the little doggie.

The United States of America "put spin" on ITU-R S25.5 in making the "send by hand" optional and unneccessary for years. ITU-R S25.5 is very specific, "receive by ear and send by hand."

"Taht" is what is written, little doggie.

"Adherence" was broken. Try a better glue mighty macho morse-man. Lock and load, prepare to embark for foreign service to fight for the rights of all mighty macho morsemen and obeyance to the letter of "international law."

Now get along, little doggie.

892. Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 19:57:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030315145730.11134.00000040@mb-mp.aol.com>
Source record: 63076

In article <TStca.7383$se1.4312633@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"K0HB" <k0hb@arrl.net> wrote in message
>news:e79dbd9b.0303140803.cac2b19@posting.google.com...
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote
>>
>> Should we break diplomatic relations with England over their new
>> code-free HF license class?
>
>Technically speaking England's is not code free. They have to demonstrate
>some knowledge of it. However they have chosen to put a spin on it that
>doesn't require receiving or sending.

Oh, my, "spin!" Tsk, tsk, tsk.

The USA has "put spin" on the "send by hand" part of ITU-R S25.5 for years. Japan "put spin" on S25.5 entire for an even longer time.

ITU-R S25.5 is very specific on its "international law." ["law" according to the PCTA spin on what mighty macho morsemen think all should obey] "Receive by ear and send by hand" in ITU-R S25.5 is rather specific with no room to wiggle out.

That makes three large member nations of the ITU who have broken "international law" in regards to amateur radio. Tsk, tsk.

893. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 19:57:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030315145730.11134.00000041@mb-mp.aol.com>
Source record: 63078

In article <3E735231.2BE70EBD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> So, it is only a Ham radio playground for contesting, etc.?
>
>I didn't write that. Part 97 will tell what amateur radio is. I am
>amazed that you actually obtained a license without finding out what
>amateur radio is.

Incorrect. ARRL "tells what amateur radio is." Part 97, Title
47 Code of Federal Regulations, only codifies the regulations
of the Federal Communications Commission in regard to USA
amateur radio.

US amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW.

Try not to end a sentence with the word "is." That isn't
proficient English. You have demonstrated bad proficiency
at least twice in one message. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

894. Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 20:20:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303151220.2ec72c5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63081

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030315100338.12210.00000066@mb-cs.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/15/03 8:42 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303150642.68f4bf3@posting.google.com>
>
> >Welp, Steve, the way some PCTA's talk, the code IS a matter national
> >security. Be prepared to join your 8th hostile action in Japan.
> >We've got to bring them around to your way of thinking.
>
> "(My) way of thinking", Brain?

Yes, your way of thinking.

> I've not stated how it SHOULD be... I have pointed out how it IS. Taht
> Japan or anyone else should decide to not adhere to the letter of the law is
> their business. I am not Japanese. I am American, and I expect MY country to
> adhere to it's treaties and agreements it signs.

All of them or just the Morse Code traties?

Are you're prepared to go to war with Japan over Morse Code?

> Unless, of course, you can prove otherwise...?!?!
>
> Steve

Falkland Islands, SDI? Where were you?

895. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 20:23:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303151223.1be844d3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63082

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E72A8C0.C0E94877@att.net>...
>
> That would be the twelth of never.

Dick, kindly have the courage to respond directly to me when taking
such pot shots.

And don't worry about your promise to put me in the kill file - its
obviously been broken.

Courage, DICK, courage.

Show some if you've got even a little cartilage left in what was once
a spine.

896. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 20:26:51 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303151226.57a75f21@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63083

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<FA2E6F19D71B8EFA.02253178E8F4FD15.578D7F18BCBC2C0A@lp.airnews.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0303140512.21f10847@posting.google.com...
> > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> news:<3E7155DF.52EF1E92@att.net>...
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > He needs a whole lot more thast just good luck.
> >
> > He who? You promised not to read anymore of my stuff, DICK.
>
> Wow, you won first place on the list today, Brian (first post listed). Oh,
> did Dick make another promise to killfile someone then not? LOL
>
> Kim W5TIT

Yep. I'm a winner today.

DICK and Alec Baldwin have apparently made a lasting relationship.

Not that Dave has noticed or would break his PCTA double standard to comment.

He's too busy tuning 6M.

897. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 20:30:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303151230.57d266f9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63084

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<31D97BFC6FA4060F.E29B5CD8550D8AE1.1FCEF492B4C5F036@lp.airnews.net>...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030314222509.01930.00001144@mb-mq.aol.com...
> > In article
> <6C1487A2351CBDA8.321BE4BCB2F65A88.620099A7F066F4A6@lp.airnews.net>,
> > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >
> > >
> > >Well, the bandplans are supported by the FCC. Not a good way to explain
> > >that, but it's the closest I can come right now. And, isn't a good idea
> to
> > >include those items that are considered "good operating practice" since
> that
> > >is a part of the spirit of amateur radio (in the Amateur Code).
> > >
> > >Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Kim:
> >
> > Is selecting a Vanity Call Sign that is demeaning to YL hams and incites
> > prurient interest something that is in "good amateur practice?"
> >
>
> Absolutely not. I don't know of anyone who's done that. Is acting the way
> you do in the spirit of good amateur practice?
>
> >
> > Is it in
> > the "spirit of amateur radio" and in keeping with the Amateur Code? If
> > you say "yes" to any of the above, then get 25 other licensed hams
> > to agree with you, have them post their agreement in this newsgroup,
> > identified by name and call sign, and I'll never make another posting
> > about your call sign. None of them can be current regular participants
> > in this newsgroup.
> >
>
> Well, let's see. First, how could anyone say "yes" to the above? I don't
> know of anyone who'd agree that selecting a Vanity Call Sign that's
> "demeaning to YL hams and incites prurient interest" would be good amateur
> practice. Nor, do I know anyone who's done so. Secondly, why would your
> statement "and I'll never make another posting about your callsign" be
> something that interests me, Larry? Or, were you directing that to me?
> You're free to post anything you wish and as much as you wish about my

> callsign--or anyone else's for that matter. Why would you think otherwise?
>
> >
> > Failure to meet the above standard of proof will be construed that even
> > YOU don't think you made the proper choice of call sign, since you won't
> > take action to defend it.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
> Well, whatever. Like I said above, you live in a free country, Larry. You
> think however it is you wish to think--about anything you wish. Is it that
> I respond to you that you think your statements about my callsign bug me?
> OK, I'll stop responding.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Larry's been acting this way ever since you posted that you had an
XOM. He needs to go back to the Russian Personals and find another
Natasha.

898. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 20:33:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303151233.b2b0544@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63085

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030314222510.01930.00001145@mb-mq.aol.com>...
> In article <D77EDF047E195FE9.757E4E8C906841F5.C982DBDB624EB189@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> You obviously do not possess the intellectual or emotional maturity
> >> necessary to have whatever you say taken seriously. Therefore,
> >> your continued participation in this newsgroup will serve only to act
> >> as an annoyance to your intellectual and moral superiors.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >You're cracking me up...ROFLMAO
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Ah, the classic Kim Walker response! Some things never change --
> even if they *should* be changing for the better.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Why should they be changing for the better? You've predicted here for
the past 8+ years that the sky was falling on amateur radio.

Maybe Kim could upgrade and get W5TI, but no, that's already taken.

899. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 20:52:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303151252.4c1c9db1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63086

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
>
> >> >Someone who can send and receive morse at five words per minute is on
> >> >the low end of mediocrity.
> >>
> >> I disagree!
> >>
> >> Someone who can send and receive morse at no more than five words per
> >> minute
> >> has some basic Morse code skills. Such a person is not proficient - yet.
> >
> >Even if sending and receiving are 100% accurate, and the desired
> >message gets through, you would classify the operator as less than
> >proficient?
>
> If 5 wpm is the maximum Morse speed a person can do, regardless of
> circumstances, I would not call that person "proficient".
>
> Was that not clear from what I wrote?
>
> It's not a put-down to describe such skills as entry-level.

Modern day reenactors enjoy jousting, and though if they were pitted
against actual middle age knights, they would become dog food. Is it
really necessary to to walk up and down an SCA event, blow trumpets,
and tell everyone there that they are not proficient and are merely
entry level?

Of course none would be insulted and heartily agree that they don't
have a clue.

Meanwhile, Western Union no longer uses the telegraph. The US Army
Signal Corps no longer uses the telegraph. The Union Pacific Railroad
no longer uses the telegraph.

That a few amateurs still enjoy it is wunnerful. And telling
newcomers that 5wpm isn't proficient will ensure that you bury the

code forever. Keep it light cause it ain't going anywhere.

> The Morse test only requires either one solid minute out of five or correct
> answers to seven of ten fill-in-the-blank questions. Nowhere near perfect copy
> is required to pass.
> >
> >> And the sending test disappeared in the USA about 20 years ago.
> >
> >For all Morse exams regardless of speed, not just the 5wpm exam.
>
> Was that not clear from what I wrote?

No. You weren't specific.

> >> The stated goal was elimination of the Morse proficiency test. That's been
> >> accomplished in the USA, because the remaining test is a basic skill test,
> >> not a proficiency test.
> >
> >Really?
>
> Yes, really.

I don't see that in Part 97. Could you direct me to the right spot?

> >Is that in Part 97? All of Title 34?
>
> You tell me where the term "Morse proficiency" appears in those documents.

It would be better if you told me. You after all, are the Amateur
Extra, and I the mere General.

I'll fall to my knees and worship your God if you can produce it.

> >The rules don't even define what Morse Code is, let alone what are
> >basic skills or proficiency.
>
> Because such definitions are so self-evident as to be unnecessary.

That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.

Brian

900. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 20:55:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303151255.1f2bc40d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63087

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E6A42AA.BF87F867@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6580E1.83D5D4B3@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > Get back to me if you have anything useful.
> > >
> > > How would you recognize it? Your failure to read carefully has you
> > > dangling once again.
> >
> > I said, "Get back to me if you have anything useful."
>
> Useful? most of us thought that a full-access ham radio license would be
> useful, despite
> being required to actually DO something to get it. Evidently you
> wouldn't recognize "useful".

Well, DICK, I recognize useless, and a guy who can't operate his radio
away from the utility mains has got his picture all over it.

Get a battery.

901. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 20:57:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303151257.67f7d3d6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63088

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E67E61C.94666CB6@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6580E1.83D5D4B3@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > Get back to me if you have anything useful.
> > >
> > > How would you recognize it? Your failure to read carefully has you
> > > dangling once again.
> >
> > I said, "Get back to me if you have anything useful."
>
> ...and I asked how you'd recognize something useful. I have all kinds
> of useful information. Get back to me when you've found a way to
> process it.
>
> Dave K8MN

Cool, how do I go about working Frenchmen out of band on 6M?

902. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 20:59:40 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303151259.11b5123e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63089

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E659C2D.E9CF09DD@att.net>...

> Seems clear to all interested observers (the few that there are) that Slim doesn't ever bother
> to think at all.

It is clear that you are DICK.

903. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-15 23:11:44 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA991D5F.13174%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63090
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mike Herry's" wrote:

> Now, everyone together: BWAHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHH!!!!!
> BWAHHHHHHHHHHHHHH
> BWAHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHH

What's wrong, Mike? Couldn't dispute the facts presented?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

904. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 00:07:20 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b50f7q$p93$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63091
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Guess thats the internet version of a jamming tape, eh?

Just about as smart.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA991D5F.13174%stewart@say.net...
> "Mike Herry's" wrote:
>
> > Now, everyone together: BWAHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHH!!!!!
> > BWAHHHHHHHHHHHHHH
> > BWAHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHH
>
>
> What's wrong, Mike? Couldn't dispute the facts presented?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>
> ------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

905. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 00:38:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303151638.4f77338@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63092

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E735497.B878D89B@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > > You just don't have enough information to make a judgement. Get back to
> > > me when you have enough experience to make such a call.
>
> > No, Dave, that's not it. 0.02wpm sets a world record, and that's a fact.
>
> It certainly is. It is one which has nothing to do with the code
> proficiency of either ham.

You don't know the code proficiency of either ham. Yet you want to talk facts.

> > I can make just as many arbitrary claims as you can, re: 5wpm not proficient.
>
> The big difference I see between us is that I use pertinent facts to
> make a point while you misinterpret the facts you've seen. You still
> seem to confuse the words "proficient" and "efficient".

You confuse a world record set using Morse Code with "not proficient."

906. Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 00:41:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303151641.28eabfac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63093

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030315145729.11134.00000039@mb-mp.aol.com>...
> In article <20030315100338.12210.00000066@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steam
> Outadaears) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101
> >>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >>Date: 3/15/03 8:42 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303150642.68f4bf3@posting.google.com>
>
> >>Welp, Steve, the way some PCTA's talk, the code IS a matter national
> >>security. Be prepared to join your 8th hostile action in Japan.
> >>We've got to bring them around to your way of thinking.
> >
> > "(My) way of thinking", Brain?
> >
> > I've not stated how it SHOULD be... I have pointed out how it IS. Taht
> >Japan or anyone else should decide to not adhere to the letter of the law is
> >their business. I am not Japanese. I am American, and I expect MY country
> >to adhere to it's treaties and agreements it signs.
> >
> > Unless, of course, you can prove otherwise...?!?!
>
> "Arf, arf, arf" yipped the little doggie.
>
> The United States of America "put spin" on ITU-R S25.5 in making
> the "send by hand" optional and unneccessary for years. ITU-R
> S25.5 is very specific, "receive by ear and send by hand."
>
> "Taht" is what is written, little doggie.
>
> "Adherence" was broken. Try a better glue mighty macho morse-
> man. Lock and load, prepare to embark for foreign service to fight
> for the rights of all mighty macho morsemen and obeyance to the
> letter of "international law."
>
> Now get along, little doggie.

Yippie kay ay!

907. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 00:54:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E73CB2E.30922A91@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63094

Brian wrote:
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<FA2E6F19D71B8EFA.02253178E8F4FD15.578D7F18BCBC2C0A@lp.airnews.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0303140512.21f10847@posting.google.com...
> > > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> > news:<3E7155DF.52EF1E92@att.net>...
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > He needs a whole lot more thast just good luck.
> > >
> > > He who? You promised not to read anymore of my stuff, DICK.
> >
> > Wow, you won first place on the list today, Brian (first post listed). Oh,
> > did Dick make another promise to killfile someone then not? LOL
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Yep. I'm a winner today.
>
> DICK and Alec Baldwin have apparently made a lasting relationship.
>
> Not that Dave has noticed or would break his PCTA double standard to comment.
>
> He's too busy tuning 6M.

None but the clueless are busy tuning 6m these days.

Once again, Dick replied to one of my posts. You and Kim were caught up
in the heat of the chase. You goofed. There's my comment.

Dave K8MN

908. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 00:59:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E73CC76.F15539A7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63095

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E67E61C.94666CB6@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6580E1.83D5D4B3@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > > > Get back to me if you have anything useful.
> > > >
> > > > How would you recognize it? Your failure to read carefully has you
> > > > dangling once again.
> > >
> > > I said, "Get back to me if you have anything useful."
> >
> > ...and I asked how you'd recognize something useful. I have all kinds
> > of useful information. Get back to me when you've found a way to
> > process it.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Cool, how do I go about working Frenchmen out of band on 6M?

I don't see any indication that you've come up with a way to process the
information but here goes:

Write to the REF and see if you can set up a sked. You may have to wait
a while for 6m to open to Europe. Your alternative is to move to
Europe.

Dave K8MN

909. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 01:08:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E73CE56.C2F4CDDA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63096

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E735497.B878D89B@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > You just don't have enough information to make a judgement. Get back to
> > > > me when you have enough experience to make such a call.
> > >
> > > > No, Dave, that's not it. 0.02wpm sets a world record, and that's a fact.
> > >
> > It certainly is. It is one which has nothing to do with the code
> > proficiency of either ham.
>
> You don't know the code proficiency of either ham. Yet you want to talk facts.

Dig back in the thread a little, Brian. That's one of the points I
made--that we don't know the code proficiency of either ham. We don't
know that their maximum morse receiving speed is higher than .02 wpm. I
have an idea that it it. You seem to have made an assumption that it is
on the order of .02 wpm and then asked if that was "proficient". Such
comments just make you look like a dullard.

> > > I can make just as many arbitrary claims as you can, re: 5wpm not proficient.
> > >
> > The big difference I see between us is that I use pertinent facts to
> > make a point while you misinterpret the facts you've seen. You still
> > seem to confuse the words "proficient" and "efficient".
>
> You confuse a world record set using Morse Code with "not proficient."

That's completely untrue. I've never written anything to indicate
anything like it. It is likely another example of your poor (not
proficient) reading comprehension skills.

Dave K8MN

910. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 01:17:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E73D096.9511C46F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63097

Brian wrote:
>
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> > >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> > <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > >> writes:

> Meanwhile, Western Union no longer uses the telegraph. The US Army
> Signal Corps no longer uses the telegraph. The Union Pacific Railroad
> no longer uses the telegraph.

Amateur radio is not Western Union. Amateur radio is not the U.S. Army Signal Corps. Amateur radio is not the Union Pacific Railroad. The morse code is in wide use in amateur radio.

> That a few amateurs still enjoy it is wunnerful.

False premise. Not just a few radio amateurs use morse code. It is in widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.

> And telling
> newcomers that 5wpm isn't proficient will ensure that you bury the
> code forever. Keep it light cause it ain't going anywhere.

What newcomer is foolish enough to believe that morse at five words per minute makes him proficient? Wouldn't want to hurt anyone's self-esteem would we?

"I sweated that stupid morse code for three whole weeks until I could copy five words per minute. Now they tell me I'm not proficient. I quit!"

> That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
> Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.

False premise again. Amateur radio isn't Western Union. Amateur radio isn't the U.S. Army Signal Corps. Amateur radio isn't the U.S. Coast Guard. Amateur radio isn't the Union Pacific Railroad. Morse is in widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.

Dave K8MN

911. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 01:18:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E73D0F5.E2A7C862@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63098

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E735231.2BE70EBD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> So, it is only a Ham radio playground for contesting, etc.?
> > >
> > >I didn't write that. Part 97 will tell what amateur radio is. I am
> > >amazed that you actually obtained a license without finding out what
> > >amateur radio is.
>
> Incorrect. ARRL "tells what amateur radio is." Part 97, Title
> 47 Code of Federal Regulations, only codifies the regulations
> of the Federal Communications Commission in regard to USA
> amateur radio.

You've stated an incorrect false premise.

> US amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW.

You've stated an incorrect false premise.

> Try not to end a sentence with the word "is." That isn't
> proficient English. You have demonstrated bad proficiency
> at least twice in one message. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Leonard a lonely voice crying in the wilderness is.

Dave K8MN

912. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 01:53:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E73D8EC.EA910379@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63099

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <nQtca.7382$se1.4312179@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <Our Gal Flint> writes:
>

> >Although I've allowed myself to be drawn in from time to time, I shall
> >continue to resist the urge to respond to your nonsense.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...use of the word "nonsense" in the above sentence
> is clear personal loading of a statement to reflect your viewpoint.
> No telepathy necessary to "read" it in context.

I think that's why it was written, Len. It made clear her meaning so
that no one would have difficulty reading it in context.

> Since many cannot take strong opposition to their self-righteous
> opinions (such opposition is a "mistake" or "error"), at least one
> has come up with a standard boilerplate response for roaring
> back when all else fails:
>
> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> See how simple that is? No straining of originality neurons,
> no need to argue the substance of any subject, just reject an
> opposing opinion with a little rubber-stamp-like macro. :-)
>
> Just attack the messenger, not the substance of the message.
> "If thine eye offend thee, cast it out..."
>
> Beep, beep.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

It is concise. It describes, in one simple paragraph, your typical actions quite accurately and wraps them all up in a neat little package. It presents quite a dilemma for you. You dont' seem to be able to counter it without doing the things which the profile outlines. The profile hasn't been used instead of rebuttal to your "strong opinion" but rather as a follow on after you've used insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and/or infantile behavior. You generally do one or more of these things when it appears that YOU cannot take strong disagreement with your own self-righteous views.

You, aren't doing your "messenger" job when you resort to the things outlined in the profile. You are attacking others by means of the tactics N2EY's profile says you use. If you tire of seeing the profile, I can think of only one way for it to go away. That is for you to stop doing the things that it outlines.

Dave K8MN

913. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 02:08:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030315210827.23981.00000300@mb-fv.aol.com>
Source record: 63252

In article <3E73D096.9511C46F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
>> > In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
>> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> >
>> > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> > >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>> > >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> > <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> > >> writes:
>
>> Meanwhile, Western Union no longer uses the telegraph. The US Army
>> Signal Corps no longer uses the telegraph. The Union Pacific Railroad
>> no longer uses the telegraph.
>
>Amateur radio is not Western Union. Amateur radio is not the U.S. Army
>Signal Corps. Amateur radio is not the Union Pacific Railroad. The
>morse code is in wide use in amateur radio.

It is only second (according to league polling) on HF...voice modes
being in WIDER use on HF.

How much morse code is actually used above 30 MHz? :-)

>> That a few amateurs still enjoy it is wunnerful.
>
>False premise. Not just a few radio amateurs use morse code. It is in
>widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, FALSE colonel, FALSE.

Brian wrote "a few amateurs STILL ENJOY it..."

There's been no poll by anyone saying how many ENJOYED it.

>> And telling
>> newcomers that 5wpm isn't proficient will ensure that you bury the
>> code forever. Keep it light cause it ain't going anywhere.
>
>What newcomer is foolish enough to believe that morse at five words per
>minute makes him proficient? Wouldn't want to hurt anyone's self-esteem
>would we?

Oh, my no, Herr Robust. It is unthinkable to challenge the
mighty macho morsemen's self-esteem!

>"I sweated that stupid morse code for three whole weeks until I could
>copy five words per minute. Now they tell me I'm not proficient. I
>quit!"

Tsk, tsk, tsk...the truth comes out!

What is puzzling is why the colonel didn't turn in his license?

>> That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
>> Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.
>
>False premise again. Amateur radio isn't Western Union. Amateur radio
>isn't the U.S. Army Signal Corps. Amateur radio isn't the U.S. Coast
>Guard. Amateur radio isn't the Union Pacific Railroad. Morse is in
>widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.

Amateur radio isn't Citizens Band Radio Service.
Amateur radio isn't Mass Media Radio Service.
Amateur radio isn't Family Radio Service.
Amateur radio isn't Aviation Radio Service.
Amateur radio isn't Experimental Radio Service.
Amateur radio isn't Maritime Radio Services.
Amateur radio isn't the United States Navy.
Amateur radio isn't the United States Air Force.
Amateur radio isn't the United States Marine Corps.
Amateur radio isn't the Private Land Mobile Radio Service.
Amateur radio isn't professional anything. It is AMATEUR.

Amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW.

Amateur radio seems to be about emulating what was
done in the 1930s, complete with old standards and
practices, but with ready-built modern equipment that
no one knew about in the 1930s.

Beep, beep.

914. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 02:08:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030315210828.23981.00000301@mb-fv.aol.com>
Source record: 63100

In article <3E73D0F5.E2A7C862@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E735231.2BE70EBD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >> So, it is only a Ham radio playground for contesting, etc.?
>> >
>> >I didn't write that. Part 97 will tell what amateur radio is. I am
>> >amazed that you actually obtained a license without finding out what
>> >amateur radio is.
>>
>> Incorrect. ARRL "tells what amateur radio is." Part 97, Title
>> 47 Code of Federal Regulations, only codifies the regulations
>> of the Federal Communications Commission in regard to USA
>> amateur radio.
>
>You've stated an incorrect false premise.

Poor baby, can't understand either premises or promises or
much of anything else.

Title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, only states federal law
in regards to US amateur radio.

FCC does not support, encourage, or otherwise boost US
amateur radio. It only regulates US amateur radio. Tries to,
at any rate.

FCC is not a membership organization. It is, by law the only
US civil radio services' regulating agency.

FCC is not an academic institution. Its tests are not academic
tests, just tests to ascertain whether or not an examinee should
be granted legal permission to operate in a radio service.

American Radio Relay League is a membership organization.
It boosts, promotes, tries to encourage amateur radio in many
ways according to the wishes of its executives and board of
directors. ARRL defines US amateur radio.

>> US amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW.
>
>You've stated an incorrect false premise.

No again, Herr Robust. I've stated a de facto truism to nearly
every PCTA's self-righteous statements.

>> Try not to end a sentence with the word "is." That isn't
>> proficient English. You have demonstrated bad proficiency
>> at least twice in one message. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
>Leonard a lonely voice crying in the wilderness is.

Poor baby. Can't even be corrected on proper grammar,
syntax, or grade-school-level English. It must be the influence
of all his Hun Language studies.

Heil is something up with which we should not put. :-)

915. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 02:08:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030315210828.23981.00000302@mb-fv.aol.com>
Source record: 63251

In article <f45722ac.0303151230.57d266f9@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Well, whatever. Like I said above, you live in a free country, Larry. You
>> think however it is you wish to think--about anything you wish. Is it that
>> I respond to you that you think your statements about my callsign bug me?
>> OK, I'll stop responding.
>>
>> Kim W5TIT
>
>Larry's been acting this way ever since you posted that you had an
>XOM. He needs to go back to the Russian Personals and find another
>Natasha.

Would he know what to do with one? :-)

916. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 02:09:38 UTC
From: averyfineman@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030315210938.23981.00000303@mb-fv.aol.com>
Source record: 63254

In article <3E73D096.9511C46F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
>> > In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
>> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> >
>> > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> > >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>> > >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> > <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> > >> writes:
>
>> Meanwhile, Western Union no longer uses the telegraph. The US Army
>> Signal Corps no longer uses the telegraph. The Union Pacific Railroad
>> no longer uses the telegraph.
>
>Amateur radio is not Western Union. Amateur radio is not the U.S. Army
>Signal Corps. Amateur radio is not the Union Pacific Railroad. The
>morse code is in wide use in amateur radio.
>
>> That a few amateurs still enjoy it is wunnerful.
>
>False premise. Not just a few radio amateurs use morse code. It is in
>widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.
>
>> And telling
>> newcomers that 5wpm isn't proficient will ensure that you bury the
>> code forever. Keep it light cause it ain't going anywhere.
>
>What newcomer is foolish enough to believe that morse at five words per
>minute makes him proficient? Wouldn't want to hurt anyone's self-esteem
>would we?
>
>"I sweated that stupid morse code for three whole weeks until I could
>copy five words per minute. Now they tell me I'm not proficient. I
>quit!"
>
>> That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
>> Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.
>

>False premise again. Amateur radio isn't Western Union. Amateur radio
>isn't the U.S. Army Signal Corps. Amateur radio isn't the U.S. Coast
>Guard. Amateur radio isn't the Union Pacific Railroad. Morse is in
>widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.
>

917. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 02:09:39 UTC
From: averyfineman@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030315210939.23981.00000304@mb-fv.aol.com>
Source record: 63253

In article <3E73D0F5.E2A7C862@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E735231.2BE70EBD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >> So, it is only a Ham radio playground for contesting, etc.?
>> >
>> >I didn't write that. Part 97 will tell what amateur radio is. I am
>> >amazed that you actually obtained a license without finding out what
>> >amateur radio is.
>>
>> Incorrect. ARRL "tells what amateur radio is." Part 97, Title
>> 47 Code of Federal Regulations, only codifies the regulations
>> of the Federal Communications Commission in regard to USA
>> amateur radio.
>
>You've stated an incorrect false premise.
>
>> US amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW.
>
>You've stated an incorrect false premise.
>
>> Try not to end a sentence with the word "is." That isn't
>> proficient English. You have demonstrated bad proficiency
>> at least twice in one message. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
>Leonard a lonely voice crying in the wilderness is.

918. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 02:47:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030315214728.25801.00000360@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 63255

In article <3E6EC42A.27F1F85@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E6E24E4.98E81BE4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Someone who uses a morse code speed of .02 wpm may or may not be
>> >proficient at morse code. That would depend on the maximum speed at
>> >which he is capable.
>>
>> Dave,
>>
>> I don't think those hams are actually listening to the 136 kHz received
>> signals. Betcha both encoding and decoding are being done by computers.
>>
>> Then there's the matter of ID'ing every 10 minutes....
>
>I don't believe they're listening to the stuff either, Jim, but somehow
>we have at least two individuals here who both confuse the words
>"proficiency" and "efficiency" and who seem to believe these two guys
>are plodding along at .02 wpm as if that's the best they can do.

Maybe those two are just trying to "brown you off", Dave. Why bother with them?

It's obvious that the whole setup is semi-automated, with computers doing the
sending and receiving. Nothing wrong with that, of course, but in such a
situation there's no need for any code skill at either end of the circuit.

The ID thing is easily handled. At the very end of each dot or dash, the system
sends an ID in Morse at about 20 wpm. This would take about 3-5 seconds with
most callsigns, and would be ignored by the receiving setup.

73 de Jim, N2EY

919. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 03:15:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030315221539.22866.00000460@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 63258

In article <20030315210938.23981.00000303@mb-fv.aol.com>, averyfineman@aol.com (Len Anderson) xerocopied:

>In article <3E73D096.9511C46F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>writes:
>
>>Brian wrote:
>>>
>>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>>news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
>>> > In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
>>> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>> >
>>> > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>>> > >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>>> > >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>>> > <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>> > >> writes:
>>
>>> Meanwhile, Western Union no longer uses the telegraph. The US Army
>>> Signal Corps no longer uses the telegraph. The Union Pacific Railroad
>>> no longer uses the telegraph.
>>
>>Amateur radio is not Western Union. Amateur radio is not the U.S. Army
>>Signal Corps. Amateur radio is not the Union Pacific Railroad. The
>>morse code is in wide use in amateur radio.
>>
>>> That a few amateurs still enjoy it is wunnerful.
>>
>>False premise. Not just a few radio amateurs use morse code. It is in
>>widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.
>>
>>> And telling
>>> newcomers that 5wpm isn't proficient will ensure that you bury the
>>> code forever. Keep it light cause it ain't going anywhere.
>>
>>What newcomer is foolish enough to believe that morse at five words per
>>minute makes him proficient? Wouldn't want to hurt anyone's self-esteem
>>would we?
>>
>>"I sweated that stupid morse code for three whole weeks until I could
>>copy five words per minute. Now they tell me I'm not proficient. I
>>quit!"
>>

>>> That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
>>> Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.
>>
>>False premise again. Amateur radio isn't Western Union. Amateur radio
>>isn't the U.S. Army Signal Corps. Amateur radio isn't the U.S. Coast
>>Guard. Amateur radio isn't the Union Pacific Railroad. Morse is in
>>widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.

Ah yes, evacuate the premises! It's time to red-dog the SS
oberst!

Now what will you come up with, Yoda wannabe?

920. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 03:15:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030315221540.22866.00000461@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 63256

In article <20030315210939.23981.00000304@mb-fv.aol.com>, averyfineman@aol.com
(Avery Fineman) writes:

>In article <3E73D0F5.E2A7C862@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>writes:
>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>
>>> In article <3E735231.2BE70EBD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>> writes:
>>>
>>> >> So, it is only a Ham radio playground for contesting, etc.?
>>> >
>>> >I didn't write that. Part 97 will tell what amateur radio is. I am
>>> >amazed that you actually obtained a license without finding out what
>>> >amateur radio is.
>>>
>>> Incorrect. ARRL "tells what amateur radio is." Part 97, Title
>>> 47 Code of Federal Regulations, only codifies the regulations
>>> of the Federal Communications Commission in regard to USA
>>> amateur radio.
>>
>>You've stated an incorrect false premise.
>>
>>> US amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW.
>>
>>You've stated an incorrect false premise.
>>
>>> Try not to end a sentence with the word "is." That isn't
>>> proficient English. You have demonstrated bad proficiency
>>> at least twice in one message. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>>
>>Leonard a lonely voice crying in the wilderness is.

Goodie...now Herr Robust can play hall monitor some more
and do more character assassinations (two are better than
one). Go for it. Heil!

921. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 03:15:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030315221542.22866.00000462@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 63257

In article <3E73D8EC.EA910379@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <nQtca.7382$se1.4312179@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint"
>> <Our Gal Flint> writes:
>>
>
>> >Although I've allowed myself to be drawn in from time to time, I shall
>> >continue to resist the urge to respond to your nonsense.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...use of the word "nonsense" in the above sentence
>> is clear personal loading of a statement to reflect your viewpoint.
>> No telepathy necessary to "read" it in context.
>
>I think that's why it was written, Len. It made clear her meaning so
>that no one would have difficulty reading it in context.

I had no difficulty reading its content in context. Dee is a PCTA.
Dee echoes the propaganda mill at Newington. So do you.

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
>It is concise. It describes, in one simple paragraph, your typical
>actions quite accurately and wraps them all up in a neat little package.
>It presents quite a dilemma for you.

Not at all. A bit of time-wasting, but that is all. :-)

You want it repeated some more? No problem.

>You dont' seem to be able to
>counter it without doing the things which the profile outlines.

What is to counter? You want only to assassinate someone's
character if their opinion differs from yours. So does Reverend
Jim in some kind of odd parable to the newingtonians. :-)

Miccolis tried for some originality. Heil gets zero points for originality.

>The
>profile hasn't been used instead of rebuttal to your "strong opinion"
>but rather as a follow on after you've used insults, ridicule,
>name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and/or
>infantile behavior.

No problem. We all realize you can't address a subject without slamming someone's character who writes opposite to your views on the subject. "Character assassination" is the term. You aren't that good an assassin. Just an ass.

You've been outraged by lack of respect for morse code and rank in the US ARS ever since you tried to pull a snow job on the folks in here about "using CW for an orderwire on an RTTY radio circuit." You didn't realize there might be someone here who had worked professional comm before you did. You bluffed, got called, lost the pot. Ever since you've tried to deal from a marked deck.

>You generally do one or more of these things when
>it appears that YOU cannot take strong disagreement with your own
>self-righteous views.

:-) What "self-righteous views?"

Morse code is an obsolete mode of communications. It just isn't defunct yet. Every other radio service has either dropped it or never considered that mode to begin with. Yes, the amateur radio folks still use morse code and "ever other radio service" is definitely not amateur radio. Factual, not a personal opinion.

FCC does not demand morse code use by any US amateur, any band, any class license. FCC said 13 years ago in a public document that it doesn't consider a morse code test to be of value in that agency determining anyone for an amateur license. That's more facts, not my personal opinion.

Yet the FCC has test element 1 for morse code cognition because some die-hard zealots lobbied to keep it there. THEIR self-righteous opinions, not mine. My opinion is to remove the morse code test. It isn't needed, it isn't required by the only agency that grants US amateur radio licenses.

Is freedom from arbitrary laws and regulations "self-righteous?" You say so. Not many would agree with you. All you want, rather DEMAND is adherence to The LAW as it is. You don't want the law to change. With a code test removed, you would lose some of your status, rank, and privileges (real or imaginary) in the Ancient Radiotelegraphy Society. Just who is the "self-righteous" one now?

>You, aren't doing your "messenger" job when you resort to the things
>outlined in the profile. You are attacking others by means of the

>tactics N2EY's profile says you use. If you tire of seeing the profile,
>I can think of only one way for it to go away. That is for you to stop
>doing the things that it outlines.

Why should I want some individual's very biased pejorative
paragraph to "go away?" Here, I will repeat it -

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Use it as much as you want. I'll even copy it in other messages
to make sure that all can see it. No problem.

Gruss gott.

922. Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 05:06:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E740654.81C0B9A4@att.net>
Source record: 63259

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> >Subject: Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/15/03 8:42 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303150642.68f4bf3@posting.google.com>
>
> >Welp, Steve, the way some PCTA's talk, the code IS a matter national
> >security. Be prepared to join your 8th hostile action in Japan.
> >We've got to bring them around to your way of thinking.
>
> "(My) way of thinking", Brain?
>
> I've not stated how it SHOULD be... I have pointed out how it IS.

Ya gotta admit, Steve, your way of thinking is at *some* way, as opposed to Slim
who has
a real problem with thinking. The evidence shows up in his every post.
Unfortunatly in order
to avoid reading any of his I'd have to avoid most of those by everyone else too.

923. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 05:08:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7406CB.50B95A81@att.net>
Source record: 63260

Dave Heil wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E724A77.F48AF1E1@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E71E6E4.92385194@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70D928.5CEA29E7@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E70201C.D257E876@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > > > > > > You say that if the message is 100% copy every time at 5wpm, that is
not proficient.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > No, that is not what I wrote. Your reading comprehension sucks.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Decide to bypass this one in hopes that no one noticed?
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > All of Amateur Radio is about Fast CW on HF.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Is it? I operate SSB, FM and RTTY. I do some quite slow CW on 160m, 2m
> > > > > > > > > > > and 70cm. You're starting to sound like Mini-Len once again.
> > > >
> > > > > > > > > Good. How fast do you talk on FM? I'm going to judge if you are proficient.
> > > >
> > > > > > > > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
> > > >
> > > > > > > I've spoken to you on SSB, and you're not fast enough.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > I have documentation which proves that I talk fast enough to make three
> > > > > > hundred QSOs per hour on SSB. Your sampling just wasn't sufficient.
> > > > > >
> > > > > You're just not proficient. Sorry.
> > > > >
> > > > It would seem that you don't have enough information to make a sound

> > > > > judgement.
> > >
> > > > Someone had to make the call and I did. You're just not proficient.
> > >
> > > > Too bad.
> > >
> > > Facts don't lie, Brian. In the CQ Worldwide SSB DX Contest of '91, my
> > > average hourly rate (which includes time spent listening, sleeping,
> > > bathroom breaks, CQing and eating) was 135.43 QSOs per hour. My highest
> > > hourly rate was over 300 contacts per hour. My score, as published in
> > > CQ, put me in the top ten worldwide. I'm proficient in the use of morse;
> > > I'm proficient in speaking. Aside from morse code proficiency, one area
> > > in which you and I differ is that I'm also proficient in the
> > > comprehension of the written and spoken word.
> > >
> > > You just don't have enough information to make a judgement. Get back to
> > > me when you have enough experience to make such a call.
>
> > No, Dave, that's not it. 0.02wpm sets a world record, and that's a fact.
>
> It certainly is. It is one which has nothing to do with the code
> proficiency of either ham.
>
> > I can make just as many arbitrary claims as you can, re: 5wpm not proficient.
>
> The big difference I see between us is that I use pertinent facts to
> make a point while you misinterpret the facts you've seen. You still
> seem to confuse the words "proficient" and "efficient".
>
> > Sorry.
>
> No need to apologize. Just get your act together.

Never happen.To even suggest otherwise is futile.

924. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 05:15:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E740853.9150F905@att.net>
Source record: 63261

Dave Heil wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> >
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> > > In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> > > >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> > > <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > >> writes:
>
> > Meanwhile, Western Union no longer uses the telegraph. The US Army
> > Signal Corps no longer uses the telegraph. The Union Pacific Railroad
> > no longer uses the telegraph.
>
> Amateur radio is not Western Union. Amateur radio is not the U.S. Army
> Signal Corps. Amateur radio is not the Union Pacific Railroad. The
> morse code is in wide use in amateur radio.
>
> > That a few amateurs still enjoy it is wunnerful.
>
> False premise. Not just a few radio amateurs use morse code. It is in
> widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.
>
> > And telling
> > newcomers that 5wpm isn't proficient will ensure that you bury the
> > code forever. Keep it light cause it ain't going anywhere.
>
> What newcomer is foolish enough to believe that morse at five words per
> minute makes him proficient? Wouldn't want to hurt anyone's self-esteem
> would we?
>
> "I sweated that stupid morse code for three whole weeks until I could
> copy five words per minute. Now they tell me I'm not proficient. I
> quit!"
>
> > That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
> > Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.
>
> False premise again. Amateur radio isn't Western Union. Amateur radio

> isn't the U.S. Army Signal Corps. Amateur radio isn't the U.S. Coast
> Guard. Amateur radio isn't the Union Pacific Railroad. Morse is in
> widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave I admire your patience, truly equal that of Job himself, but it's all to no avail...
Beauty is only skin deep but ugly and stupid go all the way to the bone.....

925. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 06:33:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030316013334.12355.00000111@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63262

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/15/03 2:14 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303151214.7745e04a@posting.google.com>

>> First of all I am already in pretty good health. In as much as I had
>been
>> told on prior occassions that I would suffer permanent injury from
>accidents
>> serious acidents sustained, yet am at the level of functionality that I am
>at,
>> I would have to say that proper mental attitude contributed to my
>successful
>> recovery.
>
>Huh? Either people can think themselves well, or they can't. Which is it?

B r i a n,

I a m t y p i n g t h i s s l o w e r s o y o u h a v e a
c h a n c e t o b e t t e r u n d e r s t a n d i t.

P l e a s e p r o v i d e t h e p o s t w h e r e y o u t h i n
k t h a t I s a i d y o u c a n "t h i n k" y o u r s e l f w
e l l .

Now, was that too hard to understand, Your Iminent Putziness?

>> Again..I said contributed. As I did in the original post.
>
>Which is it?

You tell me, Your Lyingness. You are the one making an assertion that I
have said something other than what I have said.

>Steve, try to stay on topic.

Since you are the one who can't seem to stay focused, this is quite
humorous.

>Steve, do try to stay on topic.

Ditto.

>Steve, try to think yourself on topic. It just might happen.

Brian, try to provide the "evidence" that you've been asked to provide.

To fail to do so manisfests yourself as a liar.

Again.

Steve, K4YZ

926. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 06:36:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030316013633.12355.00000112@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63263

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/15/03 1:57 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030315145725.11134.00000037@mb-mp.aol.com>

>>Since you persist in jumping to conclusions that are not inherent in any of
>>my statements and then digress to unrelated material, it is meaningless to
>>even attempt to hold any conversation with you.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Public newsgroup messaging is not "conversation."
> Never was.

Sure it is. Not for YOU perhaps, but for the rest of us it is.

A conversation requires two willing participants. Since you are UNwilling
to consider any opinion other than your own, no conversation is possible.

Steve

927. Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 06:41:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030316014146.12355.00000113@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63264

>Subject: Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/15/03 1:57 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030315145729.11134.00000039@mb-mp.aol.com>
>
>In article <20030315100338.12210.00000066@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steam
>Outadaears) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101
>>>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>>Date: 3/15/03 8:42 AM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303150642.68f4bf3@posting.google.com>
>>
>>>Welp, Steve, the way some PCTA's talk, the code IS a matter national
>>>security. Be prepared to join your 8th hostile action in Japan.
>>>We've got to bring them around to your way of thinking.
>>
>> "(My) way of thinking", Brain?
>>
>> I've not stated how it SHOULD be... I have pointed out how it IS. Taht
>>Japan or anyone else should decide to not adhere to the letter of the law is
>>their business. I am not Japanese. I am American, and I expect MY country
>>to adhere to it's treaties and agreements it signs.
>>
>> Unless, of course, you can prove otherwise...?!?!
>
> "Arf, arf, arf" yipped the little doggie.

"Arf, arf, arf"...?!?! You went to college to learn to do this>

> The United States of America "put spin" on ITU-R S25.5 in making
> the "send by hand" optional and unneccessary for years. ITU-R
> S25.5 is very specific, "receive by ear and send by hand."

I agree. We should still be doing the sending test.

> "Taht" is what is written, little doggie.

Yep. It is. And I still disagree with the idea of simply ignoring our
written agreements.

I see YOU do, however. How socialist of you.

> "Adherence" was broken. Try a better glue mighty macho morse-
> man. Lock and load, prepare to embark for foreign service to fight
> for the rights of all mighty macho morsemen and obeyance to the

> letter of "international law."

You DO have a problem with obeying the law, don't you, Your Scumminess?

> Now get along, little doggie.

After you, Your Putziness.

Steve

928. Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 06:44:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030316014410.12355.00000114@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63265

>Subject: Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/15/03 2:20 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303151220.2ec72c5@posting.google.com>

>> I've not stated how it SHOULD be... I have pointed out how it IS.
>Taht
>> Japan or anyone else should decide to not adhere to the letter of the law
>is
>> their business. I am not Japanese. I am American, and I expect MY country
>to
>> adhere to it's treaties and agreements it signs.
>
>All of them or just the Morse Code traties?

Traties?

>Are you're prepared to go to war with Japan over Morse Code?

Are you? Who suggested such a foolish thing, Your Dingyness?

>Falkland Islands, SDI? Where were you?

Southern California. You?

929. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 06:56:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E742075.8E999470@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63266

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E73D096.9511C46F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> >> > In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
> >> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >> >
> >> > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >> > >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >> > >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> > <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> > >> writes:
> >
> >> Meanwhile, Western Union no longer uses the telegraph. The US Army
> >> Signal Corps no longer uses the telegraph. The Union Pacific Railroad
> >> no longer uses the telegraph.
> >
> >Amateur radio is not Western Union. Amateur radio is not the U.S. Army
> >Signal Corps. Amateur radio is not the Union Pacific Railroad. The
> >morse code is in wide use in amateur radio.
>
> It is only second (according to league polling) on HF...voice modes
> being in WIDER use on HF.
>
> How much morse code is actually used above 30 MHz? :-)

"Smiley" discounted. There's plenty of morse being used on VHF and UHF
by weak signal enthusiasts and satellite ops. Oh, I forgot--you're out
of the loop!

> >> That a few amateurs still enjoy it is wunnerful.
> >
> >False premise. Not just a few radio amateurs use morse code. It is in
> >widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, FALSE colonel, FALSE.
>
> Brian wrote "a few amateurs STILL ENJOY it..."
>
> There's been no poll by anyone saying how many ENJOYED it.

So it is your view that the thousands and thousands using morse code worldwide in amateur radio are not enjoying it? Is that about it? There's an amusing but moronic idea.

> >> And telling
> >> newcomers that 5wpm isn't proficient will ensure that you bury the
> >> code forever. Keep it light cause it ain't going anywhere.
> >
> >What newcomer is foolish enough to believe that morse at five words per
> >minute makes him proficient? Wouldn't want to hurt anyone's self-esteem
> >would we?
>
> Oh, my no, Herr Robust. It is unthinkable to challenge the
> mighty macho morsemen's self-esteem!

I'm not "Herr Robust" and I'm not challenging the self-esteem of anyone. I am ridiculing Brian's silly premise that 5 wpm beginners shouldn't be told that they aren't proficient in the use of morse because they'll get their feelings hurt.

> >"I sweated that stupid morse code for three whole weeks until I could
> >copy five words per minute. Now they tell me I'm not proficient. I
> >quit!"
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...the truth comes out!
>
> What is puzzling is why the colonel didn't turn in his license?

Did you think I was quoting myself? I gave you too much credit for "smarts".

> >> That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
> >> Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.
> >
> >False premise again. Amateur radio isn't Western Union. Amateur radio
> >isn't the U.S. Army Signal Corps. Amateur radio isn't the U.S. Coast
> >Guard. Amateur radio isn't the Union Pacific Railroad. Morse is in
> >widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.
>
> Amateur radio isn't Citizens Band Radio Service.
> Amateur radio isn't Mass Media Radio Service.
> Amateur radio isn't Family Radio Service.
> Amateur radio isn't Aviation Radio Service.
> Amateur radio isn't Experimental Radio Service.
> Amateur radio isn't Maritime Radio Services.
> Amateur radio isn't the United States Navy.
> Amateur radio isn't the United States Air Force.
> Amateur radio isn't the United States Marine Corps.
> Amateur radio isn't the Private Land Mobile Radio Service.
> Amateur radio isn't professional anything. It is AMATEUR.

That's exactly right. I think you've finally gotten it. It is AMATEUR and not professional. I am a radio amateur. You aren't a radio

amateur.

> Amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW.

So far, you and Mini-Len seem to be the only parties spouting this line.

> Amateur radio seems to be about emulating what was
> done in the 1930s, complete with old standards and
> practices, but with ready-built modern equipment that
> no one knew about in the 1930s.
>
> Beep, beep.

Don't let it get to you Foghorn. Hams use whatever mode they wish to.
You're still just a bystander.

Dave K8MN

930. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 07:04:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E74223B.CA1DAC9A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63267

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E73D0F5.E2A7C862@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E735231.2BE70EBD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >> So, it is only a Ham radio playground for contesting, etc.?
> >> >
> >> >I didn't write that. Part 97 will tell what amateur radio is. I am
> >> >amazed that you actually obtained a license without finding out what
> >> >amateur radio is.
> >>
> >> Incorrect. ARRL "tells what amateur radio is." Part 97, Title
> >> 47 Code of Federal Regulations, only codifies the regulations
> >> of the Federal Communications Commission in regard to USA
> >> amateur radio.
> >
> >You've stated an incorrect false premise.
>
> Poor baby, can't understand either premises or promises or
> much of anything else.

Poor old Leonard. Tsk, tsk tsk. I understood your premise and pointed
out that it is faulty.

> Title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, only states federal law
> in regards to US amateur radio.
>
> FCC does not support, encourage, or otherwise boost US
> amateur radio. It only regulates US amateur radio. Tries to,
> at any rate.

Doesn't support? It issues licenses. It provides regulations which
outlines what amateur radio is and which tells all who read those regs
what hams are permitted to do and what they are not permitted to do.

> FCC is not a membership organization. It is, by law the only
> US civil radio services' regulating agency.

I looked through what I'd written. There was no claim that the FCC was
a membership organization.

> FCC is not an academic institution. Its tests are not academic
> tests, just tests to ascertain whether or not an examinee should
> be granted legal permission to operate in a radio service.

I looked through what I'd written. There was no claim that the FCC is
an academic institution.

> American Radio Relay League is a membership organization.
> It boosts, promotes, tries to encourage amateur radio in many
> ways according to the wishes of its executives and board of
> directors. ARRL defines US amateur radio.

I looked through what I'd written. There was nothing about the ARRL at
all. The ARRL certainly does not define amateur radio.

>
> >> US amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW.
> >
> >You've stated an incorrect false premise.
>
> No again, Herr Robust. I've stated a de facto truism to nearly
> every PCTA's self-righteous statements.

You are again mistaken. You and Mini-Len are the only folks I see
making such a claim.

> >> Try not to end a sentence with the word "is." That isn't
> >> proficient English. You have demonstrated bad proficiency
> >> at least twice in one message. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
> >
> >Leonard a lonely voice crying in the wilderness is.
>
> Poor baby. Can't even be corrected on proper grammar,
> syntax, or grade-school-level English. It must be the influence
> of all his Hun Language studies.

Even your correction was in error, LeonardoOverSeventy.

> Heil is something up with which we should not put. :-)

You have a mouse in your pocket?

Dave K8MN

931. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 07:06:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7422E1.C05DE7BB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63268

```
Avery Fineman wrote:
>
> In article <3E73D0F5.E2A7C862@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E735231.2BE70EBD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >> So, it is only a Ham radio playground for contesting, etc.?
> >> >
> >> >I didn't write that. Part 97 will tell what amateur radio is. I am
> >> >amazed that you actually obtained a license without finding out what
> >> >amateur radio is.
> >>
> >> Incorrect. ARRL "tells what amateur radio is." Part 97, Title
> >> 47 Code of Federal Regulations, only codifies the regulations
> >> of the Federal Communications Commission in regard to USA
> >> amateur radio.
> >
> >You've stated an incorrect false premise.
> >
> >> US amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW.
> >
> >You've stated an incorrect false premise.
> >
> >> Try not to end a sentence with the word "is." That isn't
> >> proficient English. You have demonstrated bad proficiency
> >> at least twice in one message. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
> >
> >Leonard a lonely voice crying in the wilderness is.

You seem to have a hiccup in your reperf machine, AveryOver70.

Dave K8MN
```

932. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 07:15:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E74250F.A4DDB399@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63269

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030315210938.23981.00000303@mb-fv.aol.com>, averyfineman@aol.com
> (Len Anderson) xerocopied:
>
> >In article <3E73D096.9511C46F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >writes:
> >
> >>Brian wrote:
> >>>
> >>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >>news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> >>> > In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
> >>> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >>> >
> >>> > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >>> > >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >>> > >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >>> > <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >>> > >> writes:
> >>
> >>> Meanwhile, Western Union no longer uses the telegraph. The US Army
> >>> Signal Corps no longer uses the telegraph. The Union Pacific Railroad
> >>> no longer uses the telegraph.
> >>
> >>Amateur radio is not Western Union. Amateur radio is not the U.S. Army
> >>Signal Corps. Amateur radio is not the Union Pacific Railroad. The
> >>morse code is in wide use in amateur radio.
> >>
> >>> That a few amateurs still enjoy it is wunnerful.
> >>
> >>False premise. Not just a few radio amateurs use morse code. It is in
> >>widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.
> >>
> >>> And telling
> >>> newcomers that 5wpm isn't proficient will ensure that you bury the
> >>> code forever. Keep it light cause it ain't going anywhere.
> >>
> >>What newcomer is foolish enough to believe that morse at five words per
> >>minute makes him proficient? Wouldn't want to hurt anyone's self-esteem
> >>would we?
> >>
> >>"I sweated that stupid morse code for three whole weeks until I could
> >>copy five words per minute. Now they tell me I'm not proficient. I

> >>quit!"
> >>
> >>> That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
> >>> Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.
> >>
> >>False premise again. Amateur radio isn't Western Union. Amateur radio
> >>isn't the U.S. Army Signal Corps. Amateur radio isn't the U.S. Coast
> >>Guard. Amateur radio isn't the Union Pacific Railroad. Morse is in
> >>widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.
>
> Ah yes, evacuate the premises! It's time to red-dog the SS
> oberst!
>
> Now what will you come up with, Yoda wannabe?

Looks like you've had an accident in the comm center, old timer. Your Avery Labels persona tangled with LenOver70 and spilled a few non responses. Come to think of it, that's not necessarily a bad thing.

Dave K8MN

933. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 07:18:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7425B5.14436899@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63270

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030315210939.23981.00000304@mb-fv.aol.com>, averyfineman@aol.com
> (Avery Fineman) writes:
>
> >In article <3E73D0F5.E2A7C862@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >writes:
> >
> >>Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>>
> >>> In article <3E735231.2BE70EBD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >>> writes:
> >>>
> >>> >> So, it is only a Ham radio playground for contesting, etc.?
> >>> >
> >>> >I didn't write that. Part 97 will tell what amateur radio is. I am
> >>> >amazed that you actually obtained a license without finding out what
> >>> >amateur radio is.
> >>>
> >>> Incorrect. ARRL "tells what amateur radio is." Part 97, Title
> >>> 47 Code of Federal Regulations, only codifies the regulations
> >>> of the Federal Communications Commission in regard to USA
> >>> amateur radio.
> >>
> >>You've stated an incorrect false premise.
> >>
> >>> US amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW.
> >>
> >>You've stated an incorrect false premise.
> >>
> >>> Try not to end a sentence with the word "is." That isn't
> >>> proficient English. You have demonstrated bad proficiency
> >>> at least twice in one message. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
> >>
> >>Leonard a lonely voice crying in the wilderness is.
>
> Goodie...now Herr Robust can play hall monitor some more
> and do more character assassinations (two are better than
> one). Go for it. Heil!

I guess two are better than one, LenOver/Avery. Which one of your
characters has been assassinated?

Dave K8MN

934. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 08:02:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E742F71.9D34A08A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63271

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E73D8EC.EA910379@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <nQtca.7382$se1.4312179@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> >Flint"
> >> <Our Gal Flint> writes:
> >>
> >>
> >> >Although I've allowed myself to be drawn in from time to time, I shall
> >> >continue to resist the urge to respond to your nonsense.
> >>
> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk...use of the word "nonsense" in the above sentence
> >> is clear personal loading of a statement to reflect your viewpoint.
> >> No telepathy necessary to "read" it in context.
> >
> >I think that's why it was written, Len. It made clear her meaning so
> >that no one would have difficulty reading it in context.
>
> I had no difficulty reading its content in context. Dee is a PCTA.
> Dee echoes the propaganda mill at Newington. So do you.

What of the high regard in which you hold the ARRL? You've touted that
several times. Eventually, the real Leonard H. comes out, huh?

> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
> >
> >It is concise. It describes, in one simple paragraph, your typical
> >actions quite accurately and wraps them all up in a neat little package.
> >It presents quite a dilemma for you.
>
> Not at all. A bit of time-wasting, but that is all. :-)

Yes. All. It isn't wasting my time. It isn't wasting your time. Whose
time is being wasted?

> You want it repeated some more? No problem.

If you'd like to help, be my guest.

> >You dont' seem to be able to
> >counter it without doing the things which the profile outlines.
>
> What is to counter? You want only to assassinate someone's
> character if their opinion differs from yours. So does Reverend
> Jim in some kind of odd parable to the newingtonians. :-)

Your character can't be assassinated if you actually do the things described in the profile. Oh baby, you actually do the things. That's what is to counter and that's what you can't do.

> Miccolis tried for some originality. Heil gets zero points for
> originality.

Since I'm not claiming originality and since I'm clearly quoting N2EY, the point you thought you had is meaningless.

> >The
> >profile hasn't been used instead of rebuttal to your "strong opinion"
> >but rather as a follow on after you've used insults, ridicule,
> >name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and/or
> >infantile behavior.
>
> No problem. We all realize you can't address a subject without
> slamming someone's character who writes opposite to your
> views on the subject. "Character assassination" is the term.
> You aren't that good an assassin. Just an ass.

When you comment to me, do you use terms descriptive of the German military? Have you used references to Nazis? Have you attempted to belittle my job? my foreign service postings? Have you written in response to my comment that I'd done Radio/TV news releases something about a rear echelon clerk job? Have you written similar things about the jobs of others posting here? Have you written things like, "HF Amateur radio is all about chasing DX on CW" when nobody has made a statement like that? Are those who disagree with you treated to "Tsk, tsk, tsk", "poor baby", "Pedantic Parson", "Reverend Jim" and the like? Then you have no character to assassinate. You actually do the things outlined in the N2EY profile. Your words are there. That the profile causes you discomfort doesn't bother me. In time, you may learn to live with the rotting albatross of the profile hanging around your neck.

> You've been outraged by lack of respect for morse code and rank
> in the US ARS ever since you tried to pull a snow job on the folks
> in here about "using CW for an orderwire on an RTTY radio circuit."

There you go again. I'm not outraged. I've not attempted ever to pull a snow job. You don't know amateur radio and you know even less about the Department of State. You've proven it several times.

> You didn't realize there might be someone here who had worked
> professional comm before you did. You bluffed, got called, lost
> the pot. Ever since you've tried to deal from a marked deck.

I don't care what you've done, Len. The fact that you were on the planet first doesn't get you any points. The fact that you worked in communications doing something other than what I did doesn't get you any points. You didn't "call" me on anything because you have nothing with which to "call". For you to pretend that you know more about the job that I did than I can only be called stupid.

> >You generally do one or more of these things when
> >it appears that YOU cannot take strong disagreement with your own
> >self-righteous views.
>
> :-) What "self-righteous views?"

Why, YOUR self-righteous views. I find your view on morse testing to be self-righteous. I find your views on a minimum age for amateur radio licensing to be self-righteous. I'm able to do the same thing you are doing: Finding the views of those with whom you disagree to be self-righteous.

> Morse code is an obsolete mode of communications. It just isn't
> defunct yet. Every other radio service has either dropped it or
> never considered that mode to begin with. Yes, the amateur radio
> folks still use morse code and "ever other radio service" is
> definitely not amateur radio. Factual, not a personal opinion.

Amplitude modulation and SSSC are then obsolete modes of communication. They just aren't defunct yet.

> FCC does not demand morse code use by any US amateur, any
> band, any class license. FCC said 13 years ago in a public
> document that it doesn't consider a morse code test to be of value
> in that agency determining anyone for an amateur license. That's
> more facts, not my personal opinion.

Yet the FCC still requires that one pass a 5 wpm morse test for HF access. You know and I know that this will eventually disappear. You're one of the few still attempting to make an issue of it.

> Yet the FCC has test element 1 for morse code cognition because
> some die-hard zealots lobbied to keep it there.

That can only be considered a stupid statement.

> THEIR self-
> righteous opinions, not mine. My opinion is to remove the morse
> code test. It isn't needed, it isn't required by the only agency that
> grants US amateur radio licenses.

There you have it. You have a different opinion which I can only refer to as self-righteous.

> Is freedom from arbitrary laws and regulations "self-righteous?"

No, but your deciding what is arbitrary is self-righteous. My opinion
differs from yours.

> You say so. Not many would agree with you.

Show your work.

> All you want, rather
> DEMAND is adherence to The LAW as it is.

Hell, the FCC DEMANDS adherance to the LAW as it is. Are you advocating
civil disobedience? Go for it.

> You don't want the
> law to change.

No, I don't. But I'm not silly enough to believe that it isn't going to
change. You know that too but you're an impatient type.

> With a code test removed, you would lose some of
> your status, rank, and privileges (real or imaginary) in the
> Ancient Radiotelegraphy Society.

I don't lose anything. I'm still proficient in the use of morse code;
will still use morse code and any other mode permitted by regs, which
choose to use. You'll likely still be on the sidelines.

> Just who is the "self-righteous" one now?

My money is on the guy who uses terms like, "Ancient Radiotelegraphy
Society". That guy is pretty self-righteous.

> >You, aren't doing your "messenger" job when you resort to the things
> >outlined in the profile. You are attacking others by means of the
> >tactics N2EY's profile says you use. If you tire of seeing the profile,
> >I can think of only one way for it to go away. That is for you to stop
> >doing the things that it outlines.
>
> Why should I want some individual's very biased pejorative
> paragraph to "go away?" Here, I will repeat it -
>
> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Use it as much as you want. I'll even copy it in other messages
> to make sure that all can see it. No problem.
>
> Gruss gott.

See, you can't help yourself. Your makeup forces you to live up to the profile. There's one step you could take to avoid fulfilling the description of your likely actions...but you can't bring yourself to take that step.

Dave K8MN

935. Re: N5QXX/R: The New Orleans linked repeater that isn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 09:19:43 UTC
From: Leigh Marrin/KM6JE <leigh@coyote.rain.org>
Message-ID: <b51fjfdnh1@news.rain.org>
Source record: 63272
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,neworleans.general

In rec.radio.amateur.misc LRod <LRod@removethispartpobox.com> wrote:
> What did you do to get kicked out? Would you like some cheese
> with that whine?

What a friend we have in cheeses.

73. --Leigh Marrin/KM6JE [Ducking.]

936. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 13:22:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303160522.577c84a5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63273

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E73CE56.C2F4CDDA@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E735497.B878D89B@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > You just don't have enough information to make a judgement. Get back to
> > > > > me when you have enough experience to make such a call.
>
> > > > No, Dave, that's not it. 0.02wpm sets a world record, and that's a fact.
> > >
> > > It certainly is. It is one which has nothing to do with the code
> > > proficiency of either ham.
> >
> > You don't know the code proficiency of either ham. Yet you want to talk facts.
>
> Dig back in the thread a little, Brian. That's one of the points I
> made--that we don't know the code proficiency of either ham. We don't
> know that their maximum morse receiving speed is higher than .02 wpm. I
> have an idea that it it. You seem to have made an assumption that it is
> on the order of .02 wpm and then asked if that was "proficient". Such
> comments just make you look like a dullard.
>
> > > > I can make just as many arbitrary claims as you can, re: 5wpm not proficient.
> > >
> > > The big difference I see between us is that I use pertinent facts to
> > > make a point while you misinterpret the facts you've seen. You still
> > > seem to confuse the words "proficient" and "efficient".
> >
> > You confuse a world record set using Morse Code with "not proficient."
>
> That's completely untrue. I've never written anything to indicate
> anything like it. It is likely another example of your poor (not
> proficient) reading comprehension skills.

Doubtful. You still don't know if the record setters are proficient
with a demostrated "skill" of 0.02 wpm, but declare those with a
demonstrated skill of 5wpm as not proficient.

Then you confuse your record of entering a contest with with proof of
proficiency, but don't allow someone with 250 times the speed of a
world record to be considered proficient.

You're mixed up.

Best wishes, Brian

937. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 13:27:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030316082701.23139.00001320@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 63274

In article <f45722ac.0303151252.4c1c9db1@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> writes:
>>
>> >> >Someone who can send and receive morse at five words per minute is on
>> >> >the low end of mediocrity.
>> >>
>> >> I disagree!
>> >>
>> >> Someone who can send and receive morse at no more than five words per
>> >> minute
>> >> has some basic Morse code skills. Such a person is not proficient - yet.
>> >
>> >Even if sending and receiving are 100% accurate, and the desired
>> >message gets through, you would classify the operator as less than
>> >proficient?
>>
>> If 5 wpm is the maximum Morse speed a person can do, regardless of
>> circumstances, I would not call that person "proficient".
>>
>> Was that not clear from what I wrote?
>>
>> It's not a put-down to describe such skills as entry-level.
>
>Modern day reenactors enjoy jousting, and though if they were pitted
>against actual middle age knights, they would become dog food.

How do you know?

>Is it
>really necessary to to walk up and down an SCA event, blow trumpets,
>and tell everyone there that they are not proficient and are merely
>entry level?
>
Amateur radio is not a reenactment of anything. Your analogy simply doesn't

work.

It is simply an honest statement of fact to say that a person whose Morse skills are limited to 5 wpm has entry-level skills and is not proficient at Morse code.

I don't know any reasonable person whose Morse skills are limited to 5 wpm who is offended by that description.

>Of course none would be insulted and heartily agree that they don't
>have a clue.

Your analogy simply doesn't work.
>
>Meanwhile, Western Union no longer uses the telegraph.

So? Amateur radio isn't Western Union.

>The US Army
>Signal Corps no longer uses the telegraph.

So? Amateur radio isn't the US Army Signal Corps

>The Union Pacific Railroad no longer uses the telegraph.

So? Amateur radio isn't the Union Pacific Railroad.
>
>That a few amateurs still enjoy it is wunnerful.

More than "a few". Do you ever actually listen to the amateur bands, particularly the non-voice HF/MF amateur bands, Brian? Lots of radio amateurs using RADIOtelegraphy. Right now, today.

> And telling
>newcomers that 5wpm isn't proficient will ensure that you bury the
>code forever.

Nonsense. Telling folks with entry-level skills that they are 'proficient' is patronizing and insults their intelligent. It's a form of lying. I respect those folks too much to do that sort of thing.

> Keep it light cause it ain't going anywhere.
>
What "isn't going anywhere"?

>> The Morse test only requires either one solid minute out of five or correct
>> answers to seven of ten fill-in-the-blank questions. Nowhere near perfect
>> copy is required to pass.

And that's a fact.

>> >> The stated goal was elimination of the Morse proficiency test. That's
>> >> been
>> >> accomplished in the USA, because the remaining test is a basic skill
>> >> test,

>> >> not a proficiency test.
>> >
>> >Really?
>>
>> Yes, really.
>
>I don't see that in Part 97. Could you direct me to the right spot?

No.
>
>> >Is that in Part 97? All of Title 34?
>>
>> You tell me where the term "Morse proficiency" appears in those documents.
>
>It would be better if you told me. You after all, are the Amateur
>Extra, and I the mere General.

You're the one asking the question. Do some research. Part 97 is available on
line. You obviously have more time than me. Go for it.
>
>> >The rules don't even define what Morse Code is, let alone what are
>> >basic skills or proficiency.
>>
>> Because such definitions are so self-evident as to be unnecessary.
>
>That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
>Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.

Nonsense.

But your statement shows us that it isn't just the all Morse code TESTING that
you want to eliminate, but all Morse code USE.

Do Western Union, the US Army Signal Corps or the UPRR use SSB? AM? Baudot
RTTY? Are those modes "obsolete"?

Or are you simply trying to "brown people off"?

Jim, N2EY

938. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 13:28:48 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303160528.4e66f084@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63275

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E73D096.9511C46F@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> > > In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> > > >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > >> writes:
>
> > Meanwhile, Western Union no longer uses the telegraph. The US Army
> > Signal Corps no longer uses the telegraph. The Union Pacific Railroad
> > no longer uses the telegraph.
>
> Amateur radio is not Western Union. Amateur radio is not the U.S. Army
> Signal Corps. Amateur radio is not the Union Pacific Railroad. The
> morse code is in wide use in amateur radio.

Telegraph operators are telegraph operators.

> > That a few amateurs still enjoy it is wunnerful.
>
> False premise. Not just a few radio amateurs use morse code. It is in
> widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.

True premise. Of all the telegraph operators of yore, a few amateurs
are still using it.

> > And telling
> > newcomers that 5wpm isn't proficient will ensure that you bury the
> > code forever. Keep it light cause it ain't going anywhere.
>
> What newcomer is foolish enough to believe that morse at five words per
> minute makes him proficient? Wouldn't want to hurt anyone's self-esteem
> would we?

Take it up with the FCC. I didn't settle on 5wpm as the exam speed.

> "I sweated that stupid morse code for three whole weeks until I could
> copy five words per minute. Now they tell me I'm not proficient. I
> quit!"

Suit yourself.

> > That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
> > Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.
>
> False premise again. Amateur radio isn't Western Union. Amateur radio
> isn't the U.S. Army Signal Corps. Amateur radio isn't the U.S. Coast
> Guard. Amateur radio isn't the Union Pacific Railroad. Morse is in
> widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.

Telegraph operators are telegraph operators. Of all the telegraph
operators of yore, a few amateurs are still using it.

There will be fewer still, tomorrow. Be sure to tell every newcomer
that they aren't proficient.

939. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 13:31:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303160531.27e2178a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63276

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030315210827.23981.00000300@mb-fv.aol.com>...
> In article <3E73D096.9511C46F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:

> >False premise again. Amateur radio isn't Western Union. Amateur radio
> >isn't the U.S. Army Signal Corps. Amateur radio isn't the U.S. Coast
> >Guard. Amateur radio isn't the Union Pacific Railroad. Morse is in
> >widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.
>
> Amateur radio isn't Citizens Band Radio Service.
> Amateur radio isn't Mass Media Radio Service.
> Amateur radio isn't Family Radio Service.
> Amateur radio isn't Aviation Radio Service.
> Amateur radio isn't Experimental Radio Service.
> Amateur radio isn't Maritime Radio Services.
> Amateur radio isn't the United States Navy.
> Amateur radio isn't the United States Air Force.
> Amateur radio isn't the United States Marine Corps.
> Amateur radio isn't the Private Land Mobile Radio Service.
> Amateur radio isn't professional anything. It is AMATEUR.
>
> Amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW.

FAST, PROFICIENT CW. Newcomers need not apply.

> Amateur radio seems to be about emulating what was
> done in the 1930s, complete with old standards and
> practices, but with ready-built modern equipment that
> no one knew about in the 1930s.
>
> Beep, beep.

didit

940. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 13:35:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303160535.1aaee353@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63277

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E73CC76.F15539A7@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E67E61C.94666CB6@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6580E1.83D5D4B3@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > > > Get back to me if you have anything useful.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > How would you recognize it? Your failure to read carefully has you
> > > > > > dangling once again.
> > > > >
> > > > > I said, "Get back to me if you have anything useful."
> > > >
> > > ...and I asked how you'd recognize something useful. I have all kinds
> > > of useful information. Get back to me when you've found a way to
> > > process it.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Cool, how do I go about working Frenchmen out of band on 6M?
>
> I don't see any indication that you've come up with a way to process the
> information but here goes:
>
> Write to the REF and see if you can set up a sked. You may have to wait
> a while for 6m to open to Europe. Your alternative is to move to
> Europe.
>
> Dave K8MN

And that's coming from someone who's done it! Whohooo!

No thanks, I'd prefer to work them in-band.

941. Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 13:39:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303160539.4ba6475d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63278

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030316014410.12355.00000114@mb-cs.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/15/03 2:20 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303151220.2ec72c5@posting.google.com>
>
> >> I've not stated how it SHOULD be... I have pointed out how it IS.
> Taht
> >> Japan or anyone else should decide to not adhere to the letter of the law
> is
> >> their business. I am not Japanese. I am American, and I expect MY country
> to
> >> adhere to it's treaties and agreements it signs.
> >
> >All of them or just the Morse Code traties?
>
> Traties?

Poor Steve, taking tricks from the Master. Pretends to trip over a
misspelled word and now claims a skinned knee.

Sue for damages!

> >Are you're prepared to go to war with Japan over Morse Code?
>
> Are you? Who suggested such a foolish thing, Your Dingyness?
>
> >Falkland Islands, SDI? Where were you?
>
> Southern California. You?

You obviously thought Argentina was a threat to the USA, or you would
have protested our aid to Britian, and lack of protection to another
treaty American State being attacked.

Definitely a PCTA double standard.

942. Atlanta Hamfest Yesterday

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 13:41:40 UTC
From: ProBroadcaster <FM@fmradiodial87.net>
Message-ID: <b51v08sss0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 63279

Drove down from Raleigh for the Atlanta Hamfest yesterday.
Am I missing something, or is our hobby taking a major shift?
Every imaginable piece of CB equipment for sale, plenty guys with
KF4 and KG4 call sign hats on but were talking about CB radio,
computer links, modified radios for CB, Famradio, MURS,
"opened up" business radios. Even saw a few people selling low
powered FM broadcast equipment, easy set up, no license required,
"broadcast" to your neighbors and friends. All sorts of high tech
communications gear, but where was just plain old ham radios?
Saw a small group gathering where two guys were screaming at
each other "you walk on me and bleed on me." Huh? What's
that all about? Saw one guy smoking a funny looking cigarette.
Another sipping from a paper bag. Ham Radio R.I.P.

Mike
Gen Mgr @ Raleigh FM (licensed) station.

943. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 13:44:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303160544.6d18fa4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63280

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030315210828.23981.00000302@mb-fv.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0303151230.57d266f9@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>
>
>
> >> Well, whatever. Like I said above, you live in a free country, Larry. You
> >> think however it is you wish to think--about anything you wish. Is it that
> >> I respond to you that you think your statements about my callsign bug me?
> >> OK, I'll stop responding.
> >>
> >> Kim W5TIT
> >
> >Larry's been acting this way ever since you posted that you had an
> >XOM. He needs to go back to the Russian Personals and find another
> >Natasha.
>
>
> Would he know what to do with one? :-)

I would hope so. What a miserable life if he didn't.

944. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 14:08:54 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <315B4A074526BD4C.F3BA0E6EEC17D676.5E0C0D81B5C62C55@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 63281

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0303151230.57d266f9@posting.google.com...
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<31D97BFC6FA4060F.E29B5CD8550D8AE1.1FCEF492B4C5F036@lp.airnews.net>...
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20030314222509.01930.00001144@mb-mq.aol.com...
> > > In article
> > <6C1487A2351CBDA8.321BE4BCB2F65A88.620099A7F066F4A6@lp.airnews.net>,
> > > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> > >
> > > >
> > > >Well, the bandplans are supported by the FCC. Not a good way to
explain
> > > >that, but it's the closest I can come right now. And, isn't a good
idea
> > to
> > > >include those items that are considered "good operating practice"
since
> > that
> > > >is a part of the spirit of amateur radio (in the Amateur Code).
> > > >
> > > >Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > > Kim:
> > >
> > > Is selecting a Vanity Call Sign that is demeaning to YL hams and
incites
> > > prurient interest something that is in "good amateur practice?"
> > >
> >
> > Absolutely not. I don't know of anyone who's done that. Is acting the
way
> > you do in the spirit of good amateur practice?
> >
> > >
> > > Is it in
> > > the "spirit of amateur radio" and in keeping with the Amateur Code?
If
> > > you say "yes" to any of the above, then get 25 other licensed hams
> > > to agree with you, have them post their agreement in this newsgroup,
> > > identified by name and call sign, and I'll never make another posting
> > > about your call sign. None of them can be current regular
participants
> > > in this newsgroup.

> > >
> >
> > Well, let's see. First, how could anyone say "yes" to the above? I
don't
> > know of anyone who'd agree that selecting a Vanity Call Sign that's
> > "demeaning to YL hams and incites prurient interest" would be good
amateur
> > practice. Nor, do I know anyone who's done so. Secondly, why would
your
> > statement "and I'll never make another posting about your callsign" be
> > something that interests me, Larry? Or, were you directing that to me?
> > You're free to post anything you wish and as much as you wish about my
> > callsign--or anyone else's for that matter. Why would you think
otherwise?
> >
> > >
> > > Failure to meet the above standard of proof will be construed that
even
> > > YOU don't think you made the proper choice of call sign, since you
won't
> > > take action to defend it.
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> >
> > Well, whatever. Like I said above, you live in a free country, Larry.
You
> > think however it is you wish to think--about anything you wish. Is it
that
> > I respond to you that you think your statements about my callsign bug
me?
> > OK, I'll stop responding.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Larry's been acting this way ever since you posted that you had an
> XOM. He needs to go back to the Russian Personals and find another
> Natasha.

heh heh, I've got two. But, I am very happily married now--to the best in
my opinion! And, I'm still great friends with my second OM and his wife!
In fact, my 2nd XOM was the photographer at my wedding to Cliff...LOL

Kim W5TIT

Kim W5TIT

945. Re: Larry on Larry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 15:27:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030316102709.25505.00000073@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 63282

>Subject: Larry on Larry
>From: O_Epstein@att.net (O. Epstein)
>Date: 3/16/03 3:43 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <b9c836fe.0303160143.5f2ae754@posting.google.com>

>Larry does...(SNIP)

>73 de Larry, WR2F
>President, Larry Roll Fan Club

Interesting that this anti-Larry Roll troll is signed by someone alleged
to be an Amateur Radio operator whose name is neither "Epstein" or "Larry".

What a scumbag.

Steve, K4YZ
Steven J Robeson, LPN

946. Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 15:32:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030316103254.25505.00000074@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 63283

>Subject: Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/16/03 7:39 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303160539.4ba6475d@posting.google.com>

>You obviously thought Argentina was a threat to the USA, or you would
>have protested our aid to Britian, and lack of protection to another
>treaty American State being attacked.

The Falkland Islands had been continuously inhabited by Subjects of the
British Crown for over a century. With the exception of a company of Royal
Marines, they were unarmed. They were attacked in force by the Armed Forces of
Argentina and the Argentine flag raised over them.

That the Argentines disputed this claim to the islands is evdent, but to
take them by force was also contrary to the UN and OAS charters.

That particular "American State" was, in that case, the aggressor.
Britain repatriated the islands by force when the Argentines refused to
withraw.

>Definitely a PCTA double standard

How?

947. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 15:38:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030316103822.25505.00000075@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 63284

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/16/03 7:41 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303160541.409220f4@posting.google.com>

>Steve, its time to put up or shut up. Your choice

OK, Your Lyingness. I choose "put up". Now, we will await your answer
that "put's up" the alleged post wherein you claim I said you can "think
yourself well".

Is Brain Burke going to "put up", or just keep on lying?

I expect he's going to keep on dodging the inevitible and keep on trying
to spin his way out of the corner he's backed himself into.

Take a hint from Lennie the Lame, Brain. Usually when he get's bcked into
corners he's stuck in, he "goes on vacation" or takes some othr "scheduled"
road trip with Mrs Lennie, only to reappear some weeks or months later.

Steve, K4YZ

948. Re: N5QXX/R: The New Orleans linked repeater that isn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 16:07:36 UTC
From: LRod@removethispartpobox.com
Message-ID: <3e749fd2.469057012@netnews.att.net>
Source record: 63285
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,neworleans.general

On Sun, 16 Mar 2003 09:19:43 +0000 (UTC), Leigh Marrin/KM6JE
<leigh@coyote.rain.org> wrote:

>In rec.radio.amateur.misc LRod <LRod@removethispartpobox.com> wrote:
>> What did you do to get kicked out? Would you like some cheese
>> with that whine?
>
>What a friend we have in cheeses.
>
>73. --Leigh Marrin/KM6JE [Ducking.]

No need to. The crossposting lowlife did a hit-and-run and won't be
back...even to fire another shot at me.

LRod

Master Woodbutcher and seasoned termite

Shamelessly whoring my website since 1999

http://www.woodbutcher.net

949. Re: Unattended Packet ok?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 16:09:04 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Ak1da.1608$Ad2.1326223@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 63286

"Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:n%uba.15950$gF3.1405781@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> "XYZ" <XYZ@microsoft.com> wrote
>
> :
> : If I want to help our local Fire/Rescue squad and install an APRS unit
in
> a
> : vehicle, is that legal? I understand it is as long as they are not able
> to
> : hook a computer to it and it is locked out from them doing anything.
> :
>
> Neat idea, but I think 97.109(e) rules it out.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB
> --
> I am not a communications lawyer, nor do I play one on TV.

But, Hans, did you stay at a Holiday Inn Express last night? 8-)

73,
Carl - wk3c

950. Re: Larry on Larry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 16:12:07 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <rn1da.1610$Ad2.1326826@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 63287

ROTFLMAO!!!!!!!!

Spot on!!!

Carl - wk3c

"O. Epstein" <O_Epstein@att.net> wrote in message
news:b9c836fe.0303160143.5f2ae754@posting.google.com...
> Larry does EVERYTHING better than everyone, don't you know that by
> now? He's a one-man army, the hero of heroes, and a legend in his own
> mind! I just hope I get a chance to meet him in person some day and
> see what he's really like! But for now, all I can do is read his
> posts here, where he graciously tells us of his overall superiority as
> a human being, ham radio operator, lover, etc. and just dream about
> being like Larry when I grow up!
>
> I think Steven Spielberg should do a film all about the adventures of
> Larry Roll. Larry could be played by Harrison Ford, his wife by Anne
> Archer. The screen play should be based on the upcoming novel by
> Tom Clancy entitled "Larry Roll...A Clear and Present Hero of the
> World!"
> I can't wait...it should be quite entertaining to see how normal,
> everyday people stumble around, trying to muddle through their
> pitifully
> dull lives somehow, while Larry Roll stands apart from them all,
> serving
> as the shining example of perfection for all to emulate.
>
> I think Larry should also have his own nationally syndicated radio
> talk
> show, just like Rush Limbaugh or G. Gordon Liddy. Instead of the
> "Excellence In Broadcasting Network" his show could run on the
> "Overwhelming Superiority in Broadcasting" network.
>
> Of course, Larry probably agrees with all of this. After all, a
> person
> with all of Larry's qualities has no need for false modesty. And,
> it's
> just as well...after all, how we know about all of Larry's fine
> qualities,
> and our own shortcomings, if he didn't tell us of them!
>
> Ah, yes...Larry Roll...the man, the myth, the legend! Larry Roll for
> President? Naw...that's too lowly an office for him. We need to
> think

> of something a lot better. Dictator? Chancellor? Fueher?
>
> Hey Larry...I know you're reading this...how about an autographed
> picture?
>
> 73 de Larry, WR2F
> President, Larry Roll Fan Club
>
> ... I am Roll of Borg...No Hams are good enough to be assimilated!

951. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 16:45:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030316114523.25154.00000811@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63288

In article <b4l7hh$d8u$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "me" <me@here.com> writes:

>Would you want to learn how to ride a horse?

Sure! Sounds like fun.

>Horseback riding was
>an early form of transportation. It is a tradition that was used for
>hundreds of years.

And it's still in use in some places.

>Wouldn't you want to keep up the tradition? Just think,
>you can brag to your friends that you can ride a horse. In an emergency, you
>and the Lone Ranger can ride for help. Everybody in the newsgroup would be
>impressed.

If you're looking for an analogy to the Morse code test, the horseback riding thing is not a good analogy. Try this one:

Once upon a time, practically all motor vehicles had manual transmissions of one type or another. Learning to use a clutch and gear shift was a big part of learning to drive.

Today, most (I read an estimate of 80%) passenger cars, minivans and light trucks on the road have automatic transmissions. I don't know of a single US state or commonwealth that requires manual transmission skill testing for an ordinary driver's license.

It's a good idea for all drivers to have manual transmission driving skills. But should such skills be mandated by law?

The current Morse test is akin to requiring all prospective drivers be able to drive across an empty parking lot with a manual-transmission car in first gear, starting and stopping without stalling the engine.

73 de Jim, N2EY

952. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 18:56:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E74C904.1ED72CF3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63289

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E73CE56.C2F4CDDA@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E735497.B878D89B@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > > > You just don't have enough information to make a judgement. Get back to
> > > > > > me when you have enough experience to make such a call.
> > >
> > > > > No, Dave, that's not it. 0.02wpm sets a world record, and that's a fact.
> > > > >
> > > > It certainly is. It is one which has nothing to do with the code
> > > > proficiency of either ham.
> > >
> > > You don't know the code proficiency of either ham. Yet you want to talk facts.
> >
> > Dig back in the thread a little, Brian. That's one of the points I
> > made--that we don't know the code proficiency of either ham. We don't
> > know that their maximum morse receiving speed is higher than .02 wpm. I
> > have an idea that it it. You seem to have made an assumption that it is
> > on the order of .02 wpm and then asked if that was "proficient". Such
> > comments just make you look like a dullard.
> >
> > > > > I can make just as many arbitrary claims as you can, re: 5wpm not proficient.
> > > > >
> > > > The big difference I see between us is that I use pertinent facts to
> > > > make a point while you misinterpret the facts you've seen. You still
> > > > seem to confuse the words "proficient" and "efficient".
> > >
> > > You confuse a world record set using Morse Code with "not proficient."
> >
> > That's completely untrue. I've never written anything to indicate
> > anything like it. It is likely another example of your poor (not
> > proficient) reading comprehension skills.
>
> Doubtful. You still don't know if the record setters are proficient
> with a demostrated "skill" of 0.02 wpm, but declare those with a
> demonstrated skill of 5wpm as not proficient.

There's no doubt at all, Brian. You're still plodding along, making the same mistakes. The fellows on 136 KHz were likely using computers to bring the signal above the noise. We don't know either fellow's top morse speed but can safely assume that it is well above .02 wpm and likely in excess of 5 wpm. As I've pointed out several times, w e d o n ' t k n o w i f t h e y a r e p r o f i c i e n t in the use of morse. Someone whose top speed is o n l y 5 wpm is not proficient in the use of morse.

> Then you confuse your record of entering a contest with with proof of
> proficiency, but don't allow someone with 250 times the speed of a
> world record to be considered proficient.

I'm not confused at all, Brian. The average man speaks at a rate of about 150 wpm. One would have to assume that the top ten contest scorers worldwide would have to be at least average speakers to beat the thousands of other entrants and the hundreds with similar equipment and antennas.

Your diddling about the world record on 136 KHz ignore the fact that the slow speed was of necessity and that the ops weren't even depending upon copy by ear. You'd also have us assume that .02 wpm is their top receiving speed. You're attempting a stretch and your arguments still sound absurd.

> You're mixed up.

Naw, that's still the mental fog in which you're operating. Maybe the fog will clear and you'll see the daylight.

Dave K8MN

953. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 19:15:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E74CD51.2C3658AB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63290

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E73D096.9511C46F@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
> > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > >
> > > > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > > >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> > > > >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> > <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > >> writes:
> > >
> > > Meanwhile, Western Union no longer uses the telegraph. The US Army
> > > Signal Corps no longer uses the telegraph. The Union Pacific Railroad
> > > no longer uses the telegraph.
> > >
> > Amateur radio is not Western Union. Amateur radio is not the U.S. Army
> > Signal Corps. Amateur radio is not the Union Pacific Railroad. The
> > morse code is in wide use in amateur radio.
>
> Telegraph operators are telegraph operators.

Fish are fish. To you, they must all look the same. Birds are birds. To
you, they must all look the same. Houses are houses. To you, they must
all look the same.

> > > That a few amateurs still enjoy it is wunnerful.
> >
> > False premise. Not just a few radio amateurs use morse code. It is in
> > widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.
>
> True premise. Of all the telegraph operators of yore, a few amateurs
> are still using it.

So you'd like to compare apples and oranges. Most hams who use morse
code have never been commercial telegraphers. They're content to use
morse on the ham bands. They enjoy using it. The mode is popular.
Thousands use it daily.

> > > And telling
> > > newcomers that 5wpm isn't proficient will ensure that you bury the
> > > code forever. Keep it light cause it ain't going anywhere.
> >
> > What newcomer is foolish enough to believe that morse at five words per
> > minute makes him proficient? Wouldn't want to hurt anyone's self-esteem
> > would we?
>
> Take it up with the FCC. I didn't settle on 5wpm as the exam speed.

It has nothing to do with the FCC. If the FCC mandated testing at 13
wpm, those who could do only 5 wpm would still not be considered
proficient.

> > "I sweated that stupid morse code for three whole weeks until I could
> > copy five words per minute. Now they tell me I'm not proficient. I
> > quit!"
>
> Suit yourself.

You, like Len, assumed that I wrote of myself. I passed all the exams
they gave, Brian--all of the written exams; all of the morse exams. I
didn't quit. I didn't say, "I can't". I didn't say that I'd wait until
they changed the rules to suit me.

> > > That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
> > > Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.
> >
> > False premise again. Amateur radio isn't Western Union. Amateur radio
> > isn't the U.S. Army Signal Corps. Amateur radio isn't the U.S. Coast
> > Guard. Amateur radio isn't the Union Pacific Railroad. Morse is in
> > widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.
>
> Telegraph operators are telegraph operators. Of all the telegraph
> operators of yore, a few amateurs are still using it.

That isn't correct. Thousands and thousands of radio amateurs are using
morse daily. The mode is the second most popular on HF.

> There will be fewer still, tomorrow.

That hasn't been demonstrated.

> Be sure to tell every newcomer
> that they aren't proficient.

I'm sure they already know it.

Dave K8MN

954. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 19:17:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E74CDC9.20FDD46B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63291

Brian wrote:
>
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030315210827.23981.00000300@mb-fv.aol.com>...

> > Amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW.
>
> FAST, PROFICIENT CW. Newcomers need not apply.

I'm happy that you two found each other. You'd have likely had an
otherwise lonely existence. One writes a falsehood and the other tops
it.

Dave K8MN

955. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 19:20:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E74CE70.C8EEC599@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63292

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E73CC76.F15539A7@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E67E61C.94666CB6@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6580E1.83D5D4B3@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > > > > > Get back to me if you have anything useful.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > How would you recognize it? Your failure to read carefully has you
> > > > > > > dangling once again.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I said, "Get back to me if you have anything useful."
> > > > >
> > > > ...and I asked how you'd recognize something useful. I have all kinds
> > > > of useful information. Get back to me when you've found a way to
> > > > process it.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Cool, how do I go about working Frenchmen out of band on 6M?
> >
> > I don't see any indication that you've come up with a way to process the
> > information but here goes:
> >
> > Write to the REF and see if you can set up a sked. You may have to wait
> > a while for 6m to open to Europe. Your alternative is to move to
> > Europe.

> And that's coming from someone who's done it! Whohooo!

That's coming from someone who offered you information.

> No thanks, I'd prefer to work them in-band.

That's what I did. I never strayed from my allocated band segment even
once. I'm curious though--why'd you ask if you had no intention of
following up?

How're you coming along with the answers to those questions about your T5 operation?

Dave K8MN

956. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 19:27:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030316142732.10890.00000275@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 63293

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of March 15, 2003:

Novice - 35,124 (decrease of 14,205)
Tech - 251,221 (increase of 45,827)
Tech Plus - 70,742 (decrease of 58,118)
General - 140,285 (increase of 27,608)
Advanced - 83,911 (decrease of 15,871)
Extra - 103,590 (increase of 24,840)
Total - 684,873 (increase of 10,081)

73 de Jim, N2EY

957. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 19:27:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030316142732.10890.00000274@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 63294

In article <f45722ac.0303160528.4e66f084@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E73D096.9511C46F@earthlink.net>...
>> Brian wrote:
>> >
>> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
>> > > In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
>> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> > >
>> > > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> > > >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>> > > >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> > > >> writes:
>> >
>> > Meanwhile, Western Union no longer uses the telegraph. The US Army
>> > Signal Corps no longer uses the telegraph. The Union Pacific Railroad
>> > no longer uses the telegraph.
>> >
>> Amateur radio is not Western Union. Amateur radio is not the U.S. Army
>> Signal Corps. Amateur radio is not the Union Pacific Railroad. The
>> morse code is in wide use in amateur radio.
>
>Telegraph operators are telegraph operators.

Radio amateurs are radiotelegraph operators. The land wire telegraph in North
America used a different code (sometimes referred to as "American Morse") and a
different receive interface (sounder clicks vs. tone).

>
>> > That a few amateurs still enjoy it is wunnerful.
>>
>> False premise. Not just a few radio amateurs use morse code. It is in
>> widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.
>
>True premise. Of all the telegraph operators of yore, a few amateurs
>are still using it.

How many is "a few"? There are more US hams today than even a few years ago,
and far more than in the 80s, 70s, 60s, 50s, etc. If only 1 in 10 US hams today
uses Morse code on the air, that's more hams than there were in the US before
WW2.

>> > That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
>> > Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.
>>
>> False premise again. Amateur radio isn't Western Union. Amateur radio
>> isn't the U.S. Army Signal Corps. Amateur radio isn't the U.S. Coast
>> Guard. Amateur radio isn't the Union Pacific Railroad. Morse is in
>> widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.
>
>Telegraph operators are telegraph operators. Of all the telegraph
>operators of yore, a few amateurs are still using it.

See above.
>
>There will be fewer still, tomorrow.

How do you know?

>Be sure to tell every newcomer that they aren't proficient.
>
Would you prefer we lie to them and patronize them, insulting their
intelligence?

When I was a 5 wpm beginner, if someone had told me I was "proficient", I'd
have thought they were either nuts or ignorant of what true Morse proficiency
is. Either way it would not have helped me.

Perhaps that's your goal.

Jim, N2EY

958. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 20:18:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030316151846.20123.00001026@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 63295

In article <20030316082701.23139.00001320@mb-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <f45722ac.0303151252.4c1c9db1@posting.google.com>,
>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>>news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
>>> In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
>>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>>
>>> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>>> >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>>> >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>>> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>> >> writes:
>>>
>>> >> >Someone who can send and receive morse at five words per minute is on
>>> >> >the low end of mediocrity.
>>> >>
>>> >> I disagree!
>>> >>
>>> >> Someone who can send and receive morse at no more than five words per
>>> >> minute
>>> >> has some basic Morse code skills. Such a person is not proficient -
>yet.
>>> >
>>> >Even if sending and receiving are 100% accurate, and the desired
>>> >message gets through, you would classify the operator as less than
>>> >proficient?
>>>
>>> If 5 wpm is the maximum Morse speed a person can do, regardless of
>>> circumstances, I would not call that person "proficient".
>>>
>>> Was that not clear from what I wrote?
>>>
>>> It's not a put-down to describe such skills as entry-level.
>>
>>Modern day reenactors enjoy jousting, and though if they were pitted
>>against actual middle age knights, they would become dog food.
>
>How do you know?

How can you disagree?

Are you a midieval knight?

Tilting at NCTA windmills does not a knight make.

>Amateur radio is not a reenactment of anything. Your analogy simply doesn't
>work.

Anceint Radiotelegraphy Society (ARS) is a reenactment of old
radio days over a half century in the past.

>It is simply an honest statement of fact to say that a person whose Morse
>skills are limited to 5 wpm has entry-level skills and is not proficient at
>Morse code.

FCC does not require proficiency in morse code. FCC rerquies
only a certain passing grade.

FCC does not require US amateurs to use morse code over and
above any other mode of communications. All allocated modes
are optional to use by US radio amateurs.

>I don't know any reasonable person whose Morse skills are limited to 5 wpm
>who is offended by that description.

Get out more.

>Your analogy simply doesn't work.

Your reply to Brian's message doesn't work.

>More than "a few". Do you ever actually listen to the amateur bands,
>particularly the non-voice HF/MF amateur bands, Brian? Lots of radio amateurs
>using RADIOtelegraphy. Right now, today.

Obtain a receiver capable of receiving non-morse communications.

>Nonsense. Telling folks with entry-level skills that they are 'proficient' is
>patronizing and insults their intelligent. It's a form of lying. I respect
>those folks too much to do that sort of thing.

FCC does not demand proficiency in morse code. FCC requires
only a minimum passing score.

You respect only those "folks" who love and respect morse code.

>What "isn't going anywhere"?

Your analogy that morse code testing is like driving a manual
transmission vehicle.

>And that's a fact.

FCC does not demand proficiency in morse code. FCC requires
only a minimum passing score.

If you agree with that, why belabor the obvious?

If you don't agree with that, you are ridiculing mortals who do not
love and respect morse code.

Which is it?

>You're the one asking the question. Do some research. Part 97 is available on
>line. You obviously have more time than me. Go for it.

You are acting the radio god again. You are irrational.

>>That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
>>Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.
>
>Nonsense.

Not "nonsense." Fact.

>But your statement shows us that it isn't just the all Morse code TESTING
>that you want to eliminate, but all Morse code USE.

Paranoia and fear shown to all. Irrational.

>Or are you simply trying to "brown people off"?

Only certain gods of radio. Gods of radio are superior to ordinary
mortals. Gods of radio are irrational.

Live with it, god of radio.

959. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 20:29:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030316152904.23139.00001337@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 63298

In article <20030316082701.23139.00001320@mb-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <f45722ac.0303151252.4c1c9db1@posting.google.com>,
>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>>news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
>>> In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
>>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>>
>>> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>>> >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>>> >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>>> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>> >> writes:
>>>
>>> >> >Someone who can send and receive morse at five words per minute is on
>>> >> >the low end of mediocrity.
>>> >>
>>> >> I disagree!
>>> >>
>>> >> Someone who can send and receive morse at no more than five words per
>>> >> minute
>>> >> has some basic Morse code skills. Such a person is not proficient -
>yet.
>>> >
>>> >Even if sending and receiving are 100% accurate, and the desired
>>> >message gets through, you would classify the operator as less than
>>> >proficient?
>>>
>>> If 5 wpm is the maximum Morse speed a person can do, regardless of
>>> circumstances, I would not call that person "proficient".
>>>
>>> Was that not clear from what I wrote?
>>>
>>> It's not a put-down to describe such skills as entry-level.
>>
>>Modern day reenactors enjoy jousting, and though if they were pitted
>>against actual middle age knights, they would become dog food.
>
>How do you know?

How can you disagree?

Are you a midieval knight?

Tilting at NCTA windmills does not a knight make.

>Amateur radio is not a reenactment of anything. Your analogy simply doesn't
>work.

Anceint Radiotelegraphy Society (ARS) is a reenactment of old
radio days over a half century in the past.

>It is simply an honest statement of fact to say that a person whose Morse
>skills are limited to 5 wpm has entry-level skills and is not proficient at
>Morse code.

FCC does not require proficiency in morse code. FCC rerquies
only a certain passing grade.

FCC does not require US amateurs to use morse code over and
above any other mode of communications. All allocated modes
are optional to use by US radio amateurs.

>I don't know any reasonable person whose Morse skills are limited to 5 wpm
>who is offended by that description.

Get out more.

>Your analogy simply doesn't work.

Your reply to Brian's message doesn't work.

>More than "a few". Do you ever actually listen to the amateur bands,
>particularly the non-voice HF/MF amateur bands, Brian? Lots of radio amateurs
>using RADIOtelegraphy. Right now, today.

Obtain a receiver capable of receiving non-morse communications.

>Nonsense. Telling folks with entry-level skills that they are 'proficient' is
>patronizing and insults their intelligent. It's a form of lying. I respect
>those folks too much to do that sort of thing.

FCC does not demand proficiency in morse code. FCC requires
only a minimum passing score.

You respect only those "folks" who love and respect morse code.

>What "isn't going anywhere"?

Your analogy that morse code testing is like driving a manual
transmission vehicle.

>And that's a fact.

FCC does not demand proficiency in morse code. FCC requires
only a minimum passing score.

If you agree with that, why belabor the obvious?

If you don't agree with that, you are ridiculing mortals who do not
love and respect morse code.

Which is it?

>You're the one asking the question. Do some research. Part 97 is available on
>line. You obviously have more time than me. Go for it.

You are acting the radio god again. You are irrational.

>>That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
>>Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.
>
>Nonsense.

Not "nonsense." Fact.

>But your statement shows us that it isn't just the all Morse code TESTING
>that you want to eliminate, but all Morse code USE.

Paranoia and fear shown to all. Irrational.

>Or are you simply trying to "brown people off"?

Only certain gods of radio. Gods of radio are superior to ordinary
mortals. Gods of radio are irrational.

Live with it, god of radio.

960. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 20:29:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030316152905.23139.00001338@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 63296

In article <3E74250F.A4DDB399@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20030315210938.23981.00000303@mb-fv.aol.com>,
>averyfineman@aol.com

>Looks like you've had an accident in the comm center, old timer. Your
>Avery Labels persona tangled with LenOver70 and spilled a few non
>responses. Come to think of it, that's not necessarily a bad thing.

No accident. Deliberate. It got an expected response.

That shows that radio gods love to ridicule ordinary mortals.
They are superior. They have self-appointed authority.

They are also irrational.

961. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 20:29:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030316152906.23139.00001339@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 63297

In article <3E742075.8E999470@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E73D096.9511C46F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Brian wrote:
>> >>
>> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
>> >> > In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
>> >> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> >> >
>> >> > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >> > >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>> >> > >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> >> > <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> > >> writes:

>"Smiley" discounted. There's plenty of morse being used on VHF and UHF
>by weak signal enthusiasts and satellite ops. Oh, I forgot--you're out
>of the loop!

You are irrational. You are angry.

Advocacy of elimination of code testing does not require licensing.

There is not secrecy in US amateur radio. Such is not allowed
by US law on US amateur radio.

>So it is your view that the thousands and thousands using morse code
>worldwide in amateur radio are not enjoying it? Is that about it?
>There's an amusing but moronic idea.

You are a god of radio and "superior." You are irrational.
You are angry. You attempt character assassination.

There has been no poll done on how many enjoy morse
code.

Morse code is not a required mode in US amateur radio use.
All modes are optional to use in US amateur radio law.

>I'm not "Herr Robust" and I'm not challenging the self-esteem of anyone.

Your own self-esteem is most important. You are a radio god.
You are "superior." You are irrational.

Your virtual prussian prune uniform fits badly. Get a tailor.

>I am ridiculing Brian's silly premise that 5 wpm beginners shouldn't be
>told that they aren't proficient in the use of morse because they'll get
>their feelings hurt.

Radio gods love ridiculing ordinary mortals. They are superior.
They are also irrational.

>Did you think I was quoting myself? I gave you too much credit for
>"smarts".

Radio gods talk about themselves endlessly. They are superior.
They are also irrational.

>That's exactly right. I think you've finally gotten it. It is AMATEUR
>and not professional. I am a radio amateur. You aren't a radio
>amateur.

I am a professional.

>So far, you and Mini-Len seem to be the only parties spouting this line.

Radio gods still like character ridicule. They are superior.
They are also irrational.

>Don't let it get to you Foghorn. Hams use whatever mode they wish to.
>You're still just a bystander.

I am still a professional in radio and electronics.

Radio gods were never professional despite their past titles.

962. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 20:29:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030316152911.23139.00001340@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 63299

In article <3E742F71.9D34A08A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E73D8EC.EA910379@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <nQtca.7382$se1.4312179@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>> >Flint"
>> >> <Our Gal Flint> writes:
>> >>
>> >
>> >> >Although I've allowed myself to be drawn in from time to time, I shall
>> >> >continue to resist the urge to respond to your nonsense.
>> >>
>> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk...use of the word "nonsense" in the above sentence
>> >> is clear personal loading of a statement to reflect your viewpoint.
>> >> No telepathy necessary to "read" it in context.
>> >
>> >I think that's why it was written, Len. It made clear her meaning so
>> >that no one would have difficulty reading it in context.
>>
>> I had no difficulty reading its content in context. Dee is a PCTA.
>> Dee echoes the propaganda mill at Newington. So do you.
>
>What of the high regard in which you hold the ARRL? You've touted that
>several times. Eventually, the real Leonard H. comes out, huh?

What "high regard" have I expressed about the ARRL?

You are very confused. Try to stay focussed.

You are not our man Flint. Are you transgendered?

>> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>> >
>> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>> >

>> >It is concise. It describes, in one simple paragraph, your typical
>> >actions quite accurately and wraps them all up in a neat little package.
>> >It presents quite a dilemma for you.
>>
>> Not at all. A bit of time-wasting, but that is all. :-)
>
>Yes. All. It isn't wasting my time. It isn't wasting your time. Whose
>time is being wasted?

Yours. Mine. Everyone's.

You want the Last Word and can't get it.

Poor baby.

>> You want it repeated some more? No problem.
>
>If you'd like to help, be my guest.

I am not "your guest." Neither are you a host.

>Your character can't be assassinated if you actually do the things
>described in the profile. Oh baby, you actually do the things. That's
>what is to counter and that's what you can't do.

My character cannot be assassinated by amateurs.

You have no authority to do much of anything except be an
amateur. At nearly everything. That includes snow jobs.

>Since I'm not claiming originality and since I'm clearly quoting N2EY,
>the point you thought you had is meaningless.

You cannot claim something you do not possess.

You are not original. You are an amateur.

>When you comment to me, do you use terms descriptive of the German
>military? Have you used references to Nazis? Have you attempted to
>belittle my job? my foreign service postings? Have you written in
>response to my comment that I'd done Radio/TV news releases something
>about a rear echelon clerk job? Have you written similar things about
>the jobs of others posting here? Have you written things like, "HF
>Amateur radio is all about chasing DX on CW" when nobody has made a
>statement like that? Are those who disagree with you treated to "Tsk,
>tsk, tsk", "poor baby", "Pedantic Parson", "Reverend Jim" and the like?
>Then you have no character to assassinate. You actually do the things
>outlined in the N2EY profile. Your words are there. That the profile
>causes you discomfort doesn't bother me. In time, you may learn to live
>with the rotting albatross of the profile hanging around your neck.

You are not an Ancient Mariner yet you are all at sea.

Your life preserver is the virtual dressing up as an order-giving
prussian prune complete with jackboots and twin lightning

bolts on the collar.

This is not a newsgroup about policies of entertainment
industry costumers, Actor's Studio, or role-playing games.

Try to remember where you are.

Get an Alzheimer's patient's bracelet to let others guide you
back to the subject.

>There you go again. I'm not outraged. I've not attempted ever to pull
>a snow job.

Of course you did. Five years ago. That nonsense about mode
changing on HF just for order-wire purposes.

Your bluffing banked on so very few people here having any
experience in commercial/military/government HF
communications. You got caught. Try to admit it.

>You don't know amateur radio and you know even less about
>the Department of State. You've proven it several times.

I know about amateur radio. Stop the "big lie" technique.

You cannot issue edicts of what others know. You don't
have the authority.

This isn't a newsgroup for State Department policy.

Try to stay focussed on the general supposed subject of
this newsgroup.

>I don't care what you've done, Len.

Everyone already knows that. You care only about the
"expertise" and "superiority" of Dave Heil.

>The fact that you were on the
>planet first doesn't get you any points.

It should. I've had more experience in radio than you and
before you in HF communications.

You don't like that. It blows away your attempts at snow
jobs.

>The fact that you worked in
>communications doing something other than what I did doesn't get you any
>points.

Oh, it does. I've pointed out the illogic of your original snow
job in public.

You can't bear to admit it.

>You didn't "call" me on anything because you have nothing with
>which to "call".

Yes I do. You were called. You tried more bluffing. You
got called again. You've folded but you won't leave the
table.

You have nothing but bluff left.

>For you to pretend that you know more about the job
>that I did than I can only be called stupid.

More bluff. HF communications is the same for all users.

US Department of State is not the Central Intelligence
Agency.

US Department of State is not US amateur radio.

>Why, YOUR self-righteous views. I find your view on morse testing to be
>self-righteous.

You must say that. Your amateur rank, status, privileges are
all related to morsemanship.

Take away your amateur rank, status, privilege you are not much.
You are an amateur.

>I find your views on a minimum age for amateur radio
>licensing to be self-righteous.

You want 4-year-olds to be licensed amateurs.

You want children to assume responsibility of adults.

You are immature.

>I'm able to do the same thing you are
>doing: Finding the views of those with whom you disagree to be
>self-righteous.

You are a self-perceived god.

Irrational.

>Amplitude modulation and SSSC are then obsolete modes of communication.
>They just aren't defunct yet.

Irrelevant to the subject of code testing.

Try to stay focussed on subjects.

>Yet the FCC still requires that one pass a 5 wpm morse test for HF
>access.

Only for amateur radio.

Professionals and military people are not required to be code
tested to work in HF.

>You know and I know that this will eventually disappear.

I am not a god. I cannot foretell the future. You claim to do
that. You are a god. You are irrational.

>You're one of the few still attempting to make an issue of it.

One of the many.

>That can only be considered a stupid statement.

Self-appointed gods make statements which are irrational.

>There you have it. You have a different opinion which I can only refer
>to as self-righteous.

You are still irrational.

>No, but your deciding what is arbitrary is self-righteous. My opinion
>differs from yours.

It must. You claim god-like powers and "superiority."

You are still irrational.

>Show your work.

On display in Ham Radio magazine for part of it.

$150 for a 3-disk CD from CQ or ARRL. Shipping extra.

>Hell, the FCC DEMANDS adherance to the LAW as it is.

I am not "Hell." You are "Heil."

All US laws may be changed.

The Constitution of the United States includes provisions for
changing it. It also includes its own dissolussion.

>Are you advocating civil disobedience? Go for it.

You are irrational. No one is advocating civil disobedience.

PCTAs demand changeless regulations on morse code.

PCTAs are not the law. PCTAs are not gods.

>No, I don't. But I'm not silly enough to believe that it isn't going to
>change. You know that too but you're an impatient type.

You are irrational. You are a radio god. You can foretell the
future. Nutcase.

>I don't lose anything. I'm still proficient in the use of morse code;
>will still use morse code and any other mode permitted by regs, which

>choose to use. You'll likely still be on the sidelines.

You are still irrational.

The major subject of the newsgroup is morse code testing.

There are no rules demanding licenses to participate.

You have no authority here. You are not a god. You are still
irrational.

>My money is on the guy who uses terms like, "Ancient Radiotelegraphy
>Society". That guy is pretty self-righteous.

PCTAs are self-defined as members of the Ancient Radiotelegraphy
Society, the ARS.

That is self-evident, not self-righteous.

PCTAs are self-righteous.

>See, you can't help yourself. Your makeup forces you to live up to the
>profile. There's one step you could take to avoid fulfilling the
>description of your likely actions...but you can't bring yourself to
>take that step.

You are irrational.

Advocacy of code test elimination does not require licensing.

Licenses are not required to discuss US government laws.

You are only an amateur.

963. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 20:29:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030316152923.23139.00001341@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 63300

In article <20030316114523.25154.00000811@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <b4l7hh$d8u$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "me" <me@here.com> writes:
>
>>Would you want to learn how to ride a horse?
>
>Sure! Sounds like fun.

This isn't an equine interest newsgroup. No riding license is
required.

>>Horseback riding was
>>an early form of transportation. It is a tradition that was used for
>>hundreds of years.
>
>And it's still in use in some places.

Then why doesn't Miccolis go there?

>>Wouldn't you want to keep up the tradition? Just think,
>>you can brag to your friends that you can ride a horse. In an emergency, you
>>and the Lone Ranger can ride for help. Everybody in the newsgroup would be
>>impressed.
>
>If you're looking for an analogy to the Morse code test, the horseback riding
>thing is not a good analogy. Try this one:

This is neither an equine interest nor automotive interest group.
Why do you persist in misdirection to thread lines far from
the intended newsgroup topics?

>It's a good idea for all drivers to have manual transmission driving skills.
>But should such skills be mandated by law?

This is not a newsgroup for discussion of automotive vehicle
laws.

>The current Morse test is akin to requiring all prospective drivers be able to
>drive across an empty parking lot with a manual-transmission car in first
gear,
>starting and stopping without stalling the engine.

Nonsense. Misdirection.

Your entire life interest seems "kin" to manual telegraphy.

There are NO vehicle driving test elements for US amateur radio
license examinations, any class, at VE sessions or required
by the FCC.

Try to stay focussed.

964. Re: Atlanta Hamfest Yesterday

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 21:28:58 UTC
From: lumushahs@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030316162858.16830.00000094@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 63101

This is one example of how politics has taken over amatuer radio, now known as "Ham" radio. You must fit the traditional Ham conventions, have the "right attitude" (as said by lenover21), to be a "Ham".

From: "ProBroadcaster" FM@fmradiodial87.net
>Every imaginable piece of CB equipment for sale
Nothing wrong with that. Its still amateur radio. I have bought a CB troubleshooting manual to learn more about amateur radio - blasphemy.

>call sign hats on but were talking about CB radio,
Okay, call sign hats are weird.

>computer links, modified radios for CB, Famradio, MURS,
>"opened up" business radios.
Except for the specific services mentioned. Seems like it is in line with Ham radio. Also, modified radios for CB is fine. As long as they have the license, its legal. Where's YOUR Ham radio spirit, ProBroadcaster?

>Even saw a few people selling low
>powered FM broadcast equipment, easy set up, no license required,
>"broadcast" to your neighbors and friends
FM broadcast equip IS legal as far as I know.

>All sorts of high tech
>communications gear, but where was just plain old ham radios?

Hint. These are all radio activities. Sorry if it does not fit the Ham traditions.

965. Re: Unattended Packet ok?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 21:48:10 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0303161348.48cc8c54@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63102

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

>
> But, Hans, did you stay at a Holiday Inn Express last night? 8-)
>

I guess I need to stand up, because that question went over my head.

73, Hans, K0HB

966. Re: Unattended Packet ok?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 22:50:56 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <kd7da.1635$Ad2.1354700@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 63103

"K0HB" <k0hb@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:e79dbd9b.0303161348.48cc8c54@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
> >
> > But, Hans, did you stay at a Holiday Inn Express last night? 8-)
> >
>
> I guess I need to stand up, because that question went over my head.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

Hans,

You used the "disclaimer":

> I am not a communications lawyer, nor do I play one on TV.

I was making a joke based on the series of TV commercials for
Holiday Inn Express ...

73,
Carl - wk3c

967. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-16 22:56:07 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <bi7da.1637$Ad2.1354560@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 63104

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030316114523.25154.00000811@mb-cb.aol.com...
> In article <b4l7hh$d8u$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "me" <me@here.com>
writes:
>
> >Would you want to learn how to ride a horse?
>
> Sure! Sounds like fun.
>
> >Horseback riding was
> >an early form of transportation. It is a tradition that was used for
> >hundreds of years.
>
> And it's still in use in some places.
>
> >Wouldn't you want to keep up the tradition? Just think,
> >you can brag to your friends that you can ride a horse. In an emergency,
you
> >and the Lone Ranger can ride for help. Everybody in the newsgroup would
be
> >impressed.
>
> If you're looking for an analogy to the Morse code test, the horseback
riding
> thing is not a good analogy.

Jim,

I think the horseback riding analogy is a good one ... however, since you
prefer the transmission one, I'll speak to that.

> Try this one:
>
> Once upon a time, practically all motor vehicles had manual transmissions
of
> one type or another. Learning to use a clutch and gear shift was a big
part of
> learning to drive.
>
> Today, most (I read an estimate of 80%) passenger cars, minivans and light
> trucks on the road have automatic transmissions. I don't know of a single
US
> state or commonwealth that requires manual transmission skill testing for
an
> ordinary driver's license.

Neither do I ...

> It's a good idea for all drivers to have manual transmission driving
skills.

Why???

> But should such skills be mandated by law?

Of course not.

> The current Morse test is akin to requiring all prospective drivers be
able to
> drive across an empty parking lot with a manual-transmission car in first
gear,
> starting and stopping without stalling the engine.

Exactly ... such a test should not be mandated because it isn't necessary
and serves no legitimate regulatory purpose.

I'm glad you finally seem to agree :-)

73,
Carl - wk3c

968. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 02:05:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303161805.2a72ceaa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63105

```
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E74C904.1ED72CF3@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E73CE56.C2F4CDDA@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E735497.B878D89B@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > > You just don't have enough information to make a judgement. Get back to
> > > > > > > me when you have enough experience to make such a call.
>
> > > > > > No, Dave, that's not it. 0.02wpm sets a world record, and that's a fact.
> > > > > >
> > > > > It certainly is. It is one which has nothing to do with the code
> > > > > proficiency of either ham.
> > > > >
> > > > You don't know the code proficiency of either ham. Yet you want to talk facts.
> > > >
> > > Dig back in the thread a little, Brian. That's one of the points I
> > > made--that we don't know the code proficiency of either ham. We don't
> > > know that their maximum morse receiving speed is higher than .02 wpm. I
> > > have an idea that it it. You seem to have made an assumption that it is
> > > on the order of .02 wpm and then asked if that was "proficient". Such
> > > comments just make you look like a dullard.
> > >
> > > > > I can make just as many arbitrary claims as you can, re: 5wpm not proficient.
> > > > >
> > > > The big difference I see between us is that I use pertinent facts to
> > > > make a point while you misinterpret the facts you've seen. You still
> > > > seem to confuse the words "proficient" and "efficient".
> > > >
> > > You confuse a world record set using Morse Code with "not proficient."
> > >
> > That's completely untrue. I've never written anything to indicate
> > anything like it. It is likely another example of your poor (not
> > proficient) reading comprehension skills.
> >
> Doubtful. You still don't know if the record setters are proficient
> with a demostrated "skill" of 0.02 wpm, but declare those with a
> demonstrated skill of 5wpm as not proficient.
>
```

> There's no doubt at all, Brian. You're still plodding along, making the
> same mistakes.

I'm making mistakes?

The fellows on 136 KHz were likely using computers to
> bring the signal above the noise. We don't know either fellow's top
> morse speed but can safely assume that it is well above .02 wpm and
> likely in excess of 5 wpm.

Why can you assume that?

Because a world record was set they must be fast coders?

And you say I make mistakes.

As I've pointed out several times, w e
> d o n ' t k n o w i f t h e y a r e p r o f i c i e n t in
> the use of morse.

But somehow you can assume it is well in excess of 5wpm?

Someone whose top speed is o n l y 5 wpm is not
> proficient in the use of morse.

Especailly if they set world's records.

> > Then you confuse your record of entering a contest with with proof of
> > proficiency, but don't allow someone with 250 times the speed of a
> > world record to be considered proficient.
>
> I'm not confused at all, Brian. The average man speaks at a rate of
> about 150 wpm. One would have to assume that the top ten contest
> scorers worldwide would have to be at least average speakers to beat the
> thousands of other entrants and the hundreds with similar equipment and
> antennas.

You do a lot of assuming.

> Your diddling about the world record on 136 KHz ignore the fact that the
> slow speed was of necessity and that the ops weren't even depending upon
> copy by ear. You'd also have us assume that .02 wpm is their top
> receiving speed. You're attempting a stretch and your arguments still
> sound absurd.

I assume nothing. They used CW; their speed was 0.02wpm. They set a
world's record.

969. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 02:10:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303161810.2b26988d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63106

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E73CB2E.30922A91@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<FA2E6F19D71B8EFA.02253178E8F4FD15.578D7F18BCBC2C0A@lp.airnews.net>...
> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > news:f45722ac.0303140512.21f10847@posting.google.com...
> > > > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> news:<3E7155DF.52EF1E92@att.net>...
> > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > >
> > > > > He needs a whole lot more thast just good luck.
> > > > >
> > > > He who? You promised not to read anymore of my stuff, DICK.
> > > >
> > > Wow, you won first place on the list today, Brian (first post listed). Oh,
> > > did Dick make another promise to killfile someone then not? LOL
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > Yep. I'm a winner today.
> >
> > DICK and Alec Baldwin have apparently made a lasting relationship.
> >
> > Not that Dave has noticed or would break his PCTA double standard to comment.
> >
> > He's too busy tuning 6M.
>
> None but the clueless are busy tuning 6m these days.

Welp, there you have it. I guess the bootleggers have rolled it up and gone home.

> Once again, Dick replied to one of my posts. You and Kim were caught up
> in the heat of the chase. You goofed. There's my comment.

You are the enabler. DICK just can't stay away even though he said he would.

970. Re: Unattended Packet ok?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 02:23:49 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0303161823.74e38320@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63107

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

>
> I was making a joke based on the series of TV commercials for
> Holiday Inn Express ...
>

Haven't seen those ads I guess.

73, K0HB

971. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 02:25:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303161825.3b78b793@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63108

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E74CD51.2C3658AB@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E73D096.9511C46F@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> > > > > In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > > > >
> > > > > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > > > >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> > > > > >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > > >> writes:
>
> > > > Meanwhile, Western Union no longer uses the telegraph. The US Army
> > > > Signal Corps no longer uses the telegraph. The Union Pacific Railroad
> > > > no longer uses the telegraph.
> > >
> > > Amateur radio is not Western Union. Amateur radio is not the U.S. Army
> > > Signal Corps. Amateur radio is not the Union Pacific Railroad. The
> > > morse code is in wide use in amateur radio.
> >
> > Telegraph operators are telegraph operators.
>
> Fish are fish. To you, they must all look the same. Birds are birds. To
> you, they must all look the same. Houses are houses. To you, they must
> all look the same.

Can you describe any commonalities that telegraph operators share?

Gills?

> > > > That a few amateurs still enjoy it is wunnerful.
> > >
> > > False premise. Not just a few radio amateurs use morse code. It is in
> > > widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.
> >
> > True premise. Of all the telegraph operators of yore, a few amateurs
> > are still using it.
>
> So you'd like to compare apples and oranges. Most hams who use morse

> code have never been commercial telegraphers. They're content to use
> morse on the ham bands. They enjoy using it. The mode is popular.
> Thousands use it daily.

I'd like to stick with telegraph operators.

You're welcome to discuss apples and oranges with someone else, anyone
else. But not with me.

I don't have time for your stupid games.

> > > > And telling
> > > > newcomers that 5wpm isn't proficient will ensure that you bury the
> > > > code forever. Keep it light cause it ain't going anywhere.
> > > >
> > > What newcomer is foolish enough to believe that morse at five words per
> > > minute makes him proficient? Wouldn't want to hurt anyone's self-esteem
> > > would we?
> > >
> > Take it up with the FCC. I didn't settle on 5wpm as the exam speed.
> >
> It has nothing to do with the FCC. If the FCC mandated testing at 13
> wpm, those who could do only 5 wpm would still not be considered
> proficient.

Would 13wpm be considered proficient by you?

> > > "I sweated that stupid morse code for three whole weeks until I could
> > > copy five words per minute. Now they tell me I'm not proficient. I
> > > quit!"
> > >
> > Suit yourself.
> >
> You, like Len, assumed that I wrote of myself.

I assumes no such thing. You flout your Extraness at every
opportunity.

I passed all the exams
> they gave, Brian--all of the written exams; all of the morse exams. I
> didn't quit. I didn't say, "I can't". I didn't say that I'd wait until
> they changed the rules to suit me.

So?

> > > > That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
> > > > Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.
> > > >
> > > False premise again. Amateur radio isn't Western Union. Amateur radio
> > > isn't the U.S. Army Signal Corps. Amateur radio isn't the U.S. Coast
> > > Guard. Amateur radio isn't the Union Pacific Railroad. Morse is in
> > > widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.
> > >

> > Telegraph operators are telegraph operators. Of all the telegraph
> > operators of yore, a few amateurs are still using it.
>
> That isn't correct. Thousands and thousands of radio amateurs are using
> morse daily. The mode is the second most popular on HF.

I am correct. They are using telegraphy. And they are but a few in
comparison with all the telegraph operators who plied the trade when
telegraphy was king.

> > There will be fewer still, tomorrow.
>
> That hasn't been demonstrated.

Then wait till tomorrow.

> > Be sure to tell every newcomer
> > that they aren't proficient.
>
> I'm sure they already know it.

You'll be sure to tell them, Mr Smug.

972. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 02:33:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303161833.333255b3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63109

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E74CE70.C8EEC599@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E73CC76.F15539A7@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E67E61C.94666CB6@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E6580E1.83D5D4B3@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > > > Get back to me if you have anything useful.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > How would you recognize it? Your failure to read carefully has you
> > > > > > > > dangling once again.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I said, "Get back to me if you have anything useful."
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > ...and I asked how you'd recognize something useful. I have all kinds
> > > > > > of useful information. Get back to me when you've found a way to
> > > > > > process it.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > > > Cool, how do I go about working Frenchmen out of band on 6M?
> > > >
> > > I don't see any indication that you've come up with a way to process the
> > > information but here goes:
> > >
> > > Write to the REF and see if you can set up a sked. You may have to wait
> > > a while for 6m to open to Europe. Your alternative is to move to
> > > Europe.
>
> > And that's coming from someone who's done it! Whohooo!
>
> That's coming from someone who offered you information.

No kidding?

> > No thanks, I'd prefer to work them in-band.
>

> That's what I did. I never strayed from my allocated band segment even
> once. I'm curious though--why'd you ask if you had no intention of
> following up?

They did.

> How're you coming along with the answers to those questions about your
> T5 operation?

Those questions were just too hard, Dave. I gave up.

973. Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 02:51:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303161851.6a073d57@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63110

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030316103254.25505.00000074@mb-fm.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/16/03 7:39 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303160539.4ba6475d@posting.google.com>
>
> >You obviously thought Argentina was a threat to the USA, or you would
> >have protested our aid to Britian, and lack of protection to another
> >treaty American State being attacked.
>
> The Falkland Islands had been continuously inhabited by Subjects of the
> British Crown for over a century. With the exception of a company of Royal
> Marines, they were unarmed. They were attacked in force by the Armed Forces of
> Argentina and the Argentine flag raised over them.
>
> That the Argentines disputed this claim to the islands is evdent, but to
> take them by force was also contrary to the UN and OAS charters.
>
> That particular "American State" was, in that case, the aggressor.
> Britain repatriated the islands by force when the Argentines refused to
> withraw.
>
> >Definitely a PCTA double standard
>
> How?

Squatting on a piece of land doesn't make it yours.

974. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 03:54:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030316225411.19751.00003802@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 63111

In article <315B4A074526BD4C.F3BA0E6EEC17D676.5E0C0D81B5C62C55@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Larry's been acting this way ever since you posted that you had an
>> XOM. He needs to go back to the Russian Personals and find another
>> Natasha.
>
>heh heh, I've got two. But, I am very happily married now--to the best in
>my opinion! And, I'm still great friends with my second OM and his wife!
>In fact, my 2nd XOM was the photographer at my wedding to Cliff...LOL
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

He was that happy to be rid of you, eh?

73 de Larry, K3LT

975. Re: Larry on Larry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 03:54:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030316225411.19751.00003801@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 63112

In article <b9c836fe.0303160143.5f2ae754@posting.google.com>, O_Epstein@att.net (O. Epstein) writes:

> Ah, yes...Larry Roll...the man, the myth, the legend! Larry Roll for
> President? Naw...that's too lowly an office for him. We need to
>think
> of something a lot better. Dictator? Chancellor? Fueher?
>
> Hey Larry...I know you're reading this...how about an autographed
>picture?
>
> 73 de Larry, WR2F
> President, Larry Roll Fan Club

Dear O.:

Well, thank you for all the unsolicited compliments, but I think you'll find that there's a gentleman named Jeff in New Jersey who would most likely not appreciate your using his call sign with my name attached to it!

>... I am Roll of Borg...No Hams are good enough to be assimilated!

Ah, that takes me back to the old days of Fidonet! Making fun of the Borg was ripping good fun then -- I just hope they have a sense of humor!

73 de Larry, K3LT
President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, entire Board of Directors and Entire membership of the Larry Roll Fan Club. If anyone else wants to join, fine by me, but I ain't payin' no steenking dues! Moreover, after over fifty years of holding all those offices all by myself, it will be YOUR turn to be in charge!

976. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 04:21:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E754D9C.4013433E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63113

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E74250F.A4DDB399@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <20030315210938.23981.00000303@mb-fv.aol.com>,
> >averyfineman@aol.com
>
> >Looks like you've had an accident in the comm center, old timer. Your
> >Avery Labels persona tangled with LenOver70 and spilled a few non
> >responses. Come to think of it, that's not necessarily a bad thing.
>
> No accident. Deliberate. It got an expected response.

You'll forgive me if I don't believe you.

"Pardon me, Mister Anderson, you have toilet paper sticking out of your
trousers."

Andersonian response: "I meant to do that."

> That shows that radio gods love to ridicule ordinary mortals.
> They are superior. They have self-appointed authority.

I don't think so. I think it shows that you screwed up and told a
whopper to cover it.

Dave K8MN

977. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 04:39:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E75518A.F3605D79@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63114

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E742075.8E999470@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E73D096.9511C46F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Brian wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> >> >> > In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
> >> >> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >> >> >
> >> >> > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >> >> > >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >> >> > >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> >> > <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> > >> writes:
>
> >"Smiley" discounted. There's plenty of morse being used on VHF and UHF
> >by weak signal enthusiasts and satellite ops. Oh, I forgot--you're out
> >of the loop!
>
> You are irrational. You are angry.

Are you trying to hypnotize me? I'm not irrational and I'm not angry.
It is obvious that you didn't know that morse is frequently used above
30 MHz. That puts you out of the loop.

> Advocacy of elimination of code testing does not require licensing.

Nobody asked you to become an advocate. If you must, go advocate
somewhere. You aren't hitting your intended audience here.

> There is not secrecy in US amateur radio. Such is not allowed
> by US law on US amateur radio.

Just because you don't know something doesn't mean that it has been kept
a secret. It just means that you don't know.

> >So it is your view that the thousands and thousands using morse code
> >worldwide in amateur radio are not enjoying it? Is that about it?
> >There's an amusing but moronic idea.
>
> You are a god of radio and "superior." You are irrational.
> You are angry. You attempt character assassination.
>
> There has been no poll done on how many enjoy morse
> code.

You're right. There has been no poll. How likely do you believe it to be that the thousands of radio amateurs using morse each day are not enjoying it? You'd have to be a fool to stake the ranch on that one.

> Morse code is not a required mode in US amateur radio use.
> All modes are optional to use in US amateur radio law.

You're drifting. We were discussing those who USE MORSE.

> >I'm not "Herr Robust" and I'm not challenging the self-esteem of anyone.
>
> Your own self-esteem is most important. You are a radio god.
> You are "superior." You are irrational.

Is this the part where I'm supposed to be getting sleepy?

> Your virtual prussian prune uniform fits badly. Get a tailor.

[this space reserved for the N2EY profile of Leonard H. Anderson]

> >I am ridiculing Brian's silly premise that 5 wpm beginners shouldn't be
> >told that they aren't proficient in the use of morse because they'll get
> >their feelings hurt.
>
> Radio gods love ridiculing ordinary mortals. They are superior.
> They are also irrational.

I'm not going to tell someone whose maximum morse speed that he is proficient and I'm not going to tell Brian Burke that his moronic premise is brilliant.
>

I don't know any radio gods. I've never seen one, never spoken to one. I suspect they are superior but I don't know why they'd be irrational.

> >That's exactly right. I think you've finally gotten it. It is AMATEUR
> >and not professional. I am a radio amateur. You aren't a radio
> >amateur.
>
> I am a professional.

Good for you, Len! Now try for the next part of the sentence, "and amateur radio is not professional". Now you're getting it. Amateur radio isn't professional and you aren't a radio amateur. We're making progress!

> >So far, you and Mini-Len seem to be the only parties spouting this line.
>
> Radio gods still like character ridicule. They are superior.
> They are also irrational.

Maybe you can tell them when you meet them. I don't expect that to
happen until you've expired. How do you intend to get word back to us?

> >Don't let it get to you Foghorn. Hams use whatever mode they wish to.
> >You're still just a bystander.
>
> I am still a professional in radio and electronics.

...and you're still not a participant in amateur radio.

> Radio gods were never professional despite their past titles.

Gods don't get paid? Why would a god have a past title?

Dave K8MN

978. Re: Larry on Larry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 05:55:04 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v7aopd1sic5s3a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 63115

"O. Epstein" <O_Epstein@att.net> wrote in message
news:b9c836fe.0303160143.5f2ae754@posting.google.com...
<SNIP>
> Hey Larry...I know you're reading this...how about an autographed
> picture?
>

I have an autographed QSL card of his does that count?

> 73 de Larry, WR2F

According to the WM7D.net callsign server there is only one "Epstein"
in the USA with the first or middle inital of "O" and that is KD5FJN
down Flint TX way. But since this posting came out of the Google
sewer, I doubt if the "real" Mr. Epstein is the source.

> President, Larry Roll Fan Club
>
> ... I am Roll of Borg...No Hams are good enough to be assimilated!

No my name is Barf, I'm a Mog, half man half dog.
-John Candy from Spaceballs The Movie

--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/

979. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 05:57:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA9ACE12.131E7%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63116
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
> Guess thats the internet version of a jamming tape, eh?
>
> Just about as smart.

Yep. There are many interesting messages to read in these newsgroups, most from people who are a real pleasure to talk to. But, at the same time, there are messages which leave one wondering if the writer has the intelligence of a gecko. That message was the latter.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

980. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 06:05:58 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v7ape3o5sihb8e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 63117

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030316225411.19751.00003802@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article
<315B4A074526BD4C.F3BA0E6EEC17D676.5E0C0D81B5C62C55@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> Larry's been acting this way ever since you posted that you had an
> >> XOM. He needs to go back to the Russian Personals and find another
> >> Natasha.
> >
> >heh heh, I've got two. But, I am very happily married now--to the best
in
> >my opinion! And, I'm still great friends with my second OM and his wife!
> >In fact, my 2nd XOM was the photographer at my wedding to Cliff...LOL
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> He was that happy to be rid of you, eh?

Point, Set, & Match!

>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/

981. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 09:49:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030317044913.12210.00000097@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63118

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/16/03 8:42 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303161842.5916b083@posting.google.com>

>
>You're the one who took us down the road that if you just think you
>can, you too can learn the Morse Code. Then you asserted that people
>can think themselves sick, then people can think themselves well.

Time for Brian Burke to admit he's lying. However, like his mentor and documented pathological liar Lennie the Lame, he won't.

He has so bamboozled even himself that he can't tell the difference even in his OWN mistruths.

Witness his inability to seperate "permission" from "validity".

>Time for you to take a sabbatical.

To allow you to make these pronouncements unchallenged...?!?!

Heavens no!

But thanks for the laughs!

Steve

982. Re: Larry on Larry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 09:51:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030317045129.12210.00000098@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63119

>Subject: Re: Larry on Larry
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wk3cqth@wk3c.com
>Date: 3/16/03 10:12 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <rn1da.1610$Ad2.1326826@nnrp1.ptd.net>

>Spot on!!!

From a liar and imposter, Carl?

Sheeeesh.

Steve, K4YZ

983. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 09:55:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030317045509.12210.00000099@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63120

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/16/03 2:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030316152904.23139.00001337@mb-da.aol.com>

Lennie, was there a purpose to posting the same message to the NG 11 minutes apart (other than just spaming it?)...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

984. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 09:58:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030317045809.12210.00000100@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63121

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 3/16/03 10:21 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E754D9C.4013433E@earthlink.net>

>I don't think so. I think it shows that you screwed up and told a
>whopper to cover it.

I'm waiting for the "radio professional" to spin the one that tell's us why he's double posting messages.

Another one of his "e mail errors", no doubt. Of course he will blame it on the software package that some friend gave him like he did before.

Personally, I just think he's an idiot.

Steve, K4YZ

985. Re: Atlanta Hamfest Yesterday

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 10:00:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030317050011.12210.00000101@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63122

>Subject: Re: Atlanta Hamfest Yesterday
>From: lumushahs@aol.com (Lumushahs)
>Date: 3/16/03 3:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030316162858.16830.00000094@mb-cv.aol.com>

Vipul, you need to try harder if you're going to post messages under new screen names. This was waaaaaaaaay too transparent.

Steve, K4YZ

986. Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 10:04:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030317050412.12210.00000102@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63123

>Subject: Re: Even More Direct Questions For VShaw101
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/16/03 8:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303161851.6a073d57@posting.google.com>

>Squatting on a piece of land doesn't make it yours.

It does when every other nation in the world recognizes it as such.

It does when the sole occupants of that land recognize it as such.

It does when the United Nations recognizes it as such.

>Squatting on a piece of land doesn't make it yours.

Then shall we lower the Stars and Bars from Manhattan, Long Island, Hawaii,
Guam, The US Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, etc etc etc?

Steve, K4YZ

987. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 11:28:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E75B154.C8E681F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63124

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E74CE70.C8EEC599@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E73CC76.F15539A7@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E67E61C.94666CB6@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:

> > > > > Cool, how do I go about working Frenchmen out of band on 6M?

> > > > I don't see any indication that you've come up with a way to process the
> > > > information but here goes:

> > > > Write to the REF and see if you can set up a sked. You may have to wait
> > > > a while for 6m to open to Europe. Your alternative is to move to
> > > > Europe.

> > > And that's coming from someone who's done it! Whohooo!

> > That's coming from someone who offered you information.
>
> No kidding?

That's right.

> > > No thanks, I'd prefer to work them in-band.

> > That's what I did. I never strayed from my allocated band segment even
> > once. I'm curious though--why'd you ask if you had no intention of
> > following up?

> They did.

Your response doesn't make any sense.

> > How're you coming along with the answers to those questions about your
> > T5 operation?

> Those questions were just too hard, Dave.

They surely were.

> I gave up.

I noticed.

Dave K8MN

988. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 11:41:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E75B451.26E5B288@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63125

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E74CD51.2C3658AB@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E73D096.9511C46F@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> > > > > > In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > > > > >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> > > > > > >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> > <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > > > >> writes:
> > >
> > > > > > Meanwhile, Western Union no longer uses the telegraph. The US Army
> > > > > > Signal Corps no longer uses the telegraph. The Union Pacific Railroad
> > > > > > no longer uses the telegraph.
> > > > >
> > > > > Amateur radio is not Western Union. Amateur radio is not the U.S. Army
> > > > > Signal Corps. Amateur radio is not the Union Pacific Railroad. The
> > > > > morse code is in wide use in amateur radio.
> > > >
> > > > Telegraph operators are telegraph operators.
> > >
> > Fish are fish. To you, they must all look the same. Birds are birds. To
> > you, they must all look the same. Houses are houses. To you, they must
> > all look the same.
>
> Can you describe any commonalities that telegraph operators share?
>
> Gills?

No, telegraphers don't have gills.

> > > True premise. Of all the telegraph operators of yore, a few amateurs
> > > are still using it.

> > So you'd like to compare apples and oranges. Most hams who use morse
> > code have never been commercial telegraphers. They're content to use
> > morse on the ham bands. They enjoy using it. The mode is popular.
> > Thousands use it daily.

> I'd like to stick with telegraph operators.

I'll bet you would. Lumping all telegraphers together might make your
shaky premise easier to construct.

> You're welcome to discuss apples and oranges with someone else, anyone
> else. But not with me.
>
> I don't have time for your stupid games.

Actually, the stupid games are your department and you seem to have
endless time for them. Thousands of hams worldwide use morse daily.
No one, save for you and Len, believes that those hams aren't enjoying
their use of morse.

> > > > > And telling
> > > > > newcomers that 5wpm isn't proficient will ensure that you bury the
> > > > > code forever. Keep it light cause it ain't going anywhere.
> > > > >
> > > > > What newcomer is foolish enough to believe that morse at five words per
> > > > > minute makes him proficient? Wouldn't want to hurt anyone's self-esteem
> > > > > would we?
> > > >
> > > > Take it up with the FCC. I didn't settle on 5wpm as the exam speed.
> > >
> > > It has nothing to do with the FCC. If the FCC mandated testing at 13
> > > wpm, those who could do only 5 wpm would still not be considered
> > > proficient.
> >
> > Would 13wpm be considered proficient by you?

Thirteen words per minute is more proficient that five words per minute.
It is not as proficient as 20, 25, 30, 35 or 40 wpm.

> > > > > That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
> > > > > Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.
> > > > >
> > > > > False premise again. Amateur radio isn't Western Union. Amateur radio
> > > > > isn't the U.S. Army Signal Corps. Amateur radio isn't the U.S. Coast
> > > > > Guard. Amateur radio isn't the Union Pacific Railroad. Morse is in
> > > > > widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.
> > > >
> > > > Telegraph operators are telegraph operators. Of all the telegraph
> > > > operators of yore, a few amateurs are still using it.
> > >
> > > That isn't correct. Thousands and thousands of radio amateurs are using
> > > morse daily. The mode is the second most popular on HF.
> >

> I am correct. They are using telegraphy. And they are but a few in
> comparison with all the telegraph operators who plied the trade when
> telegraphy was king.

I'm sure that you believe what you wrote. That isn't sufficient to make
it correct.

> > > There will be fewer still, tomorrow.
> >
> > That hasn't been demonstrated.
>
> Then wait till tomorrow.

It is now tomorrow. I've noticed no change.

> > > Be sure to tell every newcomer
> > > that they aren't proficient.
> >
> > I'm sure they already know it.
>
> You'll be sure to tell them, Mr Smug.

I doubt that I will. If I encounter a couple of 5 wpm maximum types who
crow that they are proficient in the use of morse code, I'll pass it
along.

Dave K8MN

989. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 11:41:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E75B472.E24767E7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63126

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E73CB2E.30922A91@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<FA2E6F19D71B8EFA.02253178E8F4FD15.578D7F18BCBC2C0A@lp.airnews.net>...
> > > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:f45722ac.0303140512.21f10847@posting.google.com...
> > > > > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> > news:<3E7155DF.52EF1E92@att.net>...
> > > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > >
> > > > > > He needs a whole lot more thast just good luck.
> > > > > >
> > > > > He who? You promised not to read anymore of my stuff, DICK.
> > > > >
> > > > Wow, you won first place on the list today, Brian (first post listed). Oh,
> > > > did Dick make another promise to killfile someone then not? LOL
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > >
> > > Yep. I'm a winner today.
> > >
> > > DICK and Alec Baldwin have apparently made a lasting relationship.
> > >
> > > Not that Dave has noticed or would break his PCTA double standard to comment.
> > >
> > > He's too busy tuning 6M.
> > >
> > None but the clueless are busy tuning 6m these days.
>
> Welp, there you have it. I guess the bootleggers have rolled it up and gone home.
>
> > Once again, Dick replied to one of my posts. You and Kim were caught up
> > in the heat of the chase. You goofed. There's my comment.
>
> You are the enabler. DICK just can't stay away even though he said he would.

See! You do have time for stupid games!

Dave K8MN

990. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 11:46:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E75B589.A9D1FB99@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63127

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E74C904.1ED72CF3@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E73CE56.C2F4CDDA@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E735497.B878D89B@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:

> > > Doubtful. You still don't know if the record setters are proficient
> > > with a demostrated "skill" of 0.02 wpm, but declare those with a
> > > demonstrated skill of 5wpm as not proficient.
> > >
> > There's no doubt at all, Brian. You're still plodding along, making the
> > same mistakes.
>
> I'm making mistakes?

You seem to be the only one who is surprised.

> > The fellows on 136 KHz were likely using computers to
> > bring the signal above the noise. We don't know either fellow's top
> > morse speed but can safely assume that it is well above .02 wpm and
> > likely in excess of 5 wpm.
>
> Why can you assume that?

See! You DO have time for stupid games!

> Because a world record was set they must be fast coders?

Did you believe they were going for a world speed record?

> And you say I make mistakes.

Yes, I do say that you make mistakes.

> As I've pointed out several times, w e
> > d o n ' t k n o w i f t h e y a r e p r o f i c i e n t in
> > the use of morse.
>
> But somehow you can assume it is well in excess of 5wpm?

Yes, that's right.

> Someone whose top speed is o n l y 5 wpm is not
> > proficient in the use of morse.
>
> Especailly if they set world's records.

Where do we have a case of someone whose top speed is only 5 wpm setting
a world record in anything?

> > > Then you confuse your record of entering a contest with with proof of
> > > proficiency, but don't allow someone with 250 times the speed of a
> > > world record to be considered proficient.
> >
> > I'm not confused at all, Brian. The average man speaks at a rate of
> > about 150 wpm. One would have to assume that the top ten contest
> > scorers worldwide would have to be at least average speakers to beat the
> > thousands of other entrants and the hundreds with similar equipment and
> > antennas.
>
> You do a lot of assuming.

I made reasonable assumptions.

> > Your diddling about the world record on 136 KHz ignore the fact that the
> > slow speed was of necessity and that the ops weren't even depending upon
> > copy by ear. You'd also have us assume that .02 wpm is their top
> > receiving speed. You're attempting a stretch and your arguments still
> > sound absurd.
>
> I assume nothing. They used CW; their speed was 0.02wpm. They set a
> world's record.

That makes you sound incredibly stupid.

Dave K8MN

991. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 12:49:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E75C45A.802A36E3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63128

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E742F71.9D34A08A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E73D8EC.EA910379@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <nQtca.7382$se1.4312179@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> >> >Flint"
> >> >> <Our Gal Flint> writes:

> >>
> >> I had no difficulty reading its content in context. Dee is a PCTA.
> >> Dee echoes the propaganda mill at Newington. So do you.
> >>
> >What of the high regard in which you hold the ARRL? You've touted that
> >several times. Eventually, the real Leonard H. comes out, huh?
>
> What "high regard" have I expressed about the ARRL?

Have you forgotten what you've written? Be honest, Google knows.

> You are very confused. Try to stay focussed.

I'm not the individual who forgot his previous position.

> You are not our man Flint. Are you transgendered?

Aren't you getting rather personal?

> >> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >> >
> >> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
> >> >
> >> >It is concise. It describes, in one simple paragraph, your typical
> >> >actions quite accurately and wraps them all up in a neat little package.

> >> >It presents quite a dilemma for you.
> >>
> >> Not at all. A bit of time-wasting, but that is all. :-)
> >
> >Yes. All. It isn't wasting my time. It isn't wasting your time. Whose
> >time is being wasted?
>
> Yours. Mine. Everyone's.

I've already written that it isn't wasting my time. Did you forget that too? It isn't wasting your time since any response is of your own volition. We haven't heard from everyone.

> You want the Last Word and can't get it.
>
> Poor baby.

The poor baby would be you, wouldn't it? Post in your typical style and you'll see the profile.

> >> You want it repeated some more? No problem.
> >
> >If you'd like to help, be my guest.
>
> I am not "your guest." Neither are you a host.

Yes, I'm frequently a host.

> >Your character can't be assassinated if you actually do the things
> >described in the profile. Oh baby, you actually do the things. That's
> >what is to counter and that's what you can't do.
>
> My character cannot be assassinated by amateurs.

Your character can't have been assassinated. You actually do the things attributed to you.

> You have no authority to do much of anything except be an
> amateur. At nearly everything. That includes snow jobs.

Your statement rings hollow.

> >Since I'm not claiming originality and since I'm clearly quoting N2EY,
> >the point you thought you had is meaningless.
>
> You cannot claim something you do not possess.

Many people claim something they don't possess. You claim to engage only in civil debate about the code testing issue, for example.

> You are not original. You are an amateur.

I'm quite original but I didn't write N2EY's profile of your likely actions.

Yes, I'm a radio amateur. You aren't.

> >When you comment to me, do you use terms descriptive of the German
> >military? Have you used references to Nazis? Have you attempted to
> >belittle my job? my foreign service postings? Have you written in
> >response to my comment that I'd done Radio/TV news releases something
> >about a rear echelon clerk job? Have you written similar things about
> >the jobs of others posting here? Have you written things like, "HF
> >Amateur radio is all about chasing DX on CW" when nobody has made a
> >statement like that? Are those who disagree with you treated to "Tsk,
> >tsk, tsk", "poor baby", "Pedantic Parson", "Reverend Jim" and the like?
> >Then you have no character to assassinate. You actually do the things
> >outlined in the N2EY profile. Your words are there. That the profile
> >causes you discomfort doesn't bother me. In time, you may learn to live
> >with the rotting albatross of the profile hanging around your neck.
>
> You are not an Ancient Mariner yet you are all at sea.

Don't you care to address whether or not you've done those things which
I described? I understand that they may cause you discomfort.

> Your life preserver is the virtual dressing up as an order-giving
> prussian prune complete with jackboots and twin lightning
> bolts on the collar.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

There you go, Leonard, old boy.

> This is not a newsgroup about policies of entertainment
> industry costumers, Actor's Studio, or role-playing games.

I didn't write of any of those things. I wrote of things you do in this
newsgroup.

> Try to remember where you are.

I'm not confused.

> Get an Alzheimer's patient's bracelet to let others guide you
> back to the subject.

I wrote of things you do here and your response is about lightning
bolts, Prussian prune uniforms and jackboots.

> >There you go again. I'm not outraged. I've not attempted ever to pull
> >a snow job.
>
> Of course you did. Five years ago. That nonsense about mode

> changing on HF just for order-wire purposes.

No snow job there.

> Your bluffing banked on so very few people here having any
> experience in commercial/military/government HF
> communications. You got caught. Try to admit it.

I'd only admit it if it wasn't the case.

> >You don't know amateur radio and you know even less about
> >the Department of State. You've proven it several times.
>
> I know about amateur radio. Stop the "big lie" technique.

You've repeatedly shown that you have almost no feeling for what it is
that most radio amateurs do. You lift material from web sites and you
know a few radio amateurs. You yourself are not a radio amateur.

> You cannot issue edicts of what others know. You don't
> have the authority.

Edicts? I've written my opinion. Feel free to counter them with facts.

> This isn't a newsgroup for State Department policy.

Doesn't matter much. You don't know much about amateur radio or the
Department of State.

> Try to stay focussed on the general supposed subject of
> this newsgroup.

What was it again--Prussian uniforms? Lightning bolts? Jackboots?

> >I don't care what you've done, Len.
>
> Everyone already knows that. You care only about the
> "expertise" and "superiority" of Dave Heil.

Awwwwww, poor baby. Anyone who is able to use Google can compare your
posts to mine. Your problem is one of transference.

> >The fact that you were on the
> >planet first doesn't get you any points.
>
> It should. I've had more experience in radio than you and
> before you in HF communications.

I do hope you'll keep your own comments in mind then. I've been a radio
amateur for almost forty years. I have forty years more experience in
amateur radio than you.

> You don't like that. It blows away your attempts at snow
> jobs.

Why would that be so? You didn't work where I worked.

> >The fact that you worked in
> >communications doing something other than what I did doesn't get you any
> >points.
>
> Oh, it does. I've pointed out the illogic of your original snow
> job in public.

...and I've countered you in public. You weren't where I was, doing
what I was doing. You were no more a commo type for the U.S. Department
of State than you are a radio amateur. You aren't expert about either
thing.

> You can't bear to admit it.

What's to admit?

> >You didn't "call" me on anything because you have nothing with
> >which to "call".
>
> Yes I do. You were called. You tried more bluffing. You
> got called again. You've folded but you won't leave the
> table.

I'm sure you are quite the riverboat gambler in your mental home movies.
Do you ever play a radio amateur in any of those flicks?

> You have nothing but bluff left.

I have news for you. There is only one person posting here who knows
the facts. That person isn't you.

> >For you to pretend that you know more about the job
> >that I did than I can only be called stupid.
>
> More bluff. HF communications is the same for all users.

You're making that up. Why, you'd have to be a foot to make a statement
like that.

> US Department of State is not the Central Intelligence
> Agency.

...and B.F. Goodrich is not IBM.

> US Department of State is not US amateur radio.

I'm well aware of that. I've never confused the two.

> >Why, YOUR self-righteous views. I find your view on morse testing to be
> >self-righteous.
>
> You must say that. Your amateur rank, status, privileges are
> all related to morsemanship.

You couldn't be more wrong. I'm a multi-mode kind of guy, Leonard.
I operate using four modes on a regular basis. What modes do you use

when operating your amateur radio station, Leonard?

> Take away your amateur rank, status, privilege you are not much.

Why, you have no way of knowing that.

> You are an amateur.

Yes, a radio amateur. You are not.

> >I find your views on a minimum age for amateur radio
> >licensing to be self-righteous.
>
> You want 4-year-olds to be licensed amateurs.

If they can pass the exams, yes.

> You want children to assume responsibility of adults.

If they can pass the exams and wish to become radio amateurs, yes.

> You are immature.

No, to paraphrase Brian Burke, the FCC is an enabler. The commission
has never set a minimum age.

> >I'm able to do the same thing you are
> >doing: Finding the views of those with whom you disagree to be
> >self-righteous.
>
> You are a self-perceived god.
>
> Irrational.
>
> >Amplitude modulation and SSSC are then obsolete modes of communication.
> >They just aren't defunct yet.
>
> Irrelevant to the subject of code testing.

Oh, I think they're much more relevant as obsolete modes than Prussian
prunes, lightning bolt collars and jackboots.

> Try to stay focussed on subjects.
>
> >Yet the FCC still requires that one pass a 5 wpm morse test for HF
> >access.
>
> Only for amateur radio.

We're discussing amateur radio here. Try to stay focussed.

> Professionals and military people are not required to be code
> tested to work in HF.

We're discussing amateur radio here. Try to stay focussed.

> >You know and I know that this will eventually disappear.
>
> I am not a god. I cannot foretell the future. You claim to do
> that. You are a god. You are irrational.
>
> >You're one of the few still attempting to make an issue of it.
>
> One of the many.

Where are the many?

> >No, but your deciding what is arbitrary is self-righteous. My opinion
> >differs from yours.
>
> It must. You claim god-like powers and "superiority."

Let's see if I have this one straight: You have an opinion which you
believe to be correct. Anyone who holds a differing opinion is assuming
godlike powers, feelings of superiority and is irrational. Is that
about it?

> >Hell, the FCC DEMANDS adherance to the LAW as it is.
>
> I am not "Hell."

Don't sell yourself short.

> All US laws may be changed.

Until and unless a law is changed, it is demanded that we adhere to it.

> The Constitution of the United States includes provisions for
> changing it. It also includes its own dissolussion.

Until and unless a law is changed, it is demanded that we adhere to it.

> >Are you advocating civil disobedience? Go for it.
>
> You are irrational. No one is advocating civil disobedience.

Your statement (conveniently snipped in the Andersonesque manner) used
caps (in the usual Andersonesque manner) speaks to DEMANDS of adherance
to the LAW as it is, as if that was an onerous burden. Since government
demands adherance to any law as it is, what are we to make of your
statement?

> PCTAs demand changeless regulations on morse code.
>
> PCTAs are not the law. PCTAs are not gods.

Why then have you spent a goodly portion of your posting in telling me
that I am a god?

> >No, I don't. But I'm not silly enough to believe that it isn't going to
> >change. You know that too but you're an impatient type.
>

> You are irrational. You are a radio god. You can foretell the
> future. Nutcase.

I'm a nutcase? You just told me that I wasn't a god. No you tell me
that I am a god. I wish you'd make up your mind.

> >I don't lose anything. I'm still proficient in the use of morse code;
> >will still use morse code and any other mode permitted by regs, which
> >choose to use. You'll likely still be on the sidelines.
>
> You are still irrational.

You've spent years here telling us what is good for amateur radio.
You've done nothing in all that time toward becoming a radio amateur.
Who is irrational?

> The major subject of the newsgroup is morse code testing.

> There are no rules demanding licenses to participate.

You've participated. Now what?

> You have no authority here. You are not a god. You are still
> irrational.

But just a while ago I was a god. Then I wasn't a god. Then I was a
god. Now I'm not a god. Who is irrational?

> >My money is on the guy who uses terms like, "Ancient Radiotelegraphy
> >Society". That guy is pretty self-righteous.
>
> PCTAs are self-defined as members of the Ancient Radiotelegraphy
> Society, the ARS.

Self-defined? I haven't defined myself in that way. I've not seen a
single posting from any others here which would indicate that they
define themselves in that way. Who is irrational?

> >See, you can't help yourself. Your makeup forces you to live up to the
> >profile. There's one step you could take to avoid fulfilling the
> >description of your likely actions...but you can't bring yourself to
> >take that step.
>
> You are irrational.

Show your "You're a god. You are no god. You're a god. You are no god.
You're a god. You are no god. You're a god. You are no god." routine
to your psychologist wife.

> Advocacy of code test elimination does not require licensing.

You don't need a license to avoid fulfilling the N2EY profile.

> Licenses are not required to discuss US government laws.

You don't need a license to avoid fulfilling the N2EY profile.

> You are only an amateur.

Yes, a radio amateur. You are not.

Dave K8MN

992. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 15:35:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303170735.19d00798@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63129

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E75B589.A9D1FB99@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > I assume nothing. They used CW; their speed was 0.02wpm. They set a
> > world's record.
>
> That makes you sound incredibly stupid.
>
> Dave K8MN

It was President Reagan who first said "Facts are stupid things."

You are the second.

You'll get over it.

993. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 15:37:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303170737.17968c9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63130

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E75B472.E24767E7@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E73CB2E.30922A91@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<FA2E6F19D71B8EFA.02253178E8F4FD15.578D7F18BCBC2C0A@lp.airnews.net>...
> > > > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:f45722ac.0303140512.21f10847@posting.google.com...
> > > > > > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> news:<3E7155DF.52EF1E92@att.net>...
> > > > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > He needs a whole lot more thast just good luck.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > He who? You promised not to read anymore of my stuff, DICK.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Wow, you won first place on the list today, Brian (first post listed). Oh,
> > > > > > did Dick make another promise to killfile someone then not? LOL
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > >
> > > > > Yep. I'm a winner today.
> > > > >
> > > > > DICK and Alec Baldwin have apparently made a lasting relationship.
> > > > >
> > > > > Not that Dave has noticed or would break his PCTA double standard to comment.
> > > > >
> > > > > He's too busy tuning 6M.
> > > >
> > > > None but the clueless are busy tuning 6m these days.
> > >
> > > Welp, there you have it. I guess the bootleggers have rolled it up and gone home.
> > >
> > > Once again, Dick replied to one of my posts. You and Kim were caught up
> > > in the heat of the chase. You goofed. There's my comment.
> >
> > You are the enabler. DICK just can't stay away even though he said he would.

>
> See! You do have time for stupid games!
>
> Dave K8MN

Yeh, I guess. You're here, aren't you?

994. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 15:47:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303170747.1480f8b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63131

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E75B451.26E5B288@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E74CD51.2C3658AB@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:

> > > > Telegraph operators are telegraph operators.
> > >
> > > Fish are fish. To you, they must all look the same. Birds are birds. To
> > > you, they must all look the same. Houses are houses. To you, they must
> > > all look the same.
> >
> > Can you describe any commonalities that telegraph operators share?
> >
> > Gills?
>
> No, telegraphers don't have gills.

Do they share any commonalities?

> > > > True premise. Of all the telegraph operators of yore, a few amateurs
> > > > are still using it.
>
> > > So you'd like to compare apples and oranges. Most hams who use morse
> > > code have never been commercial telegraphers. They're content to use
> > > morse on the ham bands. They enjoy using it. The mode is popular.
> > > Thousands use it daily.
>
> > I'd like to stick with telegraph operators.
>
> I'll bet you would. Lumping all telegraphers together might make your
> shaky premise easier to construct.

I've never seen an apple press a telegraph key, nor an orange.
Perhaps you have. I suppose there could have been a fish a fish
telegrapher in a Disney film (Don Knotts comes to mind), but you'd
have to research that on your own.

In the meantime, we should stick with people telegraph operators.

> > You're welcome to discuss apples and oranges with someone else, anyone
> > else. But not with me.
> >
> > I don't have time for your stupid games.
>

> Actually, the stupid games are your department and you seem to have
> endless time for them. Thousands of hams worldwide use morse daily.
> No one, save for you and Len, believes that those hams aren't enjoying
> their use of morse.

That is simply not true. In my first statement I said that it was
enjoyed.

Go back. Do not collect $200.

> > > > > > And telling
> > > > > > newcomers that 5wpm isn't proficient will ensure that you bury the
> > > > > > code forever. Keep it light cause it ain't going anywhere.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > What newcomer is foolish enough to believe that morse at five words per
> > > > > > minute makes him proficient? Wouldn't want to hurt anyone's self-esteem
> > > > > > would we?
> > > > >
> > > > > Take it up with the FCC. I didn't settle on 5wpm as the exam speed.
> > > >
> > > It has nothing to do with the FCC. If the FCC mandated testing at 13
> > > wpm, those who could do only 5 wpm would still not be considered
> > > proficient.
> >
> > Would 13wpm be considered proficient by you?
>
> Thirteen words per minute is more proficient that five words per minute.
> It is not as proficient as 20, 25, 30, 35 or 40 wpm.

I see. "Proficiency" is a moving target. It can be whatever you say
it is on any given day.

You need to define "proficient." At what use level does it become
proficient?

> > > > > > That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
> > > > > > Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > False premise again. Amateur radio isn't Western Union. Amateur radio
> > > > > > isn't the U.S. Army Signal Corps. Amateur radio isn't the U.S. Coast
> > > > > > Guard. Amateur radio isn't the Union Pacific Railroad. Morse is in
> > > > > > widespread use by radio amateurs worldwide.
> > > > >
> > > > > Telegraph operators are telegraph operators. Of all the telegraph
> > > > > operators of yore, a few amateurs are still using it.
> > > >
> > > That isn't correct. Thousands and thousands of radio amateurs are using
> > > morse daily. The mode is the second most popular on HF.
> >
> > I am correct. They are using telegraphy. And they are but a few in
> > comparison with all the telegraph operators who plied the trade when
> > telegraphy was king.

>
> I'm sure that you believe what you wrote. That isn't sufficient to make
> it correct.

Is what I said a moving target?

> > > > There will be fewer still, tomorrow.
> > >
> > > That hasn't been demonstrated.
> >
> > Then wait till tomorrow.
>
> It is now tomorrow. I've noticed no change.

Oh, no. I was wrong. There are more telegraphers today than there
were during the heyday of telegragh useage.

You can support that with facts at any time. Unless you think facts
will make you look stupid.

> > > > Be sure to tell every newcomer
> > > > that they aren't proficient.
> > >
> > > I'm sure they already know it.
> >
> > You'll be sure to tell them, Mr Smug.
>
> I doubt that I will. If I encounter a couple of 5 wpm maximum types who
> crow that they are proficient in the use of morse code, I'll pass it
> along.
>
> Dave K8MN

You're welcome.

995. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 17:04:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b54v6r$95a$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63132
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Wait a minute now....I saw some really smart geckos....sort of. Well at
least as smart as our allies...hi.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA9ACE12.131E7%stewart@say.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
> >
> > Guess thats the internet version of a jamming tape, eh?
> >
> > Just about as smart.
>
>
> Yep. There are many interesting messages to read in these newsgroups,
most
> from people who are a real pleasure to talk to. But, at the same time,
there
> are messages which leave one wondering if the writer has the intelligence
of
> a gecko. That message was the latter.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>
> ------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

996. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 17:54:57 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303170954.7c80bbb9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63133

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<bi7da.1637$Ad2.1354560@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030316114523.25154.00000811@mb-cb.aol.com...
> > In article <b4l7hh$d8u$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "me" <me@here.com>
> writes:
> >
> > >Would you want to learn how to ride a horse?
> >
> > Sure! Sounds like fun.
> >
> > >Horseback riding was
> > >an early form of transportation. It is a tradition that was used for
> > >hundreds of years.
> >
> > And it's still in use in some places.
> >
> > >Wouldn't you want to keep up the tradition? Just think,
> > >you can brag to your friends that you can ride a horse. In an emergency,
> > >you
> > >and the Lone Ranger can ride for help. Everybody in the newsgroup would
> > >be
> > >impressed.
> >
> > If you're looking for an analogy to the Morse code test, the horseback
> > riding
> > thing is not a good analogy.
>
> Jim,
>
> I think the horseback riding analogy is a good one ...

Why?

Horses are not motor vehicles. No horse-riding license needed anywhere
I know. And except for a few areas (Lancaster County, some big cities
with mounted police), horses are almost unknown on American streets
and roads.

Manual transmission vehicles, on the other hand, are ubiquitous. Just
not as common as they once were.

The percentage of CW signals on the HF/MF ham bands is at least as
high, if not much higher, thans the percentage of manual transmission
cars on US roads. Much greater than the percentage of horses on the

road...

> however, since you
> prefer the transmission one, I'll speak to that.
>
> > Try this one:
> >
> > Once upon a time, practically all motor vehicles had manual transmissions
> > of
> > one type or another. Learning to use a clutch and gear shift was a big
> > part of
> > learning to drive.
> >
> > Today, most (I read an estimate of 80%) passenger cars, minivans and light
> > trucks on the road have automatic transmissions. I don't know of a single
> > US
> > state or commonwealth that requires manual transmission skill testing for
> > an
> > ordinary driver's license.
>
> Neither do I ...
>
I recall reading somewhere that the majority of new US-made cars had
automatic transmissions starting in the late 1950s.

> > It's a good idea for all drivers to have manual transmission driving
> > skills.
>
> Why???
>
Because it increases all drivers' opportunities and possibilities wrt
driving situations. For example, the choice of vehicle is greater. No
problems with "we have to take/buy X's car because Y can't drive
stick", etc. (Been there, done that!)

Manual transmission cars are simpler, cost less, use less fuel and
pollute less than their automatic-transmission equivalents.

Note that we're talking about something being a "a good idea" not
being mandated by law.

Do you think it's not a good idea for all drivers to have manual
transmission driving skills?

> > But should such skills be mandated by law?
>
> Of course not.

Well, that's one opinion.
>
> > The current Morse test is akin to requiring all prospective drivers be
> > able to

> > drive across an empty parking lot with a manual-transmission car in first
> > gear,
> > starting and stopping without stalling the engine.
>
> Exactly ... such a test should not be mandated because it isn't necessary
> and serves no legitimate regulatory purpose.

There's no S25.5 for clutches, anyway.
>
> I'm glad you finally seem to agree :-)
>
You're inferring what I've neither stated nor implied. I haven't
stated any opinion other than "It's a good idea for all drivers to
have manual transmission driving skills."

My point is simply that the transmission analogy is a much better and
more relevant one than the horse analogy.

73 de Jim, N2EY

997. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 18:10:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA9B79D1.13D21%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63134
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:

> Wait a minute now....I saw some really smart geckos....sort of.

Sort of? Well, I guess there is "sort of" intelligence in almost any
living thing. However, I doubt the gecko is right up there on the
intelligence ladder. But, I'll admit I've never given one an intelligence
test, so you're probably right - I should give the gecko the benefit of
doubt when comparing them to others the way I did.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

998. Re: Flash! Truckers getting ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-17 22:24:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b55huteak1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63135
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

What I meant was they at least knew to get out of the light. HI HI

Dan/W4NTI

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA9B79D1.13D21%stewart@say.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
> > Wait a minute now....I saw some really smart geckos....sort of.
>
>
> Sort of? Well, I guess there is "sort of" intelligence in almost any
> living thing. However, I doubt the gecko is right up there on the
> intelligence ladder. But, I'll admit I've never given one an intelligence
> test, so you're probably right - I should give the gecko the benefit of
> doubt when comparing them to others the way I did.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>
> ------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

999. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 01:27:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030317202736.23598.00000903@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63136

In article <20030316151846.20123.00001026@mb-mv.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030316082701.23139.00001320@mb-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>In article <f45722ac.0303151252.4c1c9db1@posting.google.com>,
>>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>>>news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
>>>> In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
>>>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>>>
>>>> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>>>> >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>>>> >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>>>> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>>> >> writes:
>>>>
>>>> >> >Someone who can send and receive morse at five words per minute is on
>>>> >> >the low end of mediocrity.
>>>> >>
>>>> >> I disagree!
>>>> >>
>>>> >> Someone who can send and receive morse at no more than five words per
>>>> >> minute
>>>> >> has some basic Morse code skills. Such a person is not proficient -
>>yet.
>>>> >
>>>> >Even if sending and receiving are 100% accurate, and the desired
>>>> >message gets through, you would classify the operator as less than
>>>> >proficient?
>>>>
>>>> If 5 wpm is the maximum Morse speed a person can do, regardless of
>>>> circumstances, I would not call that person "proficient".
>>>>
>>>> Was that not clear from what I wrote?
>>>>
>>>> It's not a put-down to describe such skills as entry-level.
>>>
>>>Modern day reenactors enjoy jousting, and though if they were pitted
>>>against actual middle age knights, they would become dog food.
>>

>>How do you know?
>
> How can you disagree?

"You cannot answer a question with another question" - those are YOUR words,
Len.
>
> Are you a midieval knight?

"You cannot answer a question with another question" - those are YOUR words,
Len.

>>Amateur radio is not a reenactment of anything. Your analogy simply doesn't
>>work.

> Anceint Radiotelegraphy Society (ARS) is a reenactment of old
> radio days over a half century in the past.

Never heard of it. Where can I join? ;-)
>
>>It is simply an honest statement of fact to say that a person whose Morse
>>skills are limited to 5 wpm has entry-level skills and is not proficient at
>>Morse code.
>
> FCC does not require proficiency in morse code. FCC rerquies
> only a certain passing grade.
>
I agree! The code test is therefore not a proficiency test at all. Just an
entry-level skill test.

> FCC does not require US amateurs to use morse code over and
> above any other mode of communications.

So? What's your point?

> All allocated modes
> are optional to use by US radio amateurs.
>
And? FCC does not require any amateur to actually use their amateur license at
all. That's not true in many other services.

>>I don't know any reasonable person whose Morse skills are limited to 5 wpm
>>who is offended by that description.
>
> Get out more.
>
I get out plenty. My statement is true.

>>Your analogy simply doesn't work.
>
> Your reply to Brian's message doesn't work.
>
Sure it does. You just don't like it, because you cannot tolerate strong

opposition to your cherished opinions.
>
>>More than "a few". Do you ever actually listen to the amateur bands,
>>particularly the non-voice HF/MF amateur bands, Brian? Lots of radio
>>amateurs
>>using RADIOtelegraphy. Right now, today.
>
> Obtain a receiver capable of receiving non-morse communications.

I have at least seven receivers in working condition capable of receiving non-Morse code signals on the HF amateur bands.

Do you have any that are capable of receiving Morse code on the HF amateur bands, Len? Brian?
>
>>Nonsense. Telling folks with entry-level skills that they are 'proficient'
>>is
>>patronizing and insults their intelligence. It's a form of lying. I respect
>>those folks too much to do that sort of thing.
>
> FCC does not demand proficiency in morse code. FCC requires
> only a minimum passing score.

I agree! The code test is therefore not a proficiency test at all. Just an entry-level skill test.

But what does that have to do with lying to and patronizing folks with entry-level code skills?

> You respect only those "folks" who love and respect morse code.

Not at all. There are many people I respect regardless of their "love" and "respect" of Morse code. You're not one of them, Len.
>
>>What "isn't going anywhere"?
>
> Your analogy that morse code testing is like driving a manual
> transmission vehicle.

Why not? It's a good analogy. I should mention that Bill, K2UNK (whom I admire and respect even though we disagree on many things) seems to think it's a good analogy.

I'm not sure what Carl, WK3C, thinks of it, but in a recent post he seemed to indicate he thought it was a good analogy.
>
>>And that's a fact.
>
> FCC does not demand proficiency in morse code. FCC requires
> only a minimum passing score.

I agree! The code test is therefore not a proficiency test at all. Just an entry-level skill test.

Why do you keep repeating the obvious, Len?
>
> If you agree with that, why belabor the obvious?
>
It's not me that keeps repeating that bit about the test.

> If you don't agree with that, you are ridiculing mortals who do not
> love and respect morse code.

How?
>
> Which is it?
>
Neither.

>>You're the one asking the question. Do some research. Part 97 is available
>>on
>>line. You obviously have more time than me. Go for it.
>
> You are acting the radio god again.

Not me.

> You are irrational.

How? What have I stated that is not true?
>
>>>That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
>>>Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.
>>
>>Nonsense.
>
> Not "nonsense." Fact.

No, it's nonsense. Those organizations have nothing to do with amateur radio.
>
>>But your statement shows us that it isn't just the all Morse code TESTING
>>that you want to eliminate, but all Morse code USE.
>
> Paranoia and fear shown to all.

Not by me.

> Irrational.
>
Yes, your replies here often are, Len ;-)
>
>>Or are you simply trying to "brown people off"?
>
> Only certain gods of radio.

Well, that leaves me out.

> Gods of radio are superior to ordinary
> mortals. Gods of radio are irrational.

>
> Live with it, god of radio.
>
Can't be talking about me. I'm just a plain old mortal degreed Yankee EE
gainfully employed at

(you don't need to know where I work or what I do, Len)

with a ham license who happens to like homebrewing, contesting, ragchewing,
DXing, CW, FM, SSB, AM, and a bunch of other things connected with amateur
radio.

And that's a plain, simple fact.

Jim, N2EY

"midieval", "Anceint" "rerquies"?

1000. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 02:57:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b56235avl1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63137

```
"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0303170954.7c80bbb9@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<bi7da.1637$Ad2.1354560@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030316114523.25154.00000811@mb-cb.aol.com...
> > > In article <b4l7hh$d8u$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "me" <me@here.com>
> > writes:
> > >
> > > >Would you want to learn how to ride a horse?
> > >
> > > Sure! Sounds like fun.
> > >
> > > >Horseback riding was
> > > >an early form of transportation. It is a tradition that was used for
> > > >hundreds of years.
> > >
> > > And it's still in use in some places.
> > >
> > > >Wouldn't you want to keep up the tradition? Just think,
> > > >you can brag to your friends that you can ride a horse. In an
emergency,
> > > >you
> > > >and the Lone Ranger can ride for help. Everybody in the newsgroup
would
> > > >be
> > > >impressed.
> > >
> > > If you're looking for an analogy to the Morse code test, the horseback
> > > riding
> > > thing is not a good analogy.
> >
> > Jim,
> >
> > I think the horseback riding analogy is a good one ...
>
> Why?
>
> Horses are not motor vehicles. No horse-riding license needed anywhere
> I know. And except for a few areas (Lancaster County, some big cities
> with mounted police), horses are almost unknown on American streets
> and roads.
>
> Manual transmission vehicles, on the other hand, are ubiquitous. Just
```

> not as common as they once were.
>
> The percentage of CW signals on the HF/MF ham bands is at least as
> high, if not much higher, thans the percentage of manual transmission
> cars on US roads. Much greater than the percentage of horses on the
> road...
>
> > however, since you
> > prefer the transmission one, I'll speak to that.
> >
> > > Try this one:
> > >
> > > Once upon a time, practically all motor vehicles had manual
transmissions
> > > of
> > > one type or another. Learning to use a clutch and gear shift was a big
> > > part of
> > > learning to drive.
> > >
> > > Today, most (I read an estimate of 80%) passenger cars, minivans and
light
> > > trucks on the road have automatic transmissions. I don't know of a
single
> > > US
> > > state or commonwealth that requires manual transmission skill testing
for
> > > an
> > > ordinary driver's license.
> >
> > Neither do I ...
> >
> I recall reading somewhere that the majority of new US-made cars had
> automatic transmissions starting in the late 1950s.

True, and in today's market, less than 10% of new cars are manual.

> > > It's a good idea for all drivers to have manual transmission driving
> > > skills.
> >
> > Why???
> >
> Because it increases all drivers' opportunities and possibilities wrt
> driving situations. For example, the choice of vehicle is greater.

That's a "personal choice." There's NO value to society and thus
the states abondoned any testing.

>No
> problems with "we have to take/buy X's car because Y can't drive
> stick", etc. (Been there, done that!)

That's a personal problem. All my kids learned to drive
manuals.

> Manual transmission cars are simpler, cost less, use less fuel and
> pollute less than their automatic-transmission equivalents.

The fuel efficiency of automatics is very close to that of a manual
gearbox these days. Pollution wise, unless you are factoring the
small mileage difference, the emissions shouldn't be any different.

> Note that we're talking about something being a "a good idea" not
> being mandated by law.

The ONLY reason manual transmissions are still be maded is
because there's a market for them that is big enough
to justify the continued availability.

> Do you think it's not a good idea for all drivers to have manual
> transmission driving skills?

Nope. I think it's a choice an individual makes. I could care
less that anyone else knows how to drive my cars.

> > > But should such skills be mandated by law?
> >
> > Of course not.
>
> Well, that's one opinion.

Would you rather manual transmission knowledge/skill be mandated?

> > > The current Morse test is akin to requiring all prospective drivers be
> > > able to
> > > drive across an empty parking lot with a manual-transmission car in
first
> > > gear,
> > > starting and stopping without stalling the engine.
> >
> > Exactly ... such a test should not be mandated because it isn't
necessary
> > and serves no legitimate regulatory purpose.
>
> There's no S25.5 for clutches, anyway.

Fine by me.

> >
> > I'm glad you finally seem to agree :-)
> >
> You're inferring what I've neither stated nor implied. I haven't
> stated any opinion other than "It's a good idea for all drivers to
> have manual transmission driving skills."
>
> My point is simply that the transmission analogy is a much better and
> more relevant one than the horse analogy.

I agee also and have used this analogy myself many
times.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1001. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 05:40:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E76B130.BFE1A098@att.net>
Source record: 63138

Dave Heil wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E73CB2E.30922A91@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<FA2E6F19D71B8EFA.02253178E8F4FD15.578D7F18BCBC2C0A@lp.airnews.net>...
> > > > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:f45722ac.0303140512.21f10847@posting.google.com...
> > > > > > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:<3E7155DF.52EF1E92@att.net>...
> > > > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > He needs a whole lot more thast just good luck.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > He who? You promised not to read anymore of my stuff, DICK.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Wow, you won first place on the list today, Brian (first post listed). Oh,
> > > > > > did Dick make another promise to killfile someone then not? LOL
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > >
> > > > > Yep. I'm a winner today.
> > > > >
> > > > > DICK and Alec Baldwin have apparently made a lasting relationship.
> > > > >
> > > > > Not that Dave has noticed or would break his PCTA double standard to comment.
> > > > >
> > > > > He's too busy tuning 6M.
> > > >
> > > > None but the clueless are busy tuning 6m these days.
> > >
> > Welp, there you have it. I guess the bootleggers have rolled it up and gone home.
> >
> > > Once again, Dick replied to one of my posts. You and Kim were caught up
> > > in the heat of the chase. You goofed. There's my comment.
> >

> > You are the enabler. DICK just can't stay away even though he said he would.
>
> See! You do have time for stupid games!
>
> Dave K8MN

That's all he, Lennie and Kim know how to play at.

1002. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 05:42:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E76B19D.3657E952@att.net>
Source record: 63139

Dave Heil wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E74C904.1ED72CF3@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E73CE56.C2F4CDDA@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E735497.B878D89B@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > Doubtful. You still don't know if the record setters are proficient
> > > > > with a demostrated "skill" of 0.02 wpm, but declare those with a
> > > > > demonstrated skill of 5wpm as not proficient.
> > > >
> > > > There's no doubt at all, Brian. You're still plodding along, making the
> > > same mistakes.
> > >
> > > I'm making mistakes?
>
> You seem to be the only one who is surprised.
>
> > > The fellows on 136 KHz were likely using computers to
> > > bring the signal above the noise. We don't know either fellow's top
> > > morse speed but can safely assume that it is well above .02 wpm and
> > > likely in excess of 5 wpm.
> >
> > Why can you assume that?
>
> See! You DO have time for stupid games!
>
> > Because a world record was set they must be fast coders?
>
> Did you believe they were going for a world speed record?
>
> > And you say I make mistakes.
>
> Yes, I do say that you make mistakes.
>

> > As I've pointed out several times, w e
> > > d o n ' t k n o w i f t h e y a r e p r o f i c i e n t in
> > > the use of morse.
> >
> > But somehow you can assume it is well in excess of 5wpm?
>
> Yes, that's right.
>
> > Someone whose top speed is o n l y 5 wpm is not
> > > proficient in the use of morse.
> >
> > Especailly if they set world's records.
>
> Where do we have a case of someone whose top speed is only 5 wpm setting
> a world record in anything?
>
> > > > Then you confuse your record of entering a contest with with proof of
> > > > proficiency, but don't allow someone with 250 times the speed of a
> > > > world record to be considered proficient.
> > >
> > > I'm not confused at all, Brian. The average man speaks at a rate of
> > > about 150 wpm. One would have to assume that the top ten contest
> > > scorers worldwide would have to be at least average speakers to beat the
> > > thousands of other entrants and the hundreds with similar equipment and
> > > antennas.
> >
> > You do a lot of assuming.
>
> I made reasonable assumptions.
>
> > > Your diddling about the world record on 136 KHz ignore the fact that the
> > > slow speed was of necessity and that the ops weren't even depending upon
> > > copy by ear. You'd also have us assume that .02 wpm is their top
> > > receiving speed. You're attempting a stretch and your arguments still
> > > sound absurd.
> >
> > I assume nothing. They used CW; their speed was 0.02wpm. They set a
> > world's record.
>
> That makes you sound incredibly stupid.
>

And there would be good reason for that.

1003. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 08:20:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E76D756.AE3C9B6B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63140

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E75B589.A9D1FB99@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > I assume nothing. They used CW; their speed was 0.02wpm. They set a
> > > world's record.
> >
> > That makes you sound incredibly stupid.

> It was President Reagan who first said "Facts are stupid things."
>
> You are the second.
>
> You'll get over it.

He was probably saying it about a guy just like you--one who takes
several facts and puts them together in an effort to say that they prove
an entirely different thing. I didn't write that facts were stupid. I
wrote that you sound stupid.

Dave K8MN

1004. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 08:24:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E76D828.88478EC4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63141

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E75B472.E24767E7@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E73CB2E.30922A91@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<FA2E6F19D71B8EFA.02253178E8F4FD15.578D7F18BCBC2C0A@lp.airnews.net>...
> > > > > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:f45722ac.0303140512.21f10847@posting.google.com...
> > > > > > > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> > news:<3E7155DF.52EF1E92@att.net>...
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I talk at the same speed on FM as I do on SSB and AM. Good luck.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > He needs a whole lot more thast just good luck.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > He who? You promised not to read anymore of my stuff, DICK.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Wow, you won first place on the list today, Brian (first post listed). Oh,
> > > > > > > did Dick make another promise to killfile someone then not? LOL
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Yep. I'm a winner today.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > DICK and Alec Baldwin have apparently made a lasting relationship.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Not that Dave has noticed or would break his PCTA double standard to comment.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > He's too busy tuning 6M.
> > > > >
> > > > > None but the clueless are busy tuning 6m these days.
> > > >
> > > > Welp, there you have it. I guess the bootleggers have rolled it up and gone home.
> > > >
> > > > Once again, Dick replied to one of my posts. You and Kim were caught up

> > > > in the heat of the chase. You goofed. There's my comment.
> > >
> > > You are the enabler. DICK just can't stay away even though he said he would.
> >
> > See! You do have time for stupid games!
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Yeh, I guess.

Okay, Brian/Kim/Alec. You don't have time but you meant that you do
have time.

> You're here, aren't you?

I'm not the guy who wrote that I didn't have time.

Dave K8MN

1005. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 08:35:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E76DAC8.3BC35295@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63142

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E75B451.26E5B288@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E74CD51.2C3658AB@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:

> > > I don't have time for your stupid games.
> >
> > Actually, the stupid games are your department and you seem to have
> > endless time for them. Thousands of hams worldwide use morse daily.
> > No one, save for you and Len, believes that those hams aren't enjoying
> > their use of morse.
>
> That is simply not true. In my first statement I said that it was
> enjoyed.
>
> Go back. Do not collect $200.

Fine. That leaves only Len who believes that those using morse aren't
enjoying it.

> > > > It has nothing to do with the FCC. If the FCC mandated testing at 13
> > > > wpm, those who could do only 5 wpm would still not be considered
> > > > proficient.
> > >
> > > Would 13wpm be considered proficient by you?
> >
> > Thirteen words per minute is more proficient that five words per minute.
> > It is not as proficient as 20, 25, 30, 35 or 40 wpm.
>
> I see. "Proficiency" is a moving target. It can be whatever you say
> it is on any given day.

You haven't been paying attention.

> You need to define "proficient." At what use level does it become
> proficient?

I already did so. Go back. Do not collect $200. Read the definition
of the word. We'll discuss it when you've digested it.

> > > > That isn't correct. Thousands and thousands of radio amateurs are using
> > > > morse daily. The mode is the second most popular on HF.
> > >
> > > I am correct. They are using telegraphy. And they are but a few in
> > > comparison with all the telegraph operators who plied the trade when
> > > telegraphy was king.
> >
> > I'm sure that you believe what you wrote. That isn't sufficient to make
> > it correct.
>
> Is what I said a moving target?

No, what you said is just plain wrong.

> > > > > There will be fewer still, tomorrow.
> > > >
> > > > That hasn't been demonstrated.
> > >
> > > Then wait till tomorrow.
> >
> > It is now tomorrow. I've noticed no change.
>
> Oh, no. I was wrong. There are more telegraphers today than there
> were during the heyday of telegragh useage.
>
> You can support that with facts at any time. Unless you think facts
> will make you look stupid.

The same would go for your statements. I haven't seen any numbers from
you. Where are they?

Dave K8MN

1006. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 13:10:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303180510.492a74a9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63143

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E76B19D.3657E952@att.net>...

> And there would be good reason for that.

Dave must have his hand up your skirt like a puppet.

1007. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 13:32:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030318083241.25614.00000152@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 63144

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/18/03 7:10 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303180510.492a74a9@posting.google.com>

>Dave must have his hand up your skirt like a puppet.

What is it with you and the Left Coast Liar that whenever you're getting a good dusting in here you start making comments of a homosexual overtone, Brian...?!?!

Jealous?

Steve

1008. Re: Larry on Larry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 16:36:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030318113629.00929.00000289@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 63145

In article <rn1da.1610$Ad2.1326826@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>ROTFLMAO!!!!!!!!
>
>Spot on!!!

Carl:

I suggest you try some club soda on that spot.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1009. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 17:28:37 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303180928.4fe12a6d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63146

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b56235avl1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>...

(old stuff removed)

> > Manual transmission vehicles, on the other hand, are ubiquitous. Just
> > not as common as they once were.
> >
> > The percentage of CW signals on the HF/MF ham bands is at least as
> > high, if not much higher, thans the percentage of manual transmission
> > cars on US roads. Much greater than the percentage of horses on the
> > road...
> >
> > > however, since you
> > > prefer the transmission one, I'll speak to that.
> > >
> > > > Try this one:
> > > >
> > > > Once upon a time, practically all motor vehicles had manual
> transmissions
> > > > of
> > > > one type or another. Learning to use a clutch and gear shift was a big
> > > > part of
> > > > learning to drive.
> > > >
> > > > Today, most (I read an estimate of 80%) passenger cars, minivans and
> light
> > > > trucks on the road have automatic transmissions. I don't know of a
> single
> > > > US
> > > > state or commonwealth that requires manual transmission skill testing
> for
> > > > an
> > > > ordinary driver's license.
> > >
> > > Neither do I ...
> > >
> > I recall reading somewhere that the majority of new US-made cars had
> > automatic transmissions starting in the late 1950s.
>
> True, and in today's market, less than 10% of new cars are manual.

Is it really that low, Bill? I'd guess more like 25%. However, if it's
10%, that simply reinforces my earlier statement that the percentage
of CW signals on the HF/MF ham bands is higher than the percentage of

manual transmission
cars on US roads. And much greater than the percentage of horses on
the road...

> > > > It's a good idea for all drivers to have manual transmission driving
> > > > skills.
> > >
> > > Why???
> > >
> > Because it increases all drivers' opportunities and possibilities wrt
> > driving situations. For example, the choice of vehicle is greater.
>
> That's a "personal choice."

Usually true.

> There's NO value to society

I disagree! Less fuel used and less pollution are definitely a value
to society. So is the ability to choose the best driver from among
those available.

Example: Some friends go out for dinner in a stick-shift car. The
person who drove has a big meal and feels sleepy afterwards, but has
to drive home anyway because the others 'can't drive stick'. Of course
it's easy to say they should have taken another car in the first
place, but in real life such situations do arise.

> and thus the states abondoned any testing.

I disagree again!

I think the reasons the states we know of stopped being fussy about
what sort of vehicle was used for testing were:

1) it's a hassle to require a stick shift car for testing (in PA the
person being tested supplies the car).

2) lots of people wanted drivers licenses

3) the perceived benefits to society of having lots of people licensed
to drive were greater than the perceived benefits of having all
drivers pass a stick-shift test.
>
> > No
> > problems with "we have to take/buy X's car because Y can't drive
> > stick", etc. (Been there, done that!)
>
> That's a personal problem.

Not mine, because I drive all sorts of vehicles. Tested in a manual
transmission car, in fact, to avoid any possibility of the dreaded
"automatic transmission only" limitation on the license.

> All my kids learned to drive
> manuals.
>
Great!

> > Manual transmission cars are simpler, cost less, use less fuel and
> > pollute less than their automatic-transmission equivalents.
>
> The fuel efficiency of automatics is very close to that of a manual
> gearbox these days.

But there is still an advantage. The percentage varies with the
vehicle, of course.

> Pollution wise, unless you are factoring the
> small mileage difference, the emissions shouldn't be any different.

But there is a difference. 10% less fuel burned in equivalent engines
means 10% less pollution.

Returning to radio for a moment, the spectrum and power efficiency of
CW is much better than any analog voice mode. "Takes up less of the
road", so to speak.
>
> > Note that we're talking about something being a "a good idea" not
> > being mandated by law.
>
> The ONLY reason manual transmissions are still be maded is
> because there's a market for them that is big enough
> to justify the continued availability.

IOW, folks still want them. Even though some folks might call them
"luddites" or describe the manual transmission as "antique",
"obsolete", or "1930s technology".

Note how that market continues to exist even though there is no
stick-shift test nor mandatory stick-shift use requirement....

> > Do you think it's not a good idea for all drivers to have manual
> > transmission driving skills?
>
> Nope.

Why not? Remember, we're talking about it being "a good idea" only,
NOT a mandated requirement.

> I think it's a choice an individual makes. I could care
> less that anyone else knows how to drive my cars.

> > > > But should such skills be mandated by law?
> > >
> > > Of course not.
> >
> > Well, that's one opinion.
>

> Would you rather manual transmission knowledge/skill be mandated?

I'm not sure. I am sure that manual-transmission skill is a good thing
to have, and should be a goal of practically all drivers.
>
> > > > The current Morse test is akin to requiring all prospective drivers be
> > > > able to
> > > > drive across an empty parking lot with a manual-transmission car in
> > > > first
> > > > gear,
> > > > starting and stopping without stalling the engine.
> > >
> > > Exactly ... such a test should not be mandated because it isn't
> > > necessary
> > > and serves no legitimate regulatory purpose.
> >
> > There's no S25.5 for clutches, anyway.
>
> Fine by me.

Not in NJ, PA, or NY, anyway. Any other states to be heard from?
>
> > >
> > > I'm glad you finally seem to agree :-)
> > >
> > You're inferring what I've neither stated nor implied. I haven't
> > stated any opinion other than "It's a good idea for all drivers to
> > have manual transmission driving skills."
> >
> > My point is simply that the transmission analogy is a much better and
> > more relevant one than the horse analogy.
>
> I agee also and have used this analogy myself many
> times.

In fact, I think that's where I first saw it. Sorry if I did not
properly credit the source, Bill.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1010. Re: Larry on Larry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 18:43:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030318134319.28866.00000103@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63147

>Subject: Re: Larry on Larry
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 3/18/03 10:36 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030318113629.00929.00000289@mb-fo.aol.com>

>I suggest you try some club soda on that spot.

With a twist!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1011. Re: Unattended Packet ok?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 21:11:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030318161115.15648.00001157@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 63151

In article <kd7da.1635$Ad2.1354700@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"K0HB" <k0hb@arrl.net> wrote in message
>news:e79dbd9b.0303161348.48cc8c54@posting.google.com...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>>
>> > But, Hans, did you stay at a Holiday Inn Express last night? 8-)
>>
>> I guess I need to stand up, because that question went over my head.
>>
>> 73, Hans, K0HB
>
>Hans,
>
>You used the "disclaimer":
>
>> I am not a communications lawyer, nor do I play one on TV.
>
>I was making a joke based on the series of TV commercials for
>Holiday Inn Express ...

There is a definite LACK of HUMOR among gods of radio.

Perhaps proficiency in morse code robs them of the ability
to observe advertising on television. Television is a Mass
Media Radio Service, not amateur radio. QED.

With all kind regards,

Leonard H. Anderson
retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

1012. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 21:11:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030318161116.15648.00001158@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 63153

In article <20030317202736.23598.00000903@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030316151846.20123.00001026@mb-mv.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20030316082701.23139.00001320@mb-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>>writes:

>>>I don't know any reasonable person whose Morse skills are limited to 5 wpm
>>>who is offended by that description.
>>
>> Get out more.
>>
>I get out plenty. My statement is true.

Miccolis' statement only indicates he does not know many others.

>>>Your analogy simply doesn't work.
>>
>> Your reply to Brian's message doesn't work.
>>
>Sure it does. You just don't like it, because you cannot tolerate strong
>opposition to your cherished opinions.

Miccolis is NOT a "judge" of "what works" in the opinions of
others.

Miccolis is becoming irrational again.

>I have at least seven receivers in working condition capable of receiving
>non-Morse code signals on the HF amateur bands.

Irrelevant. See subject thread title.

>Do you have any that are capable of receiving Morse code on the HF amateur
>bands, Len? Brian?

Irrelevant. None of my receivers receive only "morse code."

My receivers receive only radio signals.

>> FCC does not demand proficiency in morse code. FCC requires
>> only a minimum passing score.
>
>I agree! The code test is therefore not a proficiency test at all. Just an
>entry-level skill test.

No. A passing score is simply a passing score.

The FCC tests prospective radio amateurs as part of their
radio regulating charter.

The FCC is not an academic or trade-school organization.

>But what does that have to do with lying to and patronizing folks with
>entry-level code skills?

Irrelevant again.

This is not about character assassination attempts by others,
notably David Heil.

FCC does not mandate morse code mode use by any US radio
amateur. All allocated modes are optional for use by any US
radio amateur.

>> You respect only those "folks" who love and respect morse code.
>
>Not at all. There are many people I respect regardless of their "love" and
>"respect" of Morse code. You're not one of them, Len.

Irrelevant again.

Miccolis is NOT a "judge" of "love or respect."

>> Your analogy that morse code testing is like driving a manual
>> transmission vehicle.
>
>Why not? It's a good analogy. I should mention that Bill, K2UNK (whom I
>admire
>and respect even though we disagree on many things) seems to think it's a
>good
>analogy.

This is NOT a newsgroup for policy on vehicle operation.

FCC does NOT require vehicle operation testing for any class
of US amateur radio license.

>> FCC does not demand proficiency in morse code. FCC requires
>> only a minimum passing score.
>
>I agree! The code test is therefore not a proficiency test at all. Just an
>entry-level skill test.

Incorrect. FCC has only one morse code cognition test element
for a US amateur radio license of General or Extra class.

The FCC is not an academic or trade-school organization. FCC
uses testing as part of its US civil radio regulation activity.

>Why do you keep repeating the obvious, Len?

Miccolis seems unaware of radio license testing true nature.

Miccolis tends toward irrationality.

>> You are irrational.
>
>How? What have I stated that is not true?

Yes. Your mistakes have been pointed out to you.

>>>>That Morse is obsolete is also self evident, re: Western Union, US
>>>>Army Signal Corps, US Coast Guard, Union Pacific Railroad.
>>>
>>>Nonsense.
>>
>> Not "nonsense." Fact.
>
>No, it's nonsense. Those organizations have nothing to do with amateur radio.

All of those organizations USE RADIO.

Operation of vehicles or horseback riding has NOTHING to do
with RADIO.

Try to stay close to focus.

1013. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 21:11:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030318161118.15648.00001159@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 63149

In article <3E75518A.F3605D79@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E742075.8E999470@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <3E73D096.9511C46F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Brian wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >> >news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
>> >> >> > In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
>> >> >> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >> >> > >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>> >> >> > >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> >> >> > <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> >> > >> writes:
>>
>> >"Smiley" discounted. There's plenty of morse being used on VHF and UHF
>> >by weak signal enthusiasts and satellite ops. Oh, I forgot--you're out
>> >of the loop!
>>
>> You are irrational. You are angry.
>
>Are you trying to hypnotize me? I'm not irrational and I'm not angry.
>It is obvious that you didn't know that morse is frequently used above
>30 MHz. That puts you out of the loop.

Heil is both irrational and angry.

"Morse" is NOT "frequently used above 30 MHz."

Heil's "loop" is only his own irrationality.

>> Advocacy of elimination of code testing does not require licensing.
>

>Nobody asked you to become an advocate. If you must, go advocate
>somewhere. You aren't hitting your intended audience here.

Heil is irrational, angry, and now frustrated.

Heil is NOT an "authority" on any participation permission.

>> There is not secrecy in US amateur radio. Such is not allowed
>> by US law on US amateur radio.
>
>Just because you don't know something doesn't mean that it has been kept
>a secret. It just means that you don't know.

US radio amateurs are forbidden by law to use means of obscuring
communications.

Heil has now demonstrated irrationality, anger, frustration AND
ignorance of law.

>You're right. There has been no poll. How likely do you believe it to
>be that the thousands of radio amateurs using morse each day are not
>enjoying it? You'd have to be a fool to stake the ranch on that one.

This is not a newsgroup for real estate ownership matters or
western living.

There is NO poll on "enjoyment of morse."

>> Morse code is not a required mode in US amateur radio use.
>> All modes are optional to use in US amateur radio law.
>
>You're drifting. We were discussing those who USE MORSE.

There is NO discussion. Heil is irrational.

There has been NO poll on "enjoyment of morse (code)."

>Is this the part where I'm supposed to be getting sleepy?

Irrational people like Heil cannot focus on the subject.

Note subject thread title: "Extra-Lite Status."

>[this space reserved for the N2EY profile of Leonard H. Anderson]

Heil is still irrational AND lacks orginality.

Heil only wants to engage in character assassination.

>I'm not going to tell someone whose maximum morse speed that he is
>proficient and I'm not going to tell Brian Burke that his moronic
>premise is brilliant.

Heil now tries character assassination on Brian Burke.

Brian Burke is NOT the subject of this thread.

Heil thinks that the subject is character assassination.

Heil is still irrational.

>I don't know any radio gods. I've never seen one, never spoken to one.
>I suspect they are superior but I don't know why they'd be irrational.

More irrationality.

>> I am a professional.
>
>Good for you, Len! Now try for the next part of the sentence, "and
>amateur radio is not professional". Now you're getting it. Amateur
>radio isn't professional and you aren't a radio amateur.

Heil is both an amateur AND irrational.

I am a professional in radio-electronics. I have been such for
over half a century. I am licensed by the US government in
radio operation.

>Maybe you can tell them when you meet them. I don't expect that to
>happen until you've expired. How do you intend to get word back to us?

Heil is still irrational. Heil is still into character assassination
with wishes for one to "expire."

>> I am still a professional in radio and electronics.
>
>...and you're still not a participant in amateur radio.

Heil remains irrational.

There is NO requirement to be licensed to discuss US law on
licensing.

>> Radio gods were never professional despite their past titles.
>
>Gods don't get paid? Why would a god have a past title?

Heil's statements of "past work" indicate he was an amateur.

Heil is an example of the fleecing of America.

1014. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 21:11:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030318161118.15648.00001160@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 63150

In article <3E754D9C.4013433E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E74250F.A4DDB399@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <20030315210938.23981.00000303@mb-fv.aol.com>,
>> >averyfineman@aol.com
>>
>> >Looks like you've had an accident in the comm center, old timer. Your
>> >Avery Labels persona tangled with LenOver70 and spilled a few non
>> >responses. Come to think of it, that's not necessarily a bad thing.
>>
>> No accident. Deliberate. It got an expected response.
>
>You'll forgive me if I don't believe you.

You are not forgiven.

I baited a trap. You fell into it, got caught.

Poor baby, now you are all upset. TS.

>"Pardon me, Mister Anderson, you have toilet paper sticking out of your
>trousers."
>
>Andersonian response: "I meant to do that."

I meant to do what I did. No "toilet paper" was involved.

The ONLY person to get copies from my alternate screen
name was Heil.

Heil makes it a point to attack only certain individuals.

Heil is mean-spirited as well as irrational.

>I don't think so. I think it shows that you screwed up and told a
>whopper to cover it.

I have no affiliation with Burger King.

I did what I said. Heil got caught. Poor baby.

Heil is an amateur.

1015. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 21:11:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030318161120.15648.00001161@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 63152

In article <c2356669.0303170954.7c80bbb9@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<bi7da.1637$Ad2.1354560@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> news:20030316114523.25154.00000811@mb-cb.aol.com...
>> > In article <b4l7hh$d8u$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "me" <me@here.com>
>> writes:
>> >
>> > >Would you want to learn how to ride a horse?
>> >
>> > Sure! Sounds like fun.
>> >
>> > >Horseback riding was
>> > >an early form of transportation. It is a tradition that was used for
>> > >hundreds of years.
>> >
>> > And it's still in use in some places.
>> >
>> > >Wouldn't you want to keep up the tradition? Just think,
>> > >you can brag to your friends that you can ride a horse. In an emergency,
>> > >you
>> > >and the Lone Ranger can ride for help. Everybody in the newsgroup would
>> > >be
>> > >impressed.
>> >
>> > If you're looking for an analogy to the Morse code test, the horseback
>> > riding
>> > thing is not a good analogy.
>>
>> Jim,
>>
>> I think the horseback riding analogy is a good one ...
>
>Why?
>
>Horses are not motor vehicles. No horse-riding license needed anywhere
>I know. And except for a few areas (Lancaster County, some big cities
>with mounted police), horses are almost unknown on American streets
>and roads.
>
>Manual transmission vehicles, on the other hand, are ubiquitous. Just
>not as common as they once were.

This is NOT a vehicle operator's newsgroup.

There is NO requirement to demonstrate vehicle or equine
proficiency for a US amateur radio license.

"Ubiquitous" is defined in dictionaries as "seemingly present
everywhere at the same time." Any examination/observation
of vehicles on the roads of the USA will demonstrate that the
word "ubiquitous" does NOT apply to your statement.

>The percentage of CW signals on the HF/MF ham bands is at least as
>high, if not much higher, thans the percentage of manual transmission
>cars on US roads. Much greater than the percentage of horses on the
>road...

The presence or absence of "CW signals" on "ham bands" has
NOTHING to do with the kinds of vehicles on US roads.

Pluralizing the word "than" is INCORRECT English useage.

>I recall reading somewhere that the majority of new US-made cars had
>automatic transmissions starting in the late 1950s.

Irrelevant to an amateur RADIO newsgroup.

Try to stay focussed.

>Because it increases all drivers' opportunities and possibilities wrt
>driving situations. For example, the choice of vehicle is greater. No
>problems with "we have to take/buy X's car because Y can't drive
>stick", etc. (Been there, done that!)

Irrelevant to an amateur RADIO newsgroup.

Go to some automotive-interest newsgroup.

>Do you think it's not a good idea for all drivers to have manual
>transmission driving skills?

You are becoming irrational. There is NO requirement for
motor vehicle operation skills in US amateur radio.

>> Exactly ... such a test should not be mandated because it isn't necessary
>> and serves no legitimate regulatory purpose.
>
>There's no S25.5 for clutches, anyway.

The International Telecommunications Union does NOT make
regulations or recommendations for motor vehicle operation.

You've become irrational.

>You're inferring what I've neither stated nor implied. I haven't
>stated any opinion other than "It's a good idea for all drivers to
>have manual transmission driving skills."

Vehicle operation is NOT a requirement for any US radio
amateur, any class.

>My point is simply that the transmission analogy is a much better and
>more relevant one than the horse analogy.

This newsgroup is NOT involved with automotive or equine
matters.

Try to stay focussed.

1016. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 21:11:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030318161121.15648.00001162@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 63148

In article <3E75C45A.802A36E3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E742F71.9D34A08A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <3E73D8EC.EA910379@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:

<one helluva lot of irrational replies by Heil omitted...>

>> You are irrational.
>
>Show your "You're a god. You are no god. You're a god. You are no god.
>You're a god. You are no god. You're a god. You are no god." routine
>to your psychologist wife.

You are being irrational again. Stop that.

My wife is not a psychologist. She has a Masters Degree in
Education, another Masters in Social Work, both from the
University of Illinois.

>> Advocacy of code test elimination does not require licensing.
>
>You don't need a license to avoid fulfilling the N2EY profile.

Subject is CODE TEST ELIMINATION, not your attempts at
character assassination.

Try to stay somewhat close to the subject.

>> Licenses are not required to discuss US government laws.
>
>You don't need a license to avoid fulfilling the N2EY profile.

You are still irrational. Subject is CODE TEST ELIMINATION,
not Heil's attempts at character assassination.

>> You are only an amateur.
>
>Yes, a radio amateur. You are not.

I am a radio-electronics PROFESSIONAL. You are not a
professional. You are an amateur in radio.

You are also irrational. Get mental help.

1017. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 22:06:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303181406.55069694@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63154

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E76DAC8.3BC35295@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > You need to define "proficient." At what use level does it become
> > proficient?
>
> I already did so.

You have not.

Go back. Do not collect $200. Read the definition
> of the word. We'll discuss it when you've digested it.

I have.

Webster's does not address Morse Code proficiency.

Title 47, Part 97 does not address Morse Code proficiency.

You do not define Morse Code proficiency, but you're here to tell
others they aren't proficient.

I'd call that "smug."

> > You can support that with facts at any time. Unless you think facts
> > will make you look stupid.
>
> The same would go for your statements. I haven't seen any numbers from
> you. Where are they?

You need to define proficiency at Morse Code. You need to state the
number that you think (or "feel") is the point of proficiency.

You have not done so. You have only provided a moving target.

Time to get real, Dave. Define Morse proficiency.

1018. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 22:47:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030318174752.16148.00000116@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 63155

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/18/03 3:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030318161121.15648.00001162@mb-md.aol.com>

><one helluva lot of irrational replies by Heil omitted...>

Whoa! There's something new! Lennie accusing someone of being
irrational! How unique! (guffaw...chortle...outright laughter!)

>>Show your "You're a god. You are no god. You're a god. You are no god.
>>You're a god. You are no god. You're a god. You are no god." routine
>>to your psychologist wife.
>
> You are being irrational again. Stop that.
>
> My wife is not a psychologist. She has a Masters Degree in
> Education, another Masters in Social Work, both from the
> University of Illinois.

Ahhhhhh! But LENNIE! YOU are the LYING PUTZ who has stated his loving
spouse was so skilled in psychology and psychiatric disciplines!

So what's the truth...?!?!

Or should the question be "What's the truth THIS week?"

>Subject is CODE TEST ELIMINATION, not your attempts at
> character assassination.

This from the guy with the sightblack around his orbits from having
sighted-in more than one assassination target of his own!

Whoooooie!

>Try to stay somewhat close to the subject.

He's right on subject here, Your Lyingness. Lennie and his Lies.
Anderson and his Antagonisms...The Putz and his...Well, we won't go there....

>You are still irrational. Subject is CODE TEST ELIMINATION,
> not Heil's attempts at character assassination.

Hmmmmmmmmm.......Lennie spends YEARS posting hateful bile and
denigrations to a newsgroup related to a radio service in which he is neither
licensed nor experienced, then calls someone who IS "irrational".

THAT makes sense.

>I am a radio-electronics PROFESSIONAL.

Uh huh...One who can't send e-mail correctly. Reeeeeeeeal professional.

>You are also irrational. Get mental help.

You're a liar and a creep. You are BEYOND help.

Steve, K4YZ

1019. How stupid is K1MAN?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 22:48:14 UTC
From: Chuck O'Neal <coneal@ultranet.com>
Message-ID: <OmNda.133905$3D1.9714@sccrnsc01>
Source record: 63156
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Guess what folks...it appears that the Belgrade bastard (read Webster's
for a definition), as he is affectionately known as here in the NE, has
again
screwed up. He states in his current broadcasts that the FCC hasn't
published the 3 page letter to him which likely outlines previously reported
serious violations of FCC rules and regulations by K1MAN. Well, if one is
even slightly observant, you will see that the FCC logs on the ARRL website
are behind by a few weeks. I suggest that we wait and see if this letter is
published on the next cycle. For K1MAN's previous rules violations see:
http://www.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/
for Feb, 9 2002

K1MAN claims in his current broadcast that the FCC will not publish it.
HA!!!

When they do publish it, consider this in determining K1MAN's credibility
with his
whining's, threats, conspiracy theories, and other BS in the future.

Check this site out in the next week or two.
http://www.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/

1020. Lennie As Role Model...(NOT!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 23:04:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030318180418.16148.00000117@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 63157

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/18/03 3:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030318161121.15648.00001162@mb-md.aol.com>

><one helluva lot of irrational replies by Heil omitted...>

Whoa! There's something new! Lennie accusing someone of being
irrational! How unique! (guffaw...chortle...outright laughter!)

>>Show your "You're a god. You are no god. You're a god. You are no god.
>>You're a god. You are no god. You're a god. You are no god." routine
>>to your psychologist wife.
>
> You are being irrational again. Stop that.
>
> My wife is not a psychologist. She has a Masters Degree in
> Education, another Masters in Social Work, both from the
> University of Illinois.

Ahhhhhh! But LENNIE! YOU are the LYING PUTZ who has stated his loving
spouse was so skilled in psychology and psychiatric disciplines!

So what's the truth...?!?!

Or should the question be "What's the truth THIS week?"

>Subject is CODE TEST ELIMINATION, not your attempts at
> character assassination.

This from the guy with the sightblack around his orbits from having
sighted-in more than one assassination target of his own!

Whoooooie!

>Try to stay somewhat close to the subject.

He's right on subject here, Your Lyingness. Lennie and his Lies.
Anderson and his Antagonisms...The Putz and his...Well, we won't go there....

>You are still irrational. Subject is CODE TEST ELIMINATION,
> not Heil's attempts at character assassination.

Hmmmmmmmmm.......Lennie spends YEARS posting hateful bile and
denigrations to a newsgroup related to a radio service in which he is neither
licensed nor experienced, then calls someone who IS "irrational".

THAT makes sense.

>I am a radio-electronics PROFESSIONAL.

Uh huh...One who can't send e-mail correctly. Reeeeeeeeal professional.

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/18/03 3:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030318161120.15648.00001161@mb-md.aol.com>

>In article <c2356669.0303170954.7c80bbb9@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:

>>Manual transmission vehicles, on the other hand, are ubiquitous. Just
>>not as common as they once were.

>This is NOT a vehicle operator's newsgroup.

First Lennie the Lame chastises Jim for making an off-topic reference, but
then slides into:

>There is NO requirement to demonstrate vehicle or equine
> proficiency for a US amateur radio license.
>
> "Ubiquitous" is defined in dictionaries as "seemingly present
> everywhere at the same time." Any examination/observation
> of vehicles on the roads of the USA will demonstrate that the
> word "ubiquitous" does NOT apply to your statement.

Sure it applies. Pass an 18-wheeler lately? A dumptruck or military
vehicle?

>The presence or absence of "CW signals" on "ham bands" has
> NOTHING to do with the kinds of vehicles on US roads.
>
> Pluralizing the word "than" is INCORRECT English useage.

Lacking any valid rebuttal to the comments made, Lennie tries to hide a
veil of authortarianism as an English teacher.

>>I recall reading somewhere that the majority of new US-made cars had
>>automatic transmissions starting in the late 1950s.
>
> Irrelevant to an amateur RADIO newsgroup.
>
> Try to stay focussed.

Of course we KNOW that Lennie Anderscum NEVER deviates from discussing
Amateur Radio topics in this Amateur Radio
newsgroup...Uh-huh...riiiiiiiiight......

> Go to some automotive-interest newsgroup.

Lennie, contrary to your own self-determined rules, and as YOU have
pointed out in OTHER posts, this is NOT a moderated forum.

And even if it were (and ESPECIALLY if it were...) your lack of licensure and experience in Amateur Radio matters would preclude you from being a moderator. One with no practical experience in a subject can hardly sit in judgement of the matter discussed.

>You are becoming irrational. There is NO requirement for
> motor vehicle operation skills in US amateur radio.

What's even MORE irrational (and immensely humorous) is that you keep trying to argue as irrational that which is only an analogy.

Whew.

>Try to stay focussed.

Try to spell "focused" correctly, Mr English Teacher.

Steve, K4YZ

1021. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-18 23:07:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030318180751.16148.00000118@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 63158

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/18/03 4:06 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303181406.55069694@posting.google.com>

>You have not done so. You have only provided a moving target

You can't hit fixed ones, so what's the difference?

>Time to get real, Dave. Define Morse proficiency.

I can do that! It's that which you, Lennie and Vippy AREN'T...! ! !

Steve, K4YZ

1022. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 02:31:13 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030318213113.17176.00000071@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 63159

From Lenover21:
> The presence or absence of "CW signals" on "ham bands" has
> NOTHING to do with the kinds of vehicles on US roads.

Len, N2EY was using an analogy. By giving an example of (manual transmission and automobile operation), and relating it to (Morse code and amateur radio operation), he clarified the role of Morse code testing.

Below, N2EY further explains this analogy:
>>Because it increases all drivers' opportunities and possibilities wrt
>>driving situations. For example, the choice of vehicle is greater. No
>>problems with "we have to take/buy X's car because Y can't drive
>>stick", etc. (Been there, done that!)

From Lenover21:
>Go to some automotive-interest newsgroup.

N2EY did not extensively talk about automobiles - just enough to give an analogy.

N2EY says manual transmission is used in some cars - it is useful to know, but should not be part of the license test. By analogy, Morse may be useful for some Hams to learn, but there is no need to test for it.

Whether <Morse> code is useful is debatable. I feel <Morse> code is not useful and possibly harms to the hobby (and one's "state") more than there are benefits. I feel that the only reason <Morse> code is used is that Hams insist on using it. Non-testing seems like a reasonable compromise (yes, its still a compromise) to accept. As long as it does not affect me, I have no problem with that. There are enough people that will learn it and <Morse> code skill can be useful for them. I would elect not to learn it.

1023. Re: Larry on Larry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 02:38:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030318213828.08152.00001171@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 63160

In article <20030318134319.28866.00000103@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>
>>I suggest you try some club soda on that spot.
>
> With a twist!
>
>73
>
>Steve, K4YZ

Steve:

No, I think Carl's twisted enough as it is!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1024. Re: How stupid is K1MAN?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 02:44:21 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@14313BARFforever.net>
Message-ID: <b58lgf$h20$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 63161
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

One more time,

A. K1MAN has been getting "correspondence" from the
Commission since the 1980s.

B. If K1MAN is taken off the air, W1AW will follow, immediately.

C. K1MAN has a well documented case against the FCC. The
commission will do anything to avoid metting K1MAN in a
federal courtroom.

D. If you don't understand A, B, C above, refer back to A,
then B, then C. Repeat as necessary.

Herb

"Chuck O'Neal" <coneal@ultranet.com> wrote in message
news:OmNda.133905$3D1.9714@sccrnsc01...
> Guess what folks...it appears that the Belgrade bastard (read Webster's
> for a definition), as he is affectionately known as here in the NE, has
> again
> screwed up. He states in his current broadcasts that the FCC hasn't
> published the 3 page letter to him which likely outlines previously
reported
> serious violations of FCC rules and regulations by K1MAN. Well, if one is
> even slightly observant, you will see that the FCC logs on the ARRL
website
> are behind by a few weeks. I suggest that we wait and see if this letter
is
> published on the next cycle. For K1MAN's previous rules violations see:
> http://www.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/
> for Feb, 9 2002
>
> K1MAN claims in his current broadcast that the FCC will not publish it.
> HA!!!
>
> When they do publish it, consider this in determining K1MAN's credibility
> with his
> whining's, threats, conspiracy theories, and other BS in the future.
>
> Check this site out in the next week or two.
> http://www.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/
>
>

1025. Re: How stupid is K1MAN?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 03:51:03 UTC
From: Chuck O'Neal <coneal@ultranet.com>
Message-ID: <HORda.165891$sf5.88961@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 63162
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Your reply means nothing since you have failed the first test of credibility
>> No identity.
You are a chicken shit. Reply if you have the testicular fortitude to use
your real name.

A) K1MAN, the NAL queen, has failed to pay fines, a FELONY!!!
"Correspondence"
yeah, right!!! Perhaps he will be in the cell next to yours.

B) W1AW is not anything like K1MAN. The other day I heard the control op of
W1AW
ask if the freq was in use before airing their bulletin. It was. They
waited. K1boy doesn't
do that because he is selfish and has yet to understand the rules. W1AW has
less than one
hour of weekly HF voice bulletins. K1MAN spews forth over 100 times that
amount in useless,
sickening, drivel while trying to earn a meager living at it, also a
FELONY!!! Can you
say "pecuniary interest"? And he doesn't care about any amateur using the
frequency when
he starts his jamming QRMcasts.

C) BULLSHIT. K1MAN fears the day that he, a fake and wannabe lawyer, faces
a
real one, in a real court. Just like Saddam H, he is another bully, but
exists as a radio terrorist.
(If you think about it on a far smaller scale, the parallels are amazing!!!)
Glen is a pathetic old MAN, a loud mouth bully with a 50 year old
transmitter, tape
loops, Radio Shack timers, and living on the edge of poverty....with nothing
to offer
than his fantasy world view of conspiracy. Just like those other wanna be
shortwave
kooks....Hey glen, get the idea? Get off the ham bands with your
commercialism and peddle
it elsewhere. The ham bands are for REAL hams, not wannabe broadcasters.
Call WBCQ,
perhaps they will air your crap, but I suspect you can't afford it.

D) Read the above again, and again, and again...

Chuck...K1KW

1026. Re: How stupid is K1MAN?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 04:15:05 UTC
From: guess who? <chris2003@aol.com>
Message-ID: <d9Sda.134803$F1.4587@sccrnsc04>
Source record: 63163
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

A Story with a Happy Ending...

Once upon a time there was this guy (let's call him Joe Ham) in a public bathroom at the park. He was sitting on the toilet relieving himself, when suddenly, a raving lunatic threw open the door without even bothering to knock, and the lunatic began cry like a little girl because Joe Ham was using HIS toilet. Yes, HIS toilet.

"Waah, you're using my toilet," the deranged Man whined, like a child.

Joe Ham was very startled, and a little angry, so he said, "It's not YOUR toilet, ya friggin' moron, now close the door and get lost ya loser!"

But the Man didn't leave... "It is too mine," the Man whined, "it's mine, it is too mine! It's a violation of sections 88 and 73 for you to even be in here right now! I use this stall at 8, 12, 4, 8, 12, 2 and 4 every day! You're an alleged criminal and I'm writing an alleged letter to an alleged someone who allegedly cares!

Seeing the tiny tears in the deranged old man's eyes, and beginning to feel sorry for the pathetic jack ass, Joe Ham said, "Now look MAN! I'm using this public toilet right now, OK? All you have to do is wait your turn. I won't be long, I promise, and then you can spend 12 hours in here if you want to."

But the Man wasn't satisfied, so he obtained Joe Ham's email address and he started sending Joe Ham an endless bunch of crazy garbage about s tuff Joe Ham didn't even give one teensy f*#^ about.

Then the Man stood in a corner of the park and started yelling at every one who passed by, that Joe Ham and all his friends were criminals; that they stole his stall; and that EVERYONE should know and WOULD know if they bothered to read his web page, that the stall they dared to use was RESERVED for him because he PUBLISHED A SCHEDULE!

So all the friends got together and called the
public works office because the Man was o
bviously crazier than a shite house rat. And the Park
Ranger who reads the reports said, "Yeah
we know this fruit. He's practically homeless,
but he thinks he's King of the park. We call him
Boo-Hoo. He's a known pest, just ignore him."

But, after enough people complained to the Ranger
that the Man was crashing stall doors on a regular
basis, the Ranger's office sent old Boo-Hoo a letter.
It was 3 pages long!

They said, "Man, we have evidence you've been
crashing into certain stalls uninvited. Why do you
think YOU own those stalls? YOU don't own t
hose stalls, they're PUBLIC stalls, and EVERYONE
with a park pass can use them. They're
first-come-first served-stalls, you silly wabbit, a
nd if you can't get that through your wittle numb-skull
we're gonna have to lock you out of the park, and
you won't be able to play there at all!"

But the Man wasn't satisfied (possibly because his
tiny brain didn't understand the concept of sharing)
so he tried to reply to the Ranger's letter using
certified mail, because in another part of his tiny
brain he fancied himself smarter than a Philadelphia
lawyer.

He didn't realize the Park Ranger's were much too
busy to care about returning certified mail cards,
or that they got about 50,000 pieces of mail a day,
delivered to a really big mail room, and in fact no
one at the park office had any time to deal with
silly crap like signing certified mail receipts from
crazy stall-crashers, because much more important
things were happening in the park just then.

Anyhow, to make a really long story a little shorter...

One day, the Park Rangers finally told old Boo-Hoo
that he could use the park no more...

And old Boo-Hoo, the crazy stall-crasher, took
them to court (again) and he lost (again) and he
became so frustrated, angry, depressed, and insane
from his complete failure to intimidate people, and
his inability to crash anyone's stall anymore, that
he took a slow boat to Bougainville and attempted
to start a new business selling shrunken heads to
cannibals on the beach.

Word has it he was delicious.

And all the people who used the park didn't miss
him one bit and they all lived happily ever after.

1027. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 04:59:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E77F999.69768FE5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63164

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E754D9C.4013433E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E74250F.A4DDB399@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <20030315210938.23981.00000303@mb-fv.aol.com>,
> >> >averyfineman@aol.com
> >> >>
> >> >Looks like you've had an accident in the comm center, old timer. Your
> >> >Avery Labels persona tangled with LenOver70 and spilled a few non
> >> >responses. Come to think of it, that's not necessarily a bad thing.
> >> >>
> >> No accident. Deliberate. It got an expected response.
> >>
> >You'll forgive me if I don't believe you.
>
> You are not forgiven.
>
> I baited a trap. You fell into it, got caught.

Sure you did, Leonard. That must be what happened.

> Poor baby, now you are all upset. TS.

I'm all upset because you screwed up? Why would that be?

> >"Pardon me, Mister Anderson, you have toilet paper sticking out of your
> >trousers."
> >
> >Andersonian response: "I meant to do that."
>
> I meant to do what I did. No "toilet paper" was involved.

Sure you meant to, Len.

> The ONLY person to get copies from my alternate screen
> name was Heil.

Copies? Only "Heil" got them? You're out of your tree.

> Heil makes it a point to attack only certain individuals.

Why would I slam anyone who is civil and pleasant? You fall into a
category of those who are not civil and not pleasant, Leonard.

> Heil is mean-spirited as well as irrational.

Awww...Did the kindly old pirhana get his feelings hurt?

> >I don't think so. I think it shows that you screwed up and told a
> >whopper to cover it.
>
> I have no affiliation with Burger King.

...and you likely thought your words were somehow amusing.

> I did what I said. Heil got caught. Poor baby.

Sure you did, Len. I'm sure that all here believe that's just how it
took place.

> Heil is an amateur.

That's right, Leonard--a radio amateur. Despite your having declared a
decades long interest and your having posted to an amateur radio
newsgroup for about seven years, you are still not a radio amateur.

Dave K8MN

1028. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 05:14:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E77FCB4.994606C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63165

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E76DAC8.3BC35295@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > You need to define "proficient." At what use level does it become
> > > proficient?
> >
> > I already did so.
>
> You have not.

Yes, Brian, I did produce a dictionary definition of "proficient".

> Go back. Do not collect $200. Read the definition
> > of the word. We'll discuss it when you've digested it.
>
> I have.

You may have thought you did.

> Webster's does not address Morse Code proficiency.

I see part of your problem. Look at the dictionary definition of
"proficiency". Now place the words "morse code" in front of the
defintion.

> Title 47, Part 97 does not address Morse Code proficiency.
>
> You do not define Morse Code proficiency, but you're here to tell
> others they aren't proficient.

> I'd call that "smug."

Sure you would but you're also the guy who says I didn't define
proficiency and you were, after all, wrong about that too.

> > > You can support that with facts at any time. Unless you think facts
> > > will make you look stupid.
> >
> > The same would go for your statements. I haven't seen any numbers from
> > you. Where are they?
>
> You need to define proficiency at Morse Code.

I've done so.

> You need to state the
> number that you think (or "feel") is the point of proficiency.

No, I don't feel any need at all to do so. I think you mean that Brian Burke needs me to do so. That'll likely happen when you provide some numbers about all those "telegraphers of yore" vice those using the mode today.

> You have not done so. You have only provided a moving target.

I've not given you a target at all. I've offered that someone who can handle 35 wpm is more proficient than someone who can handle 13 wpm.

> Time to get real, Dave. Define Morse proficiency.

Not again. Do at least some of the work yourself, Brian.

Dave K8MN

1029. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 05:54:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E78060D.5818313F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63166

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E75C45A.802A36E3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E742F71.9D34A08A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <3E73D8EC.EA910379@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:

> >> You are irrational.
> >
> >Show your "You're a god. You are no god. You're a god. You are no god.
> >You're a god. You are no god. You're a god. You are no god." routine
> >to your psychologist wife.
>
> You are being irrational again. Stop that.

You're such a card, Len. Have you made up your mind yet?

> My wife is not a psychologist. She has a Masters Degree in
> Education, another Masters in Social Work, both from the
> University of Illinois.

From Google, you wrote on January 28:

"For "credentials" in psychology, I can call on my own
consultant, my wife, who has two Masters degrees (both
from University of Illinois) with one of those being in Social
Work. She was a licensed private counselor in the states
of Illinois and Washington for a number of years."

So we are now to understand that neither she nor you have any
credentials in psychology despite what you wrote earlier. Glad we
cleared that up.

> >> Advocacy of code test elimination does not require licensing.
> >
> >You don't need a license to avoid fulfilling the N2EY profile.
>
> Subject is CODE TEST ELIMINATION, not your attempts at
> character assassination.
>
> Try to stay somewhat close to the subject.

How far back does one need go in this thread to find an example of you discussing code test elimination? How far back does one need to in order to find examples of your writing which fit the N2EY profile?

> >> Licenses are not required to discuss US government laws.
> >
> >You don't need a license to avoid fulfilling the N2EY profile.
>
> You are still irrational. Subject is CODE TEST ELIMINATION,
> not Heil's attempts at character assassination.

I gave you a chance to respond and to defend yourself against what you say is character assassination. I brought up a number of things which you've done here in this newsgroup and asked if you've done those things. The list was quite specific and it touches upon just a few of the instances I could come up with. Instead of responding to those items, you snipped the entire paragraph and chose to ignore it.

I wrote

"When you comment to me, do you use terms descriptive of the German military? Have you used references to Nazis? Have you attempted to belittle my job? my foreign service postings? Have you written in response to my comment that I'd done Radio/TV news releases something about a rear echelon clerk job? Have you written similar things about the jobs of others posting here? Have you written things like, "HF Amateur radio is all about chasing DX on CW" when nobody has made a statement like that? Are those who disagree with you treated to "Tsk, tsk, tsk", "poor baby", "Pedantic Parson", "Reverend Jim" and the like?"

You can compare the list above to the N2EY profile below.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Now perhaps you can tell us how you believe your character to have been assassinated. I'll be happy to help you by providing more examples of your words which I believe fit the profile.

> >> You are only an amateur.
> >
> >Yes, a radio amateur. You are not.
>
> I am a radio-electronics PROFESSIONAL. You are not a
> professional. You are an amateur in radio.

Sorry old boy, Despite my own professional background in communications,
this newsgroup isn't about professional radio and electronics. This one
deals with amateur radio. I'm a radio amateur.
You're still a bystander.

Dave K8MN

1030. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 06:15:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030319011501.00564.00001477@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 63167

In article <20030318213113.17176.00000071@mb-df.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From Lenover21:
>> The presence or absence of "CW signals" on "ham bands" has
>> NOTHING to do with the kinds of vehicles on US roads.
>
>Len, N2EY was using an analogy. By giving an example of (manual transmission >and automobile operation), and relating it to (Morse code and amateur radio >operation), he clarified the role of Morse code testing.

Miccolis was using whatever he could imagine. Still irrelevant.

Vehicular driving skills are NOT tested for a US amateur
radio license.

>Below, N2EY further explains this analogy:
>>>Because it increases all drivers' opportunities and possibilities wrt
>>>driving situations. For example, the choice of vehicle is greater. No
>>>problems with "we have to take/buy X's car because Y can't drive
>>>stick", etc. (Been there, done that!)
>
>From Lenover21:
>>Go to some automotive-interest newsgroup.
>
>N2EY did not extensively talk about automobiles - just enough to give an >analogy.

Miccolis still acts irrational when imagining analogies.

>N2EY says manual transmission is used in some cars - it is useful to know, but >should not be part of the license test. By analogy, Morse may be useful for >some Hams to learn, but there is no need to test for it.

The FCC does not consider a morse code test useful for them
to determine if any US amateur radio applicant should be
granted a license.

Miccolis took a morse code test and passed. Ergo, to Miccolis,
a morse code test is "useful." It is not. Miccolis wants to halt
change. Change would take away some of his status.

>Whether <Morse> code is useful is debatable. I feel <Morse> code is not useful >and possibly harms to the hobby (and one's "state") more than there are >benefits. I feel that the only reason <Morse> code is used is that Hams insist >on using it. Non-testing seems like a reasonable compromise (yes, its still a >compromise) to accept. As long as it does not affect me, I have no problem

with
>that. There are enough people that will learn it and <Morse> code skill can be
>useful for them. I would elect not to learn it.

I do not elect to take any morse code test. Morse code testing
is obsolete. Morse code testing is not useful to the agency
granting US amateur radio licenses.

Miccolis insists on having a morse code test. Miccolis took a
morse code test once and passed it. Miccolis is not a role
model for the future. Miccolis is self-righteous and uncaring of
the future. At times Miccolis appears irrational.

1031. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 06:21:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E780CB0.10F198F7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63168

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E75518A.F3605D79@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E742075.8E999470@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <3E73D096.9511C46F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >Brian wrote:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >> >> >news:<20030304042813.27873.00000920@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> >> >> >> > In article <f45722ac.0303030954.38d2a823@posting.google.com>,
> >> >> >> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >> >> >> > >news:<20030228205715.23598.00000544@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >> >> >> > >> In article <3E600738.9C86FE73@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> >> >> > <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> >> > >> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >"Smiley" discounted. There's plenty of morse being used on VHF and UHF
> >> >> >by weak signal enthusiasts and satellite ops. Oh, I forgot--you're out
> >> >> >of the loop!
> >> >>
> >> >> You are irrational. You are angry.
> >> >
> >> >Are you trying to hypnotize me? I'm not irrational and I'm not angry.
> >> >It is obvious that you didn't know that morse is frequently used above
> >> >30 MHz. That puts you out of the loop.
> >>
> >> Heil is both irrational and angry.

Nope. I'm still not irrational or angry. See if you can get your money
back from that hypnotism correspondence course.

> "Morse" is NOT "frequently used above 30 MHz."

We'll put this down as yet another thing about which you haven't an inkling. You strike me as the kind of guy who is a bit foggy about 6 or 2m band openings.

> Heil's "loop" is only his own irrationality.

You mean that irrationality I exhibit about working all those CW stations on VHF?

> >> Advocacy of elimination of code testing does not require licensing.
> >
> >Nobody asked you to become an advocate. If you must, go advocate
> >somewhere. You aren't hitting your intended audience here.
>
> Heil is irrational, angry, and now frustrated.

Nope. I'm not sleepy yet and I still don't feel angry, irrational or frustrated. Did they give you a pendulum to swing?

> >> There is not secrecy in US amateur radio. Such is not allowed
> >> by US law on US amateur radio.
> >
> >Just because you don't know something doesn't mean that it has been kept
> >a secret. It just means that you don't know.
>
> US radio amateurs are forbidden by law to use means of obscuring
> communications.

You seem to be the only guy who believes that radio amateurs are obscuring communications. I wrote that just because you, Leonard H. Anderson, doesn't know something, doesn't mean that it has been kept a secret.

> Heil has now demonstrated irrationality, anger, frustration AND
> ignorance of law.

Only if we accept your introduction of the false premise that I was writing of radio amateurs obscuring communications. I don't accept that.

> >You're right. There has been no poll. How likely do you believe it to
> >be that the thousands of radio amateurs using morse each day are not
> >enjoying it? You'd have to be a fool to stake the ranch on that one.
>
> This is not a newsgroup for real estate ownership matters or
> western living.
>
> There is NO poll on "enjoyment of morse."

I've already agreed that there has been no poll. I also pointed out how foolish you'd be to believe that there are those using morse on the amateur bands who do not enjoy it.

>
> >> Morse code is not a required mode in US amateur radio use.
> >> All modes are optional to use in US amateur radio law.
> >
> >You're drifting. We were discussing those who USE MORSE.
>
> There is NO discussion. Heil is irrational.

Oh--so you think none of this is real, huh? Well, kindly old gent,
that's precisely what was being discussed.

> There has been NO poll on "enjoyment of morse (code)."

You just can't take agreement for an answer, can you?

> >Is this the part where I'm supposed to be getting sleepy?
>
> Irrational people like Heil cannot focus on the subject.

> Note subject thread title: "Extra-Lite Status."

You might want to check back just a few teensy messages in the thread to
refresh yourself. After all, you introduced irrationality. Why can't
you stick to the subject?

> >[this space reserved for the N2EY profile of Leonard H. Anderson]
>
> Heil is still irrational AND lacks orginality.
>
> Heil only wants to engage in character assassination.

That reminds me, you never did answer those items I put to you.
It certainly looks to me like you fit the profile. If you do those
things which the profiles outlines, you'd not be able to make a case for
character assassination. Tell you what--when I have some time later in
the week, I'll take each one of those specifics laid out in the profile,
then go back through some of your old stuff archived at Google and list
them under individual headings. That'd give us a way to determine if
your claim of character assassination is credible. Would that be okay?

> >I'm not going to tell someone whose maximum morse speed that he is
> >proficient and I'm not going to tell Brian Burke that his moronic
> >premise is brilliant.
>
> Heil now tries character assassination on Brian Burke.

That accusation would be another tough sell.

> Brian Burke is NOT the subject of this thread.

Quit trying to hog the limelight, Len.

> Heil thinks that the subject is character assassination.

No. Offhand, I'd say that you think that is the subject. You are the
individual who keeps bringing up that term.

> Heil is still irrational.

You're fixated on character assassination and I'm irrational?

> >I don't know any radio gods. I've never seen one, never spoken to one.
> >I suspect they are superior but I don't know why they'd be irrational.
>
> More irrationality.

Which part is irrational? That I don't know any radio gods? That I've never seen one? That I've never spoken to one? Tell us, Len, if my statement is irrational, have you had conversations with radio gods?

> >> I am a professional.
> >
> >Good for you, Len! Now try for the next part of the sentence, "and
> >amateur radio is not professional". Now you're getting it. Amateur
> >radio isn't professional and you aren't a radio amateur.
>
> Heil is both an amateur AND irrational.

> I am a professional in radio-electronics. I have been such for
> over half a century. I am licensed by the US government in
> radio operation.

...but not in the amateur service. Licensing in another service doesn't really sway the FCC in the granting of an amateur license.

> >Maybe you can tell them when you meet them. I don't expect that to
> >happen until you've expired. How do you intend to get word back to us?
>
> Heil is still irrational. Heil is still into character assassination
> with wishes for one to "expire."

Where is that wish expressed, Leonard, old boy?

> >> Radio gods were never professional despite their past titles.
> >
> >Gods don't get paid? Why would a god have a past title?
>
> Heil's statements of "past work" indicate he was an amateur.
>
> Heil is an example of the fleecing of America.

[Here it comes, Leonard]

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

For those keeping track, this one falls under "job" and "government/military service". It uses "insults", "ridicule", "factual errors" and "generally infantile behavior".

Dave K8MN

1032. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 07:16:54 UTC
From: averyfineman@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030319021654.23305.00000998@mb-fs.aol.com>
Source record: 63170

In article <3E78060D.5818313F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E75C45A.802A36E3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <3E742F71.9D34A08A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> In article <3E73D8EC.EA910379@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> >> writes:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> >> You are irrational.
>> >
>> >Show your "You're a god. You are no god. You're a god. You are no god.
>> >You're a god. You are no god. You're a god. You are no god." routine
>> >to your psychologist wife.
>>
>> You are being irrational again. Stop that.
>
>You're such a card, Len. Have you made up your mind yet?
>
>> My wife is not a psychologist. She has a Masters Degree in
>> Education, another Masters in Social Work, both from the
>> University of Illinois.
>
>From Google, you wrote on January 28:
>
> "For "credentials" in psychology, I can call on my own
> consultant, my wife, who has two Masters degrees (both
> from University of Illinois) with one of those being in Social
> Work. She was a licensed private counselor in the states
> of Illinois and Washington for a number of years."

>
>So we are now to understand that neither she nor you have any
>credentials in psychology despite what you wrote earlier. Glad we
>cleared that up.

Heil does not understand the requisite studies in psychology
necessary for a Masters degree in Social Work.

Heil does not understand the necessary qualifications for
private counseling in Social Work.

Heil is ignorant as well as irrational, mean-spirited, uncivil,
and arrogant.

This is not a newsgroup about psychology.

Psychologists might be interested in studying Heil as a
case example.

Heil attempts character assassination by targeting my
wife.

Heil again demonstrates mean-spirited and uncivil behavior.

>
>> >> Advocacy of code test elimination does not require licensing.
>> >
>> >You don't need a license to avoid fulfilling the N2EY profile.
>>
>> Subject is CODE TEST ELIMINATION, not your attempts at
>> character assassination.
>>
>> Try to stay somewhat close to the subject.
>
>How far back does one need go in this thread to find an example of you
>discussing code test elimination? How far back does one need to in
>order to find examples of your writing which fit the N2EY profile?

Heil is deliberately misdirecting from the subject to
character assassination.

>> >> Licenses are not required to discuss US government laws.
>> >
>> >You don't need a license to avoid fulfilling the N2EY profile.
>>
>> You are still irrational. Subject is CODE TEST ELIMINATION,
>> not Heil's attempts at character assassination.
>
>I gave you a chance to respond and to defend yourself against what you
>say is character assassination. I brought up a number of things which
>you've done here in this newsgroup and asked if you've done those
>things. The list was quite specific and it touches upon just a few of
>the instances I could come up with. Instead of responding to those

>items, you snipped the entire paragraph and chose to ignore it.

License grants are not required to discuss any part of US
law in open forums.

Heil once again misdirects to character assassination.

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

This is another example of Heil's character assassination
tactics.

Heil cannot discuss the subject. He has no valid arguments.

All Heil does is to engage in character assassination.

>Now perhaps you can tell us how you believe your character to have been
>assassinated. I'll be happy to help you by providing more examples of
>your words which I believe fit the profile.

Try to stay focussed on subjects. Avoid misdirections
into character assassination attempts.

>> >> You are only an amateur.
>> >
>> >Yes, a radio amateur. You are not.
>>
>> I am a radio-electronics PROFESSIONAL. You are not a
>> professional. You are an amateur in radio.
>
>Sorry old boy, Despite my own professional background in communications,
>this newsgroup isn't about professional radio and electronics.

Heil was paid for services in State Department.

Heil's self-reported activities are those of an amateur, not
a professional.

>This one deals with amateur radio. I'm a radio amateur.
>You're still a bystander.

Amateur radio license grants are not required to discuss any
part of US law in public forums.

Heil has no authority to rule on admissability here.

Heil is an amateur.

Len Anderson
retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

1033. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 07:16:55 UTC
From: averyfineman@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030319021655.23305.00000999@mb-fs.aol.com>
Source record: 63169

In article <3E77F999.69768FE5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E754D9C.4013433E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <3E74250F.A4DDB399@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> In article <20030315210938.23981.00000303@mb-fv.aol.com>,
>> >> >averyfineman@aol.com
>> >>
>> >> >Looks like you've had an accident in the comm center, old timer. Your
>> >> >Avery Labels persona tangled with LenOver70 and spilled a few non
>> >> >responses. Come to think of it, that's not necessarily a bad thing.
>> >>
>> >> No accident. Deliberate. It got an expected response.
>> >
>> >You'll forgive me if I don't believe you.
>>
>> You are not forgiven.
>>
>> I baited a trap. You fell into it, got caught.
>
>Sure you did, Leonard. That must be what happened.

It happened just like this posting happened.

Trapped again, Heil.

>> Poor baby, now you are all upset. TS.
>
>I'm all upset because you screwed up? Why would that be?

Heil doesn't know how to handle the situation.

ARRL has not advised him on how to act.

Heil is an amateur.

>> >"Pardon me, Mister Anderson, you have toilet paper sticking out of your
>> >trousers."
>> >
>> >Andersonian response: "I meant to do that."
>>
>> I meant to do what I did. No "toilet paper" was involved.
>
>Sure you meant to, Len.

This post was also meant.

Heil was again trapped.

>> The ONLY person to get copies from my alternate screen
>> name was Heil.
>
>Copies? Only "Heil" got them? You're out of your tree.

Heil gets posts from this screen name when I choose to
do so.

Heil is treed.

>> Heil makes it a point to attack only certain individuals.
>
>Why would I slam anyone who is civil and pleasant?

It is your nature.

>> Heil is mean-spirited as well as irrational.
>
>Awww...Did the kindly old pirhana get his feelings hurt?

Heil is mean-spirited as well as irrational.

Heil falls into a category of those not civil nor pleasant.

>Sure you did, Len. I'm sure that all here believe that's just how it
>took place.

It is "taking place" again. Live with it, poor baby.

>> Heil is an amateur.
>
>That's right, Leonard--a radio amateur. Despite your having declared a
>decades long interest and your having posted to an amateur radio
>newsgroup for about seven years, you are still not a radio amateur.

I am still a radio-electronics professional.

Len Anderson
retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

1034. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 11:27:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030319062727.10890.00000304@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 63171

In article <20030318213113.17176.00000071@mb-df.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From Lenover21:
>> The presence or absence of "CW signals" on "ham bands" has
>> NOTHING to do with the kinds of vehicles on US roads.
>
>Len, N2EY was using an analogy.

Exactly. But it appears that analogy is too abstract for Lenover21 to understand.

>By giving an example of (manual transmission
>and automobile operation), and relating it to (Morse code and amateur radio
>operation), he clarified the role of Morse code testing.

Sort of.
>
>Below, N2EY further explains this analogy:

>>>Because it increases all drivers' opportunities and possibilities wrt
>>>driving situations. For example, the choice of vehicle is greater. No
>>>problems with "we have to take/buy X's car because Y can't drive
>>>stick", etc. (Been there, done that!)
>
>From Lenover21:
>>Go to some automotive-interest newsgroup.
>
>N2EY did not extensively talk about automobiles - just enough to give an
>analogy.
>
I don't think lenover21 wants to have a civil discussion on the subject.
>--
>----------------------
>
>N2EY says manual transmission is used in some cars -

I have one of those cars.

> it is useful to know,
>but should not be part of the license test.

That's YOUR opinion. I haven't stated mine.

> By analogy, Morse may be useful for
>some Hams to learn, but there is no need to test for it.
>

That's your conclusion. I haven't stated mine.

>Whether <Morse> code is useful is debatable.

Of course Morse code is useful. Radio amateurs all over the world use it every day.

>I feel <Morse> code is not useful
>and possibly harms to the hobby (and one's "state") more than there are
>benefits.

Why?

Are manual transmissions not useful?

>I feel that the only reason <Morse> code is used is that Hams
>insist on using it.

What is wrong with free choice of modes? How does the USE (not the test, the USE) of Morse code by hams cause any problems?

>Non-testing seems like a reasonable compromise (yes, its still a
>compromise) to accept. As long as it does not affect me, I have no problem
>with
>that. There are enough people that will learn it and <Morse> code skill can
>be
>useful for them. I would elect not to learn it.
>
Same as for manual transmissions.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1035. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 11:47:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303190347.39d23ac3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63172

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E73CE56.C2F4CDDA@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E735497.B878D89B@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > You just don't have enough information to make a judgement. Get back to
> > > > > me when you have enough experience to make such a call.
>
> > > > No, Dave, that's not it. 0.02wpm sets a world record, and that's a fact.
> > >
> > > It certainly is. It is one which has nothing to do with the code
> > > proficiency of either ham.
> >
> > You don't know the code proficiency of either ham. Yet you want to talk facts.
>
> Dig back in the thread a little, Brian. That's one of the points I
> made--that we don't know the code proficiency of either ham. We don't
> know that their maximum morse receiving speed is higher than .02 wpm. I
> have an idea that it it. You seem to have made an assumption that it is
> on the order of .02 wpm and then asked if that was "proficient". Such
> comments just make you look like a dullard.

Dave, then you should have stuck with that point rather than continue
on and make assumptions about the record setters code prowess.

That is where you went down the wrong road.

> > > > I can make just as many arbitrary claims as you can, re: 5wpm not proficient.
> > >
> > > The big difference I see between us is that I use pertinent facts to
> > > make a point while you misinterpret the facts you've seen. You still
> > > seem to confuse the words "proficient" and "efficient".
> >
> > You confuse a world record set using Morse Code with "not proficient."
>
> That's completely untrue. I've never written anything to indicate
> anything like it. It is likely another example of your poor (not
> proficient) reading comprehension skills.

Then stick with the facts, even if they won't support your argument.

Lose the argument gracefully.

1036. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 11:51:58 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303190351.28f5e3da@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63173

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E76D756.AE3C9B6B@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E75B589.A9D1FB99@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > I assume nothing. They used CW; their speed was 0.02wpm. They set a
> > > > world's record.
> > >
> > > That makes you sound incredibly stupid.
> >
> > It was President Reagan who first said "Facts are stupid things."
> >
> > You are the second.
> >
> > You'll get over it.
> >
> He was probably saying it about a guy just like you--one who takes
> several facts and puts them together in an effort to say that they prove
> an entirely different thing. I didn't write that facts were stupid. I
> wrote that you sound stupid.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, what did I say the facts proved? Why did that make me "sound" stupid?

1037. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 11:57:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303190357.6bd7363b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63174

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030318180751.16148.00000118@mb-mr.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/18/03 4:06 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303181406.55069694@posting.google.com>
>
> >You have not done so. You have only provided a moving target
>
> You can't hit fixed ones, so what's the difference?

Steve, did you have something intelligent to say?

> >Time to get real, Dave. Define Morse proficiency.
>
> I can do that! It's that which you, Lennie and Vippy AREN'T...! ! !
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Obviously not a definition. Did you have -anything- intelligent to say?

1038. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 12:03:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303190403.1a509938@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63175

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E77FCB4.994606C@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E76DAC8.3BC35295@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > You need to define "proficient." At what use level does it become
> > > > proficient?
> > >
> > > I already did so.
> >
> > You have not.
>
> Yes, Brian, I did produce a dictionary definition of "proficient".
>
> > Go back. Do not collect $200. Read the definition
> > > of the word. We'll discuss it when you've digested it.
> >
> > I have.
>
> You may have thought you did.
>
> > Webster's does not address Morse Code proficiency.
>
> I see part of your problem. Look at the dictionary definition of
> "proficiency". Now place the words "morse code" in front of the
> defintion.

Now I see the disconnect. The dictionary does indeed define
proficient, and putting the word "Morse" in front of it would move me
from the "P" pages to teh "M" pages. Let go there.

Nope. There is no Morse Proficiency defined.

I asked for a WPM rate that is proficient.

You procalim "this" isn't proficient and "that" isn't proficient. Or
"this" is more proficient than "that."

Yet you pass judgement on what is and isn't proficient.

I just don't believe you.

> > Title 47, Part 97 does not address Morse Code proficiency.
> >

> > You do not define Morse Code proficiency, but you're here to tell
> > others they aren't proficient.
>
> > I'd call that "smug."
>
> Sure you would but you're also the guy who says I didn't define
> proficiency and you were, after all, wrong about that too.

State the WPM rate at which "proficiency" is achieved.

> > > > You can support that with facts at any time. Unless you think facts
> > > > will make you look stupid.
> > >
> > > The same would go for your statements. I haven't seen any numbers from
> > > you. Where are they?
> >
> > You need to define proficiency at Morse Code.
>
> I've done so.

State the WPM rate at which "proficiency" is achieved.

> > You need to state the
> > number that you think (or "feel") is the point of proficiency.
>
> No, I don't feel any need at all to do so. I think you mean that Brian
> Burke needs me to do so. That'll likely happen when you provide some
> numbers about all those "telegraphers of yore" vice those using the mode
> today.

State the WPM rate at which "proficiency" is achieved.

> > You have not done so. You have only provided a moving target.
>
> I've not given you a target at all. I've offered that someone who can
> handle 35 wpm is more proficient than someone who can handle 13 wpm.

State the WPM rate at which "proficiency" is achieved.

> > Time to get real, Dave. Define Morse proficiency.
>
> Not again. Do at least some of the work yourself, Brian.

State the WPM rate at which "proficiency" is achieved.

1039. Re: Lennie As Role Model...(NOT!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 14:03:31 UTC
From: Watcher <observer@thenet.net>
Message-ID: <3gtg7vgqq4o618q29kdod5olprlkmibt21@4ax.com>
Source record: 63176

On 18 Mar 2003 23:04:18 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:

>>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 3/18/03 3:11 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030318161121.15648.00001162@mb-md.aol.com>
>
>><one helluva lot of irrational replies by Heil omitted...>
>
> Whoa! There's something new! Lennie accusing someone of being
>irrational! How unique! (guffaw...chortle...outright laughter!)
>
>>>Show your "You're a god. You are no god. You're a god. You are no god.
>>>You're a god. You are no god. You're a god. You are no god." routine
>>>to your psychologist wife.
>>
>> You are being irrational again. Stop that.
>>

Big old snip of real crap

Steve could you please get over your unnatural love for this
"Len" fellow? People are starting to talk.

You really need some time with a mental health professional
to get over this obsession once and for all.

Your pig headed obsession with this guy give a hint as to
why you can't seem to hold on to a job even in a critically
understaffed profession like nursing.

If you think your constant whining about this "Len" fellow
in some way defends or benefits amateur radio you are
even dumber than you appear to be.

Have you ever done anything in your life you are proud
of except pass a silly code exam? I didn't think so.

To the rest, sorry for the rant but it gets really old seeing
these constant personal attacks. It is Steve not Len who
make amateur radio look bad to outsiders but he is just
too stupid to realize it.
>
>Steve, K4YZ
>
>

1040. Re: Lennie As Role Model...(NOT!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 15:25:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030319102514.16148.00000133@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 63177

>Model...(NOT!)
>From: Watcher observer@thenet.net
>Date: 3/19/03 8:03 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3gtg7vgqq4o618q29kdod5olprlkmibt21@4ax.com>

>You really need some time with a mental health professional
>to get over this obsession once and for all.

Hmmmmm...sounds exactly LIKE Lennie. Yet another anonymous personna? I bet it is.

>Your pig headed obsession with this guy give a hint as to
>why you can't seem to hold on to a job even in a critically
>understaffed profession like nursing.

Whew! Been at this facility for over three years, and with the same staffing agency since 96. Yes, I took a sabatical in 2000 to work in a non-nursing job after my daughter and dad died.

Whoopie doo.

>If you think your constant whining about this "Len" fellow
>in some way defends or benefits amateur radio you are
>even dumber than you appear to be.

NO, I don't think it "defends" Amateur Radio. I think it exposes a pathological liar (somewhat like you) for what he is.

>Have you ever done anything in your life you are proud
>of except pass a silly code exam? I didn't think so.

Then you are the one even dumber than he appears. Not that it took much to do. Fools easily succumb to their own rhetoric. Just like Lennie.

>To the rest, sorry for the rant but it gets really old seeing
>these constant personal attacks. It is Steve not Len who
>make amateur radio look bad to outsiders but he is just
>too stupid to realize it.

And you're yet another anonymous idiot without the intestinal fortitude to stand up like a man (I assume) and be counted by putting your name behind your comments.

We'll just refer to you as Mr Scumbag. How's that?

Steve

1041. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 15:27:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030319102757.16148.00000134@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 63178

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/19/03 12:15 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030319011501.00564.00001477@mb-de.aol.com>
>
>In article <20030318213113.17176.00000071@mb-df.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.

>Miccolis took a morse code test and passed. Ergo, to Miccolis,
> a morse code test is "useful." It is not. Miccolis wants to halt
> change. Change would take away some of his status.

No, Jim USES Morse Code, ergo he KNOWS how useful it can be.

And you have no evidence other than your spiteful rhetoric to support any claim that Jim wants to halt change. A blatant lie, actually.

Steve

1042. Re: How stupid is K1MAN?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 15:43:12 UTC
From: Lloyd <BroLloyd@brollloyde.com>
Message-ID: <b5a357nsa0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 63179
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

After you wipe the spittle off your chin and face and take
your meds, please share with the group where you earned
your communications law degree.

73,

Lloyd

"Chuck O'Neal" <coneal@ultranet.com> wrote in message
news:HORda.165891$sf5.88961@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> Your reply means nothing since you have failed the first test of
credibility
> >> No identity.
> You are a chicken shit. Reply if you have the testicular fortitude to use
> your real name.
>
> A) K1MAN, the NAL queen, has failed to pay fines, a FELONY!!!
> "Correspondence"
> yeah, right!!! Perhaps he will be in the cell next to yours.
>
> B) W1AW is not anything like K1MAN. The other day I heard the control op
of
> W1AW
> ask if the freq was in use before airing their bulletin. It was. They
> waited. K1boy doesn't
> do that because he is selfish and has yet to understand the rules. W1AW
has
> less than one
> hour of weekly HF voice bulletins. K1MAN spews forth over 100 times that
> amount in useless,
> sickening, drivel while trying to earn a meager living at it, also a
> FELONY!!! Can you
> say "pecuniary interest"? And he doesn't care about any amateur using the
> frequency when
> he starts his jamming QRMcasts.
>
> C) BULLSHIT. K1MAN fears the day that he, a fake and wannabe lawyer,
faces
> a
> real one, in a real court. Just like Saddam H, he is another bully, but
> exists as a radio terrorist.
> (If you think about it on a far smaller scale, the parallels are
amazing!!!)
> Glen is a pathetic old MAN, a loud mouth bully with a 50 year old

> transmitter, tape
> loops, Radio Shack timers, and living on the edge of poverty....with
nothing
> to offer
> than his fantasy world view of conspiracy. Just like those other wanna be
> shortwave
> kooks....Hey glen, get the idea? Get off the ham bands with your
> commercialism and peddle
> it elsewhere. The ham bands are for REAL hams, not wannabe broadcasters.
> Call WBCQ,
> perhaps they will air your crap, but I suspect you can't afford it.
>
> D) Read the above again, and again, and again...
>
> Chuck...K1KW
>
>

1043. Re: How stupid is K1MAN?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 16:20:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5a5b9sar1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63180
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Not to mention that he is totally 180 degrees out of phase with the reality
of the situation.

Dan/W4NTI

"Chuck O'Neal" <coneal@ultranet.com> wrote in message
news:HORda.165891$sf5.88961@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> Your reply means nothing since you have failed the first test of
credibility
> >> No identity.
> You are a chicken shit. Reply if you have the testicular fortitude to use
> your real name.
>
> A) K1MAN, the NAL queen, has failed to pay fines, a FELONY!!!
> "Correspondence"
> yeah, right!!! Perhaps he will be in the cell next to yours.
>
> B) W1AW is not anything like K1MAN. The other day I heard the control op
of
> W1AW
> ask if the freq was in use before airing their bulletin. It was. They
> waited. K1boy doesn't
> do that because he is selfish and has yet to understand the rules. W1AW
has
> less than one
> hour of weekly HF voice bulletins. K1MAN spews forth over 100 times that
> amount in useless,
> sickening, drivel while trying to earn a meager living at it, also a
> FELONY!!! Can you
> say "pecuniary interest"? And he doesn't care about any amateur using the
> frequency when
> he starts his jamming QRMcasts.
>
> C) BULLSHIT. K1MAN fears the day that he, a fake and wannabe lawyer,
faces
> a
> real one, in a real court. Just like Saddam H, he is another bully, but
> exists as a radio terrorist.
> (If you think about it on a far smaller scale, the parallels are
amazing!!!)
> Glen is a pathetic old MAN, a loud mouth bully with a 50 year old
> transmitter, tape
> loops, Radio Shack timers, and living on the edge of poverty....with
nothing

> to offer
> than his fantasy world view of conspiracy. Just like those other wanna be
> shortwave
> kooks....Hey glen, get the idea? Get off the ham bands with your
> commercialism and peddle
> it elsewhere. The ham bands are for REAL hams, not wannabe broadcasters.
> Call WBCQ,
> perhaps they will air your crap, but I suspect you can't afford it.
>
> D) Read the above again, and again, and again...
>
> Chuck...K1KW
>
>

1044. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 16:23:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7899CC.81F8D963@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63181

```
Avery Fineman wrote:
>
> In article <3E78060D.5818313F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E75C45A.802A36E3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <3E742F71.9D34A08A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> In article <3E73D8EC.EA910379@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> >> writes:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >
> >> >> You are irrational.
> >> >
> >> >Show your "You're a god. You are no god. You're a god. You are no god.
> >> >You're a god. You are no god. You're a god. You are no god." routine
> >> >to your psychologist wife.
> >>
> >> You are being irrational again. Stop that.
> >
> >You're such a card, Len. Have you made up your mind yet?
> >
> >> My wife is not a psychologist. She has a Masters Degree in
> >> Education, another Masters in Social Work, both from the
> >> University of Illinois.
> >
> >From Google, you wrote on January 28:
> >
> > "For "credentials" in psychology, I can call on my own
> > consultant, my wife, who has two Masters degrees (both
> > from University of Illinois) with one of those being in Social
```

> > Work. She was a licensed private counselor in the states
> > of Illinois and Washington for a number of years."
> >
> >So we are now to understand that neither she nor you have any
> >credentials in psychology despite what you wrote earlier. Glad we
> >cleared that up.
>
> Heil does not understand the requisite studies in psychology
> necessary for a Masters degree in Social Work.
>
> Heil does not understand the necessary qualifications for
> private counseling in Social Work.

Okay. You figure it out. Your wife is a psychologist. Your wife is not a psychologist. You can show your "You're a god. You're not a god" material to her anyway. By the way, have you made up your mind yet? Am I a god or am I not a god?

> Heil is ignorant as well as irrational, mean-spirited, uncivil,
> and arrogant.

We can go over the N2EY profile of Leonard Anderson again if you like. I think we can find numerous examples of your having made comments which show ignorance and in which you demonstrate that you are irrational, mean spirited, uncivil and arrogant.

> This is not a newsgroup about psychology.

Then why did you state credentials through your wife in an earlier post?

> Psychologists might be interested in studying Heil as a
> case example.

They might be. They'd be certain to express interest in studying a seventy year old man with a fixation on amateur radio despite the fact that he isn't a radio amateur. You'll be quick to point out that your rants address getting into amateur radio. With your declaration of several decades of interest, you'd be one of the slowest entrants on record for getting into amateur radio. If we discount the several decades, you've posted here for seven or more years and in that period of time, you still haven't gotten in.

> Heil attempts character assassination by targeting my
> wife.

Your wife isn't a target of anything. We have only your comments relating to her. I'm sure she's nothing like you. She undoubtedly has no idea of how you spend the bulk of your time here.

> Heil again demonstrates mean-spirited and uncivil behavior.

Awwww--did the little old pirhana get his feelings hurt?

> >
> >> >> Advocacy of code test elimination does not require licensing.
> >> >
> >> >You don't need a license to avoid fulfilling the N2EY profile.
> >>
> >> Subject is CODE TEST ELIMINATION, not your attempts at
> >> character assassination.
> >>
> >> Try to stay somewhat close to the subject.
> >
> >How far back does one need go in this thread to find an example of you
> >discussing code test elimination? How far back does one need to in
> >order to find examples of your writing which fit the N2EY profile?
>
> Heil is deliberately misdirecting from the subject to
> character assassination.

No, Heil is trying to determine if you observe in your habits here what
you decry in others. My observation is that you don't.

> >> >> Licenses are not required to discuss US government laws.
> >> >
> >> >You don't need a license to avoid fulfilling the N2EY profile.
> >>
> >> You are still irrational. Subject is CODE TEST ELIMINATION,
> >> not Heil's attempts at character assassination.
> >
> >I gave you a chance to respond and to defend yourself against what you
> >say is character assassination. I brought up a number of things which
> >you've done here in this newsgroup and asked if you've done those
> >things. The list was quite specific and it touches upon just a few of
> >the instances I could come up with. Instead of responding to those
> >items, you snipped the entire paragraph and chose to ignore it.
>
> License grants are not required to discuss any part of US
> law in open forums.

There was nothing about license grants in what I asked about your
behavior here. Don't you want to address the points in that material?

> Heil once again misdirects to character assassination.

It seems that you don't have a character to assassinate.

> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> This is another example of Heil's character assassination

> tactics.

Not at all, Len old boy. I quoted what I'd asked you. I quoted the profile. I asked if you'd care to comment on any of the items after making a comparison between the profile and what I asked. You've not done so. Do you find that embarrassing?

> Heil cannot discuss the subject. He has no valid arguments.

What subject is it that you address when you belittle someone's job or experience. What subject are you discussing when you make your Nazi references, make up names for people, use the diminuitive form of their names or begin your "Tsk, tsk, tsk" or "Poor baby" routine?

> All Heil does is to engage in character assassination.

Your character can't have been assassinated. You've actually done those things which the profile outlines. Those questions I've asked? They are examples of things you've written here. How do you explain those?

> >Now perhaps you can tell us how you believe your character to have been
> >assassinated. I'll be happy to help you by providing more examples of
> >your words which I believe fit the profile.
>
> Try to stay focussed on subjects. Avoid misdirections
> into character assassination attempts.

You aren't even willing to provide any material you have which refutes the N2EY profile or of the questions I've asked you. How has your character been assassinated? What explanation can you provide for the abundant examples of your writings which lend proof to what is outlined in the N2EY profile?

> >> >> You are only an amateur.
> >> >
> >> >Yes, a radio amateur. You are not.
> >>
> >> I am a radio-electronics PROFESSIONAL. You are not a
> >> professional. You are an amateur in radio.
> >
> >Sorry old boy, Despite my own professional background in communications,
> >this newsgroup isn't about professional radio and electronics.
>
> Heil was paid for services in State Department.

State, like most employers, would have a really difficult time retaining people if they weren't paid. Most of us occasionally need money for food, housing, medical expenses, transportation and the like. Did you work for free?

> Heil's self-reported activities are those of an amateur, not
> a professional.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >This one deals with amateur radio. I'm a radio amateur.
> >You're still a bystander.
>
> Amateur radio license grants are not required to discuss any
> part of US law in public forums.

You've discussed. I'm not required to agree with you. I'm not required
to be silent regarding your opinions.

> Heil is an amateur.

A radio amateur. You are some guy who has been standing on the
sidelines for decades. Yet you tell us that you know best how amateur
radio should be regulated. You insult amateur radio (see any Anderson
comments about public service efforts in emergencies) You insult those
who choose to use morse code and who support morse testing. You insult
the ARRL. You insult and impugn those who work for the ARRL. You
insult amateur radio's traditions.

Why would such an individual want to become a radio amateur? What
interest could such an individual have in amateur radio? Why would such
an individual be concerned about regulations governing amateur radio?

Dave K8MN

1045. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 16:38:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E789CB8.42974C3F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63182

Avery Fineman wrote:
>
> In article <3E77F999.69768FE5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E754D9C.4013433E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <3E74250F.A4DDB399@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> In article <20030315210938.23981.00000303@mb-fv.aol.com>,
> >> >> >averyfineman@aol.com
> >> >>
> >> >> >Looks like you've had an accident in the comm center, old timer. Your
> >> >> >Avery Labels persona tangled with LenOver70 and spilled a few non
> >> >> >responses. Come to think of it, that's not necessarily a bad thing.
> >> >>
> >> >> No accident. Deliberate. It got an expected response.
> >> >
> >> >You'll forgive me if I don't believe you.
> >>
> >> You are not forgiven.
> >>
> >> I baited a trap. You fell into it, got caught.
> >
> >Sure you did, Leonard. That must be what happened.
>
> It happened just like this posting happened.
>
> Trapped again, Heil.

Maybe you'll explain how you believe that your making a posting is a
trap.

> >> Poor baby, now you are all upset. TS.
> >

> >I'm all upset because you screwed up? Why would that be?
>
> Heil doesn't know how to handle the situation.

What's to handle?

> ARRL has not advised him on how to act.

What a perfectly peculiar thing to write!

> Heil is an amateur.

Yes, a radio amateur.

> >> >"Pardon me, Mister Anderson, you have toilet paper sticking out of your
> >> >trousers."
> >> >
> >> >Andersonian response: "I meant to do that."
> >>
> >> I meant to do what I did. No "toilet paper" was involved.
> >
> >Sure you meant to, Len.
>
> This post was also meant.

There's the part where old Avery/Len actually wrote something in this
one.

> Heil was again trapped.

I'm sure you're the hero of many of your mental movies.

>
> >> The ONLY person to get copies from my alternate screen
> >> name was Heil.
> >
> >Copies? Only "Heil" got them? You're out of your tree.
>
> Heil gets posts from this screen name when I choose to
> do so.

I'm dying for your explanation about how I'm the only person who
receives material that you've posted to a newsgroup under your alternate
screen name. It isn't as if you'd sent me an e-mail, Leonard. Others
have noted your blank Avery Labels material. You're out of your tree.

> Heil is treed.

Many a dog believes that he has treed a bird.

>
> >> Heil makes it a point to attack only certain individuals.
> >
> >Why would I slam anyone who is civil and pleasant?
>

> It is your nature.

[We may be getting near breakthrough here]

...and you, Leonard Anderson, consider your behavior here to have been
pleasant and civil?

> >> Heil is mean-spirited as well as irrational.
> >
> >Awww...Did the kindly old pirhana get his feelings hurt?
>
> Heil is mean-spirited as well as irrational.

Awww...Did the kindly old pirhana get his feelings hurt?

> Heil falls into a category of those not civil nor pleasant.

As I've told you previously, what you are doing is called transference.

> >Sure you did, Len. I'm sure that all here believe that's just how it
> >took place.
>
> It is "taking place" again. Live with it, poor baby.

I have to call you on this one, Len. You actually wrote something here.
It wasn't like the previous screwup in your home comm center.

> >> Heil is an amateur.
> >
> >That's right, Leonard--a radio amateur. Despite your having declared a
> >decades long interest and your having posted to an amateur radio
> >newsgroup for about seven years, you are still not a radio amateur.
>
> I am still a radio-electronics professional.

...and you are still not a radio amateur.

Dave K8MN

1046. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 16:44:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E789EAD.504CD733@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63183

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E73CE56.C2F4CDDA@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E735497.B878D89B@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > > > You just don't have enough information to make a judgement. Get back to
> > > > > > me when you have enough experience to make such a call.
> >
> > > > > > No, Dave, that's not it. 0.02wpm sets a world record, and that's a fact.
> > > > >
> > > > > It certainly is. It is one which has nothing to do with the code
> > > > > proficiency of either ham.
> > > >
> > > > You don't know the code proficiency of either ham. Yet you want to talk facts.
> >
> > Dig back in the thread a little, Brian. That's one of the points I
> > made--that we don't know the code proficiency of either ham. We don't
> > know that their maximum morse receiving speed is higher than .02 wpm. I
> > have an idea that it it. You seem to have made an assumption that it is
> > on the order of .02 wpm and then asked if that was "proficient". Such
> > comments just make you look like a dullard.
>
> Dave, then you should have stuck with that point rather than continue
> on and make assumptions about the record setters code prowess.

You're a silly lad. It is a safe assumption that their maximum code
speed is in excess of .02 wpm. They have to have done magnitudes better
to pass their licensing exam.

> That is where you went down the wrong road.

Treating you as if you had a valid point was where I might have taken
the wrong road.

> > > > > > I can make just as many arbitrary claims as you can, re: 5wpm not proficient.
> > > > >
> > > > > The big difference I see between us is that I use pertinent facts to
> > > > > make a point while you misinterpret the facts you've seen. You still
> > > > > seem to confuse the words "proficient" and "efficient".
> > > >

> > > You confuse a world record set using Morse Code with "not proficient."
> >
> > That's completely untrue. I've never written anything to indicate
> > anything like it. It is likely another example of your poor (not
> > proficient) reading comprehension skills.
>
> Then stick with the facts, even if they won't support your argument.

Wouldn't want you to get tripped up over any reasonable assumptions,
would we?

> Lose the argument gracefully.

On what basis would I need to lose at all?

Dave K8MN

1047. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 18:43:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030319134310.01930.00001389@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 63184

In article <3E789CB8.42974C3F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Avery Fineman wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E77F999.69768FE5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <3E754D9C.4013433E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> In article <3E74250F.A4DDB399@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> >> writes:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> In article <20030315210938.23981.00000303@mb-fv.aol.com>,
>> >> >> >averyfineman@aol.com
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >Looks like you've had an accident in the comm center, old timer.
>Your
>> >> >> >Avery Labels persona tangled with LenOver70 and spilled a few non
>> >> >> >responses. Come to think of it, that's not necessarily a bad thing.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> No accident. Deliberate. It got an expected response.
>> >> >
>> >> >You'll forgive me if I don't believe you.
>> >>
>> >> You are not forgiven.
>> >>
>> >> I baited a trap. You fell into it, got caught.
>> >
>> >Sure you did, Leonard. That must be what happened.
>>
>> It happened just like this posting happened.
>>
>> Trapped again, Heil.

>
>Maybe you'll explain how you believe that your making a posting is a
>trap.

The trap foiled Heil's alleged charges of a "mistake."

There was NO mistake. My action was deliberate.

>> >> Poor baby, now you are all upset. TS.
>> >
>> >I'm all upset because you screwed up? Why would that be?
>>
>> Heil doesn't know how to handle the situation.
>
>What's to handle?

Heil must gnaw off the paw caught in the trap.

Bon apetit.

>> ARRL has not advised him on how to act.
>
>What a perfectly peculiar thing to write!
>
>> Heil is an amateur.
>
>Yes, a radio amateur.

Heil is an amateur in radio. All radio.

>> >> >"Pardon me, Mister Anderson, you have toilet paper sticking out of your
>> >> >trousers."
>> >> >
>> >> >Andersonian response: "I meant to do that."
>> >>
>> >> I meant to do what I did. No "toilet paper" was involved.
>> >
>> >Sure you meant to, Len.
>>
>> This post was also meant.
>
>There's the part where old Avery/Len actually wrote something in this
>one.

Irrational comment by Heil.

>> Heil was again trapped.
>
>I'm sure you're the hero of many of your mental movies.

Heil made a charge. Charge was refuted. Evidence presented.

Heil discards evidence. Heil refuses to consider any reason
but his own imaginings.

>> >> The ONLY person to get copies from my alternate screen
>> >> name was Heil.
>> >
>> >Copies? Only "Heil" got them? You're out of your tree.
>>
>> Heil gets posts from this screen name when I choose to
>> do so.
>
>I'm dying for your explanation about how I'm the only person who
>receives material that you've posted to a newsgroup under your alternate
>screen name.

Heil is dying, may even be dead. Mentally.

Heil grasps for straws in the wind of his own making.

Heil was the only one addressed by me in this newsgroup under
the alternate screen name.

Heil was under a compulsion to answer the alternate-name
posting.

>It isn't as if you'd sent me an e-mail, Leonard. Others
>have noted your blank Avery Labels material. You're out of your tree.

My alternate screen name is NOT "Avery Labels."

I have no connection with the "Avery Labels" business.

>> Heil is treed.
>
>Many a dog believes that he has treed a bird.

Heil is not a bird. His output is sometimes akin to bird-like.

>> >> Heil makes it a point to attack only certain individuals.
>> >
>> >Why would I slam anyone who is civil and pleasant?
>>
>> It is your nature.
>
>[We may be getting near breakthrough here]

It is doubtful that Heil will recognize his own irrationality.

>...and you, Leonard Anderson, consider your behavior here to have been
>pleasant and civil?

Others who are unpleasant and uncivil get replies in-kind.

Most of the poor babies cannot take it. TS.

I strive to turn back from all the misdirection towards subjects.

Heil continually misdirects from subjects to personalities.

Ergo, Heil is irrational.

>As I've told you previously, what you are doing is called transference.

Heil is irrational again.

Heil has no qualifications in psychology.

Heil has absolutely zero rating on diplomacy despite working for
a diplomatic corps.

>> It is "taking place" again. Live with it, poor baby.
>
>I have to call you on this one, Len. You actually wrote something here.
>It wasn't like the previous screwup in your home comm center.

There was NO "screwup" in the original posting under the Avery
Fineman screen name. It was deliberate.

The original posting was deliberately done to illustrate Heil's
behavior in here. As expected, Heil replied with a personal
attack charging "mistake."

Heil continues to cling to the original charge of "mistake."

Heil is obstinate. Heil will not admit his own mistake.

To admit to a mistake is to "lose face" (self-esteem).

Heil is an extra. Heil is an amateur.

Amateur extras do not make mistakes. They are radio gods.

Gods do not make mistakes.

>> I am still a radio-electronics professional.
>
>...and you are still not a radio amateur.

Irrelevant. Amateur radio licenses are not a requirement of
discussion of regulations about amateur radio in public.

I am still a radio-electronics professional.

Heil fancies himself a god. An amateur god.

1048. Re: How stupid is K1MAN? (FAKE LLOYD ALERT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 19:02:56 UTC
From: Lloyd/N0VFP <lloyd_vfp@NOmsn.NOSPAMMMM.com>
Message-ID: <3e78bb19_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 63185
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd" <BroLloyd@brollloyde.com> wrote in message
news:b5a357nsa0@pita.alt.net...
> After you wipe the spittle off your chin and face and take
> your meds, please share with the group where you earned
> your communications law degree.
>
> 73,
>
> Lloyd

********** IMPOSTER ALERT! **********

The message above came from a fake Lloyd. This is the same one who
destroyed a truce I made with W4NTI months back. I hold Glenn Baxter with
every bit of comtempt, knowing what he really is.

The imposter is probably a nut from 14.313 or 3.950

Just a pot stirrer, thats all.

--
Lloyd/N0VFP - The Real McCoy!
"And that's just the way it is"
R-75 FT-817

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1049. Re: How stupid is K1MAN?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 19:09:55 UTC
From: Lloyd/N0VFP <lloyd_vfp@NOmsn.NOSPAMMMM.com>
Message-ID: <3e78bcbd_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 63186
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b5a5b9sar1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> Not to mention that he is totally 180 degrees out of phase with the
reality
> of the situation.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

Dan,

I firmly think that most of these nuts who post with out a real name/call,
are probably the same bunch who QRM 14.275. The Cowboy charaecter is
probably one of these.

Lloyd "The Real McCoy"

--
Lloyd/N0VFP
"And that's just the way it is"
R-75 FT-817

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1050. Re: How stupid is K1MAN?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 19:14:35 UTC
From: Lloyd/N0VFP <lloyd_vfp@NOmsn.NOSPAMMMM.com>
Message-ID: <3e78bdcf$1_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 63187
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Chuck O'Neal" <coneal@ultranet.com> wrote in message
news:OmNda.133905$3D1.9714@sccrnsc01...
> Guess what folks...it appears that the Belgrade bastard (read Webster's
> for a definition), as he is affectionately known as here in the NE, has
> again
> screwed up. He states in his current broadcasts that the FCC hasn't
> published the 3 page letter to him which likely outlines previously
reported
> serious violations of FCC rules and regulations by K1MAN. Well, if one is
> even slightly observant, you will see that the FCC logs on the ARRL
website
> are behind by a few weeks. I suggest that we wait and see if this letter
is
> published on the next cycle. For K1MAN's previous rules violations see:
> http://www.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/
> for Feb, 9 2002
>
> K1MAN claims in his current broadcast that the FCC will not publish it.
> HA!!!
>
> When they do publish it, consider this in determining K1MAN's credibility
> with his
> whining's, threats, conspiracy theories, and other BS in the future.
>
> Check this site out in the next week or two.
> http://www.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/
>
>

One thing for sure, Bro Chuck, is that K1MAN is one too many fries short of
a happy meal! I fell for his crap, but saw the light, thanks to Brian,
K3VR and Mike, ND8V. I'm now against this " Belgrade bastard" too.

In Websters you say? Did you know that in the English Oxford Dictionary,
the word "dalek" is in there too.

--
Lloyd/N0VFP
"And that's just the way it is"
R-75 FT-817

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1051. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 20:54:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E78D973.E4B5E1DC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63188

```
Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E789CB8.42974C3F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Avery Fineman wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E77F999.69768FE5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <3E754D9C.4013433E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> In article <3E74250F.A4DDB399@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> >> writes:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >> In article <20030315210938.23981.00000303@mb-fv.aol.com>,
> >> >> >> >averyfineman@aol.com
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >Looks like you've had an accident in the comm center, old timer.
> >Your
> >> >> >> >Avery Labels persona tangled with LenOver70 and spilled a few non
> >> >> >> >responses. Come to think of it, that's not necessarily a bad thing.
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> No accident. Deliberate. It got an expected response.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >You'll forgive me if I don't believe you.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> You are not forgiven.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> I baited a trap. You fell into it, got caught.
> >> >>
> >> >Sure you did, Leonard. That must be what happened.
> >> >>
> >> It happened just like this posting happened.
```

> >>
> >> Trapped again, Heil.
> >
> >Maybe you'll explain how you believe that your making a posting is a
> >trap.
>
> The trap foiled Heil's alleged charges of a "mistake."

How, pray tell did it do that?

> There was NO mistake. My action was deliberate.

So you say. There is no evidence to show that it was.

> >> >> Poor baby, now you are all upset. TS.
> >> >
> >> >I'm all upset because you screwed up? Why would that be?
> >>
> >> Heil doesn't know how to handle the situation.
> >
> >What's to handle?
>
> Heil must gnaw off the paw caught in the trap.

If the trap was only in your mind, the paw must only exist in your mind.

> Bon apetit.

This isn't a good time to be a Francophile, Leonard.

> >> Heil is an amateur.
> >
> >Yes, a radio amateur.
>
> Heil is an amateur in radio. All radio.

Why, you know that isn't so. I had an entire career professional
communications. But I have a little something for you.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >There's the part where old Avery/Len actually wrote something in this
> >one.
>
> Irrational comment by Heil.

Very Daliesque, Len. To you, the real becomes unreal and the unreal
becomes real.

> >> Heil was again trapped.
> >
> >I'm sure you're the hero of many of your mental movies.
>
> Heil made a charge. Charge was refuted. Evidence presented.

A charge? A charge that there was nothing in your post? If that is the charge, how have you refuted it? Do you maintain that there was invisible writing placed there by you? Where is the evidence?

> Heil discards evidence. Heil refuses to consider any reason
> but his own imaginings.

Oh, so I only imagined that you didn't write anything and I must have ignored the invisible evidence. You're one slick operator, Len.

>
> >> >> The ONLY person to get copies from my alternate screen
> >> >> name was Heil.
> >> >
> >> >Copies? Only "Heil" got them? You're out of your tree.
> >>
> >> Heil gets posts from this screen name when I choose to
> >> do so.
> >>
> >I'm dying for your explanation about how I'm the only person who
> >receives material that you've posted to a newsgroup under your alternate
> >screen name.
>
> Heil is dying, may even be dead. Mentally.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> Heil grasps for straws in the wind of his own making.

> Heil was the only one addressed by me in this newsgroup under
> the alternate screen name.

Was I addressed by you in those in which you wrote nothing? Was there more invisible writing?

> Heil was under a compulsion to answer the alternate-name
> posting.

Maybe your home hypnotism course is paying off.

> >It isn't as if you'd sent me an e-mail, Leonard. Others
> >have noted your blank Avery Labels material. You're out of your tree.
>

> My alternate screen name is NOT "Avery Labels."
>
> I have no connection with the "Avery Labels" business.

Darn it. Last time I bought them, they were blank like your several
posts. That must be it.

> >> Heil is treed.
> >
> >Many a dog believes that he has treed a bird.
>
> Heil is not a bird.

Well, you've got me there, Leonard. By the way, you're not capable of
treeing me except in your mind.

> >> >> Heil makes it a point to attack only certain individuals.
> >> >
> >> >Why would I slam anyone who is civil and pleasant?
> >>
> >> It is your nature.
> >
> >[We may be getting near breakthrough here]
>
> It is doubtful that Heil will recognize his own irrationality.
>
> >...and you, Leonard Anderson, consider your behavior here to have been
> >pleasant and civil?
>
> Others who are unpleasant and uncivil get replies in-kind.

Anyone who disagrees with you, gets an uncivil reply. How do you say
it? You can't take strong opposition.

> Most of the poor babies cannot take it. TS.

I think you meant that most of 'em don't take it.

> I strive to turn back from all the misdirection towards subjects.

Is that how we're treated to regurgitations of you military exploits of
half a century ago? Is that how we learn about your homes and
comfortable life? Is that what you've been doing now?

> Heil continually misdirects from subjects to personalities.

Isn't this where you're supposed to steer a course toward the subject?
Why haven't you done so?

> Ergo, Heil is irrational.

Do you have much of a co-payment on those medications?

> >As I've told you previously, what you are doing is called transference.
>

> Heil is irrational again.
>
> Heil has no qualifications in psychology.

You're right. I have no more knowlege about it than you.

> Heil has absolutely zero rating on diplomacy despite working for
> a diplomatic corps.

Diplomacy, as you've seen in recent weeks, is not just a matter of
sitting around sitting cocktails and exchanging pleasantries. I'm
retired, Len and feel no compunction to take any of your guff.

> >> It is "taking place" again. Live with it, poor baby.
> >
> >I have to call you on this one, Len. You actually wrote something here.
> >It wasn't like the previous screwup in your home comm center.
>
> There was NO "screwup" in the original posting under the Avery
> Fineman screen name. It was deliberate.

So you say.

> The original posting was deliberately done to illustrate Heil's
> behavior in here. As expected, Heil replied with a personal
> attack charging "mistake."

So you say.

> Heil continues to cling to the original charge of "mistake."

There is no evidence showing that anything else took place.

> Heil is obstinate. Heil will not admit his own mistake.

I didn't send any blank posts.

> To admit to a mistake is to "lose face" (self-esteem).

I can understand your reluctance to admit error then.

> Heil is an extra. Heil is an amateur.

You're quite right.

> Amateur extras do not make mistakes. They are radio gods.

False premise not based in fact.

> Gods do not make mistakes.

If one is to believe Greek and Roman mythology, they did.

> >> I am still a radio-electronics professional.
> >
> >...and you are still not a radio amateur.

>
> Irrelevant.

No more than your being a radio-electronics professional. The newsgroup isn't about radio-electronics professionals. It addresses amateur radio, something in which you are not involved.

> Amateur radio licenses are not a requirement of
> discussion of regulations about amateur radio in public.

You've participated. You just haven't sold your grand plan to anyone. You're a guy on a soapbox railing against perceived injustices but you're minus a captivated crowd.

> I am still a radio-electronics professional.

That doesn't get you into amateur radio.

> Heil fancies himself a god. An amateur god.

Another false premise. You, by the way, don't seem to have quite made up your mind on the false premise. One minute you tell me I'm a god and the next minute, you tell me I'm not a god. It's hard to know just what of your material to believe.

Dave K8MN

1052. Re: How stupid is K1MAN?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-19 21:04:22 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5am0c$b80$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63189
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Of course it is. And many of the 275 jammers are straight off of 313. Example, the two guys with deep gravely voices. Tripple Nickle and his sidekick. Then of course there is 'Cowboy', he is near Hammond LA.

And from time to time you hear a few of the real old timers....like that goof up in NY.....nothing ever gets done. No one gets off their ass and turns in their neighbors. Nothing changes.

Most of the Stumpjumper moorons have either died or gave up 'playing'. That is a good thing.

Dan/W4NTI

"Lloyd/N0VFP" <lloyd_vfp@NOmsn.NOSPAMMMM.com> wrote in message news:3e78bcbd_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b5a5b9sar1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> > Not to mention that he is totally 180 degrees out of phase with the
> reality
> > of the situation.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> Dan,
>
> I firmly think that most of these nuts who post with out a real name/call,
> are probably the same bunch who QRM 14.275. The Cowboy charaecter is
> probably one of these.
>
> Lloyd "The Real McCoy"
>
> --
> Lloyd/N0VFP
> "And that's just the way it is"
> R-75 FT-817
>
>
>
>
> ------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers

=-----

1053. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 00:07:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030319190735.23139.00001430@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 63190

In article <f45722ac.0303190403.1a509938@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>State the WPM rate at which "proficiency" is achieved.
>
10 WPM is the lowest speed that can be considered "proficient".

73 de Jim, N2EY

1054. Re: How stupid is K1MAN?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 00:58:15 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5b3oc$t3c$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63191
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well flash in the pan "L Rod Hubbard" I tell you what the reason is.

For the first time in his radio trashing life he ran into a group of folks
that ...

1. Didn't fall for his bluster and bullcrap.

2. Didn't fall for his 'felony affidavit' bullcrap.'

3. Could care less about his so called organization.

4. Had the gonads to stand up for what was right and finally...

5. Pursued via all means possible his removal from Amateur Radio.

See how simple it is?

Dan/W4NTI

"L Rod Hubbard" <LRod@removethispart.com> wrote in message
news:fear.k1man.fcc@removethispart.com...
> On Wed, 19 Mar 2003 10:20:01 -0600, Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
wrote:
> > Not to mention that he is totally 180 degrees out of phase with the
reality
> > of the situation.
>
> It looks like he's exactly in phase with the situation. For over 10
> years now, the FCC hasn't managed to get anything to stick to K1MAN.
>
> He's coated with teflon.
>
> There has to be a reason for K1MAN's longevity, and it probably does
> have something to do with the FCC's fear of the guy. There aren't
> many other explanations left after all these years.

1055. Re: How stupid is K1MAN?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 01:34:29 UTC
From: LRod@removethispartpobox.com
Message-ID: <3e79198b.185421289@netnews.att.net>
Source record: 63192
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 19 Mar 2003 18:58:15 -0600, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:

>Well flash in the pan "L Rod Hubbard" I tell you what the reason is.

>"L Rod Hubbard" <LRod@removethispart.com> wrote in message
>news:fear.k1man.fcc@removethispart.com...

Dan, please note that although the names are similar, that poster is
not me.

Among the other ways you can tell who I am is the fact that my
website, where you can really tell who I am, is listed on every post,
and I post from an AT&T newsserver.

Note also, if you remove the "removethispart" from his e-mail address
(much like the anti-spam insert I have in mine) you are left with an
invalid address (unlike mine). E-mail to my address will get to me.

Just so no one's fooled. It's fun to have a fan club, lightweight
though he is.

LRod

Master Woodbutcher and seasoned termite

Shamelessly whoring my website since 1999

http://www.woodbutcher.net

1056. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 02:11:27 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030319211127.11308.00000236@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 63193

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>> it is useful to know,
>>but should not be part of the license test.
>
>That's YOUR opinion. I haven't stated mine.

Yes, you have. Someone else came to that same conclusion. This is what the analogy says. Now, you're backing out of it.

Instead of the analogy, why don't you just state your position on Morse code testing?

>>Whether <Morse> code is useful is debatable.
>
>Of course Morse code is useful. Radio amateurs all over the world use it
>every
>day.

You say because Hams use it, that it is useful. This is circular logic. Hams only use it because they WANT to use it, NOT because it may be useful. Just because it is in use does not make it useful.

>>I feel <Morse> code is not useful
>>and possibly harms to the hobby (and one's "state") more than there are
>>benefits.
>
>Why?

It harms the hobby because non-hams know enough about Ham radio to know that Morse code is used.

I mentioned I was a Ham to a bunch of non-Hams in a social situation. I was surprised what non-Hams have the impression of Hams. Someone asked the following questions:
"Do they still use Morse code"? (Then he mentioned that it is long obsolete and even the military does not use it anymore).
"Are Hamfests like Star-Trek conventions"? (After I said I went to a Hamfest).
"Is that like a cult or something"?
"Do Hams participate in social activities"?

I was at a loss at answering each one of these questions.

If you want positive public opinion, get rid of this Morse obsession, or keep it to yourself. It only makes the hobby look bad.

I also think its bad for you, if you don't enjoy it. If individuals enjoy it, it is fine with me - just don't make it represent the hobby.

>What is wrong with free choice of modes? How does the USE (not the test, the
>USE) of Morse code by hams cause any problems?

Nothing wrong with free choice of modes. However, it is emphasized so much that other modes suffer. Also, don't tie Morse code requirement to the general test - that is not free choice of modes.

1057. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 03:32:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303191932.1b9e4ac1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63194

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E789EAD.504CD733@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E73CE56.C2F4CDDA@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E735497.B878D89B@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > > > You just don't have enough information to make a judgement. Get back to
> > > > > > > > me when you have enough experience to make such a call.
>
> > > > > > > No, Dave, that's not it. 0.02wpm sets a world record, and that's a fact.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > It certainly is. It is one which has nothing to do with the code
> > > > > > proficiency of either ham.
> > > > > >
> > > > > You don't know the code proficiency of either ham. Yet you want to talk facts.
> > > > >
> > > > Dig back in the thread a little, Brian. That's one of the points I
> > > > made--that we don't know the code proficiency of either ham. We don't
> > > > know that their maximum morse receiving speed is higher than .02 wpm. I
> > > > have an idea that it it. You seem to have made an assumption that it is
> > > > on the order of .02 wpm and then asked if that was "proficient". Such
> > > > comments just make you look like a dullard.
> > >
> > > Dave, then you should have stuck with that point rather than continue
> > > on and make assumptions about the record setters code prowess.
> >
> > You're a silly lad. It is a safe assumption that their maximum code
> > speed is in excess of .02 wpm. They have to have done magnitudes better
> > to pass their licensing exam.

So you know of their regulations? You choose to remain ignorant of
other nation's amateur regulations, except for their code speed?

> > That is where you went down the wrong road.
> >
> > Treating you as if you had a valid point was where I might have taken
> > the wrong road.

Treating you as if you had something valid to add was my mistake.

> > > > > > I can make just as many arbitrary claims as you can, re: 5wpm not proficient.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > The big difference I see between us is that I use pertinent facts to
> > > > > > make a point while you misinterpret the facts you've seen. You still
> > > > > > seem to confuse the words "proficient" and "efficient".
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You confuse a world record set using Morse Code with "not proficient."
> > > > >
> > > > > That's completely untrue. I've never written anything to indicate
> > > > > anything like it. It is likely another example of your poor (not
> > > > > proficient) reading comprehension skills.
> > > >
> > > Then stick with the facts, even if they won't support your argument.
> >
> Wouldn't want you to get tripped up over any reasonable assumptions,
> would we?

My knees aren't the ones covered with Band-Aids.

> > Lose the argument gracefully.
> >
> On what basis would I need to lose at all?

I realize it's a foreign concept for you (smug).

1058. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 03:34:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303191934.304d1ed1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63195

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030318083241.25614.00000152@mb-fm.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/18/03 7:10 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303180510.492a74a9@posting.google.com>
>
> >Dave must have his hand up your skirt like a puppet.
>
> What is it with you and the Left Coast Liar that whenever you're getting a
> good dusting in here you start making comments of a homosexual overtone,
> Brian...?!?!
>
> Jealous?
>
> Steve

Was Kuckla, Fran and Ollie a homesexual puppet act?

OK, Steve, how else do you give animation to a sock puppet?

1059. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 04:57:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030319235710.17392.00000173@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63196

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/19/03 12:43 Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030319134310.01930.00001389@mb-mq.aol.com>

>>Avery Fineman wrote:
>>>
>>> In article <3E77F999.69768FE5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>> writes:
>>>
>>> >Len Over 21 wrote:

This is cute...Lennie quoting himself under an other screen name to
antagonize another poster.

Whew...And he calls ME "irrational"

What a putz.

Steve

1060. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 05:06:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320000601.17392.00000174@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63197

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 03/18/03 23:54 Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E78060D.5818313F@earthlink.net>

>Len Over 21 wrote:

>> My wife is not a psychologist. She has a Masters Degree in
>> Education, another Masters in Social Work, both from the
>> University of Illinois.
>
>From Google, you wrote on January 28:
>
> "For "credentials" in psychology, I can call on my own
> consultant, my wife, who has two Masters degrees (both
> from University of Illinois) with one of those being in Social
> Work. She was a licensed private counselor in the states
> of Illinois and Washington for a number of years."
>
>So we are now to understand that neither she nor you have any
>credentials in psychology despite what you wrote earlier. Glad we
>cleared that up.

OUCH!

That had to HURT!

Nice job, Dave ! ! !

>> Subject is CODE TEST ELIMINATION, not your attempts at
>> character assassination.
>>
>> Try to stay somewhat close to the subject.
>
>How far back does one need go in this thread to find an example of you
>discussing code test elimination? How far back does one need to in
>order to find examples of your writing which fit the N2EY profile?

Heaven forbid, Dave, that Lennie would adhere to his own attempts at
moderating the NG as to content and intent.

>Now perhaps you can tell us how you believe your character to have been
>assassinated. I'll be happy to help you by providing more examples of
>your words which I believe fit the profile.

Good Lord, Dave! ! ! We could choke Google with the bandwidth used
quoting his lies and rhetoric!

>Sorry old boy, Despite my own professional background in communications,
>this newsgroup isn't about professional radio and electronics. This one
>deals with amateur radio. I'm a radio amateur.
>You're still a bystander.

Here here!

Steve, K4YZ

1061. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 05:17:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320001736.17392.00000176@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63198

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman)
>Date: 03/19/03 01:16 Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030319021654.23305.00000998@mb-fs.aol.com>

>Heil does not understand the requisite studies in psychology
> necessary for a Masters degree in Social Work.

The point, Your Pointedheadedness, is that you have foisted your spouse's alleged credentials upon this newsgroup insunuating that she is a skilled (if not licensed) psychologist.

Seems you're not the only Anderson in that household without a license to practice that which is preached...

>Heil does not understand the necessary qualifications for
> private counseling in Social Work.

How does Anderscum know this for a fact?

>Heil is ignorant as well as irrational, mean-spirited, uncivil,
> and arrogant.

Pot/kettle/black.

>This is not a newsgroup about psychology.

Then why do you feel it necessary to insert your wife into various posts as allegedly being a psychologist? How is it germane to the Amateur Radio Code test issue?

>Heil attempts character assassination by targeting my
> wife.

Collaeral damage. You should have left her out of it, Your Putziness.

>Heil again demonstrates mean-spirited and uncivil behavior.

And YOU are a paragon of virtue, Lennie...?!?!

>Heil is deliberately misdirecting from the subject to
> character assassination.

And Lennie once again edited out very specific questions directed at him.

Whew.......

>License grants are not required to discuss any part of US
> law in open forums.

Licensure was not the topic of discussion.

Your lying is.

>Heil once again misdirects to character assassination.

You can't assassinate that which is already dead.

>Heil cannot discuss the subject. He has no valid arguments.

And YOU do...?!?!

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! !

> Try to stay focussed on subjects. Avoid misdirections
> into character assassination attempts.

Try to spell "focused" correctly, Lennie.

>Len Anderson
> retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

And antagonistic pathological liar without peer.

Steve

1062. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 05:22:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320002253.17392.00000177@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63199

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 03/19/03 21:34 Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303191934.304d1ed1@posting.google.com>

>OK, Steve, how else do you give animation to a sock puppet?

Your comment, Brain, asked one man if his hand was up another's "skirt".

Nothing was said about socks, Brain.

Try again, your "Stupid Factor" was in the high eighties that time.

Steve

1063. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 05:25:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320002533.17392.00000178@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63200

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 03/19/03 05:57 Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303190357.6bd7363b@posting.google.com>

>> >You have not done so. You have only provided a moving target
>>
>> You can't hit fixed ones, so what's the difference?
>
>Steve, did you have something intelligent to say?

Did you? Can you HIT a target? Can you even identify one?

>Obviously not a definition. Did you have -anything- intelligent to say?

Sure it was. Did YOU have anything intelligent to say?

Steve

1064. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 05:30:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320003031.17392.00000179@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63301

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 03/19/03 21:45 Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303191945.148b83d7@posting.google.com>

>Steve, I'm not laughing.

If I had your problems I wouldn't be laughing either. But your problems do enliven the rest of us...Again, THANKS!

>You're nuts.

So, you got your license in psychology from the same place Lennie's wife did...???

You're slipping, Brain.

Steve

1065. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 06:58:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E796694.5529D85A@att.net>
Source record: 63302

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> >Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 03/19/03 12:43 Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030319134310.01930.00001389@mb-mq.aol.com>
>
> >>Avery Fineman wrote:
> >>>
> >>> In article <3E77F999.69768FE5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >>> writes:
> >>>
> >>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> This is cute...Lennie quoting himself under an other screen name to
> antagonize another poster.
>
> Whew...And he calls ME "irrational"
>
> What a putz.

Yeah, but he's so CUTE!

1066. Now That The Shooting Has Started...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 13:05:14 UTC
From: Lloyd's Restaurant <Eat@EatAtLloydsRestaurant.org>
Message-ID: <b5ce8i$9i4$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 63305

My associate just informed me that a quick cruise across
the ham bands yields the expected increase in "war" stories
from the elder ham population. The most common lead-in
phrases seemingly start with:

When I was a Special Ops troop in Nam...
During my sixth tour of duty in Nam...
In Beruit we were in the middle of it...
In Desert Storm we kicked ass when...
Back in WWII we...
My Navy SEAL team was responsible for...
Our Air Commando Team in Nam was...

Oh well, hams have ALWAYS been great story tellers. At
least you 14275 addicts may lay off of Baxter for a few days,
until you get tired of hearing each other's war exploits of days
gone by. No wonder today's kids have no interest in this
hobby!

73,

Lloyd's Diner

1067. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 13:10:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303200510.37901e73@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63303

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030319190735.23139.00001430@mb-da.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0303190403.1a509938@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >State the WPM rate at which "proficiency" is achieved.
> >
> 10 WPM is the lowest speed that can be considered "proficient".
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim, thank you. Another question, please. How do you know 10wpm is
the lowest speed which can be considered proficient?

Brian

1068. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 13:13:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303200513.7e15b930@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63304

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030320002253.17392.00000177@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 03/19/03 21:34 Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303191934.304d1ed1@posting.google.com>
>
> >OK, Steve, how else do you give animation to a sock puppet?
>
> Your comment, Brain, asked one man if his hand was up another's "skirt".
>
> Nothing was said about socks, Brain.
>
> Try again, your "Stupid Factor" was in the high eighties that time.
>
> Steve

OK, girls. Time to lighten up.

1069. Steve Robeson as a role model

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 14:39:20 UTC
From: Just Me <JustMe@tmynet.net>
Message-ID: <gjkj7v0tmst868i9v4f94ehdfcg9vst285@4ax.com>
Source record: 63306

NOT

1070. Re: Steve Robeson as a role model

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 15:18:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320101815.25505.00000157@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 63307

>Subject: Steve Robeson as a role model
>From: Just Me JustMe@tmynet.net
>Date: 03/20/03 08:39 Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <gjkj7v0tmst868i9v4f94ehdfcg9vst285@4ax.com>
>
>
>
>NOT

Let me see.....

How impressed or offended can I be by an anonymous, gonadless poster...

Hmmmmmm......

NOT!.....

No Name...No valid e-mail address = NON-PERSON

Coward!

Steve

1071. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 15:29:31 UTC
From: kf6vyh@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320102931.11500.00000241@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 63308

>The bandplans, particularly those that apply to the HF bands, do consist
>of restrictions stated in Part 97 FCC regulations. A Technician who has
>not passed the 5 WPM code test would need to know this before he/she
>attempted to operate in the 10-meter phone segment,

How the hell does passing a 5wpm cw test mean some ome knows the band plan.

1072. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 15:30:25 UTC
From: kf6vyh@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320103025.11500.00000242@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 63309

>I only see questions about frequency limits of different bands and the
>definition of band plan.

They have questions re mode of operatiion

1073. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 15:32:35 UTC
From: kf6vyh@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320103235.11500.00000243@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 63310

>Is selecting a Vanity Call Sign that is demeaning to YL hams and incites
>prurient interest something that is in "good amateur practice?" Is it in
>the "spirit of amateur radio" and in keeping with the Amateur Code? If
>you say "yes" to any of the above, then get 25 other licensed hams
>to agree with you, have them post their agreement in this newsgroup,
>identified by name and call sign, and I'll never make another posting
>about your call sign. None of them can be current regular participants
>in this newsgroup.

whats this have to do with a tech question pool

1074. Re: How stupid is K1MAN? (FAKE LLOYD ALERT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 16:58:32 UTC
From: hotfilaments@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ba37c287.0303200858.a76d25e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63311
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Lloyd/N0VFP" <lloyd_vfp@NOmsn.NOSPAMMMM.com> wrote in message
news:<3e78bb19_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>...
> "Lloyd" <BroLloyd@brollloyde.com> wrote in message
> news:b5a357$nsa$0@pita.alt.net...
> > After you wipe the spittle off your chin and face and take
> > your meds, please share with the group where you earned
> > your communications law degree.
> >
> > 73,
> >
> > Lloyd
>
> ****************** IMPOSTER ALERT! ************************
>
> The message above came from a fake Lloyd. This is the same one who
> destroyed a truce I made with W4NTI months back. I hold Glenn Baxter with
> every bit of comtempt, knowing what he really is.
>
> The imposter is probably a nut from 14.313 or 3.950
>
> Just a pot stirrer, thats all.
>
> --
> Lloyd/N0VFP - The Real McCoy!
> "And that's just the way it is"
> R-75 FT-817
>
>
```

And, we are supposed to believe that you aren't a "nut"....?

So speaks Lloyd who has switched sides more times than the Italian Army during WW2.

James

1075. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 17:27:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320122706.25801.00000468@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 63313

In article <f45722ac.0303200510.37901e73@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030319190735.23139.00001430@mb-da.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0303190403.1a509938@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >State the WPM rate at which "proficiency" is achieved.
>> >
>> 10 WPM is the lowest speed that can be considered "proficient".
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Jim, thank you. Another question, please. How do you know 10wpm is
>the lowest speed which can be considered proficient?

It's the lowest speed for which a proficiency award is available. So 10 wpm is the very beginning - the lowest recognized level - of Morse code proficiency. Of course much higher levels of proficiency are attainable, but that's another story.

Thus, a 13 wpm code test is a code proficiency test because 13 is greater than 10, but a 5 wpm code test is not a code proficiency test because 5 is less than 10.

So when someone says their goal is 'elimination of the Morse code proficiency test for any amateur radio license in the USA', it is accurate to reply that their goal has been accomplished.

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

1076. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 17:27:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320122708.25801.00000469@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 63312

In article <20030319211127.11308.00000236@mb-dd.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

(Vshah101 wrote:)

>>> it is useful to know,
>>>but should not be part of the license test.
>>
>>That's YOUR opinion. I haven't stated mine.
>
>Yes, you have.

In other posts, yes.

>Someone else came to that same conclusion.

They were not basing their conclusion on the transmission analogy.

> This is what the
>analogy says.

Nope.

> Now, you're backing out of it.
>
Not at all.

A few posts back in this thread, someone made a comparison with riding a horse. That's not a good analogy for a number of reasons. So I suggested a much more relevant analogy - manual transmission ("stick-shift") cars, and tests for same. That analogy did not originate with me - I got it from K2UNK.

I did not state my own opinion, just the analogy, and asked I some questions.

>Instead of the analogy, why don't you just state your position on Morse code
>testing?

I've stated my position many times before, but here goes: I think that Morse code tests for an amateur radio license are a good thing and should be retained. I commented to the FCC that the tests should be 5, 13 and 20 wpm for General, Advanced and Extra. I think the dropping of the code test from the Tech wasn't a good idea.

And I also realize that there is little chance my views will be acted on by the FCC. Chances are very good that FCC will drop the one remaining code test as soon as changes to the ITU-R treaty no longer REQUIRE code testing for all amateur radio licenses that allow operation below 30 MHz.

>
>>>Whether <Morse> code is useful is debatable.
>>
>>Of course Morse code is useful. Radio amateurs all over the world use it
>>every day.
>
>You say because Hams use it, that it is useful.

No, I say that because radio amateurs use it, it is useful.

>This is circular logic.

No, it's the definition of "useful". If something has a use, it is useful.

>Hams
>only use it because they WANT to use it, NOT because it may be useful.

That can be said of any mode.

>Just because it is in use does not make it useful.

Then what is your definition of "useful"?
>
>>>I feel <Morse> code is not useful
>>>and possibly harms to the hobby (and one's "state") more than there are
>>>benefits.
>>
>>Why?
>
>It harms the hobby because non-hams know enough about Ham radio to know that
>Morse code is used.

How does that cause any harm? The non-hams I have met are impressed and
intrigued that hams use Morse code and are often amazed at even my limited
skills with the mode. "You mean you can understand that?!" is a common comment.
"Just like listening to someone talk" is my usual reply.
>
>I mentioned I was a Ham to a bunch of non-Hams in a social situation. I was
>surprised what non-Hams have the impression of Hams. Someone asked the
>following questions:
>"Do they still use Morse code"?

I'd answer those questions like this:

"Many hams use Morse code, and many do not. Hams use several types of voice,
data, image and other communications modes. There are even amateur radio
communication satellites. Most hams use a variety of modes."

>(Then he mentioned that it is long obsolete
>and even the military does not use it anymore).

"It's not obsolete to the people who use it. Just like propeller airplanes,
sailboats, manual transmission cars, or many other things."

>"Are Hamfests like Star-Trek conventions"? (After I said I went to a
>Hamfest).

"No. Most of them are basically electronic and computer flea markets. All sorts
of stuff to be found, ranging from real junk to hard-to-find treasures."

>"Is that like a cult or something"?

"No. All sorts of people are amateur radio operators, and they have all sorts
of interests in radio."

>"Do Hams participate in social activities"?

"Some are social types, some aren't. There are conventions and such, but most
hams socialize with each other on the air".
>
>I was at a loss at answering each one of these questions.
>
That's why I suggest the above answers.

>If you want positive public opinion, get rid of this Morse obsession, or keep
>it to yourself. It only makes the hobby look bad.

Not an "obsession" on my part, Vipul, just an interest.

You have not shown how the use of Morse code by hams does anyone any harm.
>
>I also think its bad for you, if you don't enjoy it.

But I do enjoy it. YMMV

>If individuals enjoy it,
>it is fine with me - just don't make it represent the hobby.

See above. Just present a balanced, accurate picture - hams use a wide variety
of modes. Morse is one of them.
>
>>What is wrong with free choice of modes? How does the USE (not the test, the
>>USE) of Morse code by hams cause any problems?
>
>Nothing wrong with free choice of modes.

That's what we have. Nobody has to use any particular mode on the air.

>However, it is emphasized so much
>that other modes suffer.

Is it wrong to emphasize what someone likes to do? What modes do YOU operate?

I look in my ham radio mags, and there's article after article on digital
modes, satellites, VHF/UHF, image modes, APRS, AM, etc. Once in a great while
there's an article on Morse code.

> Also, don't tie Morse code requirement to the general test

You keep saying that, Vipul, but you don't tell us how to avoid doing that and
still comply with ITU-R.

Perhaps you mean we should go back to requiring a code test for all ham licenses, so there is no tying of any license class to the code test.

>- that is not free choice of modes.

Sure it is. Hams can use any authorized mode. The test requires certain knowledge and skills, that's all.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1077. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 17:32:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E79FB19.29AAF4BC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63314

Brian wrote:
>
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030319190735.23139.00001430@mb-da.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0303190403.1a509938@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >State the WPM rate at which "proficiency" is achieved.
> > >
> > 10 WPM is the lowest speed that can be considered "proficient".
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim, thank you. Another question, please. How do you know 10wpm is
> the lowest speed which can be considered proficient?

I disagree with Jim on this one. The definition of "proficient" is
"skilled" or "expert". While 10 wpm may mark a journeyman level, I
don't consider it proficient. Many QSOs take place at the 20-35 wpm
level.

One thing I know is that there is no answer to your question which will
please you. You may delude yourself all you like. Someone whose top
morse speed is five wpm is not proficient in the use of morse.

Now I'm heading back to CNN's coverage of the war.

Dave K8MN

1078. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 17:34:08 UTC
From: 1009896220 <proteggere@bigfoot.com>
Message-ID: <3e79f7a8_5@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 63315

> New pool for technicians takes place this summer and the new "Now
> You're Talking" is already available.

The ARRL shows this book as not available until April. Is it available
somewhere else, maybe? Anxious for a copy. :-)

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b4st1522pmp@enews4.newsguy.com...
>
>>Here's a question for y'all.... I hear there is going to be a change in
>
> the
>
>>question pools, which license class?
>>I am interested because I want to get the "Now Your Talking" book for a
>>friend as a gift, and if there is a change in information, I would rather
>>get them the up-to-date version. If it affects the Tech class, my
>
> decision
>
>>to wait to purchase the text for them may have to wait.
>>
>
>
>
> New pool for technicians takes place this summer and the new "Now You're
> Talking" is already available. Just make sure you check the info that says
> what question pool it is for as some places may still have the old one on
> the shelf.
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
>

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1079. Re: How stupid is K1MAN?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 18:29:25 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5d1ba$s0v$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63316
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Your original post indicated you knew it all. So I straightned you out. You figure out who did what and report back.

Dan/W4NTI

"L Rod Hubbard" <LRod@removethispart.com> wrote in message news:98371834.129854AB@removethispart.com...
> On Wed, 19 Mar 2003 18:58:15 -0600, Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
> > Well flash in the pan "L Rod Hubbard" I tell you what the reason is.
> >
> > For the first time in his radio trashing life he ran into a group of folks
> > that ...
>
> What group is that? Certainly *not* the FCC.

1080. Re: Now That The Shooting Has Started...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 18:34:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5d1jmush1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63317

I think you and your 'associate' need to take a chill pill. I dont hear nothing like that going on. Course we all know this is a troll.

Dan/W4NTI

"Lloyd's Restaurant" <Eat@EatAtLloydsRestaurant.org> wrote in message news:b5ce8i$9i4$0@pita.alt.net...
> My associate just informed me that a quick cruise across
> the ham bands yields the expected increase in "war" stories
> from the elder ham population. The most common lead-in
> phrases seemingly start with:
>
> When I was a Special Ops troop in Nam...
> During my sixth tour of duty in Nam...
> In Beruit we were in the middle of it...
> In Desert Storm we kicked ass when...
> Back in WWII we...
> My Navy SEAL team was responsible for...
> Our Air Commando Team in Nam was...
>
> Oh well, hams have ALWAYS been great story tellers. At
> least you 14275 addicts may lay off of Baxter for a few days,
> until you get tired of hearing each other's war exploits of days
> gone by. No wonder today's kids have no interest in this
> hobby!
>
> 73,
>
> Lloyd's Diner
>
>
>
>
>
>

1081. Re: How stupid is K1MAN? (FAKE LLOYD ALERT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 20:15:03 UTC
From: Lloyd/N0VFP <lloyd_vfp@NOmsn.NOSPAMMMM.com>
Message-ID: <3e7a1d8c_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 63318
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"James Bond" <hotfilaments@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:ba37c287.0303200858.a76d25e@posting.google.com...
> "Lloyd/N0VFP" <lloyd_vfp@NOmsn.NOSPAMMMM.com> wrote in message
news:<3e78bb19_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>...
> And, we are supposed to believe that you aren't a "nut"....?
>
> So speaks Lloyd who has switched sides more times than the Italian Army
during WW2.
>
> James

And we are take anything you say truthfully? With no name and no call?

--
Lloyd/N0VFP
"And that's just the way it is"
R-75 FT-817

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1082. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 21:40:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320164033.09808.00002570@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 63321

In article <3E7899CC.81F8D963@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Avery Fineman wrote:
>>

>We can go over the N2EY profile of Leonard Anderson again if you like.
>I think we can find numerous examples of your having made comments which
>show ignorance and in which you demonstrate that you are irrational,
>mean spirited, uncivil and arrogant.

The subject thread is "honest code elimination question."

It is not 'Dave Heil's opinions of someone who does not worship,
respect, or honor him."

>> This is not a newsgroup about psychology.
>
>Then why did you state credentials through your wife in an earlier post?

A much earlier post. That post was on credentials alone.

Why do you insist on making such a fuss over my wife?

Isn't it just another ploy in attempting character assassination?

>Your wife isn't a target of anything.

Yes, she is. Heil makes a despicable attempt at character
assassination by relationship.

>We have only your comments relating to her.

That is all you will ever get. Try to make the most of it (as
you must to follow-through on character assassination).

>I'm sure she's nothing like you.

She is female. I am male.

>She undoubtedly has
>no idea of how you spend the bulk of your time here.

Incorrect again. We have individual computers situated
on adjoining desks in our southern home office. We do
not keep secrets from one another and discuss many
things.

>> Heil again demonstrates mean-spirited and uncivil behavior.
>
>Awwww--did the little old pirhana get his feelings hurt?

Quod Erat Demonstrandum.

[Heil demonstrates that which is remarked about him]

>> Heil is deliberately misdirecting from the subject to
>> character assassination.
>
>No, Heil is trying to determine if you observe in your habits here what
>you decry in others. My observation is that you don't.

Heil is once again trying to misdirect.

Heil has NO qualifications in psychology or human behavior.

>There was nothing about license grants in what I asked about your
>behavior here. Don't you want to address the points in that material?

Those "points" have been addressed many times. Stamped,
wrapped, and shipped faster than over-night delivery. Heil
either didn't get them or refuses to acknowlege the contents.

>> Heil once again misdirects to character assassination.
>
>It seems that you don't have a character to assassinate.

QED.

>Not at all, Len old boy. I quoted what I'd asked you. I quoted the
>profile. I asked if you'd care to comment on any of the items after
>making a comparison between the profile and what I asked. You've not
>done so. Do you find that embarrassing?

No.

I find only that Heil tries to keep up character assassination.

>> Heil cannot discuss the subject. He has no valid arguments.
>
>What subject is it that you address when you belittle someone's job or
>experience.

Heil's statements of his "experiences" in Guinea-Bisseau are
those of an amateur-thinking professional. Real professionals
in radio had long since (before that tale) worked out proper
procedures on HF communications.

Heil bristles at corrections. Heil gear-shifts from subject to
personal character assassination for not loving, honoring, or
respecting his might accomplishments and experiences.
Perhaps that is the "transmission" analogy of morse code
as cited in another thread...

>You aren't even willing to provide any material you have which refutes
>the N2EY profile or of the questions I've asked you. How has your
>character been assassinated?

If Heil doesn't understand how his own character assassination
techniques are observed, he has truly gone over the bend into
a radio god fantasy delusion.

>What explanation can you provide for the
>abundant examples of your writings which lend proof to what is outlined
>in the N2EY profile?

Both Heil and Miccolis are PCTAs of an extreme order. That
itself is an "explanation" for their behavior and "profiling." :-)

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Repetition of character assassination doesn't make it true.

>You've discussed. I'm not required to agree with you. I'm not required
>to be silent regarding your opinions.

Use of character assassination techniques doesn't make it
free speech. See US civil law on libel and slander.

1083. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 21:40:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320164035.09808.00002571@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 63320

In article <3E7899CC.81F8D963@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>A radio amateur. You are some guy who has been standing on the
>sidelines for decades.

Not at all. I've been a radio and electronics professional for over
a half century.

Amateur radio does NOT represent the sum total of all radio
communications. It is just a hobby activity, a recreation. It is also
quite a minor activity in the whole field of radio communications
worldwide.

>Yet you tell us that you know best how amateur
>radio should be regulated.

No, I present my arguments for a modernization of US amateur
radio regulations.

As an example, use of morse code as a communications mode
IS obsolete. Worldwide. It is just not defunct, extinct.

Other radio services worldwide have either dropped morse code
mode communications or never considered it in the beginning of
a radio service.

The FCC does not demand use of morse code over and above any
other mode by US radio amateurs. All allocated modes are
optional for use by all US amateur radio licensees, any class, any
amateur band. Why does the morse code test remain other than
the inertia and lobbying of old-timers at the ITU?

The FCC stated publicly in 1990 and 1999 that it does not consider
morse code skill to be of value in the FCC determining whether or
not an amateur radio license applicant should be granted a
license. The morse code test remains as a requirement for
license grants for all license classes having below-30-MHz
privileges. Morse code testing itself is obsolete.

>You insult amateur radio (see any Anderson
>comments about public service efforts in emergencies)

Incorrect. I negatively criticize ARRL for exaggerated spin
on amateur radio's alleged importance during national
emergencies. ARRL seeks to interest its membership and
to gain new members. That activity results in an
exaggeration of amateur importance, a mood thought

necessary for membership group-think.

>You insult those
>who choose to use morse code and who support morse testing.

Yes. The major reason is that old-time morse code users have presented themselves to the public as experts in radio and procedure when they are obviously not experts in radio of modern times. Their procedures are fixed to the standards and practices of six decades ago.

Those who love, honor, and worship morse code are fixated on their enobled aptitude and resultant skill. Such do not hesitate to say they are the best in radio because of that single skill... long after morse code became obsolete.

>You insult the ARRL.

Incorrect again. I negatively criticize ARRL for their public special-interest group lobbying activities as being rooted in the distant past. I negatively criticize ARRL for their "big-lie" techniques in self-serving propaganda. I negatively criticize ARRL for attempting to be a second government level on the control of US amateur radio regulations...when they have no such control or representation.

ARRL membership is not a majority group. It is a minority group of, at best, only a quarter of all licensed US radio amateurs. ARRL is a private membership organization. It is not an arm of the US government.

ARRL does provide services for their membership, but such services are lesser in comparison to all of its assumed authority in knowing what is best for the majority of licensed US radio amateurs.

ARRL is a private special-interest group. They are not divine. They made themselves into a virtual monopoly of amateur radio opinion and information in the USA...beating out earlier competitive national membership organizations. ARRL is a public political entity. ARRL is itself controlled by a small minority of its membership. Absolute power corrupts.

>You insult and impugn those who work for the ARRL.

Incorrect again. I've engaged ARRL staff in open debate in public on certain matters of radio amateurism. That does not require either love, honor, respect or worship of them. They are humans, not radio gods who must be obeyed.

>You insult amateur radio's traditions.

Incorrect once more. I do not love, honor, respect, or worship standards and practices in amateurism established before I

was born. All of radio is only 107 years old. Radio has grown, advanced much, improved by gigantic leaps in technology since a time of 35% of its life. All of radio has not remained static, unchanging, rooted into place...except some things in amateur radio.

I do not love, honor, respect, or worship fraternal order symbolism such as the so-called whouff-hong, rettysnitch, verneable sayings of "T.O.M.," or some misplaced idealism that places amateurism in radio far above all other activities and accomplishments in the giant other world of professional radio.

The thought that a National Traffic System composed of amateurs as either vital or a necessity is ludicrous in this modern age. The general public has a far greater ability to communicate nationally or internationally today than in the primitive radio days of 1914. One in three Americans now have some form of Internet access. There are about 135 million cellular telephone subscribers in the USA. Direct-dial telephony is possible to nearly every other telephone in the entire world.

It is high time that the extreme conservative traditionalists in US amateur radio try to approach modern times and methods rather than remaining mired in a fantasyland of old radio tales and mythological triumphs.

>Why would such an individual want to become a radio amateur?

For personal pleasure, to engage in a hobby recreation involving radio. A problem with certain individuals is their perverse definition of "personal pleasure."

Sociopaths and self-righteous savants find great pleasure in denigrating, demeaning, and attempting to demoralize others through any means possible. That is sometimes considered an individual survival tactic...to release tensions resulting from frustrations of theirs of regular life. Others within that group are simply twisted, cannot get along with others, and attempt to control them.

>What interest could such an individual have in amateur radio?

Those sociopaths and self-righteous individuals use amateur radio accomplishments to show they are better than the common human. They need that image for their self-esteem. They take pleasure in denigrating others who do not honor, respect, and worship their mighty accomplishments as amateurs.

>Why would such
>an individual be concerned about regulations governing amateur radio?

Amateur radio regulations MUST be fixed, static, rooted in the status quo of regulations when the sociopaths and self-righteous were first licensed. Change of such regulations is anathema to them. Regulation changes mean loss of status, rank, privilege... all highly important to the self-centered, those needing self-esteem on steroids.

Quite probably the overall average of US radio amateurs are active in the hobby for the social interaction and for radio technology interest. It is obvious that the overwhelming majority of licensed US radio amateurs do NOT belong to ARRL or follow absolute ARRL guidance in all things.

1084. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 21:40:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320164037.09808.00002572@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 63319

In article <3E7899CC.81F8D963@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Avery Fineman wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E78060D.5818313F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <3E75C45A.802A36E3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> In article <3E742F71.9D34A08A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> >> writes:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> In article <3E73D8EC.EA910379@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> >> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> >> >> writes:
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >> >> You are irrational.
>> >> >>
>> >> >Show your "You're a god. You are no god. You're a god. You are no
>god.
>> >> >You're a god. You are no god. You're a god. You are no god." routine
>> >> >to your psychologist wife.
>> >>
>> >> You are being irrational again. Stop that.
>> >
>> >You're such a card, Len. Have you made up your mind yet?
>> >
>> >> My wife is not a psychologist. She has a Masters Degree in
>> >> Education, another Masters in Social Work, both from the
>> >> University of Illinois.
>> >

>> >From Google, you wrote on January 28:
>> >
>> > "For "credentials" in psychology, I can call on my own
>> > consultant, my wife, who has two Masters degrees (both
>> > from University of Illinois) with one of those being in Social
>> > Work. She was a licensed private counselor in the states
>> > of Illinois and Washington for a number of years."
>> >
>> >So we are now to understand that neither she nor you have any
>> >credentials in psychology despite what you wrote earlier. Glad we
>> >cleared that up.
>>
>> Heil does not understand the requisite studies in psychology
>> necessary for a Masters degree in Social Work.
>>
>> Heil does not understand the necessary qualifications for
>> private counseling in Social Work.
>
>Okay. You figure it out. Your wife is a psychologist. Your wife is
>not a psychologist. You can show your "You're a god. You're not a god"
>material to her anyway. By the way, have you made up your mind yet? Am
>I a god or am I not a god?

Heil thinks he is a radio god according to his remarks in here.

Heil once bragged about bad procedure in HF professional radio
in order to exemplify morse code "use." Very questionable
since professional radio prodedures had already ruled out such
things over two decades prior to the alleged incident. Ergo,
Heil had such poor professional experience that he was
categorized as an amateur in abilities.

The character assassination by Heil continues. This may be
because he feels disrespected and dishonored by those who
do not consider him a god of radio. Heil has a standard operating
procedure of misdirection from subjects to personalities. Witness
taking small items and magnifying them into exaggerated non-
subjects.

Attempted disparagement of my wife is just such a case of
character assassination. Heil does not understand that studies
and practical application of psychology are part and parcel of
Social Work. Heil is welcome to examine the curricula on
Social Work at any college or university to see this. It is
doubtful that Heil would admit to seeing it as this takes away
validity to his character assassination.

>> Heil is ignorant as well as irrational, mean-spirited, uncivil,
>> and arrogant.
>
>We can go over the N2EY profile of Leonard Anderson again if you like.
>I think we can find numerous examples of your having made comments which

>show ignorance and in which you demonstrate that you are irrational,
>mean spirited, uncivil and arrogant.

The subject is "Honest code elimination question," not an overuse
of Heil's whining about behavior disrespecting and dishonoring his
radio god-hood.

>> This is not a newsgroup about psychology.
>
>Then why did you state credentials through your wife in an earlier post?

I stated "credentials" in reference to another subject about
the subject of credentials.

Heil needs picayune remarks as the ignitor for more mean-spirited
uncivil character assassination when he has no valid response on
subject matter.

Heil demonstrates a character flaw, minor sociopathy and self-
righteous god-hood demanding that Heil must always be right.

>> Psychologists might be interested in studying Heil as a
>> case example.
>
>They might be.

There are many aberrations to human nature. Heil exhibits
several of them.

>They'd be certain to express interest in studying a
>seventy year old man with a fixation on amateur radio despite the fact
>that he isn't a radio amateur.

Heil is again attempting character assassination. There is no
"fixation." I have a mild interest in amateur radio. Radio is a
a very big, very widespread subset of the whole technology of
electronics and electron physics. I have a very strong interest
in the overall technology of electronics. I made that my career
choice for life a long time ago.

Note that "career choice" involves professionalism.

>You'll be quick to point out that your
>rants address getting into amateur radio.

There are no "rants." There are some arguments about the
modernization (long overdue) about a radio hobby activity
requiring federal licensing.

>With your declaration of
>several decades of interest, you'd be one of the slowest entrants on
>record for getting into amateur radio. If we discount the several
>decades, you've posted here for seven or more years and in that period
>of time, you still haven't gotten in.

Heil once again misdirects from the subject of code test elimination to character assassination: Heil's attempted charge of "failure" on my part for getting into amateur radio...the way Heil got into amateur radio.

I began legal (and with proper procedure) HF transmissions for communications (on a far larger scale than any amateur station) in February of 1953. Since then I have been involved with legal transmission control of RF radiation for communications and radionavigation over a wider range of the EM spectrum than is presently allocated to any radio amateur anywhere. None of that professional activity involved any amateur knowledge or amateur procedural standards or tests about amateur radio or receiving any federal license grants in or about amateur radio..

The large technological field of electronics and radio is fascinating to tens of thousands of professionals in that activity that have made it their career choice. It is active, it has always been growing, and electronics have become a part of everyone's life activities in most parts of the world.

I also find it most fascinating that a small group of amateurs persist in the Luddite fashion of old to maintain and freeze-dry to standards and practices of radio that is over a half century old. That extreme conservatism is manifest by the manic "necessity" to maintain morse code testing for the foreseeable future in a hobby activity, a radio recreational endeavor that involves licensing because of the nature of RF transmission.

It is also fascinating to watch a minority within a minority of all radio to attempt making their amateur recreational activity as representing expertise in ALL of radio...when they clearly have no such expertise or working knowledge. That mani-festation is part of the human territorial imperative (studyable in introductory psychology courses, once an engineering major requirement in some states). "Turf" in the common colloquial phrasing. The holding up of amateur credentials and tenure as an amateur is implicit in that "turf" as if it is a roll model for all to emulate.

An interesting thing about "turf" ownership is the strong righteous demand for respect and honor for now-traditional amateur activities. This is extended to imply expertise in all of radio but it is still only in amateurism...and it forms an insular elitism among the minority group where the prevailing thought seems to be that few other humans could achieve such noble accomplishments. Rank, status, privilege seems to have become the life goal of the extreme conservative amateurs...the interest in ordinary human interactions and fascinating technology taking a very low ranking.

The worst aspect of the minority of a minority of amateurs (of rank, status, privilege) is the despicable treatment of so-

called "outsiders." That is the ultimate extension of elitism
of the self-professed experts in amateurism. Do as they do,
honor and respect them for they exist...

1085. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 21:40:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320164038.09808.00002573@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 63322

In article <20030320122706.25801.00000468@mb-mb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <f45722ac.0303200510.37901e73@posting.google.com>,
>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>So when someone says their goal is 'elimination of the Morse code proficiency
>test for any amateur radio license in the USA', it is accurate to reply that
>their goal has been accomplished.

FLASH: This just in -

FCC has not revoked or otherwise eliminated test element 1 for
a US amateur radio license examination.

1086. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 21:40:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320164039.09808.00002574@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 63323

In article <20030320122708.25801.00000469@mb-mb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030319211127.11308.00000236@mb-dd.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
>(Vshah101) writes:
>
>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>(Vshah101 wrote:)
>
>>>> it is useful to know,
>>>>but should not be part of the license test.
>>>
>>>That's YOUR opinion. I haven't stated mine.
>>
>>Yes, you have.
>
>In other posts, yes.
>
>>Someone else came to that same conclusion.
>
>They were not basing their conclusion on the transmission analogy.

True. Some folks are able to differentiate between unrelated
concepts used falsely as analogues.

>A few posts back in this thread, someone made a comparison with riding a
horse.
>That's not a good analogy for a number of reasons.

...which were never delineated, disproven. This is not a newsgroup
for equestrian skills.

>So I suggested a much more
>relevant analogy - manual transmission ("stick-shift") cars, and tests for
>same.

It was never made clear how Miccolis' analogy was "more
relevant." :-)

This is still not a newsgroup for vehicle operation policy. :-)

>I did not state my own opinion, just the analogy, and asked I some questions.

Stated I did this newsgroup for horsies and cars not it is.

[bad Yoda imitations all around...]

>I've stated my position many times before, but here goes: I think that Morse
>code tests for an amateur radio license are a good thing and should be
>retained. I commented to the FCC that the tests should be 5, 13 and 20 wpm for
>General, Advanced and Extra. I think the dropping of the code test from the
>Tech wasn't a good idea.
>
>And I also realize that there is little chance my views will be acted on by
the
>FCC.

No kidding?!?

>Chances are very good that FCC will drop the one remaining code test as
>soon as changes to the ITU-R treaty no longer REQUIRE code testing for all
>amateur radio licenses that allow operation below 30 MHz.

Sic transit gloria mundi.

[Latin for "there goes the neighborhood"]

>>>Of course Morse code is useful. Radio amateurs all over the world use it
>>>every day.
>>
>>You say because Hams use it, that it is useful.
>
>No, I say that because radio amateurs use it, it is useful.
>
>>This is circular logic.
>
>No, it's the definition of "useful". If something has a use, it is useful.

Circular logic is "useful"...for those cases where a desired
thing cannot be defended and can be "redefined" by means
of circular logic. :-)

>Then what is your definition of "useful"?

What is yours? That circular logic is useful? :-)

>How does that cause any harm? The non-hams I have met are impressed and
>intrigued that hams use Morse code and are often amazed at even my limited
>skills with the mode. "You mean you can understand that?!" is a common
>comment.
>"Just like listening to someone talk" is my usual reply.

That's nice. Square, not circular.

Perhaps Miccolis should attempt a campaign to introduce
morse code as an effective communications mode to other
radio services?

>"It's not obsolete to the people who use it. Just like propeller airplanes,
>sailboats, manual transmission cars, or many other things."

Once, at an almost prehistoric time of primitive electronics
technology, morse code (on-off keying) was the ONLY way
to communicate via radio.

107 years after the birth of radio, the ONLY radio service
having a large number of users of morse code is amateur
radio. Morse codings aren't used in any commercial
wired or wireless communications.

Morse code is OBSOLETE. It just hasn't become extinct.

>"No. All sorts of people are amateur radio operators, and they have all sorts
>of interests in radio."

Only the best hams use morse code. Morse code is useful.

The best in US amateur radio is working DX on HF with CW.

Gosh old timer, those phrases are right out of the hymnbook.

>Perhaps you mean we should go back to requiring a code test for all ham
>licenses, so there is no tying of any license class to the code test.

Perhaps you have to destroy the village in order to save it?

Tell us all what Shah "meant."

>Sure it is. Hams can use any authorized mode. The test requires certain
>knowledge and skills, that's all.

Morse code is useful. Only the best hams use morse code.

Let's see some more circular logic. Fascinating to see things
go around and around doing nothing...

1087. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 21:46:04 UTC
From: George McCouch <K3UD@charter.net>
Message-ID: <2003200315460497 51%K3UD@charter.net>
Source record: 63324

In article <20030316142732.10890.00000275@mb-mr.aol.com>, N2EY
<n2ey@aol.com> wrote:

> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
> As of March 15, 2003:
>
> Novice - 35,124 (decrease of 14,205)
> Tech - 251,221 (increase of 45,827)
> Tech Plus - 70,742 (decrease of 58,118)
> General - 140,285 (increase of 27,608)
> Advanced - 83,911 (decrease of 15,871)
> Extra - 103,590 (increase of 24,840)
> Total - 684,873 (increase of 10,081)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

A decrease of 106 in the last 15 days.

George
K3UD

1088. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-20 23:26:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Z6sea.8813$se1.5320497@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 63325

"Kf6vyh" <kf6vyh@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030320102931.11500.00000241@mb-fy.aol.com...
> >The bandplans, particularly those that apply to the HF bands, do consist
> >of restrictions stated in Part 97 FCC regulations. A Technician who has
> >not passed the 5 WPM code test would need to know this before he/she
> >attempted to operate in the 10-meter phone segment,
>
> How the hell does passing a 5wpm cw test mean some ome knows the band
plan.

No, passing the code test does not mean they know the band plan. The
statement clearly says that the Tech needs to know the regulations before
operating in the HF bands. They need to know that HF priviliges require
having passed the code test. This is why band plans and FCC regulations are
on the test.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1089. Re: Tech question pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 00:00:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E7A5645.7060501@adelphia.net>
Source record: 63326

Kf6vyh wrote:

> whats this have to do with a tech question pool?

Answer:
Nothing at all!

You must be new to the neighborhood. All topics here have roughly a three post life, then they all turn into Pro Morse code vs anti morse code, or personality grudgefests. (excluding the bizzare fringe element, which are I think spillage from the CB groups)

This thread is a grudgefest.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1090. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 01:26:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320202630.25154.00000881@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63327

In article <200320031546049751%K3UD@charter.net>, George McCouch
<K3UD@charter.net> writes:

>A decrease of 106 in the last 15 days.

Yep. But that's typical. The thing to watch is the long-term trends.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1091. Re: Now That The Shooting Has Started...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 02:17:41 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v7kti6ghcusb60@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 63328

Of course it is, Dan. He forgets that computers are likely tapping into the young sharp tacks. Those that want communications and are sharp tacks still get into amateur radio - some at a very young age. This leaves the duller tacks - of which he is obviously one ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim
ps - I've had several conversations with VE7DGL and one with VE7DTM and I assure you that war stories were not part of the conversation ;)

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message news:b5d1jmush1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> I think you and your 'associate' need to take a chill pill. I dont hear
> nothing like that going on. Course we all know this is a troll.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.462 / Virus Database: 261 - Release Date: 3/13/03

1092. Re: Steve Robeson as a role model

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 02:20:34 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v7ktnkvnkonbf@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 63329

Steve,

For some of the anonymous posters, in Outlook Express just go to "message" and "block sender". I think this also copies into Outlook (and I've blocked a couple in Outlook as well). In any case, you won't miss much ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.462 / Virus Database: 261 - Release Date: 3/13/03

1093. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 02:26:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303201826.3a0a9b09@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63330

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030320122706.25801.00000468@mb-mb.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0303200510.37901e73@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20030319190735.23139.00001430@mb-da.aol.com>...
> >> In article <f45722ac.0303190403.1a509938@posting.google.com>,
> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >>
> >> >State the WPM rate at which "proficiency" is achieved.
> >> >
> >> 10 WPM is the lowest speed that can be considered "proficient".
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Jim, thank you. Another question, please. How do you know 10wpm is
> >the lowest speed which can be considered proficient?
>
> It's the lowest speed for which a proficiency award is available. So 10 wpm is
> the very beginning - the lowest recognized level - of Morse code proficiency.

Are the awards called "proficiency" awards? Who is issuing the
awards, and are you assuming proficiency because that is what level at
which the awards begin?

This is obviously not an FCC endeavor.

> Of course much higher levels of proficiency are attainable, but that's another
> story.

Perhaps higher speeds are attainable, but isn't "proficient" really
just proficient.

> Thus, a 13 wpm code test is a code proficiency test because 13 is greater than
> 10, but a 5 wpm code test is not a code proficiency test because 5 is less than
> 10.

In all of my years reading Part 97 and subsequent changes, I've never
seen the word "proficiency" used to describe any of the exams. Why do
you assign the term to what the FCC is doing?

> So when someone says their goal is 'elimination of the Morse code proficiency
> test for any amateur radio license in the USA', it is accurate to reply that
> their goal has been accomplished.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

It is innacurate because none of the exams were ever touted as
proficiency exams by the federal agency that issued them.

1094. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 02:37:51 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303201837.79dab0dd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63331

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E79FB19.29AAF4BC@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030319190735.23139.00001430@mb-da.aol.com>...
> > > In article <f45722ac.0303190403.1a509938@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >State the WPM rate at which "proficiency" is achieved.
> > > >
> > > 10 WPM is the lowest speed that can be considered "proficient".
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Jim, thank you. Another question, please. How do you know 10wpm is
> > the lowest speed which can be considered proficient?
>
> I disagree with Jim on this one. The definition of "proficient" is
> "skilled" or "expert". While 10 wpm may mark a journeyman level, I
> don't consider it proficient. Many QSOs take place at the 20-35 wpm
> level.

How nice of you to give Jim the definition of "proficient." I'd
expect you to tell him to go look it up.

Anyway, many is how many? What percentage of all QSO's is that?

> One thing I know is that there is no answer to your question which will
> please you.

Dave, I'm not asking to be pleased nor displeased. I want to know
what is "proficient."

You may delude yourself all you like. Someone whose top
> morse speed is five wpm is not proficient in the use of morse.

It would appear that you delude yourself when you claim to know what
proficiency is, but cannot put your finger on it at this time.
Meanwhile, you're able to describe many others as not proficient.

It just doesn't ring true.

You may define proficiency using a wpm rate, and an accuracy level.

Jim is on record at 10WPM.

> Now I'm heading back to CNN's coverage of the war.

The price of gasoline just dropped. I wonder who is winning?

1095. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 02:38:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303201838.21b4c007@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63332

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E796694.5529D85A@att.net>...
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> > >Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
> > >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> > >Date: 03/19/03 12:43 Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <20030319134310.01930.00001389@mb-mq.aol.com>
>
> > >>Avery Fineman wrote:
> > >>>
> > >>> In article <3E77F999.69768FE5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > >>> writes:
> > >>>
> > >>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > This is cute...Lennie quoting himself under an other screen name to
> > antagonize another poster.
> > >
> > Whew...And he calls ME "irrational"
> > >
> > What a putz.
>
> Yeah, but he's so CUTE!

Another sock puppet.

1096. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 03:26:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320222649.27873.00001259@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63333

In article <3E79FB19.29AAF4BC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030319190735.23139.00001430@mb-da.aol.com>...
>> > In article <f45722ac.0303190403.1a509938@posting.google.com>,
>> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> >
>> > >State the WPM rate at which "proficiency" is achieved.
>> > >
>> > 10 WPM is the lowest speed that can be considered "proficient".
>> >
>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> Jim, thank you. Another question, please. How do you know 10wpm is
>> the lowest speed which can be considered proficient?
>
>I disagree with Jim on this one.

In a followup post I stated my reason for the 10 wpm definition.

> The definition of "proficient" is
>"skilled" or "expert".

10 wpm is skilled at a journeyman level. Definitely not expert. Note that I
said 10 wpm was the absolute lowest speed that could be called "proficient".
IOW it's the very beginning of proficiency, nothing more.

>While 10 wpm may mark a journeyman level, I
>don't consider it proficient.

YMMV

>Many QSOs take place at the 20-35 wpm level.
>
>One thing I know is that there is no answer to your question which will
>please you. You may delude yourself all you like.

>Someone whose top
>morse speed is five wpm is not proficient in the use of morse.
>
That we can agree on.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1097. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 04:29:20 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320232920.03802.00000134@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 63334

>N2EY
><n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
>> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
>> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

>> As of March 15, 2003:

N2EY, as an EE, don't you have more pressing matters than to be a tabulation keeper for ARS License Numbers? And, on top of that you use Morse code - Double sin. You should not do tabulation. Let the official organizations do that. However, your real sin is the advocacy of Morse code <for ALL>.

Tabulation. It does not increase its membership numbers, its activities, or its influence. It is no act of devotion.

In regards to Morse code -you are now the passive receiver/transmitter of an AUDIOMOTOR skill. Note this is NOT a radio or electronics skill.
It is a VISCERAL skill. It has NO importance anywhere, other than in a self-congratulatory organization.

Even if you were a Ham first, then became an EE, learn to put Morse in perspective. Ham radio is primarily NOT a "hobby". The traditions, rituals, practices form a unified belief system that resembles a CULT.

Ham radio is useful if you selectively participate. Those occasional useful aspects then benefit you. Otherwise it can be a drain. One is the sum total of experiences, paid with the price of efforts. So, being immersed in the "Ham" radio hobby can result in the negative.

A spouse/and our relative would give you a piece of their <unkind> words for that. I know. Sadly, I had to try and defend Ham radio. I try to say Hams are not weird. They do socialize. They are professionals and interested in technical aspects. Worst part is, from my own observation, I actually agree with them.

Those that do not believe and stay have self esteem issues. Those that do believe are delusional. I am not talking about image to impress family, friends, or society. I am talking about one's own pride.

1098. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 04:31:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7A9597.78A656F6@att.net>
Source record: 63335

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <3E7899CC.81F8D963@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Avery Fineman wrote:
> >>
>
> >We can go over the N2EY profile of Leonard Anderson again if you like.
> >I think we can find numerous examples of your having made comments which
> >show ignorance and in which you demonstrate that you are irrational,
> >mean spirited, uncivil and arrogant.
>
> The subject thread is "honest code elimination question."
>
> It is not 'Dave Heil's opinions of someone who does not worship,
> respect, or honor him."
>
> >> This is not a newsgroup about psychology.
> >
> >Then why did you state credentials through your wife in an earlier post?
>
> A much earlier post. That post was on credentials alone.
>
> Why do you insist on making such a fuss over my wife?
>
> Isn't it just another ploy in attempting character assassination?
>
> >Your wife isn't a target of anything.
>
> Yes, she is. Heil makes a despicable attempt at character
> assassination by relationship.
>
> >We have only your comments relating to her.
>
> That is all you will ever get. Try to make the most of it (as
> you must to follow-through on character assassination).
>
> >I'm sure she's nothing like you.
>
> She is female. I am male.
>
> >She undoubtedly has
> >no idea of how you spend the bulk of your time here.

>
> Incorrect again. We have individual computers situated
> on adjoining desks in our southern home office. We do
> not keep secrets from one another and discuss many
> things.
>
> >> Heil again demonstrates mean-spirited and uncivil behavior.
> > >
> > >Awwww--did the little old pirhana get his feelings hurt?
> >
> > Quod Erat Demonstrandum.
> >
> > [Heil demonstrates that which is remarked about him]
> >
> > >> Heil is deliberately misdirecting from the subject to
> > >> character assassination.
> > > >
> > > >No, Heil is trying to determine if you observe in your habits here what
> > > >you decry in others. My observation is that you don't.
> > >
> > > Heil is once again trying to misdirect.
> > >
> > > Heil has NO qualifications in psychology or human behavior.
> > >
> > > >There was nothing about license grants in what I asked about your
> > > >behavior here. Don't you want to address the points in that material?
> > >
> > > Those "points" have been addressed many times. Stamped,
> > > wrapped, and shipped faster than over-night delivery. Heil
> > > either didn't get them or refuses to acknowlege the contents.
> > >
> > > >> Heil once again misdirects to character assassination.
> > > > >
> > > > >It seems that you don't have a character to assassinate.
> > > >
> > > > QED.
> > > >
> > > > >Not at all, Len old boy. I quoted what I'd asked you. I quoted the
> > > > >profile. I asked if you'd care to comment on any of the items after
> > > > >making a comparison between the profile and what I asked. You've not
> > > > >done so. Do you find that embarrassing?
> > > >
> > > > No.
> > > >
> > > > I find only that Heil tries to keep up character assassination.
> > > >
> > > > >> Heil cannot discuss the subject. He has no valid arguments.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >What subject is it that you address when you belittle someone's job or
> > > > > >experience.

>
> Heil's statements of his "experiences" in Guinea-Bisseau are
> those of an amateur-thinking professional. Real professionals
> in radio had long since (before that tale) worked out proper
> procedures on HF communications.
>
> Heil bristles at corrections. Heil gear-shifts from subject to
> personal character assassination for not loving, honoring, or
> respecting his might accomplishments and experiences.
> Perhaps that is the "transmission" analogy of morse code
> as cited in another thread...
>
> >You aren't even willing to provide any material you have which refutes
> >the N2EY profile or of the questions I've asked you. How has your
> >character been assassinated?
>
> If Heil doesn't understand how his own character assassination
> techniques are observed, he has truly gone over the bend into
> a radio god fantasy delusion.
>
> >What explanation can you provide for the
> >abundant examples of your writings which lend proof to what is outlined
> >in the N2EY profile?
>
> Both Heil and Miccolis are PCTAs of an extreme order. That
> itself is an "explanation" for their behavior and "profiling." :-)
>
> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Repetition of character assassination doesn't make it true.
>
> >You've discussed. I'm not required to agree with you. I'm not required
> >to be silent regarding your opinions.
>
> Use of character assassination techniques doesn't make it
> free speech. See US civil law on libel and slander.

Ah. He starts to insinuate libel and slander again. He only does that when he has had it with someone
who has really poked his sensitive spot. Of course N2EY's definitive profile of AveryFineLabelman, maybe should be AveryFineLibelman, being exactly accurate, does exactly that, so here he goes
with his "libel/slander" hints threatening again. Stuff it, Foghorn Jackass, you've been tapped, and

tapped good.

1099. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 04:43:20 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030320234320.03802.00000135@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 63336

I do not hate Hams, but I would have to agree with your points. You really understand Hams and your supporting information really put it in perspective. That was truly insightful and well presented.

1100. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 04:55:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7A9B35.8194F10E@att.net>
Source record: 63337

Well, it looks like Dave is tied up, what with the war and all, so I'd be pleased to sit
in for him for a bit...

Len Over 21 wrote:

> >Okay. You figure it out. Your wife is a psychologist. Your wife is
> >not a psychologist. You can show your "You're a god. You're not a god"
> >material to her anyway. By the way, have you made up your mind yet? Am
> >I a god or am I not a god?
>
> Heil thinks he is a radio god according to his remarks in here.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>
>
> Heil once bragged about bad procedure in HF professional radio
> in order to exemplify morse code "use." Very questionable
> since professional radio prodedures had already ruled out such
> things over two decades prior to the alleged incident. Ergo,
> Heil had such poor professional experience that he was
> categorized as an amateur in abilities.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>
>
> The character assassination by Heil continues. This may be
> because he feels disrespected and dishonored by those who
> do not consider him a god of radio. Heil has a standard operating
> procedure of misdirection from subjects to personalities. Witness
> taking small items and magnifying them into exaggerated non-
> subjects.
>

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>
> Attempted disparagement of my wife is just such a case of
> character assassination. Heil does not understand that studies
> and practical application of psychology are part and parcel of
> Social Work. Heil is welcome to examine the curricula on
> Social Work at any college or university to see this. It is
> doubtful that Heil would admit to seeing it as this takes away
> validity to his character assassination.
>

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>
> >> Heil is ignorant as well as irrational, mean-spirited, uncivil,

> >> and arrogant.
> >

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>
> >We can go over the N2EY profile of Leonard Anderson again if you like.
> >I think we can find numerous examples of your having made comments which
> >show ignorance and in which you demonstrate that you are irrational,
> >mean spirited, uncivil and arrogant.
>
> The subject is "Honest code elimination question," not an overuse
> of Heil's whining about behavior disrespecting and dishonoring his
> radio god-hood.
>

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio

amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>
> >> This is not a newsgroup about psychology.
> >
> >Then why did you state credentials through your wife in an earlier post?
>
> I stated "credentials" in reference to another subject about
> the subject of credentials.
>
> Heil needs picayune remarks as the ignitor for more mean-spirited
> uncivil character assassination when he has no valid response on
> subject matter.
>

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>
> Heil demonstrates a character flaw, minor sociopathy and self-
> righteous god-hood demanding that Heil must always be right.
>

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>
> >> Psychologists might be interested in studying Heil as a
> >> case example.
> >
> >They might be.
>
> There are many aberrations to human nature. Heil exhibits
> several of them.
>

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.

Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>
> >They'd be certain to express interest in studying a
> >seventy year old man with a fixation on amateur radio despite the fact
> >that he isn't a radio amateur.
>
> Heil is again attempting character assassination. There is no
> "fixation." I have a mild interest in amateur radio. Radio is a
> a very big, very widespread subset of the whole technology of
> electronics and electron physics. I have a very strong interest
> in the overall technology of electronics. I made that my career
> choice for life a long time ago.
>
> Note that "career choice" involves professionalism.
>

Weeeellllll! Did he actually get through ONE paragraph without clearly qualifying
for another application of the Profile?

>
> >You'll be quick to point out that your
> >rants address getting into amateur radio.
>
> There are no "rants." There are some arguments about the
> modernization (long overdue) about a radio hobby activity
> requiring federal licensing.
>
> >With your declaration of
> >several decades of interest, you'd be one of the slowest entrants on
> >record for getting into amateur radio. If we discount the several
> >decades, you've posted here for seven or more years and in that period
> >of time, you still haven't gotten in.
>
> Heil once again misdirects from the subject of code test elimination
> to character assassination: Heil's attempted charge of "failure"
> on my part for getting into amateur radio...the way Heil got into
> amateur radio.
>
> I began legal (and with proper procedure) HF transmissions for
> communications (on a far larger scale than any amateur station)
> in February of 1953.
>

WHO GIVES A RAT'S PATOOTIE????? This is an AMATEUR RADIO newsgroup,
which you have continuously trolled with the singleminded purpose of trashing ham
radio and
every accomplished practitioner of it, clearly obvious to any clearminded
observer. You clearly have
a rabid obsession toward ham radio, as opposed to your vaunted "professional"

status which if
at once duplicated and even very far exceeded by many -MANY!- hams, both posting here and
among those who consider you to be not worth even a second look. So live with it.

1101. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 06:11:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7AAD09.9F3CEA8D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63338

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E7899CC.81F8D963@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Avery Fineman wrote:
> >>
>
> >We can go over the N2EY profile of Leonard Anderson again if you like.
> >I think we can find numerous examples of your having made comments which
> >show ignorance and in which you demonstrate that you are irrational,
> >mean spirited, uncivil and arrogant.
>
> The subject thread is "honest code elimination question."

Despite the subject thread, you've made a claim that your character has
been assassinated. Your character can't suffer because you do the
things which the N2EY profile of you says you will do. If you don't
wish to discuss it, why bring it up?

> It is not 'Dave Heil's opinions of someone who does not worship,
> respect, or honor him."

I'm not looking for any of the those things. You are rude and uncivil.
In the time I've posted here, I've always observed you to be rude and
uncivil.

> >> This is not a newsgroup about psychology.
> >
> >Then why did you state credentials through your wife in an earlier post?
>
> A much earlier post. That post was on credentials alone.

Except that it turns out that there aren't any.

> Why do you insist on making such a fuss over my wife?

A fuss? You left us with the impression that she had credentials in
psychology. I suggested you show her some of your posts.

> Isn't it just another ploy in attempting character assassination?

There'd have to be one ploy before there could be another.

> >Your wife isn't a target of anything.
>
> Yes, she is. Heil makes a despicable attempt at character

> assassination by relationship.

Do you believe that I think she's a toad just because you are? I don't
think that at all.

> >We have only your comments relating to her.
>
> That is all you will ever get. Try to make the most of it (as
> you must to follow-through on character assassination).

What character assassination?

> >I'm sure she's nothing like you.
>
> She is female. I am male.

She probably has some redeeming human qualities as well.

> >She undoubtedly has
> >no idea of how you spend the bulk of your time here.
>
> Incorrect again. We have individual computers situated
> on adjoining desks in our southern home office. We do
> not keep secrets from one another and discuss many
> things.

So she's aware of your rants.

> >> Heil again demonstrates mean-spirited and uncivil behavior.
> >
> >Awwww--did the little old pirhana get his feelings hurt?
>
> Quod Erat Demonstrandum.

Not at all, Len. You'd have to demonstrate that you aren't a little old
pirhana.

> [Heil demonstrates that which is remarked about him]
>
> >> Heil is deliberately misdirecting from the subject to
> >> character assassination.
> >
> >No, Heil is trying to determine if you observe in your habits here what
> >you decry in others. My observation is that you don't.
>
> Heil is once again trying to misdirect.
>
> Heil has NO qualifications in psychology or human behavior.

I've already admitted that I have no qualifications in psychology.
That said, I was under the impression that someone in your house had
some. I do have qualifications as an observer of human behavior.

> >There was nothing about license grants in what I asked about your
> >behavior here. Don't you want to address the points in that material?
>
> Those "points" have been addressed many times. Stamped,
> wrapped, and shipped faster than over-night delivery. Heil
> either didn't get them or refuses to acknowlege the contents.

Why'd you make the comment about licensing?

> >> Heil once again misdirects to character assassination.
> >
> >It seems that you don't have a character to assassinate.
>
> QED.

You've attempted to chide me about sticking to the thread. You've been ranting for several days about character assassination. You've not once tried to show how your character has been assassinated.

> >Not at all, Len old boy. I quoted what I'd asked you. I quoted the
> >profile. I asked if you'd care to comment on any of the items after
> >making a comparison between the profile and what I asked. You've not
> >done so. Do you find that embarrassing?
>
> No.

Interesting. I think most folks would if they found themselves in a similar situation.

> I find only that Heil tries to keep up character assassination.

You keep writing that but you've not explained how my quoting N2EY's profile of your likely actions below a portion of one of your posts where you actually do that which is predicted, amounts to character assassination.

> >> Heil cannot discuss the subject. He has no valid arguments.
> >
> >What subject is it that you address when you belittle someone's job or
> >experience.
>
> Heil's statements of his "experiences" in Guinea-Bisseau are
> those of an amateur-thinking professional.

No they aren't. They were the statements of someone who operated a system put in place by others. The system worked fine without assistance or guidance from you. I'm sure it was an oversight. The Department of State likely doesn't know about all of your vast experience. My question was, what subject is it that you address when you belittle someone's job or experience?

By the way--

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> Real professionals
> in radio had long since (before that tale) worked out proper
> procedures on HF communications.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> Heil bristles at corrections. Heil gear-shifts from subject to
> personal character assassination for not loving, honoring, or
> respecting his might accomplishments and experiences.
> Perhaps that is the "transmission" analogy of morse code
> as cited in another thread...

You haven't corrected me. You can't correct me on the issue of what I
did in Guinea-Bissau. All you've done repeatedly is call it a snow
job. What kind of moron tells somebody else what he can or can't have
done in his job when said moron 1) has little knowledge of the job, 2)
has no knowledge of procedures outlined by the employer or 3) wasn't in
the least involved with any aspect of the situation? This is much like
your expertise in the regulation of amateur radio. You are not involved
but you know what is best. That's typical sidewalk superintendant
stuff.

> >You aren't even willing to provide any material you have which refutes
> >the N2EY profile or of the questions I've asked you. How has your
> >character been assassinated?
>
> If Heil doesn't understand how his own character assassination
> techniques are observed, he has truly gone over the bend into
> a radio god fantasy delusion.

So far, you're the only fellow who seems to have observed any such
thing. You won't even say how you're character can have been
assassinated in light of the examples I provided.

> >What explanation can you provide for the
> >abundant examples of your writings which lend proof to what is outlined
> >in the N2EY profile?
>
> Both Heil and Miccolis are PCTAs of an extreme order. That
> itself is an "explanation" for their behavior and "profiling." :-)

That's nice. What explanation can you provide for the abundant examples of your writings which lend proof to what is outlined in the N2EY profile?

> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Repetition of character assassination doesn't make it true.

Repetition of an accusation of character assassination doesn't make it true. I'll be happy to look at your explanation of the existence of things which you've written which would seem to be proof of N2EY profile.

> >You've discussed. I'm not required to agree with you. I'm not required
> >to be silent regarding your opinions.
>
> Use of character assassination techniques doesn't make it
> free speech. See US civil law on libel and slander.

If you've believe I'm in violation of U.S. Civil law, there are avenues open to you for seeking redress of your grievance. My advice to you is to skip your typical references to Nazis and any cute names you think up for those involved with the courts. You'll want to keep in mind the copious amount of archived material, written by you which would then be introduced in any such action.

Now if you could only make that stuff disappear...

Dave K8MN

1102. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 06:14:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321011402.06818.00000409@mb-cl.aol.com>
Source record: 63339

In article <3E7A9B35.8194F10E@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>Well, it looks like Dave is tied up, what with the war and all, so I'd be
pleased
>to sit in for him for a bit...

No problem, even radio gods can get busy... :-)

Here's some more...dickiebird loves character assassination, too!

:-)

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or

>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> WHO GIVES A RAT'S PATOOTIE????? This is an AMATEUR RADIO newsgroup,
>which you have continuously trolled with the singleminded purpose of trashing
>ham radio and
>every accomplished practitioner of it, clearly obvious to any clearminded
>observer. You clearly have
>a rabid obsession toward ham radio, as opposed to your vaunted "professional"
>status which if
>at once duplicated and even very far exceeded by many -MANY!- hams, both
>posting here and
>among those who consider you to be not worth even a second look. So live with
>it.

Hmmm...let's see...judging by dickiebird's twittering, I don't think
he is kindly disposed to certain individuals in here...?

With kindest regards,

Len Anderson
retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

1103. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 06:37:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7AB2AC.EA5B8C6E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63340

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E7899CC.81F8D963@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >A radio amateur. You are some guy who has been standing on the
> >sidelines for decades.
>
> Not at all. I've been a radio and electronics professional for over
> a half century.

Sorry, Leonard. That doesn't count for squat in amateur radio except
that you might find it easier to pass the written exams.

> Amateur radio does NOT represent the sum total of all radio
> communications. It is just a hobby activity, a recreation. It is also
> quite a minor activity in the whole field of radio communications
> worldwide.

Right. One in which you are not involved.

> >Yet you tell us that you know best how amateur
> >radio should be regulated.
>
> No, I present my arguments for a modernization of US amateur
> radio regulations.

Based upon what experience?

> As an example, use of morse code as a communications mode
> IS obsolete. Worldwide. It is just not defunct, extinct.

It is no more obsolete than AM or SSB. All are used currently by radio
amateurs. Shouldn't matter to you. You aren't involved.

> Other radio services worldwide have either dropped morse code
> mode communications or never considered it in the beginning of
> a radio service.

Sure sounds like you're talking about the elimination of a mode rather
than the elimination of testing for a mode. It really doesn't matter
what other services use or don't use. Radio amateurs worldwide use
morse every day.

> The FCC does not demand use of morse code over and above any
> other mode by US radio amateurs. All allocated modes are
> optional for use by all US amateur radio licensees, any class, any

> amateur band. Why does the morse code test remain other than
> the inertia and lobbying of old-timers at the ITU?

We've been here and done this. No one will come up with a response
which will please you, a person not involved in amateur radio.

> The FCC stated publicly in 1990 and 1999 that it does not consider
> morse code skill to be of value in the FCC determining whether or
> not an amateur radio license applicant should be granted a
> license. The morse code test remains as a requirement for
> license grants for all license classes having below-30-MHz
> privileges. Morse code testing itself is obsolete.

...and will go away soon enough.

> >You insult amateur radio (see any Anderson
> >comments about public service efforts in emergencies)
>
> Incorrect. I negatively criticize ARRL for exaggerated spin
> on amateur radio's alleged importance during national
> emergencies. ARRL seeks to interest its membership and
> to gain new members. That activity results in an
> exaggeration of amateur importance, a mood thought
> necessary for membership group-think.

Noooooo, that isn't all you do. Would you like to fess up or would you
prefer to be Googled?

> >You insult those
> >who choose to use morse code and who support morse testing.
>
> Yes. The major reason is that old-time morse code users have
> presented themselves to the public as experts in radio and
> procedure when they are obviously not experts in radio of
> modern times. Their procedures are fixed to the standards and
> practices of six decades ago.

"Yes" is good enough. You've earned the lumps you take here.

> Those who love, honor, and worship morse code are fixated on
> their enobled aptitude and resultant skill. Such do not hesitate
> to say they are the best in radio because of that single skill...
> long after morse code became obsolete.

Love, honor and worship? How do you write this stuff without your face
reddening?

> >You insult the ARRL.
>
> Incorrect again. I negatively criticize ARRL for their public
> special-interest group lobbying activities as being rooted in
> the distant past. I negatively criticize ARRL for their "big-
> lie" techniques in self-serving propaganda. I negatively

> criticize ARRL for attempting to be a second government
> level on the control of US amateur radio regulations...when
> they have no such control or representation.

You write "incorrect" but the rest surely reads like "correct".

> ARRL membership is not a majority group. It is a minority
> group of, at best, only a quarter of all licensed US radio
> amateurs. ARRL is a private membership organization. It
> is not an arm of the US government.

Now who wrote that the League is an arm of the U.S. government? Nobody
here wrote anything like that. Are you watching the Sci-Fi Channel
again? The ARRL is America's biggest amateur radio membership
organization. Writing "at best a quarter" is piffle.

> ARRL does provide services for their membership, but such
> services are lesser in comparison to all of its assumed
> authority in knowing what is best for the majority of licensed
> US radio amateurs.

...and more piffle.

> ARRL is a private special-interest group. They are not divine.
> They made themselves into a virtual monopoly of amateur
> radio opinion and information in the USA...beating out earlier
> competitive national membership organizations. ARRL is
> a public political entity. ARRL is itself controlled by a small
> minority of its membership. Absolute power corrupts.

You really can't help but assist me in proving what I've written about
you, can you?

> >You insult and impugn those who work for the ARRL.
>
> Incorrect again. I've engaged ARRL staff in open debate in
> public on certain matters of radio amateurism. That does not
> require either love, honor, respect or worship of them. They
> are humans, not radio gods who must be obeyed.

You just can't help it.

> >You insult amateur radio's traditions.
>
> Incorrect once more. I do not love, honor, respect, or worship
> standards and practices in amateurism established before I
> was born. All of radio is only 107 years old. Radio has grown,
> advanced much, improved by gigantic leaps in technology
> since a time of 35% of its life. All of radio has not remained
> static, unchanging, rooted into place...except some things in
> amateur radio.
>
> I do not love, honor, respect, or worship fraternal order

> symbolism such as the so-called whouff-hong, rettysnitch,
> verneable sayings of "T.O.M.," or some misplaced idealism
> that places amateurism in radio far above all other activities
> and accomplishments in the giant other world of professional
> radio.
>
> The thought that a National Traffic System composed of
> amateurs as either vital or a necessity is ludicrous in this
> modern age. The general public has a far greater ability to
> communicate nationally or internationally today than in the
> primitive radio days of 1914. One in three Americans now
> have some form of Internet access. There are about 135
> million cellular telephone subscribers in the USA. Direct-dial
> telephony is possible to nearly every other telephone in the
> entire world.

It's like a drug to you.

> It is high time that the extreme conservative traditionalists in
> US amateur radio try to approach modern times and methods
> rather than remaining mired in a fantasyland of old radio tales
> and mythological triumphs.

...and you probably wonder why ham radio ops all over the land aren't
putting up a statue in your honor after all you've done for them.

> >Why would such an individual want to become a radio amateur?
>
> For personal pleasure, to engage in a hobby recreation involving
> radio. A problem with certain individuals is their perverse
> definition of "personal pleasure."

I can't envision amateur radio ever bringing you personal pleasure, Len.
As a matter of fact, I can't envision you ever taking the first step to
obtain a license.

> Sociopaths and self-righteous savants find great pleasure in
> denigrating, demeaning, and attempting to demoralize others
> through any means possible. That is sometimes considered an
> individual survival tactic...to release tensions resulting from
> frustrations of theirs of regular life. Others within that group are
> simply twisted, cannot get along with others, and attempt to
> control them.

You mean like guys who aren't participants in amateur radio who would
tell us how it should be regulated? I'm sorry you skipped the part
about how children shouldn't be licensed. That always makes for
entertaining reading.

> >What interest could such an individual have in amateur radio?
>
> Those sociopaths and self-righteous individuals use amateur
> radio accomplishments to show they are better than the common

> human. They need that image for their self-esteem. They take
> pleasure in denigrating others who do not honor, respect, and
> worship their mighty accomplishments as amateurs.

In other words, you don't have any interest in amateur radio as long as there are folks who won't kiss your professional ass?

> >Why would such
> >an individual be concerned about regulations governing amateur radio?
>
> Amateur radio regulations MUST be fixed, static, rooted in the
> status quo of regulations when the sociopaths and self-righteous
> were first licensed. Change of such regulations is anathema to
> them. Regulation changes mean loss of status, rank, privilege...
> all highly important to the self-centered, those needing self-
> esteem on steroids.

Poof! That was your rant going up in blue smoke. The regs have changed numerous times since I was licensed. They changed again nearly three years ago. My self-esteem is intact. You did everything but answer the question.

> Quite probably the overall average of US radio amateurs are active
> in the hobby for the social interaction and for radio technology
> interest. It is obvious that the overwhelming majority of licensed
> US radio amateurs do NOT belong to ARRL or follow absolute
> ARRL guidance in all things.

Had to get in that last bit of sniping at the ARRL, huh? You're your own worst enemy.

Dave K8MN

1104. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 06:53:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321015310.29820.00001405@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 63341

In article <3E7AAD09.9F3CEA8D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

Heil likes to quote others. :-)

Just to make sure that everyone saw everything, here's the
essential content of anything Heil can think of -

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>> >
>> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

1105. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 06:53:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321015310.29820.00001404@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 63343

In article <3E7AAD09.9F3CEA8D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> The subject thread is "honest code elimination question."
>
>Despite the subject thread, you've made a claim that your character has
>been assassinated. Your character can't suffer because you do the
>things which the N2EY profile of you says you will do. If you don't
>wish to discuss it, why bring it up?

I didn't bring up "character assassination." Heil brought it up.

One might observe Heil vomited it up...in quantity. :-)

The subject thread title is "honest code elimination question."

>> It is not 'Dave Heil's opinions of someone who does not worship,
>> respect, or honor him."
>
>I'm not looking for any of the those things.

Of course you are. You must. It is your nature.

Radio gods are always like that... :-)

>You are rude and uncivil.
>In the time I've posted here, I've always observed you to be rude and
>uncivil.

No, I've been Leonard H. Anderson all the time...although with
different screen names on AOL.

>A fuss? You left us with the impression that she had credentials in
>psychology. I suggested you show her some of your posts.

No, radio god Heil wanted another flame war on "credentials."

Poor baby Heil just doesn't know or understand certain
Masters Degree curricula or requirements. Not my problem
to educate the poor baby radio god.

>> Yes, she is. Heil makes a despicable attempt at character
>> assassination by relationship.
>
>Do you believe that I think she's a toad just because you are? I don't
>think that at all.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...there goes Heil again with more character
assassination. :-)

>What character assassination?

See Heil quote. See Heil get red-faced. See Heil stamp his
feet. :-)

>She probably has some redeeming human qualities as well.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Does Heil really want to get into comments
about wives? I don't think so...

>So she's aware of your rants.

Aware of what? She's only aware of my spending some time
on the newsgroup. She can turn to her left right now and
see me type this. No problem here. Obviously one there. :-)

>Not at all, Len. You'd have to demonstrate that you aren't a little old
>pirhana.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...there goes Heil again with character
assassination...

>I've already admitted that I have no qualifications in psychology.

That among many such qualification lacks. :-)

>That said, I was under the impression that someone in your house had
>some.

There are here. Actually, the two Masters are in a box at the
northern house in Washington.

> I do have qualifications as an observer of human behavior.

Very questionable considering some of Heil's character
assassination just in this posting. :-)

>Why'd you make the comment about licensing?

About what licensing?

>You've attempted to chide me about sticking to the thread.

Radio gods cannot be chided. Maybe with some cilantro...

>You've been
>ranting for several days about character assassination.

Have I? Does that disturb His Highness?

>You've not once
>tried to show how your character has been assassinated.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor Heil can't read well...only sees things
he wants to see...

:-)

1106. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 06:53:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321015311.29820.00001406@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 63342

In article <3E7AAD09.9F3CEA8D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>If you've believe I'm in violation of U.S. Civil law, there are avenues
>open to you for seeking redress of your grievance.

Are you worried? :-)

>My advice to you is
>to skip your typical references to Nazis and any cute names you think up
>for those involved with the courts.

Look into the mirror - do you see the names "Tugboat Annie"
and "Foghorn Leghorn" in there? Wonder who wrote those?

:-)

>You'll want to keep in mind the
>copious amount of archived material, written by you which would then be
>introduced in any such action.

I will? Oh, my... I take it you have much experience in
civil law? :-)

>Now if you could only make that stuff disappear...

Why? Heil needs a place for him and Miccolis to live... :-)

1107. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 07:17:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7ABC6A.A19C2527@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63344

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E7899CC.81F8D963@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Avery Fineman wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E78060D.5818313F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <3E75C45A.802A36E3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> In article <3E742F71.9D34A08A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> >> writes:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >> In article <3E73D8EC.EA910379@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> >> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>

> >Okay. You figure it out. Your wife is a psychologist. Your wife is
> >not a psychologist. You can show your "You're a god. You're not a god"
> >material to her anyway. By the way, have you made up your mind yet? Am
> >I a god or am I not a god?
>
> Heil thinks he is a radio god according to his remarks in here.

Bad call, Len. I've never once written anything about being a god of
anything. I even corrected Brian when he mistakenly believed me to be
the greatest DXer in the world.

> Heil once bragged about bad procedure in HF professional radio
> in order to exemplify morse code "use." Very questionable
> since professional radio prodedures had already ruled out such
> things over two decades prior to the alleged incident. Ergo,
> Heil had such poor professional experience that he was
> categorized as an amateur in abilities.

You don't get much right, do you? I didn't brag. There was no bad procedure--only a factual statement about what was used on a government circuit. That it bothers you is of no consequence. As for the rest of your statement--

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> The character assassination by Heil continues. This may be
> because he feels disrespected and dishonored by those who
> do not consider him a god of radio. Heil has a standard operating
> procedure of misdirection from subjects to personalities. Witness
> taking small items and magnifying them into exaggerated non-
> subjects.

I'll take a crack at this one again. In light of the existence of numerous archived examples of you having written things like those listed in N2EY's profile of your likely actions, how will you ever be able to prove character assassination?

> Attempted disparagement of my wife is just such a case of
> character assassination.

You are the mother of all grins, Leonard old boy.

> Heil does not understand that studies
> and practical application of psychology are part and parcel of
> Social Work.

You intimated that your wife had credentials as a psychologist. When I referred to her as a psychologist, you wrote that she is not. Who is disparaged by being called a psychologist? Did your wife take offense at being called a psychologist? If so, I offer my heartfelt apology.

> Heil is welcome to examine the curricula on
> Social Work at any college or university to see this. It is
> doubtful that Heil would admit to seeing it as this takes away
> validity to his character assassination.

Now you have me confused, Len. Are you telling me that your wife IS a psychologist?

> >> Heil is ignorant as well as irrational, mean-spirited, uncivil,
> >> and arrogant.
> >
> >We can go over the N2EY profile of Leonard Anderson again if you like.
> >I think we can find numerous examples of your having made comments which
> >show ignorance and in which you demonstrate that you are irrational,
> >mean spirited, uncivil and arrogant.
>

> The subject is "Honest code elimination question," not an overuse
> of Heil's whining about behavior disrespecting and dishonoring his
> radio god-hood.

Then why do you persist in trying to make it about psychology or
character assassination? You surely do keep dodging my questions about
comparing the N2EY profile with examples of your postings.

> >> This is not a newsgroup about psychology.
> >
> >Then why did you state credentials through your wife in an earlier post?
>
> I stated "credentials" in reference to another subject about
> the subject of credentials.

...which you brought up in a thread which wasn't about credentials.

> Heil needs picayune remarks as the ignitor for more mean-spirited
> uncivil character assassination when he has no valid response on
> subject matter.

You aren't writing about the subject matter.

> Heil demonstrates a character flaw, minor sociopathy and self-
> righteous god-hood demanding that Heil must always be right.

I've likely got a character flaw or two. I'll bet you've got trunks
full.

> >> Psychologists might be interested in studying Heil as a
> >> case example.
> >
> >They might be.
>
> There are many aberrations to human nature. Heil exhibits
> several of them.
>
> >They'd be certain to express interest in studying a
> >seventy year old man with a fixation on amateur radio despite the fact
> >that he isn't a radio amateur.
>
> Heil is again attempting character assassination. There is no
> "fixation." I have a mild interest in amateur radio.

That one is easy to counter, Len. I offer seven years of often lengthy
posts, laced with all the things described in the N2EY profile, to an
amateur radio newsgroup. Where's the character assassination?

> Radio is a
> a very big, very widespread subset of the whole technology of
> electronics and electron physics. I have a very strong interest
> in the overall technology of electronics. I made that my career
> choice for life a long time ago.

Oh, maybe your posts here have all been a mistake. Did you mean them
for a generic "Radio" newsgroup?

> Note that "career choice" involves professionalism.

I do take note of it. This particular newsgroup deals with amateur
radio. You know--that with which you have no fixation.

> >You'll be quick to point out that your
> >rants address getting into amateur radio.
>
> There are no "rants." There are some arguments about the
> modernization (long overdue) about a radio hobby activity
> requiring federal licensing.

Take my word for it--Google is filled with your rants. What would you
know about the need for modernization of something in which you are not
a participant?

> >With your declaration of
> >several decades of interest, you'd be one of the slowest entrants on
> >record for getting into amateur radio. If we discount the several
> >decades, you've posted here for seven or more years and in that period
> >of time, you still haven't gotten in.
>
> Heil once again misdirects from the subject of code test elimination
> to character assassination: Heil's attempted charge of "failure"
> on my part for getting into amateur radio...the way Heil got into
> amateur radio.

How does pointing out that you've not taken a single step toward
obtaining an amateur radio license in the seven years you've posted here
much less in the several previous decades, turn into character
assassination. Can you offer proof that you've made some attempt and
failed? Maybe you can come up with a "Well, I've been busy" defense.

> I began legal (and with proper procedure) HF transmissions for
> communications (on a far larger scale than any amateur station)
> in February of 1953. Since then I have been involved with legal
> transmission control of RF radiation for communications and
> radionavigation over a wider range of the EM spectrum than is
> presently allocated to any radio amateur anywhere. None of that
> professional activity involved any amateur knowledge or amateur
> procedural standards or tests about amateur radio or receiving
> any federal license grants in or about amateur radio..

I read it. Nothing in there about any movement on your part toward
obtaining an amateur radio license.

> The large technological field of electronics and radio is > fascinating
> to tens of thousands of professionals in that activity that have
> made it their career choice. It is active, it has always been
> growing, and electronics have become a part of everyone's life
> activities in most parts of the world.

Good. That gives you something to do in addition to your busy schedule posting here.

> I also find it most fascinating that a small group of amateurs
> persist in the Luddite fashion of old to maintain and freeze-dry
> to standards and practices of radio that is over a half century
> old. That extreme conservatism is manifest by the manic
> "necessity" to maintain morse code testing for the foreseeable
> future in a hobby activity, a radio recreational endeavor that
> involves licensing because of the nature of RF transmission.

Haven't you gotten the word? Morse testing is on the way out. We still have licensing for children though.

> It is also fascinating to watch a minority within a minority of
> all radio to attempt making their amateur recreational activity
> as representing expertise in ALL of radio...when they clearly
> have no such expertise or working knowledge. That mani-
> festation is part of the human territorial imperative (studyable
> in introductory psychology courses, once an engineering
> major requirement in some states). "Turf" in the common
> colloquial phrasing. The holding up of amateur credentials
> and tenure as an amateur is implicit in that "turf" as if it is a
> roll model for all to emulate.

> An interesting thing about "turf" ownership is the strong
> righteous demand for respect and honor for now-traditional
> amateur activities. This is extended to imply expertise in all
> of radio but it is still only in amateurism...and it forms an
> insular elitism among the minority group where the prevailing
> thought seems to be that few other humans could achieve
> such noble accomplishments. Rank, status, privilege seems
> to have become the life goal of the extreme conservative
> amateurs...the interest in ordinary human interactions and
> fascinating technology taking a very low ranking.
>
> The worst aspect of the minority of a minority of amateurs
> (of rank, status, privilege) is the despicable treatment of so-
> called "outsiders." That is the ultimate extension of elitism
> of the self-professed experts in amateurism. Do as they do,
> honor and respect them for they exist...

And you said there were no rants. You're far too modest, Leonard. The couple of paragraphs above may be your masterpiece. You could have cut it down a bit though. How about, "I have all these years as a professional in radio and I get no respect from these *%$# amateurs"?

Your latest dilemma is: Do you try to snag that 5 wpm or do you try to wait it out?

Dave K8MN

1108. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 07:34:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7AC03D.40B7CABF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63345

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Well, it looks like Dave is tied up, what with the war and all, so I'd be pleased
> to sit
> in for him for a bit...

> N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> >
> > >They'd be certain to express interest in studying a
> > >seventy year old man with a fixation on amateur radio despite the fact
> > >that he isn't a radio amateur.
> >
> > Heil is again attempting character assassination. There is no
> > "fixation." I have a mild interest in amateur radio. Radio is a
> > a very big, very widespread subset of the whole technology of
> > electronics and electron physics. I have a very strong interest
> > in the overall technology of electronics. I made that my career
> > choice for life a long time ago.
> >
> > Note that "career choice" involves professionalism.
> >
>
> Weeeellllll! Did he actually get through ONE paragraph without clearly qualifying
> for another application of the Profile?
>
> >
> > >You'll be quick to point out that your
> > >rants address getting into amateur radio.
> >
> > There are no "rants." There are some arguments about the
> > modernization (long overdue) about a radio hobby activity
> > requiring federal licensing.
> >
> > >With your declaration of
> > >several decades of interest, you'd be one of the slowest entrants on
> > >record for getting into amateur radio. If we discount the several
> > >decades, you've posted here for seven or more years and in that period

> > >of time, you still haven't gotten in.
> >
> > Heil once again misdirects from the subject of code test elimination
> > to character assassination: Heil's attempted charge of "failure"
> > on my part for getting into amateur radio...the way Heil got into
> > amateur radio.
> >
> > I began legal (and with proper procedure) HF transmissions for
> > communications (on a far larger scale than any amateur station)
> > in February of 1953.
> >
>
> WHO GIVES A RAT'S PATOOTIE????? This is an AMATEUR RADIO newsgroup,
> which you have continuously trolled with the singleminded purpose of trashing ham
> radio and
> every accomplished practitioner of it, clearly obvious to any clearminded
> observer. You clearly have
> a rabid obsession toward ham radio, as opposed to your vaunted "professional"
> status which if
> at once duplicated and even very far exceeded by many -MANY!- hams, both posting
> here and
> among those who consider you to be not worth even a second look. So live with it.

I thought you handled things well in my absence, Dick. Len's assertions
of character assassination are particularly funny in light of his
inability not to do the things which Jim's handy quote says he will do.

Dave K8MN

1109. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 07:44:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7AC2C4.5DD91D4A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63346

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E7AAD09.9F3CEA8D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:

> >You've not once
> >tried to show how your character has been assassinated.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor Heil can't read well...only sees things
> he wants to see...

Poor Heil's reading is fine. I can't read what hasn't been written.
In comparing the examples I provided of some of your recent postings to
N2EY's profile of you, what proof of character assassination have you
found?

Dave K8MN

1110. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 07:53:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7AC4F2.C5E4BC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63347

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E7AAD09.9F3CEA8D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >If you've believe I'm in violation of U.S. Civil law, there are avenues
> >open to you for seeking redress of your grievance.
>
> Are you worried? :-)

Does it sound as if I'm worried?

> >My advice to you is
> >to skip your typical references to Nazis and any cute names you think up
> >for those involved with the courts.
>
> Look into the mirror - do you see the names "Tugboat Annie"
> and "Foghorn Leghorn" in there? Wonder who wrote those?

Let's see.....hmmmmm...I wrote those. Tugboat Annie is Kim's persona
when she uses her nautical language. "Foghorn Lenhorn" is for you when
you start your cutesy names, Nazi references and the like. Keep in
mind, I'm not the guy accusing others of character assassination.

> :-)
>
> >You'll want to keep in mind the
> >copious amount of archived material, written by you which would then be
> >introduced in any such action.
>
> I will? Oh, my... I take it you have much experience in
> civil law? :-)

I don't need any experience. I only need an attorney who has much
experience.

> >Now if you could only make that stuff disappear...
>
> Why? Heil needs a place for him and Miccolis to live... :-)

No, that wouldn't be the reason. It'd be the thought of two attorneys
and a judge laughing hysterically just before your case was tossed.
No one can assassinate something which has already died.

Dave K8MN

1111. Re: Steve Robeson as a role model

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 08:30:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321033027.17322.00000112@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63348

>Subject: Re: Steve Robeson as a role model
>From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>Date: 3/20/2003 6:20 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <v7ktnkvnkonbf@corp.supernews.com>

>For some of the anonymous posters...(SNIP)

Thanks for the tip, Jim. I just use them for kitty box linings!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1112. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 08:52:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321035219.17322.00000113@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63349

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/20/2003 1:40 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030320164033.09808.00002570@mb-fk.aol.com>

>Why do you insist on making such a fuss over my wife?

Why do you insist on bringing her into it in the first place, Lennie?

>Isn't it just another ploy in attempting character assassination?

Ummmmm....more like suicide on your part.

>Yes, she is. Heil makes a despicable attempt at character
> assassination by relationship.

Your rules, Lennie...If someone volunteers the information to the forum,
it's fair game by everyone else.

>>We have only your comments relating to her.
>
> That is all you will ever get. Try to make the most of it (as
> you must to follow-through on character assassination).

No, Lennie...YOU keep reintroducing your spouse as you think it favors
your rants...You at once introduced her as being a psychologist and ergo
qualified to determine who in this NG was "irrational" and who isn't.

Now you state she's NOT a psychologist, but rather just a social worker
who did some training in psychology.

Unlicensed...Like you.

>>I'm sure she's nothing like you.
>
> She is female. I am male.

Are you sure? Your conduct in here leaves a lot to the imagination.

>>She undoubtedly has
>>no idea of how you spend the bulk of your time here.
>
> Incorrect again. We have individual computers situated
> on adjoining desks in our southern home office. We do
> not keep secrets from one another and discuss many
> things.

Does she know you make up lies about honorable men and credible
organizations?

Does she know you frequently call people "nazis" and other colorful adjectives in order to antagonize and humiliate those whom you can't otherwise intimidate into backing away from your spiteful bile?

I doubt it.

>Heil has NO qualifications in psychology or human behavior.

And you "know" this how?

>>Not at all, Len old boy. I quoted what I'd asked you. I quoted the
>>profile. I asked if you'd care to comment on any of the items after
>>making a comparison between the profile and what I asked. You've not
>>done so. Do you find that embarrassing?
>
> No.

Liar.

>Heil bristles at corrections. Heil gear-shifts from subject to
> personal character assassination for not loving, honoring, or
> respecting his might accomplishments and experiences.
> Perhaps that is the "transmission" analogy of morse code
> as cited in another thread...

Let's change a couple words:

"Anderson bristles at corrections. Anderson gear-shifts from subject to personal character assassination for not loving, honoring, or respecting his might(y) accomplishments and experiences. Perhaps that is the "nazi thug" analogy of professional radio engineers as cited in another thread..."

Yep. It fits.

>Both Heil and Miccolis are PCTAs of an extreme order. That
> itself is an "explanation" for their behavior and "profiling."

Both have demonstrated moderation, yea, even extreme tolerence, and their "profiling" of Herr Anderscum is so "on the head" as to make the term "Excedrin Headache" apply.

>>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
>
> Repetition of character assassination doesn't make it true.

YOU can call it whatever you care to, Lennie. The fact is you've backed yourself into this corner and no amount of spin doctoring is going to get you out of it, Your Putziness.

>>You've discussed. I'm not required to agree with you. I'm not required
>>to be silent regarding your opinions.
>
> Use of character assassination techniques doesn't make it
> free speech. See US civil law on libel and slander.

It's neither "libel" nor "slander" if it's true, Lennie.

That IS US civil law.

Steve

1113. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 09:21:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321042148.17322.00000114@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63350

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/20/2003 1:40 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030320164035.09808.00002571@mb-fk.aol.com>

>>A radio amateur. You are some guy who has been standing on the
>>sidelines for decades.
>
> Not at all. I've been a radio and electronics professional for over
> a half century.

And as far as Amateur radio goes...you're STILL a bystander!

>Amateur radio does NOT represent the sum total of all radio
> communications.

No, it does not, but in THIS forum it is!

>It is just a hobby activity, a recreation.

In your opinion. FCC rules and regulations do not support or condone any
one type of application of the Amateur Service over another, although it DOES
encourage certain ones.

Of course the applications the FCC encourages are the one YOU claim have
little or no impact on it's existence.

Hmmmmmm.....Guess the FCC knows something about Amateur Radio that Lennie
doesn't...?!?! Naaaaaahhhhh COULDN'T BE!

>It is also
> quite a minor activity in the whole field of radio communications
> worldwide.

For so minor a player, you sure spend a lot of time trying to disuade
others from it, Your Lyingness!

>As an example, use of morse code as a communications mode
> IS obsolete. Worldwide. It is just not defunct, extinct.

As long as it's in use, it is neither.

Bottom end of 20 meters sounded line a rock concert with all the CW this
evening.

Someone in California is veeeeeeery confused!

>>You insult the ARRL.
>

> Incorrect again.

Liar. Again.

>ARRL is itself controlled by a small minority of its membership.

That makes three. ARRL is controlled by the voting membership. A number which is in the high ninety percents, I am sure.

>>You insult and impugn those who work for the ARRL.
>
> Incorrect again. I've engaged ARRL staff in open debate in
> public on certain matters of radio amateurism. That does not
> require either love, honor, respect or worship of them. They
> are humans, not radio gods who must be obeyed.

That makes four. You have openly insulted the character of, and professional reputations of several League Staffers.

Not debate...Intentional lies and insults.

>>You insult amateur radio's traditions.
>
> Incorrect once more.

Five. Google refers.

>The thought that a National Traffic System composed of
> amateurs as either vital or a necessity is ludicrous in this
> modern age.

Only by you, Lennie. Even ongoing Homeland Defense programs integrate Amateur Radio for the very skills and programs YOU denigrate, Your Most Ignorantness.

>One in three Americans now have some form of Internet access.

Immediately deniable with simple explosives strategically placed.

>There are about 135 million cellular telephone subscribers in the USA.

And a cellular telephone infrastructure that can only accomodate about 20% at one time, and once a cell site has been denied to them that cute little hip accessory is just a paperweight.

>Direct-dial
> telephony is possible to nearly every other telephone in the
> entire world.

As long as there's an accessible cell site.

>It is high time that the extreme conservative traditionalists in
> US amateur radio try to approach modern times and methods
> rather than remaining mired in a fantasyland of old radio tales
> and mythological triumphs.

It's even a higher time that idiotic liars and ner-do-wells that continue to post drivvel in the face of facts to the contrary face up to the facts that they are wrong, and people a lot more well placed and proficient in communications practices know better than he...

>Sociopaths and self-righteous savants find great pleasure in
> denigrating, demeaning, and attempting to demoralize others
> through any means possible.

WHOA LENNIE! That had to HURT saying that and keeping a straight face! OUCH!

>Amateur radio regulations MUST be fixed, static, rooted in the
> status quo of regulations when the sociopaths and self-righteous
> were first licensed.

Who said THAT, Lennie? No one else in THIS forum has suggested ANYTHING like it...Only you...

>Regulation changes mean loss of status, rank, privilege...
> all highly important to the self-centered, those needing self-
> esteem on steroids.

Kinda like the "radio professional" who doesn't want to take an "amateur" exam because he thinks he's already done it all and knows it all, LENNIE...?!?!

Sheeesh...What a PUTZ!

Steve, K4YZ

1114. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 09:27:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321042721.17322.00000115@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63201

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/20/2003 8:43 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030320234320.03802.00000135@mb-cq.aol.com

>I do not hate Hams...(SNIP)

No, you just humiliate, criticize and denigrate them in several public forums for sport and recreation.

>...but I would have to agree with your points.

Once again, Vipul, allegedly an engineer, makes these comments supporting "someone" but not quoting the author or the comments.

>You really
>understand Hams and your supporting information really put it in perspective.
>That was truly insightful and well presented.

Supporting information? From whom? If you were citing Lennie, Lennie provided NO supporting information. His comments only reflected uninformed opinion.

Sheeeesh. Another mind gone to waste.

Steve, K4YZ

1115. Re: How stupid is K1MAN? (FAKE LLOYD ALERT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 12:19:43 UTC
From: hotfilaments@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ba37c287.0303210419.6fe831b5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63202
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd/N0VFP" <lloyd_vfp@NOmsn.NOSPAMMMM.com> wrote in message
news:<3e7a1d8c_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>...
> "James Bond" <hotfilaments@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:ba37c287.0303200858.a76d25e@posting.google.com...
> > "Lloyd/N0VFP" <lloyd_vfp@NOmsn.NOSPAMMMM.com> wrote in message
> news:<3e78bb19_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>...
> > And, we are supposed to believe that you aren't a "nut"....?
> >
> > So speaks Lloyd who has switched sides more times than the Italian Army
> during WW2.
> >
> > James
>
> And we are take anything you say truthfully? >With no name and no call?

> --
> Lloyd/N0VFP
> "And that's just the way it is"
> R-75 FT-817
>

"With no name and no call?"

My name is Bond, James Bond......my call is 007

When are you going to grow up you obese hanger on? You are overdue to
switch sides again aren't you?

James

1116. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 13:01:12 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303210501.3872fced@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63203

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030320232920.03802.00000134@mb-cq.aol.com>...
> >N2EY
> ><n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> >
> >> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> >> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> >> As of March 15, 2003:
>
> N2EY, as an EE, don't you have more pressing matters than to be a tabulation
> keeper for ARS License Numbers?

Takes me 5 minutes every two weeks to post the numbers. I can spare
that much time.

> And, on top of that you use Morse code - Double
> sin.

SIN?? The USE of Morse code is a SIN?!?

Says who?

>You should not do tabulation.

I don't.

>Let the official organizations do that.

Who?

All I do is repost the license totals here twice a month so that there
will be a record as long as the archives exist. Is that a 'sin'?

> However, your real sin is the advocacy of Morse code <for ALL>.

Why?
>
> Tabulation. It does not increase its membership numbers, its activities, or
> its influence. It is no act of devotion.

What ARE you talking about?

Growth vs. decline is a policy issue. An accurate source of numbers is
needed for any reasonable discussion.
>
> In regards to Morse code -you are now the passive receiver/transmitter of an
> AUDIOMOTOR skill.

No, it's an active thing. Just like listening/talking, or
reading/writing. Just another tool in the toolbox.

> Note this is NOT a radio or electronics skill.

I use it on the radio. Therefore, it's a radio skill.

> It is a VISCERAL skill.

Is that a 'sin', too?

> It has NO importance anywhere, other than in a
> self-congratulatory organization.
>
It has importance whenever I use it on the amateur radio bands.

btw, what is this "self-congratulatory organization" you mentioned?

> Even if you were a Ham first, then became an EE, learn to put Morse in
> perspective.

What does that mean? Morse code skill is just one of the desirable
radio skills I think all hams should try to develop. I've got a
list...

For example, long ago I learned the standard phonetics "alfa, bravo,
charlie..." to improve my voice operating skills. Don't even have to
think about them now, I just rattle them off. Was that a 'sin"?

> Ham radio is primarily NOT a "hobby".

Tell it to Mr. Anderson.

> The traditions, rituals,
> practices form a unified belief system that resembles a CULT.

Nonsense.
>
> Ham radio is useful if you selectively participate.

Isn't that what we all do? Pick out the parts you like and do them. I
like Morse code, SSB, AM, FM, homebrewing, kitbuilding, ragchewing,
contesting, elmering and a few other things.

> Those occasional useful
> aspects then benefit you. Otherwise it can be a drain. One is the sum total of
> experiences, paid with the price of efforts. So, being immersed in the "Ham"
> radio hobby can result in the negative.

What ARE you talking about?
>
> A spouse/and our relative would give you a piece of their <unkind> words for
> that.

It's called being balanced.

> I know. Sadly, I had to try and defend Ham radio. I try to say Hams are
> not weird. They do socialize. They are professionals and interested in
> technical aspects. Worst part is, from my own observation, I actually agree
> with them.

You're not looking in the right places, then.
>
> Those that do not believe and stay have self esteem issues. Those that do
> believe are delusional. I am not talking about image to impress family,
> friends, or society. I am talking about one's own pride.

I have no idea what that is supposed to mean.

Get a grip, Vipul. Ham radio is about radio for its own sake, because
people find it to be rewarding in ways other than being paid money. No
'sin' in that. Do what you find rewarding and let the rest go by.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1117. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 16:11:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303210811.3ac805aa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63204

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030321042721.17322.00000115@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 3/20/2003 8:43 PM Pacific Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030320234320.03802.00000135@mb-cq.aol.com
>
> >I do not hate Hams...(SNIP)
>
> No, you just humiliate, criticize and denigrate them in several public
> forums for sport and recreation.

How is this distinguishable from what you do?

1118. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 16:27:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7B3DD3.B13A8275@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63205

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E79FB19.29AAF4BC@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030319190735.23139.00001430@mb-da.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <f45722ac.0303190403.1a509938@posting.google.com>,
> > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > >
> > > > >State the WPM rate at which "proficiency" is achieved.
> > > > >
> > > > 10 WPM is the lowest speed that can be considered "proficient".
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > > Jim, thank you. Another question, please. How do you know 10wpm is
> > > the lowest speed which can be considered proficient?
> >
> > I disagree with Jim on this one. The definition of "proficient" is
> > "skilled" or "expert". While 10 wpm may mark a journeyman level, I
> > don't consider it proficient. Many QSOs take place at the 20-35 wpm
> > level.
>
> How nice of you to give Jim the definition of "proficient." I'd
> expect you to tell him to go look it up.

I'd provided the definition previously.

> Anyway, many is how many? What percentage of all QSO's is that?

Go look it up.

> > One thing I know is that there is no answer to your question which will
> > please you.
>
> Dave, I'm not asking to be pleased nor displeased. I want to know
> what is "proficient."

No you don't. There is no answer to your question which will
please you.

> > You may delude yourself all you like. Someone whose top
> > morse speed is five wpm is not proficient in the use of morse.

> It would appear that you delude yourself when you claim to know what
> proficiency is, but cannot put your finger on it at this time.
> Meanwhile, you're able to describe many others as not proficient.

I put my finger on it. Maybe you were just busy reading between the
lines.

> It just doesn't ring true.

...not if you're busy reading between the lines.

> You may define proficiency using a wpm rate, and an accuracy level.
>
> Jim is on record at 10WPM.

You must not have read any of my post. How is it possible for you
respond without reading it?

Dave K8MN

1119. Re: Now That The Shooting Has Started...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 16:30:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5ff52$9g0$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63207

LOL.

Dan/W4NTI

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:v7kti6ghcusb60@corp.supernews.com...
> Of course it is, Dan. He forgets that computers are likely tapping into
the
> young sharp tacks. Those that want communications and are sharp tacks
still
> get into amateur radio - some at a very young age. This leaves the duller
> tacks - of which he is obviously one ;)
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim
> ps - I've had several conversations with VE7DGL and one with VE7DTM and I
> assure you that war stories were not part of the conversation ;)
>
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b5d1jmush1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > I think you and your 'associate' need to take a chill pill. I dont hear
> > nothing like that going on. Course we all know this is a troll.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.462 / Virus Database: 261 - Release Date: 3/13/03
>
>

1120. Can't get any better publicity than Paul Harvey

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 16:32:07 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <b5fempdbn1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63206

Radio commentator Paul Harvey plugs ham radio's emergency communications role (Mar 21, 2003) -- Veteran ABC Radio Networks commentator Paul Harvey on March 19 offered some kind words for Amateur Radio. The mention was the second item on "page four" of his Paul Harvey Noon News and Comment program: "America's quiet warriors are the legion of ham radio operators, 700,000 of them, who are always at ready for backup duty in emergencies--amateur, unpaid, uncelebrated, civilian radio operators, during and after floods and fires and tornadoes. After the 9/11 attacks, hams were indispensable in reuniting friends and families. Most recently it was they who expedited the search for debris after the disaster to the space shuttle Columbia, and right now, at this moment, they are involved in homeland security to a greater degree than you would want me to make public." The commentary's enigmatic and mysterious final sentence --typical of Harvey's habit of leaving his listeners hanging--apparently refers to the fact that many Amateur Radio Emergency Service (ARES) and Radio Amateur Emergency Service (RACES) teams have ramped up their alert status as hostilities get under way in the Middle East. The entire Wednesday noon broadcast is available on Paul Harvey's Web site (http://www.paulharvey.com/). Click on the Wednesday noon link under "Listen Now."

Paul Harvey is heard 3 times a day on over 700 radio stations across the US. Granted it's not printed medium so there are some who may dispute the article. But......

1121. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 16:53:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7B4376.4FA1BFBB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63208

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> >N2EY
> ><n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> >
> >> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> >> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> >> As of March 15, 2003:
>
> N2EY, as an EE, don't you have more pressing matters than to be a tabulation
> keeper for ARS License Numbers? And, on top of that you use Morse code - Double
> sin. You should not do tabulation. Let the official organizations do that.
> However, your real sin is the advocacy of Morse code <for ALL>.

You've just lost any hope of ever being taken seriously here, Vipul.

> Tabulation. It does not increase its membership numbers, its activities, or its
> influence.

...and news reporters don't actually do anything, they just report on
what takes place.

It is no act of devotion.

Was it supposed to be?

> In regards to Morse code -you are now the passive receiver/transmitter of an
> AUDIOMOTOR skill.

Being good at volleyball is a motor skill. Is volleyball a bad thing?
Is someone who is goog at memorizing electronic formulae supposed to be
better than a good volleyball player? better than someone who is good
at sending and receiving morse?

> Note this is NOT a radio or electronics skill.

The only place I've used morse is on the radio. I've never used
landlines in sending or receiving morse.

> It is a VISCERAL skill.

It is? Do you actually read the stuff you write?

> It has NO importance anywhere, other than in a
> self-congratulatory organization.

Looks like morse occupies a pretty important place in amateur radio
given that thousands of radio amateurs worldwide use it every day.
What, by the way, is the self-congratulatory organization?

> Even if you were a Ham first, then became an EE, learn to put Morse in
> perspective. Ham radio is primarily NOT a "hobby". The traditions, rituals,
> practices form a unified belief system that resembles a CULT.

I know plumbers, engineers, salesmen, funeral directors, postal
carriers, diplomats, military members, teachers, school children,
housewives, dentists, doctors, deliverymen and truck drivers who are
radio amateurs.They are Baptists, Catholics, Episcopalians,
Presbyterians, Jews, agnostics and Mormons. They are black, white,
Asian and Hispanic. Their common bond is enjoyment of amateur radio.
You, like several others present here, don't seem to be getting much
enjoyment from amateur radio. I guess everything where people bond
together in a joint interest looks like a cult to someone who sees
himself as an outsider.

> Ham radio is useful if you selectively participate.

One can participate as much or as little as one desires. The amount
time spent participating has no bearing on usefulness.

> Those occasional useful
> aspects then benefit you.

What "occasional" aspects?

> Otherwise it can be a drain.

What?

> One is the sum total of experiences, paid with the price of efforts. So, being immersed
in the "Ham" radio hobby can result in the negative.

Is that a statement of cosmic truth or something?

> A spouse/and our relative would give you a piece of their <unkind> words for
> that. I know.

How do you know?

> Sadly, I had to try and defend Ham radio.

...and I have no doubt that sadly is how you did so.

> I try to say Hams are
> not weird.

...but you spend much of your time here implying that they are.

> They do socialize.

> They are professionals and interested in
> technical aspects. Worst part is, from my own observation, I actually > agree with them.

Not all hams are professionals. Not all hams are very interested in technical aspects. No ham is required to be more technical than is sufficient to pass the exam for a license. That license permits operation on the amateur bands. I can't determine about what you are in agreement.

> Those that do not believe and stay have self esteem issues. Those that > do believe are delusional. I am not talking about image to impress
> family, friends, or society. I am talking about one's own pride.

I can't make any sense of your paragraph. It takes the form of stream-of-consciousness rambling.

Dave K8MN

1122. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 17:14:32 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303210914.63337281@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63209

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0303201826.3a0a9b09@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030320122706.25801.00000468@mb-mb.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0303200510.37901e73@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > >news:<20030319190735.23139.00001430@mb-da.aol.com>...
> > >> In article <f45722ac.0303190403.1a509938@posting.google.com>,
> > >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >>
> > >> >State the WPM rate at which "proficiency" is achieved.
> > >> >
> > >> 10 WPM is the lowest speed that can be considered "proficient".
> > >>
> > >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > >Jim, thank you. Another question, please. How do you know 10wpm is
> > >the lowest speed which can be considered proficient?
> >
> > It's the lowest speed for which a proficiency award is available. So 10 wpm > >is
> > the very beginning - the lowest recognized level - of Morse code
> > proficiency.
>
> Are the awards called "proficiency" awards?

Yes.

> Who is issuing the
> awards, and are you assuming proficiency because that is what level at
> which the awards begin?

The awards have been available for decades and are well-known in the
amateur community. I'm surprised you don't know all about them. The
lowest speed for which an award is available is 10 wpm, and there are
endorsements at 5 wpm intervals up to at least 40 wpm. I got to the 30
wpm level back in high school with pencil-and-paper copy. I'm better
than that these days.
>
> This is obviously not an FCC endeavor.

FCC wasn't part of the discussion.
>
> > Of course much higher levels of proficiency are attainable, but that's another

> > story.
>
> Perhaps higher speeds are attainable, but isn't "proficient" really
> just proficient.

No. Absolutely not.
>
> > Thus, a 13 wpm code test is a code proficiency test because 13 is greater
> >than
> > 10, but a 5 wpm code test is not a code proficiency test because 5 is less
> > than
> > 10.
>
> In all of my years reading Part 97 and subsequent changes, I've never
> seen the word "proficiency" used to describe any of the exams. Why do
> you assign the term to what the FCC is doing?

I didn't assign it. WK3C did. Here's a quote from a post of his from
March 7 of this year:

WK3C>Reply-To: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
WK3C>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
WK3C>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
WK3C>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

WK3C>The regional positions prepared so far, as well as the national
positions
WK3C>that are known, all indicate that the elimination of the Morse
proficiency WK3C>test requirement from the ITU ("International
Telecommunications Union") WK3C>Radio Regulations will be a "slam
dunk."

Note that Carl calls it a "Morse proficiency test", not a "Morse code
test" or anything else. He came up with the term, not me, go argue
with him.

He's almost certainly correct about the slam dunk aspect, too.

Proficiency starts at 10 wpm, therefore the Morse proficiency test is
already gone in the USA. Element 1 is not, repeat not, a Morse
proficiency test.

> > So when someone says their goal is 'elimination of the Morse code
> > proficiency
> > test for any amateur radio license in the USA', it is accurate to reply
> > that
> > their goal has been accomplished.

QED.

> It is innacurate because none of the exams were ever touted as
> proficiency exams by the federal agency that issued them.

No, it's completely accurate. "Elimination of the Morse proficiency tests" and "elimination of all Morse code tests" are two different things.

--

Now, Brian, I've answered all of your questions on this subject. How about answering the following questions about your claimed T5 amateur radio operations:

What callsign was used?

What rigs and antennas were used?

Who did the equipment belong to?

What amateur bands and modes were used?

What countries and continents were worked?

How were the QSLs delivered?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1123. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 17:28:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321122828.29616.00000137@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 63210

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/20/2003 5:12 AM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303200512.7c692dbb@posting.google.com>

>Obsessive/compulsive.
>
>Go look it up.

You go ahead, Brian, and then come back and post another response to this.

OK?

Steve, K4YZ

1124. Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 17:59:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321125912.11500.00000280@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 63211

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/20/2003 8:29 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030320232920.03802.00000134@mb-cq.aol.com>

>N2EY, as an EE, don't you have more pressing matters than to be a tabulation
>keeper for ARS License Numbers?

What an assinine question.

Vipul Shah, as an EE yourself, don't YOU have more pressing matters than
policing other EE's in Amateur Radio newsgroups?

>And, on top of that you use Morse code - Double
>sin.

Only a sin if you do it badly. I've worked Jim on CW. He's got a smooth,
"armchair copy" fist. No sin there.

>You should not do tabulation. Let the official organizations do that.
>However, your real sin is the advocacy of Morse code <for ALL>.

Thank-you, RRAP moderator.

>Tabulation. It does not increase its membership numbers, its activities, or
>its
>influence. It is no act of devotion

Ahhhhhh...taking a hint from Lennie and making the Amateur
Radio-vs-Religion analogies....Things kinda slow in the Bashing Amatuer Radio
business today, huh Vippy?

>In regards to Morse code -you are now the passive receiver/transmitter of an
>AUDIOMOTOR skill.

Nothing "passive" about utilizing Morse Code, Vippy. It requires sharp
alertness, clear cognitive function, and reasonably quick reflexes to do well
(those with Morse readers and keyboard senders notwithstanding).

>Note this is NOT a radio or electronics skill.
>It is a VISCERAL skill

WHAT AN IDIOT! >>NOT<< a radio skill?
BBBWWWHHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
AHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !

>It has NO importance anywhere, other than in a
>self-congratulatory organization

Which "organization" would THAT be, Vippy? "Organization membership" is not required to be a licensed Amateur Radio operator, regardless of the mode used.

>Even if you were a Ham first, then became an EE, learn to put Morse in
>perspective. Ham radio is primarily NOT a "hobby". The traditions, rituals,
>practices form a unified belief system that resembles a CULT.

The further insistence upon by yourself only makes you look even MORE idiotic, IF that were possible!

>Ham radio is useful if you selectively participate. Those occasional useful
>aspects then benefit you. Otherwise it can be a drain.

BE A DRAIN.....?!?!

How? Were you FORCED to take an Amateur Radio exam, Vippy? Did Palestinian terrorists drag you down to the local Amateur Radio supplier and FORCE you to buy a radio? Do armed men descending from black helicopters MAKE you get on the air every day...???

>One is the sum total of
>experiences, paid with the price of efforts. So, being immersed in the "Ham"
>radio hobby can result in the negative.

The ONLY "negative" experience I have EVER had associated with Amateur radio is "meeting" complete idiots like you, Lennie and Brian that come up with these really wild, wierd assertions that are not the least little bit based in fact or reality!

>A spouse/and our relative would give you a piece of their <unkind> words for
>that. I know. Sadly, I had to try and defend Ham radio. I try to say Hams are
>not weird. They do socialize. They are professionals and interested in
>technical aspects. Worst part is, from my own observation, I actually agree
>with them.

Uh huh. Yeah. Right. That's why so many spouses join their already licensed spouse and get licenses, participate in Amatuer Radio social functions and otherwise support and condone the hobby.

>Those that do not believe and stay have self esteem issues. Those that do
>believe are delusional. I am not talking about image to impress family,
>friends, or society. I am talking about one's own pride.

"...one's own pride"...?!?!? Vippy, I see that you are still in the Amateur Radio database. If it's such a drain and social scar, WHY are YOU still licensed?

Here's a chance to show what kind of a scrupled, integrity-strong kinda guy you are, Vippy...let's see you match actions with words...

Take your FCC form 660 out (both the wallet and wall copies) and write "PLEASE CANCEL" across them. Scan a copy of the then-cancelled licenses and post to an AOL Hometown "profile" homepage with it so we can all see.

THEN send it to the FCC in Gettysburg. When I see your license drop off the database, I will know that you are a person of integrity and principle.

UNTIL then, you're just a punk with a bad attitude that can't get his way, so you have to demeaning and hateful instead.

So which way is it, Vipul? >>IS<< it the social stigma you claim it is, and therefore you will cancel your license, or are you lying?

I think you are lying. And I DON'T think you have the strength of character or principles to match your words with meaningful action.

So...Are you man enough to back it up?

Steve, K4YZ

1125. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 18:19:13 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303211019.483d7d10@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63212

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030320164035.09808.00002571@mb-fk.aol.com>...
> In article <3E7899CC.81F8D963@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >A radio amateur. You are some guy who has been standing on the
> >sidelines for decades.
>
> Not at all. I've been a radio and electronics professional for over
> a half century.

And standing on the sidelines of amateur radio for at least that long.

btw, "radio and electronics professional" covers a lot of ground.
Anybody who ever worked in a Radio Shack or circuit City store can
claim the same thing.
>
> Amateur radio does NOT represent the sum total of all radio
> communications.

I don't know anyone who claims it does.

> It is just a hobby activity, a recreation.

Incorrect.

> It is also
> quite a minor activity in the whole field of radio communications
> worldwide.

Then why are you, a non-participant and bystander, so obsessed with
it?
>
> >Yet you tell us that you know best how amateur
> >radio should be regulated.
>
> No, I present my arguments for a modernization of US amateur
> radio regulations.

Once in a great while. The rest of the time you behave as described in
my oft-quoted profile.

Your "modernization of US amateur radio regulations" ideas amount to
these two items, and nothing more:

1) Get rid of the Morse code test

2) Require that all hams be at least 14 years old to get any class of
license.

I think the latter was reduced by you to 12 years.
>
> As an example, use of morse code as a communications mode
> IS obsolete. Worldwide.

Only if you define 'obsolete' to mean 'in daily use by many thousands
of radio operators'. Otherwise, you're flat-out WRONG, Len.

> It is just not defunct, extinct.

Actually, it's alive and well. And growing. There are probably more
hams using Morse code today than there were hams back in the 1930s.

There are more varieties of keys, keyers, paddles, and other Morse
code related equipment available to hams today than ever before. More
models of manufactured and kit amateur radio equipment capable of
Morse code operation available to hams than ever before, too. And at
lower inflation-adjusted prices! Pretty good for an "obsolete" mode!

Here's a bit of history for ya, Len: Back in the '60s, when amateur
radio equipment manufacturers really began churning out HF
transceivers, most of those transceivers had minimal Morse code
performance and features. Some did not even allow Morse code operation
at all! For a while, it looked like the manufacturers were phasing out
Morse code capability in their equipment. But after a while, they
began improving the Morse code performance and features of their HF
transceivers. Today, all of the current HF amateur radio transceivers
I know of allow Morse code operation, and most offer adequate if not
excellent performance and features using the mode.
>
> Other radio services worldwide have either dropped morse code
> mode communications or never considered it in the beginning of
> a radio service.

Their goals and resources are different.

Are piston-engine propeller-driven airplanes "obsolete"?
Are manual transmissions in cars "obsolete"?
Are NTSC-standard television sets "obsolete"?

It is illogical to judge what hams do by what other radio services are
doing.
>
> The FCC does not demand use of morse code over and above any
> other mode by US radio amateurs.

You keep repeating that mantra, but never tell us why it's important.

> All allocated modes are
> optional for use by all US amateur radio licensees, any class, any
> amateur band.

And you can't use any of them.

> Why does the morse code test remain other than
> the inertia and lobbying of old-timers at the ITU?

This has been explained to you many, many times. It remains because
S25.5 requires it, and FCC won't change its interpretation of S25.5.

If you want Element 1 to go away, convince the FCC that they were
wrong when they wrote the R&O for the 2000 restructuring.

> The FCC stated publicly in 1990 and 1999 that it does not consider
> morse code skill to be of value in the FCC determining whether or
> not an amateur radio license applicant should be granted a
> license. The morse code test remains as a requirement for
> license grants for all license classes having below-30-MHz
> privileges.

This has been explained to you many, many times. It remains because
S25.5 requires it, and FCC won't change its interpretation of S25.5.

If you want Element 1 to go away, convince the FCC that they were
wrong when they wrote the R&O for the 2000 restructuring.

> Morse code testing itself is obsolete.

Just your opinion
>
> >You insult amateur radio (see any Anderson
> >comments about public service efforts in emergencies)
>
> Incorrect.

No, it's correct.

> I negatively criticize ARRL for exaggerated spin
> on amateur radio's alleged importance during national
> emergencies.

"Exaggerated spin"? Where? Show us where an ARRL document was
exaggerated.

The fact is that you dismiss the idea that radio amateurs play ANY
communications role in emergencies of any size or scope.

> >You insult those
> >who choose to use morse code and who support morse testing.
>
> Yes.

Well, there you have it. All a person has to do is disagree with you,
and out come the insults.

> The major reason is that old-time morse code users have
> presented themselves to the public as experts in radio and
> procedure when they are obviously not experts in radio of

> modern times.

I have never presented myself as an expert on anything. Yet you are
liberal with insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and general
infantile behavior towards me. All because I dare to disagree.

> Their procedures are fixed to the standards and
> practices of six decades ago.
>
Six decades ago was the 1940s.

> Those who love, honor, and worship morse code are fixated on
> their enobled aptitude and resultant skill.

All of them?

> Such do not hesitate
> to say they are the best in radio because of that single skill...
> long after morse code became obsolete.
>
Incorrect on all counts.
> >You insult and impugn those who work for the ARRL.
>
> Incorrect again. I've engaged ARRL staff in open debate in
> public on certain matters of radio amateurism.

You've accused them of fraud and dishonesty, then denied that you ever
wrote the accusations.
>
> >Why would such an individual want to become a radio amateur?
>
> For personal pleasure, to engage in a hobby recreation involving
> radio.

News flash: There's been an amateur radio license available in the USA
with no code test for more than 12 years. Full privileges license with
only a 5 wpm code test for almost 3 years.

> A problem with certain individuals is their perverse
> definition of "personal pleasure."

Sounds like you're talking about yourself, Len. ;-)
>
> Sociopaths and self-righteous savants find great pleasure in
> denigrating, demeaning, and attempting to demoralize others
> through any means possible. That is sometimes considered an
> individual survival tactic...to release tensions resulting from
> frustrations of theirs of regular life. Others within that group are
> simply twisted, cannot get along with others, and attempt to
> control them.

Yep, that pretty much describes your behavior here on rrap, Len. ;-)

1126. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 18:19:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321131945.10175.00000157@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63213

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/21/2003 8:11 AM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303210811.3ac805aa@posting.google.com>

>How is this distinguishable from what you do?

Uhhhhhh...OK, Brain, please show me the posts where I have humiliated, criticized and denigrated an entire subset of American (or any other) culture, organization, religious sect, avocation, sport, vocation, etc etc etc....

If you mean my comments vis-a-vis pathological liars like Lennie and Mark Morgan, or situationally disoriented or educationally malnourished folks such as yourself and Vippy, all I can say is that YOU and they supply the ammunition. You guys DO make it easy, you know!

Steve

1127. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 21:42:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303211342.232e24a2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63214

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030321131945.10175.00000157@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/21/2003 8:11 AM Pacific Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303210811.3ac805aa@posting.google.com

>> No, you just humiliate, criticize and denigrate them in several
public
>> forums for sport and recreation.

> >How is this distinguishable from what you do?
>
> Uhhhhhh...OK, Brain, please show me the posts where I have humiliated,
> criticized and denigrated an entire subset of American (or any other) culture,
> organization, religious sect, avocation, sport, vocation, etc etc etc....
>
> If you mean my comments vis-a-vis pathological liars like Lennie and Mark
> Morgan, or situationally disoriented or educationally malnourished folks such
> as yourself and Vippy, all I can say is that YOU and they supply the
> ammunition. You guys DO make it easy, you know!
>
> Steve

Steve, a couple of fifty-cent words doesn't release you from your
obsessive/compulsive behavior.

And you do humiliate, criticize and denigrate hams and non-hams alike
for sport and recreation. Bragging about how "easy" we make it should
tell you something about yourself. For example, "cruel" comes to
mind.

Best of luck to you.

1128. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 21:43:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303211343.6a15967b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63215

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030321125912.11500.00000280@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 3/20/2003 8:29 PM Pacific Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030320232920.03802.00000134@mb-cq.aol.com>
>
> >N2EY, as an EE, don't you have more pressing matters than to be a tabulation
> >keeper for ARS License Numbers?
>
> What an assinine question.

big snip

Please, not another new obsessive/compulsive thread.

1129. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 21:54:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303211354.47ca34aa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63216

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0303210914.63337281@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0303201826.3a0a9b09@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030320122706.25801.00000468@mb-mb.aol.com>...
> > > In article <f45722ac.0303200510.37901e73@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > >news:<20030319190735.23139.00001430@mb-da.aol.com>...
> > > >> In article <f45722ac.0303190403.1a509938@posting.google.com>,
> > > >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > >>
> > > >> >State the WPM rate at which "proficiency" is achieved.
> > > >> >
> > > >> 10 WPM is the lowest speed that can be considered "proficient".
> > > >>
> > > >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > > >
> > > >Jim, thank you. Another question, please. How do you know 10wpm is
> > > >the lowest speed which can be considered proficient?
> > >
> > > It's the lowest speed for which a proficiency award is available. So 10 wpm > >is
> > > the very beginning - the lowest recognized level - of Morse code
> > > proficiency.
> >
> > Are the awards called "proficiency" awards?
>
> Yes.
>
> > Who is issuing the
> > awards, and are you assuming proficiency because that is what level at
> > which the awards begin?
>
> The awards have been available for decades and are well-known in the
> amateur community. I'm surprised you don't know all about them. The
> lowest speed for which an award is available is 10 wpm, and there are
> endorsements at 5 wpm intervals up to at least 40 wpm. I got to the 30
> wpm level back in high school with pencil-and-paper copy. I'm better
> than that these days.

Then you should have another award. Who would issue it?

> > This is obviously not an FCC endeavor.
>
> FCC wasn't part of the discussion.
> >
> > > Of course much higher levels of proficiency are attainable, but that's another
> > > story.
> >
> > Perhaps higher speeds are attainable, but isn't "proficient" really
> > just proficient.
>
> No. Absolutely not.

So proficient isn't proficient? If 0.02wpm code is done by proficient
amateurs, then it is proficient? And if 0.02wpm is done by 5wpm
coders, it is not proficient?

> > > Thus, a 13 wpm code test is a code proficiency test because 13 is greater
> > >than
> > > 10, but a 5 wpm code test is not a code proficiency test because 5 is less
> > > than
> > > 10.
> >
> > In all of my years reading Part 97 and subsequent changes, I've never
> > seen the word "proficiency" used to describe any of the exams. Why do
> > you assign the term to what the FCC is doing?
>
> I didn't assign it. WK3C did. Here's a quote from a post of his from
> March 7 of this year:
>
> WK3C>Reply-To: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
> WK3C>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
> WK3C>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> WK3C>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>
> WK3C>The regional positions prepared so far, as well as the national
> positions
> WK3C>that are known, all indicate that the elimination of the Morse
> proficiency WK3C>test requirement from the ITU ("International
> Telecommunications Union") WK3C>Radio Regulations will be a "slam
> dunk."
>
> Note that Carl calls it a "Morse proficiency test", not a "Morse code
> test" or anything else. He came up with the term, not me, go argue
> with him.
>
> He's almost certainly correct about the slam dunk aspect, too.
>
> Proficiency starts at 10 wpm, therefore the Morse proficiency test is
> already gone in the USA. Element 1 is not, repeat not, a Morse
> proficiency test.

OK, Carl may have made a mistake. If we could only get to the bottom
of what proficiency is.

How did you come by 10wpm being the lower margin for proficiency
again?

Did the FCC declare it so?

> > > So when someone says their goal is 'elimination of the Morse code
> > > proficiency
> > > test for any amateur radio license in the USA', it is accurate to reply
> > > that
> > > their goal has been accomplished.
>
> QED.
>
> > It is innacurate because none of the exams were ever touted as
> > proficiency exams by the federal agency that issued them.
>
> No, it's completely accurate. "Elimination of the Morse proficiency
> tests" and "elimination of all Morse code tests" are two different
> things.

Maybe. Depends on the word per minute rate for proficiency, doesn't
it?

> --
>
> Now, Brian, I've answered all of your questions on this subject.

Thank you. But I still don't have an authoritative reference for what
is Morse Code proficiency.

How
> about answering the following questions about your claimed T5 amateur
> radio operations:
>
> What callsign was used?
>
> What rigs and antennas were used?
>
> Who did the equipment belong to?
>
> What amateur bands and modes were used?
>
> What countries and continents were worked?
>
> How were the QSLs delivered?
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim, those questions are just too hard. Dave asked them too, but I
gave up.

Brian

1130. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 22:00:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303211400.28522748@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63217

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E7B3DD3.B13A8275@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E79FB19.29AAF4BC@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030319190735.23139.00001430@mb-da.aol.com>...
> > > > > In article <f45722ac.0303190403.1a509938@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > > > >
> > > > > >State the WPM rate at which "proficiency" is achieved.
> > > > > >
> > > > > 10 WPM is the lowest speed that can be considered "proficient".
> > > > >
> > > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > > >
> > > > Jim, thank you. Another question, please. How do you know 10wpm is
> > > > the lowest speed which can be considered proficient?
> > >
> > > I disagree with Jim on this one. The definition of "proficient" is
> > > "skilled" or "expert". While 10 wpm may mark a journeyman level, I
> > > don't consider it proficient. Many QSOs take place at the 20-35 wpm
> > > level.
> >
> > How nice of you to give Jim the definition of "proficient." I'd
> > expect you to tell him to go look it up.
>
> I'd provided the definition previously.

Yet, without Jim asking for it, you provided it to him.

You're a swell guy.

> > Anyway, many is how many? What percentage of all QSO's is that?
>
> Go look it up.

So you answer unasked questions and then you don't answer asked
questions.

You're a swell guy.

> > > One thing I know is that there is no answer to your question which will
> > > please you.

> >
> > Dave, I'm not asking to be pleased nor displeased. I want to know
> > what is "proficient."
>
> No you don't. There is no answer to your question which will
> please you.

Then there is no authoritative answer to the question. Your guesses
don't satisfy.

> > > You may delude yourself all you like. Someone whose top
> > > morse speed is five wpm is not proficient in the use of morse.
>
> > It would appear that you delude yourself when you claim to know what
> > proficiency is, but cannot put your finger on it at this time.
> > Meanwhile, you're able to describe many others as not proficient.
>
> I put my finger on it. Maybe you were just busy reading between the
> lines.

Please quote the Title 47 paragraph and line number defining Morse
Code proficiency.

> > It just doesn't ring true.
>
> ...not if you're busy reading between the lines.

I'd certainly like to read the lines. Please quote the Title 47
paragraph and line number defining Morse Code proficiency.

> > You may define proficiency using a wpm rate, and an accuracy level.
> >
> > Jim is on record at 10WPM.
>
> You must not have read any of my post. How is it possible for you
> respond without reading it?

Of course I read your post. You said this much code is more
proficient than that much code. That's not much of an definition.

1131. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 23:13:46 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321181346.03396.00000134@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 63218

From (Steve Robeson K4YZ):
>Vipul Shah, as an EE yourself, don't YOU have more pressing matters than
>policing other EE's in Amateur Radio newsgroups?

Solely practicing one's craft is foolish. Without a guard, one will get robbed.

I should focus more on the politicians and policy makers than amateur radio. For EEs, IEEE should help. They may not be as responsive as the ARRL, but they should be. As with any organization, the members should make their interest known.

>>And, on top of that you use Morse code - Double
>>sin.
>
> Only a sin if you do it badly.

As an EE, Morse code should not be a priority.

>It has NO importance anywhere, other than in a
>>self-congratulatory organization
>
> Which "organization" would THAT be, Vippy? "Organization membership" is
>not required to be a licensed Amateur Radio operator, regardless of the mode
>used.

The "Ham radio" organization.

>Take your FCC form 660 out (both the wallet and wall copies) and write
>"PLEASE CANCEL" across them.

I would like to transmit on the bands. Without the license, I cannot do that. I can leave, but then I would not get the benefits of the license.

>I think you are lying. And I DON'T think you have the strength of
>character or principles to match your words with meaningful action.
>
> So...Are you man enough to back it up?

The more useful solution would be to make changes to increase the experimentation aspects of the hobby. If Ham radio collaborates with educators and industry, this would be more useful.

1132. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 23:20:31 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321182031.03396.00000135@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 63219

From: N2EY
>The USE of Morse code is a SIN?!?

An EE should focus more on other aspects than Morse code.

>No, it's an active thing. Just like listening/talking, or
>reading/writing. Just another tool in the toolbox.

Its often the PRIMARY focus of Ham radio meetings.

>> It is a VISCERAL skill.
>
>Is that a 'sin', too?

No, but its not an electronics skill in a technical hobby.

>It has importance whenever I use it on the amateur radio bands.
>
>btw, what is this "self-congratulatory organization" you mentioned?

You answered the question.

>I am talking about one's own pride.
>
>I have no idea what that is supposed to mean.

Learning Morse when one does not want to is not a sign of pride.

>Do what you find rewarding and let the rest go by.

Good idea.

1133. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 23:37:11 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321183711.03396.00000136@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 63220

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Is someone who is goog at memorizing electronic formulae supposed to be
>better than a good volleyball player?

I have the ability to do realtime encoding/decoding also and enjoy that also.
Neither skill is more important in society, but this is a technical hobby.

>> Note this is NOT a radio or electronics skill.
>The only place I've used morse is on the radio.

It is translating sounds into characters. This is not an electronics skill.

> I guess everything where people bond
>together in a joint interest looks like a cult to someone who sees
>himself as an outsider.

Not when the mannerisms and traditions tend to follow certain conventions that
are not required for radio operation. Even Hams know this, thats why they say
certain things are "true" Ham activities.

Here are some examples of cult activity. Excessive jargons, hatred of CB, Morse
code, Wouff Hong (okay - cheap shot).

>> Those occasional useful
>> aspects then benefit you.
>
>What "occasional" aspects?

Antenna setups, projects, new operating modes.

>> A spouse/and our relative would give you a piece of their <unkind> words
>for
>> that. I know.
>
>How do you know?

Hard to justify going to a Hamfest or Ham meeting. There must be a useful topic
(to other, not me) scheduled to justify going to a Ham meeting.

1134. We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-21 23:58:41 UTC
From: no.spam.here@usenet-nomads.com
Message-ID: <C4EDF5MV37702.0407523148@usenet-nomads.com>
Source record: 63221

Many french ham operators would be glad to help the US and UK armies in their fight against Iraq.

We apologize for the position given by President Chirac that does not represent the french people as he has not been elected by the majority of the french people (he only got 82 of about 43 of votes).

More, Chirac is involved in more than 10 criminal affairs actually and he might be put in jail quite for life if Justice did his job correctly in France.

So if we can help you a bit with our radios, ask. There are french ham operators ready to do so.

Thank you for your courage to protect humanity against islamic terrorists.

1135. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 00:19:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321191924.20623.00000288@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 63222

>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/21/2003 1:43 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303211343.6a15967b@posting.google.com>

>Please, not another new obsessive/compulsive thread.

Since you felt compelled to respond to a thread not addressing you, I guess it WAS a compulsive thing for you, wasn't it...?!?!

So I guess the answer is yes, you've made it another obsessive/compulsive thread.

Steve

1136. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 00:34:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321193430.20623.00000289@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 63223

>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/21/2003 3:13 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030321181346.03396.00000134@mb-cr.aol.com>

>From (Steve Robeson K4YZ):
>>Vipul Shah, as an EE yourself, don't YOU have more pressing matters than
>>policing other EE's in Amateur Radio newsgroups?
>
>Solely practicing one's craft is foolish. Without a guard, one will get
>robbed.

Ahhhhh...so you see yourself as protecting others friom themselves, eh?
Did you know that MOST people who wind up in my ER from a fight got into it a s
third party trying to break it up.

>I should focus more on the politicians and policy makers than amateur radio.
>For EEs, IEEE should help. They may not be as responsive as the ARRL, but
>they
>should be. As with any organization, the members should make their interest
>known.

If you are going to try and dissuade any of the EE's here from Amateur
licensure, I think you're going to be sorely disappointed.

>>>And, on top of that you use Morse code - Double
>>>sin.
>>
>> Only a sin if you do it badly.
>
>As an EE, Morse code should not be a priority.

Who said it's "it's a priority", Vippy? And who are YOU to make the
decision as to what should be what in another person's routine..???

WHAT monumental list of experiences qualifies you to make those decisions?

>The "Ham radio" organization

WHAT "Ham radio" organization? The ARRL? The FAR? IARN?

>>Take your FCC form 660 out (both the wallet and wall copies) and write
>>"PLEASE CANCEL" across them.
>
>I would like to transmit on the bands. Without the license, I cannot do that.
>I
>can leave, but then I would not get the benefits of the license.

Then you are two faced. You want to "have your cake and eat it too.".

I knew you didn't have it in you.

>The more useful solution would be to make changes to increase the
>experimentation aspects of the hobby. If Ham radio collaborates with
>educators
>and industry, this would be more useful.

At any second, at any moment, YOU can go into your garage/shop/office, or whatever, and do any infinite number of radio experiments that you care to do WITHOUT insulting or denigrating every OTHER Amateur radio operator, Vipul.

The American Radio Relay League already has programs that help to promote Amateur Radio and the opportunities it affords. They help to place technical materials in classrooms and instructor aids at the disposal of teachers.

Local "special services" clubs promote other operating activities and helps to place equipment in classrooms.

Now...still on the thread, what actions will YOU take in order to help put the advantages of Amature Radio in front of kids and new licensees, Vipul...That is OTHER that insulting it in CB newsgroups and calling Amateurs "cultists" to non-Amateurs...?!?!

Steve

1137. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 00:35:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321193537.20623.00000290@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 63224

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/21/2003 1:44 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303211344.374260d9@posting.google.com>

>How did Webster's get your photo?

Were did "Charmin" get yours?

Steve

1138. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 00:36:36 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5gbbb$75o$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63225

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0303180928.4fe12a6d@posting.google.com...
From: "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2003 12:28 PM
Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b56235avl1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>...
>
> (old stuff removed)
>
> > > Manual transmission vehicles, on the other hand, are ubiquitous. Just
> > > not as common as they once were.
> > >
> > > The percentage of CW signals on the HF/MF ham bands is at least as
> > > high, if not much higher, thans the percentage of manual transmission
> > > cars on US roads. Much greater than the percentage of horses on the
> > > road...
> > >
> > > > however, since you
> > > > prefer the transmission one, I'll speak to that.
> > > >
> > > > > Try this one:
> > > > >
> > > > > Once upon a time, practically all motor vehicles had manual
> > transmissions
> > > > > of
> > > > > one type or another. Learning to use a clutch and gear shift was a
big
> > > > > part of
> > > > > learning to drive.
> > > > >
> > > > > Today, most (I read an estimate of 80%) passenger cars, minivans
and
> > light
> > > > > trucks on the road have automatic transmissions. I don't know of a
> > single
> > > > > US
> > > > > state or commonwealth that requires manual transmission skill
testing
> > for
> > > > > an
> > > > > ordinary driver's license.

> > > >
> > > > Neither do I ...
> > > >
> > > I recall reading somewhere that the majority of new US-made cars had
> > > automatic transmissions starting in the late 1950s.
> >
> > True, and in today's market, less than 10% of new cars are manual.
>
> Is it really that low, Bill? I'd guess more like 25%. However, if it's
> 10%, that simply reinforces my earlier statement that the percentage
> of CW signals on the HF/MF ham bands is higher than the percentage of
> manual transmission
> cars on US roads. And much greater than the percentage of horses on
> the road...

I asked a friend of mine in the auto industry several years ago. He said it
was
probably only about 5%. Some vehicles are not available with manual
trans at all.

> > > > > It's a good idea for all drivers to have manual transmission
driving
> > > > > skills.
> > > >
> > > > Why???
> > > >
> > > Because it increases all drivers' opportunities and possibilities wrt
> > > driving situations. For example, the choice of vehicle is greater.
> >
> > That's a "personal choice."
>
> Usually true.
>
> > There's NO value to society
>
> I disagree! Less fuel used and less pollution are definitely a value
> to society.

I'll rephrase...there's not enough value to society to justify
requiring manual gearboxes. Additionally, there is an
argument that manual gearboxes allow greater pollution because
the driver can rev/race the engine while an auto gearbox
can be computer controlled throughout the entire operating
range.

> So is the ability to choose the best driver from among
> those available.

When has anyone asked you or otherwise tried to determine
who is the "best" driver for a partivular driving requirement?

> Example: Some friends go out for dinner in a stick-shift car. The
> person who drove has a big meal and feels sleepy afterwards, but has
> to drive home anyway because the others 'can't drive stick'. Of course
> it's easy to say they should have taken another car in the first
> place, but in real life such situations do arise.

So?

> > and thus the states abondoned any testing.
>
> I disagree again!
>
> I think the reasons the states we know of

Trust me...ALL states have no requirement for a manual
gearbox test requirement.

> ...stopped being fussy about
> what sort of vehicle was used for testing were:
>
> 1) it's a hassle to require a stick shift car for testing (in PA the
> person being tested supplies the car).

If the driver wanted a manual certification, the driver would
provide a manual car.

> 2) lots of people wanted drivers licenses

So?

> 3) the perceived benefits to society of having lots of people licensed
> to drive were greater than the perceived benefits of having all
> drivers pass a stick-shift test.

I've been licensed over 44 years and I have never seen any such
logic put forth in articles regarding testing.

> > > No
> > > problems with "we have to take/buy X's car because Y can't drive
> > > stick", etc. (Been there, done that!)
> >
> > That's a personal problem.
>
> Not mine, because I drive all sorts of vehicles. Tested in a manual
> transmission car, in fact, to avoid any possibility of the dreaded
> "automatic transmission only" limitation on the license.

Where and when was that limitation being applied?

> > All my kids learned to drive
> > manuals.
> >
> Great!
>
> > > Manual transmission cars are simpler, cost less, use less fuel and

> > > pollute less than their automatic-transmission equivalents.
> >
> > The fuel efficiency of automatics is very close to that of a manual
> > gearbox these days.
>
> But there is still an advantage. The percentage varies with the
> vehicle, of course.
>
> > Pollution wise, unless you are factoring the
> > small mileage difference, the emissions shouldn't be any different.
>
> But there is a difference. 10% less fuel burned in equivalent engines
> means 10% less pollution.

Not always. The efficiencies can be different in terms of how
power is applied during acceleration, etc.

> Returning to radio for a moment, the spectrum and power efficiency of
> CW is much better than any analog voice mode. "Takes up less of the
> road", so to speak.

Less road, lower throughput. In any case, it isn't required that
any ham ever use CW so the argument has no significant value.

> > > Note that we're talking about something being a "a good idea" not
> > > being mandated by law.
> >
> > The ONLY reason manual transmissions are still be maded is
> > because there's a market for them that is big enough
> > to justify the continued availability.
>
> IOW, folks still want them. Even though some folks might call them
> "luddites" or describe the manual transmission as "antique",
> "obsolete", or "1930s technology".

Yes. The point is no one MUST know how to drive one.

> Note how that market continues to exist even though there is no
> stick-shift test nor mandatory stick-shift use requirement....

Exactly...and the same will be the case for CW as long as hams
choose to learn and use it.

> > > Do you think it's not a good idea for all drivers to have manual
> > > transmission driving skills?
> >
> > Nope.
>
> Why not? Remember, we're talking about it being "a good idea" only,
> NOT a mandated requirement.

I belive it is only a personal choice. In today's world,
the NEED for manual knowledge is strictly personal. Has anyone heard

or read about anyone being in danger or worse because no
one was available to drive a manual gearbox vehicle?

> > I think it's a choice an individual makes. I could care
> > less that anyone else knows how to drive my cars.
>
> > > > > But should such skills be mandated by law?
> > > > >
> > > > Of course not.
> > >
> > > Well, that's one opinion.
> >
> > Would you rather manual transmission knowledge/skill be mandated?
>
> I'm not sure. I am sure that manual-transmission skill is a good thing
> to have, and should be a goal of practically all drivers.

Repeat my last comment: In today's world,
the NEED for manual knowledge is strictly personal. Has anyone heard
or read about anyone being in danger or worse because no
one was available to drive a manual gearbox vehicle?

> > > > > The current Morse test is akin to requiring all prospective
drivers be
> > > > > able to
> > > > > drive across an empty parking lot with a manual-transmission car
in
> > > > > first gear,
> > > > > starting and stopping without stalling the engine.
> > > > >
> > > > Exactly ... such a test should not be mandated because it isn't
> > > > necessary
> > > > and serves no legitimate regulatory purpose.
> > >
> > > There's no S25.5 for clutches, anyway.
> >
> > Fine by me.
>
> Not in NJ, PA, or NY, anyway. Any other states to be heard from?

I've checked before. No state requires a manual gearbox
certification.

> > > > I'm glad you finally seem to agree :-)
> > > >
> > > You're inferring what I've neither stated nor implied. I haven't
> > > stated any opinion other than "It's a good idea for all drivers to
> > > have manual transmission driving skills."
> > >
> > > My point is simply that the transmission analogy is a much better and
> > > more relevant one than the horse analogy.
> >

> > I agee also and have used this analogy myself many
> > times.
>
> In fact, I think that's where I first saw it. Sorry if I did not
> properly credit the source, Bill.

No apology needed. If I worried about credits in this
forum I'd really have to be certified as a looney. :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK`

1139. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 00:42:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321194255.20623.00000291@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 63226

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/21/2003 3:20 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030321182031.03396.00000135@mb-cr.aol.com>

>An EE should focus more on other aspects than Morse code.

Since you are NOT a code proficient (or even trained, if not proficient)
operator, from what experience do you draw in order to make such an assertion.

>>No, it's an active thing. Just like listening/talking, or
>>reading/writing. Just another tool in the toolbox.
>
>Its often the PRIMARY focus of Ham radio meetings.

I think you're making this up. In thirty-plus years of Amatuer Radio,
I've not been to more than two ot three meetings in which "Morse Code" was the
"PRIMARY" topic.

>No, but its not an electronics skill in a technical hobby.

So, in YOUR opinion, unless it's SOLELY a "technical aspect", it has no
place in Amateur Radio? JUST discussions about circuit design and
applications...?!?!

How BORING!

>>It has importance whenever I use it on the amateur radio bands.
>>
>>btw, what is this "self-congratulatory organization" you mentioned?
>
>You answered the question.

No he didn't. What is the "self congratulatory organization", Vipul?

>>I am talking about one's own pride.
>>
>>I have no idea what that is supposed to mean.
>
>Learning Morse when one does not want to is not a sign of pride.

No..but it can be a sign of cowardice.

>>Do what you find rewarding and let the rest go by.
>
>Good idea.

Can we say we've seen the last silliness of Vipul?

Be still my heart.

Steve

1140. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 00:48:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321194839.20623.00000292@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 63227

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/21/2003 3:37 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030321183711.03396.00000136@mb-cr.aol.com>

>>> Note this is NOT a radio or electronics skill.

>>The only place I've used morse is on the radio.

>It is translating sounds into characters. This is not an electronics skill.

It's only application is ON the radio, Vipul.

>Here are some examples of cult activity. Excessive jargons, hatred of CB,
>Morse
>code, Wouff Hong (okay - cheap shot).

Whew. I think the cheap shot was whatever you snorted before you posted
this, Vipul.

>>> A spouse/and our relative would give you a piece of their <unkind> words
>>for
>>> that. I know.
>>
>>How do you know?
>
>Hard to justify going to a Hamfest or Ham meeting. There must be a useful
>topic
>(to other, not me) scheduled to justify going to a Ham meeting.

And this is different from any other sport/avocation/profession than from
Amateur radio...HOW...???

Steve

1141. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 00:51:45 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5gc2o$8g3$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63228

If you are for real...then vote the bum out of office. But I think the damage is already done. We, the USA, will NO LONGER TRUST FRANCE. In fact you have become as irrelevant as the UN.

We dont need either of you. But you sure need us.

Dan/W4NTI

"Holodeck Remailer" <no.spam.here@usenet-nomads.com> wrote in message news:C4EDF5MV37702.0407523148@usenet-nomads.com...
>
> Many french ham operators would be glad to
> help the US and UK armies in their fight against
> Iraq.
>
> We apologize for the position given by President
> Chirac that does not represent the french people
> as he has not been elected by the majority of the
> french people (he only got 82 of about 43 of
> votes).
>
> More, Chirac is involved in more than 10
> criminal affairs actually and he might be put in
> jail quite for life if Justice did his job correctly in
> France.
>
> So if we can help you a bit with our radios, ask.
> There are french ham operators ready to do so.
>
> Thank you for your courage to protect humanity
> against islamic terrorists.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

1142. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 01:26:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321202642.25801.00000496@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 63229

In article <20030321182031.03396.00000135@mb-cr.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: N2EY
>>The USE of Morse code is a SIN?!?
>
>An EE should focus more on other aspects than Morse code.

Sounds like a busman's holiday to me.

I've homebrewed (designed and built from scratch) several entire ham stations (including shack furniture and antennas), built kits, restored basket-case rigs to operating order, converted surplus, written articles for amateur radio magazines, given talks at club meetings, led Field Day operations, served as a club officer, taught ham radio classes (more theory than code, btw) operated a variety of modes and bands, helped out other hams in person and via mail and internet, and always managed to have an operative ham station of one kind or another. Is that enough of a varied focus for you?

Why should an EE focus more on other aspects rather than Morse code?
>
>>No, it's an active thing. Just like listening/talking, or
>>reading/writing. Just another tool in the toolbox.
>
>Its often the PRIMARY focus of Ham radio meetings.

Where? I'd love to attend a meeting like that! The meetings I go to are all a mixed bag of club business, socializing, programs on the latest mode or piece of gear, various technical and operational subjects, etc.
>
>>> It is a VISCERAL skill.
>>
>>Is that a 'sin', too?
>
>No, but its not an electronics skill in a technical hobby.

Neither is knowing the phonetic alphabet.

Knowing Morse code lets hams get more results out of less electronics. Perhaps that's why you dislike it so much.
>
>>It has importance whenever I use it on the amateur radio bands.
>>
>>btw, what is this "self-congratulatory organization" you mentioned?
>
>You answered the question.

How?
>
>>I am talking about one's own pride.
>>
>>I have no idea what that is supposed to mean.
>
>Learning Morse when one does not want to is not a sign of pride.

Ever hear of the "seven deadly sins"? Pride is one of them.

Doing what is necessary to achieve a goal even if part of it is not what you
want to do is a sign of maturity and responsibility.
>
>>Do what you find rewarding and let the rest go by.
>
>Good idea.
>
Well, there you have it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1143. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 01:30:35 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321203035.07005.00000196@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 63230

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>If you are going to try and dissuade any of the EE's here from Amateur
>licensure, I think you're going to be sorely disappointed.

I would like more EEs or people interested in electronics in Ham radio. If an EE goes to a Ham meeting, and see what Ham radio is all about, then often they would be not be interested in Ham radio.

>>As an EE, Morse code should not be a priority.
>
> Who said it's "it's a priority", Vippy? And who are YOU to make the
>decision as to what should be what in another person's routine..???

Its common sense. Real/time encoding/decoding takes away from the more important aspects. Real EEs don't <Morse> code.
The General class license only proves you learned code.

>Then you are two faced. You want to "have your cake and eat it too."

No, there are various applications of amateur radio. I would like to find those with similar interests.

>The American Radio Relay League already has programs that help to promote
>Amateur Radio and the opportunities it affords.

What is the chance of an experimenter's club gaining such resources? Would such an organization be approved to be an "ARRL affiliated" club>

>Now...still on the thread, what actions will YOU take in order to help put
>the advantages of Amature Radio in front of kids and new licensees,
>Vipul.

I'm in limbo now. I cannot take action until a certain "situation" is resolved. Perhaps this will change soon. Most likely amateur radio will be just a diversion, so I just don't care anymore. This may sound bad, but if I get something, I can give back.

1144. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 02:01:32 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321210132.07005.00000197@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 63231

From: "Bill Sohl"
>I belive it is only a personal choice. In today's world,
>the NEED for manual knowledge is strictly personal. Has anyone heard
>or read about anyone being in danger or worse because no
>one was available to drive a manual gearbox vehicle?

You can understand the analogy. How come N2EY cannot understand the analogy HE gave? He proposed this analogy.

Now he doesn't agree with the conclusion:
There is no NEED for Morse code testing. It may be good to learn to communicate to others that use Morse code, but it is NOT essential.

1145. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 02:28:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321212847.25154.00000901@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63239

In article <3E7B4376.4FA1BFBB@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:

>> In regards to Morse code -you are now the passive receiver/transmitter of an
>> AUDIOMOTOR skill.
>
>Being good at volleyball is a motor skill. Is volleyball a bad thing?

This isn't a volleyball newsgroup.

FCC doesn't require volleyball skills to pass licensing tests.

>Is someone who is goog at memorizing electronic formulae supposed to be
>better than a good volleyball player?

"Goog?" :-)

Is Ohm's Law too hard for a radio god to memorize? :-)

>> Note this is NOT a radio or electronics skill.
>
>The only place I've used morse is on the radio. I've never used
>landlines in sending or receiving morse.

No? I'm surprised! :-)

>Looks like morse occupies a pretty important place in amateur radio
>given that thousands of radio amateurs worldwide use it every day.
>What, by the way, is the self-congratulatory organization?

The Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society (ARS).

>> Even if you were a Ham first, then became an EE, learn to put Morse in
>> perspective. Ham radio is primarily NOT a "hobby". The traditions, rituals,
>> practices form a unified belief system that resembles a CULT.
>
>I know plumbers, engineers, salesmen, funeral directors, postal
>carriers, diplomats, military members, teachers, school children,
>housewives, dentists, doctors, deliverymen and truck drivers who are
>radio amateurs.They are Baptists, Catholics, Episcopalians,
>Presbyterians, Jews, agnostics and Mormons. They are black, white,
>Asian and Hispanic. Their common bond is enjoyment of amateur radio.
>You, like several others present here, don't seem to be getting much
>enjoyment from amateur radio. I guess everything where people bond
>together in a joint interest looks like a cult to someone who sees
>himself as an outsider.

The Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society (ARS) is ecumenical?

>> Ham radio is useful if you selectively participate.
>
>One can participate as much or as little as one desires. The amount
>time spent participating has no bearing on usefulness.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, how does one develop proficiency without
practice? :-)

>Not all hams are professionals. Not all hams are very interested in
>technical aspects. No ham is required to be more technical than is
>sufficient to pass the exam for a license. That license permits
>operation on the amateur bands. I can't determine about what you are in
>agreement.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...that sounds like "stream-of-consciousness" stuff!
:-)

>> Those that do not believe and stay have self esteem issues. Those that > do
>believe are delusional. I am not talking about image to impress
>> family, friends, or society. I am talking about one's own pride.
>
>I can't make any sense of your paragraph. It takes the form of
>stream-of-consciousness rambling.

Poor baby. :-)

1146. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 02:28:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321212848.25154.00000902@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63237

In article <c2356669.0303211019.483d7d10@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>> I negatively criticize ARRL for exaggerated spin
>> on amateur radio's alleged importance during national
>> emergencies.
>
>"Exaggerated spin"? Where? Show us where an ARRL document was
>exaggerated.

It's all in Google. Go back to your newsgroup homeland there.

>The fact is that you dismiss the idea that radio amateurs play ANY
>communications role in emergencies of any size or scope.

Incorrect.

>> >You insult those
>> >who choose to use morse code and who support morse testing.
>>
>> Yes.
>
>Well, there you have it. All a person has to do is disagree with you,
>and out come the insults.

Poor baby...knows morse and feels that entitles him to insult
those who don't support morse testing. :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>I have never presented myself as an expert on anything.

Of course you have! [that's all in Google, too!] :-)

Try "renowned amateur historian" for one... :-)

>Yet you are
>liberal with insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
>ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and general
>infantile behavior towards me. All because I dare to disagree.

Poor baby...a radio god not being agreed with? Heavens!

Call in the PROFILERS!!! :-)

>> Their procedures are fixed to the standards and
>> practices of six decades ago.
>>
>Six decades ago was the 1940s.

2003 - 60 = 1943.

Was the radio god (Miccollis) alive then? No.

>> Those who love, honor, and worship morse code are fixated on
>> their enobled aptitude and resultant skill.
>
>All of them?

Just about. :-) Gods are gods. What can I say? :-)

>> Such do not hesitate
>> to say they are the best in radio because of that single skill...
>> long after morse code became obsolete.
>>
>Incorrect on all counts.

Just "your opinion." :-)

>> >You insult and impugn those who work for the ARRL.
>>
>> Incorrect again. I've engaged ARRL staff in open debate in
>> public on certain matters of radio amateurism.
>
>You've accused them of fraud and dishonesty, then denied that you ever
>wrote the accusations.

Incorrect. ARRL practices a form of fraud common to bunco
artists and confidence men. They also charge heavily for
shipping on items purchased directly from Newington. :-)

>> >Why would such an individual want to become a radio amateur?
>>
>> For personal pleasure, to engage in a hobby recreation involving
>> radio.
>
>News flash: There's been an amateur radio license available in the USA
>with no code test for more than 12 years. Full privileges license with
>only a 5 wpm code test for almost 3 years.

News flash: I've been aware and informed of FCC regulations
since 1956. Was Miccolis aware and informed in 1956? :-)

>> A problem with certain individuals is their perverse
>> definition of "personal pleasure."
>
>Sounds like you're talking about yourself, Len. ;-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Another radio god engaged in denial, accusations,
and general character assassination.

>Yep, that pretty much describes your behavior here on rrap, Len. ;-)

As I said...another radio god being self-righteous.

1147. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 02:28:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321212852.25154.00000903@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63235

In article <c2356669.0303211019.483d7d10@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>> Not at all. I've been a radio and electronics professional for over
>> a half century.
>
>And standing on the sidelines of amateur radio for at least that long.

Poor baby...doesn't realize that amateur radio is a small subset of the larger world of radio. Those in that much larger world tend to look at amateurs as being "in the sidelines."

>btw, "radio and electronics professional" covers a lot of ground.
>Anybody who ever worked in a Radio Shack or circuit City store can
>claim the same thing.

I'm sure you do. :-)

Let's just take a look at who I've worked for (in reverse order): Pinetree (at present), Rockwell International, Teledyne Electronics, Hughes Aircraft Company Missle Division, Communications Technology (contract), RCA Corporation, Electro-Optical Systems (a Xerox subsidiary), Birtcher Instruments, Micro-Radionics Inc. (microwave house), all as an electronics engineer.

Not a single "service" occupation (selling, bookkeeping, accounting, buying, etc.) there.

I don't live in fear of discovery. Why do you?

>> Amateur radio does NOT represent the sum total of all radio
>> communications.
>
>I don't know anyone who claims it does.

I doubt you know anyone working in any radio other than amateur or store selling. :-)

>> It is just a hobby activity, a recreation.
>
>Incorrect.

It isn't a hobby or recreation? Oh, my, then the FCC has classified it wrong.

Amateur radio is not referred to as Public Safety Radio
Service. It isn't Mass Media Radio Service. It isn't anything
else but AMATEUR radio service...i.e., not accepting money
for radio services rendered. It's NOT professional.

>> It is also
>> quite a minor activity in the whole field of radio communications
>> worldwide.
>
>Then why are you, a non-participant and bystander, so obsessed with
>it?

I'm a radio hobbyist. I'm just not licensed in amateur radio.

I'm not "obsessed." :-)

I'm just advocating the elimination of a morse code test for
any US radio license.

Miccollis is obsessed with keeping the morse code test
forever. :-)

>> >Yet you tell us that you know best how amateur
>> >radio should be regulated.
>>
>> No, I present my arguments for a modernization of US amateur
>> radio regulations.
>
>Once in a great while. The rest of the time you behave as described in
>my oft-quoted profile.

Poor baby...engaged in indirect character assassination, are
you? :-)

Character assassination is common among PCTAs when they
can't get their way.

>Your "modernization of US amateur radio regulations" ideas amount to
>these two items, and nothing more:
>
>1) Get rid of the Morse code test
>
>2) Require that all hams be at least 14 years old to get any class of
>license.

Oh, my, you got all that from 14 pages of text in a Comment
to the FCC on NPRM 98-143? Wizard comprehension! :-)

>I think the latter was reduced by you to 12 years.

It was? I didn't know that... :-)

>> As an example, use of morse code as a communications mode
>> IS obsolete. Worldwide.
>

>Only if you define 'obsolete' to mean 'in daily use by many thousands
>of radio operators'. Otherwise, you're flat-out WRONG, Len.

OBSOLETE. The word has two meanings: "1. No longer in
use, 2. Out of date."

FCC doesn't mandate morse code use over and above any other
allocated mode. All allocated modes are optional to all US
amateur licensees. The amateur morse code test IS obsolete
and out of date to the FCC.

Except for Maritime Radio Service in the USA on the great lakes,
morse code isn't needed or required by any other US radio
service. Those have either dropped it or never considered it in
the first place.

The Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society keeps endorsing
morsemanship to keep their living museum of amateurism
going as it once was.

>> It is just not defunct, extinct.
>
>Actually, it's alive and well. And growing. There are probably more
>hams using Morse code today than there were hams back in the 1930s.

Americans have much more time available for leisure pursuits
today than the 72% who were able to keep working during the
Great Depression of the 1930s.

What is Miccollis' obsession with standards and practices of
the 1930s?

>There are more varieties of keys, keyers, paddles, and other Morse
>code related equipment available to hams today than ever before. More
>models of manufactured and kit amateur radio equipment capable of
>Morse code operation available to hams than ever before, too. And at
>lower inflation-adjusted prices! Pretty good for an "obsolete" mode!

Well, then, go and convince the FCC that it should, at all costs,
keep that morse code test for amateurs!

There was no transistor or integrated circuit available in the 1930s.
All of the "automatic" keyers were mechanical and from only a
few vendors.

In the 1930s Bill Halligan was just starting up his radio business
in the Chicago area. National Radio was already established.
I'm not sure on the exact start of Collins Radio but it was at or
about the start of the Great Depression. Heath Company was
not doing anything in electronics...it made airplane parts. Morse
code was king in radio communications for small radio stations
(except broadcasting and the common carrier SSB folks).

In 2003 is there a Hallicrafters still in business? No. Is there a National Radio Co. still in business? No, it got sold a long time ago. Collins Radio is still in business as a division of Rockwell International but quit making amateur radio equipment a long time ago. The Heath Company and Heathkits went kaput from any radio market except reselling wireless door chimes.

There are approximately 135 MILLION cellular telephone subscribers in the USA now. [a cell phone is a little two-way radio] That means at least that many little cell phones, none of which require morse code skills to operate them.

There are more NON-MORSE radios other than cell phones in use today in all other radio services than there ever were US radio amateurs since 1912.

>Here's a bit of history for ya, Len: Back in the '60s, when amateur
>radio equipment manufacturers really began churning out HF
>transceivers, most of those transceivers had minimal Morse code
>performance and features. Some did not even allow Morse code operation
>at all!

Wow, that must have REALLY stung the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society!!! :-)

>> Other radio services worldwide have either dropped morse code
>> mode communications or never considered it in the beginning of
>> a radio service.
>
>Their goals and resources are different.

Of course. The epitome of US amateur radio is "working DX on HF with CW." :-)

>Are piston-engine propeller-driven airplanes "obsolete"?

This isn't an aircraft newsgroup.

The Wright Flyer would NOT pass any airworthiness inspection today. It was a piston-engine prop plane.

>Are manual transmissions in cars "obsolete"?

This isn't an automotive newsgroup.

Few 1912 automobiles would pass inspection for road worthiness today.

I learned to drive in a manual transmission automobile but that is not related to morse code in any way, shape, or form. Try to stay focussed at least to RADIO.

>Are NTSC-standard television sets "obsolete"?

Not now. Wait until 2010 or shortly thereafter. :-)

US BROADCAST radio never used morse code or required
its use.

>It is illogical to judge what hams do by what other radio services are
>doing.

It is illogical and emotionally immature to demand adherence
to standards and practices in amateurism that came into
being before most US radio amateurs were born.

>> The FCC does not demand use of morse code over and above any
>> other mode by US radio amateurs.
>
>You keep repeating that mantra, but never tell us why it's important.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Illogical. :-)

FCC doesn't require its use, therefore it is illogical to have a
manual test for it.

The Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society doesn't think in logical
terms. They exist in a fantasy of past times.

>> All allocated modes are
>> optional for use by all US amateur radio licensees, any class, any
>> amateur band.
>
>And you can't use any of them.

Sorry, but I CAN use all the modes allocated to US amateurs.

I just can't do so legally on US amateur radio frequency
allocations. :-)

Actually, I HAVE and legally too...on bands where amateur
use is NOT exclusive.

>> Why does the morse code test remain other than
>> the inertia and lobbying of old-timers at the ITU?
>
>This has been explained to you many, many times. It remains because
>S25.5 requires it, and FCC won't change its interpretation of S25.5.

Incorrect. FCC made the "send by hand" portion of S25.5
optional. There is no option in S25.5 for them to do so.

You've been told that many, many times. Why do you keep
forgetting that? Do you have a current copy of Part 97?

>If you want Element 1 to go away, convince the FCC that they were
>wrong when they wrote the R&O for the 2000 restructuring.

I tried to in Comments on NPRM 98-143. :-)

Do you need a copy of my document? :-)

>> The FCC stated publicly in 1990 and 1999 that it does not consider
>> morse code skill to be of value in the FCC determining whether or
>> not an amateur radio license applicant should be granted a
>> license. The morse code test remains as a requirement for
>> license grants for all license classes having below-30-MHz
>> privileges.
>
>This has been explained to you many, many times. It remains because
>S25.5 requires it, and FCC won't change its interpretation of S25.5.

FCC interprets what it wants to interpret. :-)

FCC still takes an option on S25.5 when no such option exists.

You've been told the reasons and the option MANY MANY TIMES
yet you persist in denying it. Curious. :-)

>If you want Element 1 to go away, convince the FCC that they were
>wrong when they wrote the R&O for the 2000 restructuring.

Why?

>> Morse code testing itself is obsolete.
>
>Just your opinion

You've been told the fact MANY MANY TIMES but you still don't
understand. Can't help your understanding until you return to
the present reality. Remaining in a fantasyland doesn't help
your understanding.

1148. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 02:28:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321212853.25154.00000904@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63236

In article <f45722ac.0303210811.3ac805aa@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
>news:<20030321042721.17322.00000115@mb-mj.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>> >Date: 3/20/2003 8:43 PM Pacific Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <20030320234320.03802.00000135@mb-cq.aol.com
>>
>> >I do not hate Hams...(SNIP)
>>
>> No, you just humiliate, criticize and denigrate them in several public
>> forums for sport and recreation.
>
>How is this distinguishable from what you do?

He is extra amateur and veteran of seven hostile actions!

That makes all the difference...! :-)

1149. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 02:28:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321212854.25154.00000905@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63234

In article <3E7AC4F2.C5E4BC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>No, that wouldn't be the reason. It'd be the thought of two attorneys
>and a judge laughing hysterically just before your case was tossed.
>No one can assassinate something which has already died.

Dinosaur Heil is still into denial.

Morse code is OBSOLETE. It hasn't died yet. It is kept on
life-support by radio gods who cannot understand modern
things.

Heil has no qualifications in US law. He is an amateur.

1150. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 02:28:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321212856.25154.00000906@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63232

In article <3E7AC2C4.5DD91D4A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Poor Heil's reading is fine. I can't read what hasn't been written.

Poor Heil is fined.

Radio gods have inabilities but self-define themselves not to
have inabilities. Understood.

>In comparing the examples I provided of some of your recent postings to
>N2EY's profile of you, what proof of character assassination have you
>found?

The continuing Big Lie technique of constant repetition of an
opinion by an unoriginal radio god incapable of accepting
criticsm.

Propaganda. Misdirection. Avoidance of the subject by
attacking personalities.

Radio gods are like that. It's that simple.

1151. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 02:28:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321212857.25154.00000907@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63233

In article <3E7AC03D.40B7CABF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I thought you handled things well in my absence, Dick.

Dick doesn't handle Dick.

1152. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 02:28:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321212858.25154.00000908@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63238

In article <3E7ABC6A.A19C2527@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Heil thinks he is a radio god according to his remarks in here.
>
>Bad call, Len. I've never once written anything about being a god of
>anything. I even corrected Brian when he mistakenly believed me to be
>the greatest DXer in the world.

Heil must have gotten a Dale Carneigie correspondence course
on ebay, noticed that radio gods are supposed to be self-effacing.

Heil is an amateur. Heil is unqualified to talk about law.

Gods are self-qualifying by definition. Since Heil still talks
about radio law without being qualified, ergo, he is a radio god.

It's that simple.

>You don't get much right, do you? I didn't brag. There was no bad
>procedure--only a factual statement about what was used on a government
>circuit.

What was used on a government circuit was BAD PROCEDURE.

It's that simple.

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>Now you have me confused, Len. Are you telling me that your wife IS a
>psychologist?

There is no sense in replying to Heil. He does not accept
replies unless those replies kiss his royal TLC-needing
tuches.

>You aren't writing about the subject matter.

Heil isn't.

>Take my word for it--Google is filled with your rants.

Go and live there. Join your buddy.

>What would you
>know about the need for modernization of something in which you are not
>a participant?

What does Heil know about cooperation and conciliation when
he does neither? :-)

>How does pointing out that you've not taken a single step toward
>obtaining an amateur radio license in the seven years you've posted here
>much less in the several previous decades, turn into character
>assassination.

Radio gods cannot see their arrogance. They are self-defining.
Radio gods are NEVER guilty of anything. They are never
wrong. :-)

>I read it. Nothing in there about any movement on your part toward
>obtaining an amateur radio license.

My advocacy in here was for the purpose of elimination of the
morse code test for any US radio license.

I've never stated any desire to obtain any amateur radio license
except twice...and then in jest.

What I certainly underestimated was the sheer quantity of radio
gods in here! Far more than ancient days of Mount Olympus.
All the morsemen are so Thor they cannot thit.

>Haven't you gotten the word? Morse testing is on the way out.

Morse code testing is stll the LAW. It has NOT gone away.

Dinosaurs don't die decently, they just argue away.

>We still have licensing for children though.

Heil has an amateur license. Heil is a mental child.

>Your latest dilemma is: Do you try to snag that 5 wpm or do you try to
>wait it out?

No dilemma. My advocacy is simply the elimination of a
morse code test for any radio license.

As a mental childlike dinosaur, Heil doesn't understand.

1153. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 02:29:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321212900.25154.00000909@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63241

In article <3E7AB2AC.EA5B8C6E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>We've been here and done this. No one will come up with a response
>which will please you, a person not involved in amateur radio.

Poor baby, still under delusions of grandeur and god-hood?

Amateur is as amateur does. Heil is an amateur.

Dinosaur Heil seems to think that the only "authority" to discuss
US law is to be licensed in that law.

FCC regulations are law.

Heil has NO qualifications in law to talk about law.

It's as simple as that.

Heil isn't involved in US law.

Ergo, Heil can't talk about it. Heil isn't qualified.

Why is Heil here?

>> Those who love, honor, and worship morse code are fixated on
>> their enobled aptitude and resultant skill. Such do not hesitate
>> to say they are the best in radio because of that single skill...
>> long after morse code became obsolete.
>
>Love, honor and worship? How do you write this stuff without your face
>reddening?

No problem.

Stating a simple fact of observation.

>Now who wrote that the League is an arm of the U.S. government? Nobody
>here wrote anything like that.

Several in here have described ARRL as their "representative"
with "democratic elections."

Go live in Google and go around with buddy Micollis and his
circular logic.

>Are you watching the Sci-Fi Channel again?

No, I'm watching the second Gulf War and seeing a parallel of
old dictatorial morsemen getting theirs just as the Iraqi regime

is getting theirs.

>The ARRL is America's biggest amateur radio membership
>organization. Writing "at best a quarter" is piffle.

ARRL gives out their membership totals periodically. That is
found under the publisher's statement on the QST subpage.

ARRL membership at about a quarter of all licensed US radio
amateurs is FACT.

Dinosaur Heil is still into denial.

>...and you probably wonder why ham radio ops all over the land aren't
>putting up a statue in your honor after all you've done for them.

? Strange statement.

Is Heil thinking about erecting statues for himself? Or just erecting?

>I can't envision amateur radio ever bringing you personal pleasure, Len.
>As a matter of fact, I can't envision you ever taking the first step to
>obtain a license.

Radio god Heil simply cannot envision anyone taking first
steps that His Highness never took.

>You mean like guys who aren't participants in amateur radio who would
>tell us how it should be regulated?

Tsk, tsk, tsk. They do every day. 24/7 in fact. :-)

Those telling you about regulation is the Federal Communications
Commission commissioners and staff.

"...and that's the way it is." :-)

>In other words, you don't have any interest in amateur radio as long as
>there are folks who won't kiss your professional ass?

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Getting more snarly, your Highness? :-)

Is it that your "amateur ass" hasn't gotten any TLC lately?

>*Poof!* That was your rant going up in blue smoke.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Dinosaur Heil imaging things again.

>The regs have changed numerous times since I was licensed.

Oh, my, a QUALIFICATION! :-)

>They changed again nearly three years ago.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, a more recent change unnoticed. Inattention
to the LAW. No problem, Heil isn't qualified in law.

>My self-esteem is intact.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Spelled "steam" wrong... :-)

1154. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 02:29:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321212901.25154.00000911@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63240

In article <c2356669.0303210914.63337281@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Proficiency starts at 10 wpm, therefore the Morse proficiency test is
>already gone in the USA. Element 1 is not, repeat not, a Morse
>proficiency test.

Believe it or not, all of the FCC's license tests were

NEVER

any sort of "proficiency" tests.

The FCC is a radio regulating agency, not an academic institution.

ARRL has long IMPLIED the license tests were a "proficiency (in radio)" sort of test, but they were NEVER so.

1155. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 02:29:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321212901.25154.00000910@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63242

In article <3E7AB2AC.EA5B8C6E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E7899CC.81F8D963@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >A radio amateur. You are some guy who has been standing on the
>> >sidelines for decades.
>>
>> Not at all. I've been a radio and electronics professional for over
>> a half century.
>
>Sorry, Leonard. That doesn't count for squat in amateur radio except
>that you might find it easier to pass the written exams.

It worked in your case...but in an opposite direction. :-)

DOS Tip: Amateur radio is RADIO.

Hello? Radio works by the same physical principals
regardless of the human designation/laws differentiating
the various radio services.

>> Amateur radio does NOT represent the sum total of all radio
>> communications. It is just a hobby activity, a recreation. It is also
>> quite a minor activity in the whole field of radio communications
>> worldwide.
>
>Right. One in which you are not involved.

Heil is not involved in the larger field of other radio.

Heil once held a title in a non-amateur field of radio but
behaved like an amateur in it.

>> >Yet you tell us that you know best how amateur
>> >radio should be regulated.
>>
>> No, I present my arguments for a modernization of US amateur
>> radio regulations.
>
>Based upon what experience?

A half century of other radio.

Another tip, radio god: Maintenance of the Ancient
Radiotelegraphy Society standards and practices is NO
qualification for telling others about modernization.

Stopping snapping your buggy whip old-timers.

>> As an example, use of morse code as a communications mode
>> IS obsolete. Worldwide. It is just not defunct, extinct.
>
>It is no more obsolete than AM or SSB. All are used currently by radio
>amateurs. Shouldn't matter to you. You aren't involved.

Morse code communications mode IS obsolete.

It just isn't extinct yet.

Dinosaur Heil is still into denial.

His world is ending. Slowly but inexorably.

>Sure sounds like you're talking about the elimination of a mode rather
>than the elimination of testing for a mode. It really doesn't matter
>what other services use or don't use. Radio amateurs worldwide use
>morse every day.

Circular logic, like Micollis.

Are you two going around together? :-)

>> The FCC does not demand use of morse code over and above any
>> other mode by US radio amateurs. All allocated modes are
>> optional for use by all US amateur radio licensees, any class, any
>> amateur band. Why does the morse code test remain other than
>> the inertia and lobbying of old-timers at the ITU?
>
>We've been here and done this. No one will come up with a response
>which will please you, a person not involved in amateur radio.

Dinosaur Heil, intolerant of inferior beings, cannot understand
a changing radio world. That is the doom of his radio existance.

>Noooooooo, that isn't all you do. Would you like to fess up or would you
>prefer to be Googled?

Copying the entirety of Google will not erase or change anything.

Stay with the current program.

There is nothing to "confess," Dinosaur Heil.

Morse code communications mode is OBSOLETE.

Morse code is NOT mandated by the FCC over and above
any other allocated mode by any US radio amateur licensee.

The FCC morse code test is OBSOLETE.

Old-time morsemen are the dinosaurs of the radio world.
They will die out. Goodbye pterodactyl, you never flew
well when you did all that flapping.

1156. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 04:15:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321231529.25544.00000243@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 63243

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/21/2003 1:42 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303211342.232e24a2@posting.google.com>

>Steve, a couple of fifty-cent words doesn't release you from your
>obsessive/compulsive behavior

If you insist, Brain.

I am curious as to YOUR credentials in psychology and psychiatry, too,
Brain.

>And you do humiliate, criticize and denigrate hams and non-hams alike
>for sport and recreation

Not really. No more than they insist on being vulgar or obnoxious.

>Bragging about how "easy" we make it should
>tell you something about yourself.

It's not "bragging" if it's fact, Brain. And all it tells me is that you
make it too easy to do.

Now...other than the Navy-Marine Corps thing with Hans or the free use of
dope with Cecil, I'd have a hard time "discrediting" them. They ahve opinions I
don't always like, but neither do they lie or make up outrageous stories that
are unsubstantiated or supported by facts.

You, on the other hand, seem to fall easy prey to such stories by Lennie,
Vippy, et al.

>For example, "cruel" comes to mind.

Why? Because you are unprepared to support your assertions in public and
make it easy to deride you for it? That's your fault, not mine, Brain.

>Best of luck to you.

No luck needed as long as you keep going the way you are. It's like
fishing with fragmentation grenades.

Steve

1157. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 04:24:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321232444.25544.00000244@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 63244

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/21/2003 6:28 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030321212848.25154.00000902@mb-cb.aol.com>

>>"Exaggerated spin"? Where? Show us where an ARRL document was
>>exaggerated.
>
> It's all in Google. Go back to your newsgroup homeland there.

I have. I cannot find any ARRL article in any media where the information
they presented was not supported by facts.

>>The fact is that you dismiss the idea that radio amateurs play ANY
>>communications role in emergencies of any size or scope.
>
> Incorrect.

You're lying, Lennie...

>>Well, there you have it. All a person has to do is disagree with you,
>>and out come the insults.
>
> Poor baby...knows morse and feels that entitles him to insult
> those who don't support morse testing.

So far all we have have seen in the Lennie-vs-N2EY confrontation is Jim
present facts and opinions based upon experience, and Lennie has presented such
argument as calling Jim's comments "sermons", calling him the "Pendantic
Parson", and otehrwise NOT provide ANY rebuttal of any meaningful nature.

>Tsk, tsk, tsk.

You said it, Lennie. You ARE pitiful.

> Incorrect. ARRL practices a form of fraud common to bunco
> artists and confidence men. They also charge heavily for
> shipping on items purchased directly from Newington.

More accusations of unsubstantiated fraud.

And I also make frequent use of mail order texts in my profession. What
ARRL charges for "shipping and handling" is far exceeded by countless other
publishers.

>>News flash: There's been an amateur radio license available in the USA
>>with no code test for more than 12 years. Full privileges license with
>>only a 5 wpm code test for almost 3 years.

>
> News flash: I've been aware and informed of FCC regulations
> since 1956. Was Miccolis aware and informed in 1956?

Bigger news flash: Despite insistence on awareness of FCC regulations
since 1956, Anderson still demonstrates ignorance of them. So what's that say
for "professional radio" men?

Steve, K4YZ

1158. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 04:28:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321232855.25544.00000245@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 63245

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/21/2003 6:01 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030321210132.07005.00000197@mb-bk.aol.com>

>Now he doesn't agree with the conclusion:
>There is no NEED for Morse code testing.

Sure there is. There's a continuing administrative and regulatory
requirement for testing. 47CFR97 refers.

>It may be good to learn to communicate
>to others that use Morse code, but it is NOT essential.

It is if you want an Amateur Radio license with HF privleges in the United
States, Vippy. At least until WRC-03 is over and the appropriate regulations
have been ammended.

Steve, K4YZ

1159. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 04:32:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321233209.25544.00000246@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 63246

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/21/2003 6:28 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030321212858.25154.00000908@mb-cb.aol.com>

>>Now you have me confused, Len. Are you telling me that your wife IS a
>>psychologist?
>
> There is no sense in replying to Heil. He does not accept
> replies unless those replies kiss his royal TLC-needing
> tuches.

Sure there is, Lennie. Just answer a simple question: Does Mrs Lennie posses a license to practice as a psychologist in ANY state of the union? Yes or no will suffice.

Lack of response, either affirmative or negative, will be interpreted as yet another LennieLie.

Steve, K4YZ

1160. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 04:43:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030321234355.25544.00000249@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 63247

>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/21/2003 5:30 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030321203035.07005.00000196@mb-bk.aol.com>

>I would like more EEs or people interested in electronics in Ham radio. If an
>EE goes to a Ham meeting, and see what Ham radio is all about, then often
>they
>would be not be interested in Ham radio

How do you know this? Upon which poll or study to you base your assertion
that EE's attending an Amateur Radio meeting would NOT be interested in Amateur
Radio? Or is this JUST your OPINION?

>Real EEs don't <Morse> code.

OH...?!?!

I worked for a short time in an R&D firm in Atlanta. There were fourteen
Amateurs in the company, all but two (myself being one) who were NOT EE's.
Seven of the twelve were regular CW operators, and then other five used it in
some capacity, including the operation of beacons, EME and meteor scatter
experiments.

(BTW: all of them were BSEE or MSEE's. No associate degrees present
except mine, and again, I was not an EE)

>What is the chance of an experimenter's club gaining such resources? Would
>such
>an organization be approved to be an "ARRL affiliated" club>

Only if they apply for it, Vippy!

>>Now...still on the thread, what actions will YOU take in order to help put
>>the advantages of Amature Radio in front of kids and new licensees,
>>Vipul.
>
>I'm in limbo now.

There's the understatement of the year!

>I cannot take action until a certain "situation" is
>resolved.

Bull.

You have MORE than enough time to spread your unfounded bile in this NG,
Vipul, you can be spending SOME of that time soliciting other like-minded

individuals to join you.

>Perhaps this will change soon.

I doubt it. You do not impress me as a "solutions" kind of guy.

>Most likely amateur radio will be just
>a diversion, so I just don't care anymore.

You obviously care enough to come in here and rec.radio.cnd make up stories and be insulting.

>This may sound bad, but if I get
>something, I can give back.

And vice versa...That's why you are getting this spoon fed back to you, Vippy. Getting the hint yet?

Steve, K4YZ

1161. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 04:54:01 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <J%Rea.31$iP3.17@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 63248

Heck, I know some EEs and some ASEEs as well as BSETs with tickets. I have a serious doubt by many of your posts that you seriously care about any of the tests other than you perceive them as 'hard'. I don't care about Morse one way or the other ... the next thing, I suspect a lot of folks will be whining about the theory. If you even possess algebra and trig you know how easy the tests are. BTW, ...ummmm... Scott, interogative, WTF? Snip a cap here and add a jumper there ... I doubt that adds too much to the book of knowledge, right?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.462 / Virus Database: 261 - Release Date: 3/13/03

1162. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 04:57:53 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <l3Sea.32$v94.31@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 63249

Gentlemen,

Please do a Google search on "French war victories". Then hit the "I'm feeling lucky" button. Let me know what the result is.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.462 / Virus Database: 261 - Release Date: 3/13/03

1163. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 05:11:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7BF058.18DC21A3@att.net>
Source record: 63250

N2EY wrote:

> vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030320232920.03802.00000134@mb-cq.aol.com>...
> > >N2EY
> > ><n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> > >
> > >> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> > >> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
> >
> > >> As of March 15, 2003:
> >
> > N2EY, as an EE, don't you have more pressing matters than to be a tabulation
> > keeper for ARS License Numbers?
>
> Takes me 5 minutes every two weeks to post the numbers. I can spare
> that much time.
>
> > And, on top of that you use Morse code - Double
> > sin.
>
> SIN?? The USE of Morse code is a SIN?!?
>
> Says who?
>
> >You should not do tabulation.
>
> I don't.
>
> >Let the official organizations do that.
>
> Who?
>
> All I do is repost the license totals here twice a month so that there
> will be a record as long as the archives exist. Is that a 'sin'?
>
> > However, your real sin is the advocacy of Morse code <for ALL>.
>
> Why?
> >
> > Tabulation. It does not increase its membership numbers, its activities, or
> > its influence. It is no act of devotion.
>
> What ARE you talking about?

>
> Growth vs. decline is a policy issue. An accurate source of numbers is
> needed for any reasonable discussion.
> >
> > In regards to Morse code -you are now the passive receiver/transmitter of an
> > AUDIOMOTOR skill.
>
> No, it's an active thing. Just like listening/talking, or
> reading/writing. Just another tool in the toolbox.
>
> > Note this is NOT a radio or electronics skill.
>
> I use it on the radio. Therefore, it's a radio skill.
>
> > It is a VISCERAL skill.
>
> Is that a 'sin', too?
>
> > It has NO importance anywhere, other than in a
> > self-congratulatory organization.
> >
> It has importance whenever I use it on the amateur radio bands.
>
> btw, what is this "self-congratulatory organization" you mentioned?
>
> > Even if you were a Ham first, then became an EE, learn to put Morse in
> > perspective.
>
> What does that mean? Morse code skill is just one of the desirable
> radio skills I think all hams should try to develop. I've got a
> list...
>
> For example, long ago I learned the standard phonetics "alfa, bravo,
> charlie..." to improve my voice operating skills. Don't even have to
> think about them now, I just rattle them off. Was that a 'sin"?
>
> > Ham radio is primarily NOT a "hobby".
>
> Tell it to Mr. Anderson.
>
> > The traditions, rituals,
> > practices form a unified belief system that resembles a CULT.
>
> Nonsense.
> >
> > Ham radio is useful if you selectively participate.
>
> Isn't that what we all do? Pick out the parts you like and do them. I
> like Morse code, SSB, AM, FM, homebrewing, kitbuilding, ragchewing,
> contesting, elmering and a few other things.

>
> > Those occasional useful
> > aspects then benefit you. Otherwise it can be a drain. One is the sum total of
> > experiences, paid with the price of efforts. So, being immersed in the "Ham"
> > radio hobby can result in the negative.
>
> What ARE you talking about?
> >
> > A spouse/and our relative would give you a piece of their <unkind> words for
> > that.
>
> It's called being balanced.
>
> > I know. Sadly, I had to try and defend Ham radio. I try to say Hams are
> > not weird. They do socialize. They are professionals and interested in
> > technical aspects. Worst part is, from my own observation, I actually agree
> > with them.
>
> You're not looking in the right places, then.
> >
> > Those that do not believe and stay have self esteem issues. Those that do
> > believe are delusional. I am not talking about image to impress family,
> > friends, or society. I am talking about one's own pride.
>
> I have no idea what that is supposed to mean.
>
> Get a grip, Vipul. Ham radio is about radio for its own sake, because
> people find it to be rewarding in ways other than being paid money. No
> 'sin' in that. Do what you find rewarding and let the rest go by.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Are you *SURE* that vshah isn't Cootie Boy in drag?

1164. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 05:17:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7BF1E1.F72DF073@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63451

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E7B3DD3.B13A8275@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E79FB19.29AAF4BC@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030319190735.23139.00001430@mb-da.aol.com>...

> > > Dave, I'm not asking to be pleased nor displeased. I want to know
> > > what is "proficient."
> >
> > No you don't. There is no answer to your question which will
> > please you.
>
> Then there is no authoritative answer to the question. Your guesses
> don't satisfy.

What'd I tell you.

> I'd certainly like to read the lines. Please quote the Title 47
> paragraph and line number defining Morse Code proficiency.

I didn't quote Title 47.

> > > You may define proficiency using a wpm rate, and an accuracy level.
> > >
> > > Jim is on record at 10WPM.
> >
> > You must not have read any of my post. How is it possible for you
> > respond without reading it?
>
> Of course I read your post. You said this much code is more
> proficient than that much code. That's not much of an definition.

You see, there is no answer which will please you.

Dave K8MN

1165. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 05:36:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7BF6C3.945E7337@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63452

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >Is someone who is goog at memorizing electronic formulae supposed to be
> >better than a good volleyball player?
>
> I have the ability to do realtime encoding/decoding also and enjoy that also.

On or off the volleyball court?

> Neither skill is more important in society, but this is a technical hobby.

This society, as a whole, doesn't give a hoot about volleyball players
or radio amateurs.

> >> Note this is NOT a radio or electronics skill.

> >The only place I've used morse is on the radio.
>
> It is translating sounds into characters. This is not an electronics skill.

I did not respond that I believed morse code to be an electronics skill.
It can certainly be a radio skill. As I said, I've never used morse
other than on the radio.

> > I guess everything where people bond
> >together in a joint interest looks like a cult to someone who sees
> >himself as an outsider.
>
> Not when the mannerisms and traditions tend to follow certain
> conventions that are not required for radio operation.

Why should mannerisms and traditions bother you?

> Even Hams know this, thats why they say certain things are "true" Ham > activities.

I don't know any radio amateurs who say anything like that.

> Here are some examples of cult activity. Excessive jargons, hatred of > CB, Morse code,
Wouff Hong (okay - cheap shot).

I'm going to guess that you really have no idea of what takes place at a
Wouff Hong ceremony. I'm also going to guess that you didn't mean to
imply hatred of CB, hatred of morse code and hatred of Wouff Hong.
Just how much jargon is considered excessive and who gets to be the
judge?

> >> Those occasional useful
> >> aspects then benefit you.
> >
> >What "occasional" aspects?
>
> Antenna setups, projects, new operating modes.

Why should I be bound by your "occasional aspects"?

> >> A spouse/and our relative would give you a piece of their <unkind> words
> >for
> >> that. I know.
> >
> >How do you know?
>
> Hard to justify going to a Hamfest or Ham meeting.

I don't know how they do things where you live. I usually announce that
I plan to attend a hamfest or a club meeting. Then I go to the hamfest
or club meeting. Why do I need to justify going? Have you given
control of your daily life to some sort of family cult?

> There must be a useful topic
> (to other, not me) scheduled to justify going to a Ham meeting.

I feel no such need to have a "useful" topic. I mostly go for the
socializing with others who have similar interests. We might munch on
donuts and drink coffee. We swap stories. We have a short business
meeting. We may have a program. We may not. We may even have a program
which is of no interest to me whatever. I sit through it politely. At
no point in any such meeting do I raise my hand and announce that I
believe the club setup is all wrong or that the club's raison d'etre
must be do design or build more projects. Nobody else does that either.

Dave K8MN

1166. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 07:29:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0303212329.618a9844@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63453

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030321212900.25154.00000909@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> In article <3E7AB2AC.EA5B8C6E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
>
> >We've been here and done this. No one will come up with a response
> >which will please you, a person not involved in amateur radio.
>
> Poor baby, still under delusions of grandeur and god-hood?
>
> Amateur is as amateur does. Heil is an amateur.
>
> Dinosaur Heil seems to think that the only "authority" to discuss
> US law is to be licensed in that law.
>
> FCC regulations are law.
>
> Heil has NO qualifications in law to talk about law.
>
> It's as simple as that.
>
> Heil isn't involved in US law.
>
> Ergo, Heil can't talk about it. Heil isn't qualified.
>
> Why is Heil here?
>
>
> >> Those who love, honor, and worship morse code are fixated on
> >> their enobled aptitude and resultant skill. Such do not hesitate
> >> to say they are the best in radio because of that single skill...
> >> long after morse code became obsolete.
> >
> >Love, honor and worship? How do you write this stuff without your face
> >reddening?
>
> No problem.
>
> Stating a simple fact of observation.
>
>
> >Now who wrote that the League is an arm of the U.S. government? Nobody
> >here wrote anything like that.

>
> Several in here have described ARRL as their "representative"
> with "democratic elections."
>
> Go live in Google and go around with buddy Micollis and his
> circular logic.
>
>
> >Are you watching the Sci-Fi Channel again?
>
> No, I'm watching the second Gulf War and seeing a parallel of
> old dictatorial morsemen getting theirs just as the Iraqi regime
> is getting theirs.
>
> >The ARRL is America's biggest amateur radio membership
> >organization. Writing "at best a quarter" is piffle.
>
> ARRL gives out their membership totals periodically. That is
> found under the publisher's statement on the QST subpage.
>
> ARRL membership at about a quarter of all licensed US radio
> amateurs is FACT.
>
> Dinosaur Heil is still into denial.
>
>
>
> >...and you probably wonder why ham radio ops all over the land aren't
> >putting up a statue in your honor after all you've done for them.
>
> ? Strange statement.
>
> Is Heil thinking about erecting statues for himself? Or just erecting?
>
>
> >I can't envision amateur radio ever bringing you personal pleasure, Len.
> >As a matter of fact, I can't envision you ever taking the first step to
> >obtain a license.
>
> Radio god Heil simply cannot envision anyone taking first
> steps that His Highness never took.
>
>
> >You mean like guys who aren't participants in amateur radio who would
> >tell us how it should be regulated?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. They do every day. 24/7 in fact. :-)
>
> Those telling you about regulation is the Federal Communications
> Commission commissioners and staff.

>
> "...and that's the way it is." :-)
>
>
> >In other words, you don't have any interest in amateur radio as long as
> >there are folks who won't kiss your professional ass?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Getting more snarly, your Highness? :-)
>
> Is it that your "amateur ass" hasn't gotten any TLC lately?
>
>
>
> >*Poof!* That was your rant going up in blue smoke.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Dinosaur Heil imaging things again.
>
>
> >The regs have changed numerous times since I was licensed.
>
> Oh, my, a QUALIFICATION! :-)
>
> >They changed again nearly three years ago.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, a more recent change unnoticed. Inattention
> to the LAW. No problem, Heil isn't qualified in law.
>
> >My self-esteem is intact.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Spelled "steam" wrong...

Don't you have ANYTHING better to do with your life you flaming PUTZ??

w3rv

1167. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 11:26:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030322062642.05048.00001277@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63454

In article <3E7BF058.18DC21A3@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>> Get a grip, Vipul. Ham radio is about radio for its own sake, because
>> people find it to be rewarding in ways other than being paid money. No
>> 'sin' in that. Do what you find rewarding and let the rest go by.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Are you *SURE* that vshah isn't Cootie Boy in drag?

Who knows? Vipul certainly has a much, much better command of English.

Today is March 22. Just 11 days to go until ol' Masa has to make good on his promise of April 2, 1998. You know, the one where he promised to do something special if the number of hams was greater on April 2, 2003 than it was on April 2, 1998.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1168. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 12:23:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030322072349.16326.00000165@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 63455

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 3/22/2003 3:26 AM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030322062642.05048.00001277@mb-cs.aol.com>

>Today is March 22. Just 11 days to go until ol' Masa has to make good on his
>promise of April 2, 1998. You know, the one where he promised to do something
>special if the number of hams was greater on April 2, 2003 than it was on
>April
>2, 1998.

Do you think he's any better at keeping his word than Lennie is?

Steve

1169. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 13:26:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030322082654.25154.00000912@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63456

In article <20030321212852.25154.00000903@mb-cb.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0303211019.483d7d10@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>btw, "radio and electronics professional" covers a lot of ground.
>>Anybody who ever worked in a Radio Shack or circuit City store can
>>claim the same thing.
>
> I'm sure you do. :-)

I never worked in a store of any kind.
>
> Let's just take a look at who I've worked for

This is not a newsgroup for CVs.

>>> It is just a hobby activity, a recreation.
>>
>>Incorrect.
>
> It isn't a hobby or recreation?

It isn't >*JUST*< a hobby or recreation.

> Oh, my, then the FCC has classified it wrong.

Where in Part 97 do the words "hobby" or "recreation" appear as a complete
description of the amateur radio service?
>
> Amateur radio is not referred to as Public Safety Radio
> Service. It isn't Mass Media Radio Service. It isn't anything
> else but AMATEUR radio service...i.e., not accepting money
> for radio services rendered.

All that means is it's not-for-profit.

> It's NOT professional.

So?
>
>>> It is also
>>> quite a minor activity in the whole field of radio communications
>>> worldwide.
>>
>>Then why are you, a non-participant and bystander, so obsessed with

>>it?
>
> I'm a radio hobbyist. I'm just not licensed in amateur radio.
>
> I'm not "obsessed." :-)

Denial is one of the defining characteristics of an obsession.
>
> I'm just advocating the elimination of a morse code test for
> any US radio license.

That and a minimum age requirement.

Plus a lot of garbage aimed at anyone who dares to disagree with your cherished
opinions or point out mistakes in your faulty arguments.

>>> >Yet you tell us that you know best how amateur
>>> >radio should be regulated.
>>>
>>> No, I present my arguments for a modernization of US amateur
>>> radio regulations.
>>
>>Once in a great while. The rest of the time you behave as described in
>>my oft-quoted profile.
>
> Poor baby...engaged in indirect character assassination, are
> you? :-)

How is an accurate description of your behavior "character assassination"?

>>Your "modernization of US amateur radio regulations" ideas amount to
>>these two items, and nothing more:
>>
>>1) Get rid of the Morse code test
>>
>>2) Require that all hams be at least 14 years old to get any class of
>>license.
>
>>> As an example, use of morse code as a communications mode
>>> IS obsolete. Worldwide.
>>
>>Only if you define 'obsolete' to mean 'in daily use by many thousands
>>of radio operators'. Otherwise, you're flat-out WRONG, Len.
>
> OBSOLETE. The word has two meanings: "1. No longer in
> use, 2. Out of date."

Neither of which fits Morse code as a communications mode on the amateur bands.
So you are flat out wrong, Len.
>
> FCC doesn't mandate morse code use over and above any other
> allocated mode. All allocated modes are optional to all US

> amateur licensees. The amateur morse code test IS obsolete
> and out of date to the FCC.
>
First you said the mode was obsolete, now it's the test. Backpedaling.

> Except for Maritime Radio Service in the USA on the great lakes,
> morse code isn't needed or required by any other US radio
> service.

So? This isn't a maritime newsgroup. Do try to stay focused.

> The Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society keeps endorsing
> morsemanship to keep their living museum of amateurism
> going as it once was.

Now who would you be referring to?
>
>>> It is just not defunct, extinct.
>>
>>Actually, it's alive and well. And growing. There are probably more
>>hams using Morse code today than there were hams back in the 1930s.
>
> Americans have much more time available for leisure pursuits
> today than the 72% who were able to keep working during the
> Great Depression of the 1930s.

How do you know? Were you employed during theGreat Depression of the 1930s?
>
> What is Miccollis' obsession with standards and practices of
> the 1930s?

Who is "Miccollis"?
>
>>There are more varieties of keys, keyers, paddles, and other Morse
>>code related equipment available to hams today than ever before. More
>>models of manufactured and kit amateur radio equipment capable of
>>Morse code operation available to hams than ever before, too. And at
>>lower inflation-adjusted prices! Pretty good for an "obsolete" mode!
>
> Well, then, go and convince the FCC that it should, at all costs,
> keep that morse code test for amateurs!

First you said the mode was obsolete, now it's the test. Backpedaling.
>
> There was no transistor or integrated circuit available in the 1930s.
> All of the "automatic" keyers were mechanical and from only a
> few vendors.

And the significance of this is?
>
> In the 1930s Bill Halligan was just starting up his radio business
> in the Chicago area. National Radio was already established.
> I'm not sure on the exact start of Collins Radio but it was at or

> about the start of the Great Depression. Heath Company was
> not doing anything in electronics...it made airplane parts.

Don't forget Hammarlund, and Petersen, and a bunch of other manufacturers. Like
Vibroplex, which is still in business today, making ....telegraph keys!

And the significance of this is?

> Morse
> code was king in radio communications for small radio stations
> (except broadcasting and the common carrier SSB folks).

Hams were using AM and SSB. Broadcasting was using AM and FM.

What's your point?
>
> In 2003 is there a Hallicrafters still in business? No. Is there a
> National Radio Co. still in business? No, it got sold a long time
> ago. Collins Radio is still in business as a division of Rockwell
> International but quit making amateur radio equipment a long
> time ago. The Heath Company and Heathkits went kaput from
> any radio market except reselling wireless door chimes.

Instead, we have Yaesu, Kenwood, Icom, Ten-Tec, Alinco, MFJ and its many
subsidiaries, Alpha, and a whole bunch of small companies like Elecraft,
Wilderness and Red Hot Radio.

What's your point?
>
> There are approximately 135 MILLION cellular telephone
> subscribers in the USA now. [a cell phone is a little two-way
> radio] That means at least that many little cell phones, none
> of which require morse code skills to operate them.

So? No morse code test for all amateur privileges on VHF/UHF. Cell phones
operate on UHF.

This is not a cellphone newsgroup.
>
> There are more NON-MORSE radios other than cell phones
> in use today in all other radio services than there ever were
> US radio amateurs since 1912.

So? This is not a newgroup for "other radio services".
>
>>Here's a bit of history for ya, Len: Back in the '60s, when amateur
>>radio equipment manufacturers really began churning out HF
>>transceivers, most of those transceivers had minimal Morse code
>>performance and features. Some did not even allow Morse code operation
>>at all!
>
> Wow, that must have REALLY stung the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
> Society!!! :-)

>
Who?

>>> Other radio services worldwide have either dropped morse code
>>> mode communications or never considered it in the beginning of
>>> a radio service.
>>
>>Their goals and resources are different.
>
> Of course. The epitome of US amateur radio is "working DX
> on HF with CW." :-)

Only according to you.
>
>>It is illogical to judge what hams do by what other radio services are
>>doing.
>
> It is illogical and emotionally immature to demand adherence
> to standards and practices in amateurism that came into
> being before most US radio amateurs were born.

IOW, "old" = "bad". Guess what, Len - you're old.
>
>>> The FCC does not demand use of morse code over and above any
>>> other mode by US radio amateurs.
>>
>>You keep repeating that mantra, but never tell us why it's important.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Illogical. :-)

Yes, your statements are often illogical ;-)
>
> FCC doesn't require its use, therefore it is illogical to have a
> manual test for it.

FCC doesn't require radio amateurs to build their radio equipment, either, or
even understand how it works. So, by your reasoning, it is illogical to have a
written test for radio theory beyond that necessary to understand the rules.

FCC thinks that the 35 question written test now required for Technician is
adequate proof of qualification for hams to design, build, adjust, repair,
align and operate radio transmitters on all authorized amateur modes and
frequencies above 30 MHz. At power levles up to 1500 W. Therefore, by your
reasoning,
it is illogical for the General and Extra written tests to contain any radio
theory other than HF/MF propagation.
>
>>> Why does the morse code test remain other than
>>> the inertia and lobbying of old-timers at the ITU?
>>
>>This has been explained to you many, many times. It remains because
>>S25.5 requires it, and FCC won't change its interpretation of S25.5.

>
> Incorrect. FCC made the "send by hand" portion of S25.5
> optional. There is no option in S25.5 for them to do so.

That was over 20 years ago.

FCC has said they won't change their current interpretation of S25.5. Read the
R&O.

>>If you want Element 1 to go away, convince the FCC that they were
>>wrong when they wrote the R&O for the 2000 restructuring.
>
> I tried to in Comments on NPRM 98-143. :-)

You failed. Poor baby ;-)
>
> Do you need a copy of my document? :-)

No thanks, we have plenty of bathroom tissue in this house ;-)

>>If you want Element 1 to go away, convince the FCC that they were
>>wrong when they wrote the R&O for the 2000 restructuring.
>
> Why?

Because FCC makes the rules.

1170. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 14:54:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAA1E362.14322%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63457

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:

> If you are for real...then vote the bum out
> of office. But I think the damage is already
> done. We, the USA, will NO LONGER TRUST
> FRANCE. In fact you have become as irrelevant
> as the UN.

You do not represent, or speak for, the USA.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1171. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 15:27:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030322102709.05048.00001279@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63458

In article <20030322072349.16326.00000165@mb-mr.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 22 Mar 2003 12:23:49 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>Date: 3/22/2003 3:26 AM Pacific Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030322062642.05048.00001277@mb-cs.aol.com>
>
>>Today is March 22. Just 11 days to go until ol' Masa has to make good on his
>>promise of April 2, 1998. You know, the one where he promised to do
>something
>>special if the number of hams was greater on April 2, 2003 than it was on
>>April
>>2, 1998.
>
> Do you think he's any better at keeping his word than Lennie is?
>
I will clap my hands if he is.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1172. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 15:54:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303220754.2747ffe8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63459

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030321231529.25544.00000243@mb-fm.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/21/2003 1:42 PM Pacific Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303211342.232e24a2@posting.google.com>
>
> >Steve, a couple of fifty-cent words doesn't release you from your
> >obsessive/compulsive behavior
>
> If you insist, Brain.

I do insist. You're rants make it quite clear. Seek professional help. Given that you claim to work in the medical field, you should have a good plan to help you through these times. Best of luck to you.

1173. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 15:58:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303220758.1258e3ee@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63460

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E7BF1E1.F72DF073@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E7B3DD3.B13A8275@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E79FB19.29AAF4BC@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030319190735.23139.00001430@mb-da.aol.com>...
>
> > > > > Dave, I'm not asking to be pleased nor displeased. I want to know
> > > > > what is "proficient."
> > > >
> > > No you don't. There is no answer to your question which will
> > > please you.
> > >
> > Then there is no authoritative answer to the question. Your guesses
> > don't satisfy.
>
> What'd I tell you.

You told me that there is no authorative answer to my question and
that you were just guessing.

> > I'd certainly like to read the lines. Please quote the Title 47
> > paragraph and line number defining Morse Code proficiency.
>
> I didn't quote Title 47.

Could you if "Morse Proficiency" were defined there?

> > > > You may define proficiency using a wpm rate, and an accuracy level.
> > > >
> > > > Jim is on record at 10WPM.
> > >
> > > You must not have read any of my post. How is it possible for you
> > > respond without reading it?
> > >
> > Of course I read your post. You said this much code is more
> > proficient than that much code. That's not much of an definition.
>

> You see, there is no answer which will please you.

Only because you are not an authority, and the authority in the USA has not defined "Morse Proficiency."

You were merely guessing.

1174. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 17:32:42 UTC
From: dugadare@aol.comDogie
Message-ID: <20030322123242.05035.00000209@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 63461

You speak as Aaron Voobner,you asshole!!

http://www.geocities.com/aarronvoobner/
n8 is cool

1175. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 18:06:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5i9hd$9df$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63462

And guess what Dwight? Neither do you. But I damn sure have the right to
tell them what I think.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAA1E362.14322%stewart@say.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
> > If you are for real...then vote the bum out
> > of office. But I think the damage is already
> > done. We, the USA, will NO LONGER TRUST
> > FRANCE. In fact you have become as irrelevant
> > as the UN.
>
>
> You do not represent, or speak for, the USA.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>
> ------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

1176. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 18:08:10 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5i9hf$9df$2@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63463

Thats funny.

Dan/W4NTI

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:l3Sea.32$v94.31@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> Gentlemen,
>
> Please do a Google search on "French war victories". Then hit the "I'm
> feeling lucky" button. Let me know what the result is.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.462 / Virus Database: 261 - Release Date: 3/13/03
>
>

1177. ARNewsline 1336 - March 21 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-22 19:18:54 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030322141854.25689.00000426@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 63464

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1336 – March 21, 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1336 with a release date of Friday, March 21 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. War in the middle East and ham radio prepares to help defend itself and the American homeland. Find out what you can do on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1336 coming your way right now.

The following is a Q-S-T. War looms on the horizon in the middle East, and ham radio prepares to help defend itself and the American homeland. Find out what you can do on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1336 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

AMERICA AT WAR: HAM RADIO PREPARES

America's terror threat level has again been raised to "Code Orange." This in the wake of President Bush’s ultimatum to Iraqui dictator Saddam Hussein. And with our nation on high alert for terrorist attacks, Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge outlined a national plan Tuesday March 18th. One that he said would increase America's at-home defenses. Part of it is in the area of personal communications. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Norm Seeley, KI7UP, has the latest on this and the way ham radio can be prepared:

--

The plan, which Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge has named Operation Liberty Shield heightens security at the nation's borders, airports, seaports and railways. It also provides additional security at nuclear and chemical plans along with protecting elements of the nation's food supply and distribution system.

As you have probably heard in other n ews reports, vehicles are again will be subject to random inspections on roads leading into and out of airports, sea-ports and similar facilities. Most of those who will making inspection stops are probably unaware of ham radio equipment and why hams have it in their cars. Akll they will sdee is a different kind of radio that they have never experienced before. So, for the forseeable future Amateur Radio operators would be well advised to carry a copy of their license with them if they are driving a vehicle equiped with an antenna array anyplace close to a high security area. Its much simpler to show you ham ticket to the inspector than to try to explain the hobby while a long line of cars behibd you are honking their horns.

Also suggested by Holeland Security is for every family put in place an emergency communication plan. This plan should be specific to a given family unit, understood by all of its members and practiced regularly.

Some experts have recommended that a family communications plan not be totally dependant on land based or cvellular telephones that can easily become overloaded in an emergency. Recommended are forms of personal radio including FRS and the new M.U.R.S. service. Families where all members are licensed radio amateurs have a definite advantage here. If your wife and kids are not yet hams, now might be a hood time to make getting them all tickets as a super high priority. Three places on the web you can find training information are www.arrl.org, www.w5yi.org and www.gordonwestradioschool.com. And gordonwestradioschool is one word.

Radio amateurs involved in civil defense and disaster preparedness should now be on high alert as well. Radio gear should be in tip-top shape, tested daily and H-T batteries should be maintained at full charge. Do the same spare battery sets. Also, have one or more sets of alkaline cells ready to go. If the power goes out you will have no way to quickly recharge your NiCad or NiMH packs.

If you belong to an emergency service group like ARES or RACES, make sure your leaders know how to contact you 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Take part in regular any scheduled on-the-air drills so that you will be knife-edge sharp if your services are needed.

And if you have never had Emergency Communications training, don’t wait. The ARRL is the only national Amateur Radio group certified to provide you with the schooling you need and courses are available right now. As soon as this newscast is over we urge you to go to the League’s website at www.arrl.org and to sign up.

Meantime, the American Red Cross is urging families and individuals across the nation to make appropriate preparations. The relief agency suggests everyone follow the Red Cross Recommendations for the Homeland Security Advisory System. It’s on the web at www.redcross.org.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Norm Seely, KI7UP, reporting.

--

We will have more on ham radio and its part in defending America against the threat of terrorism in future Amateur Radio Newsline reports. (ARNewsline™)

**

AMERICA AT WAR: PROTECTING THE NATIONS COMMUNICATIONS

With war now reality and the possibility of terrorism, leaders from the telecommunications, Internet Service Provider, satellite and cable industries have begun consideration of widespread recommendations to help restore communications services in the event of an attack on the nation’s communications infrastructure. Some of the recommendations were presented by members of the Network Reliability and Interoperability Council at its quarterly meeting March 14th at the FCC.

In developing what the group calls its best practices for service continuity and disaster recovery, the industry representatives identified and analyzed more than 200 such concepts. These cover a wide range of scenarios. And for the first time in the area of cyber security the communications industry has conducted a thorough assessment and analysis of its vulnerabilities.

The 56-member council vote on which recommendations to put in place will be completed on March 28th. (Published news reports)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: ARISS TO CONTINUE WHILE SHUTTLES ARE GROUNDED

The grounding of America's Space Shuttles following the February 1st Columbia disaster has not had any major impact on Amateur Radio. Roy Neal, K6DUE, brings us up to date on whats happening in the shuttle program and with manned ham radio in space:

--

The announcements by NASA that its having Boeing build a new Orbital Space Plane and that it hopes to have the remaining Space Shuttles back in the sky by this fall signal a turning point for the space agency. It is telling the world that things are getting back on track.

But in there here and now there are still several months before full space operations resume. Amateur Radio on the International Space Station Chairman Frank Bauer, KA3HDO, says that ARISS is prepared for any eventuality.

According to Bauer, until the shuttles fly there will be less scientific work taking place on the International Space Station. This is because of the reduced on-orbit staffing of two member crews.

Bauer believes the most probable scenario for a crew change will be what we reported two weeks ago. That U-S Astronaut Ed Lu, KC5WKK and Russian Cosmonaut Yuri Malenchenko will fly to the I-S-S on a Soyuz rocket to become the Expedition 7 crew. But Bauer adds that Astronaut Mike Foale, KB5UAC, is a back-up for the crew -- also in training -- just in case he is needed. He also notes that Astronaut Pedro Duque, KC5RGG, who planned to use the ARISS equipment on the upcoming Soyuz transport flight, will now probably fly in the fall.

Baueer says that the only major setback for ham radio so far concerns upgrading the I-S-S ham station itself. According to KA3HDO, with the shuttles not flying, consumables like food and water are the highest priority items to be launched on the upcoming Progress re-supply missions. This means that the ARISS hardware that was planned to be flown this year will probably be delayed. The gear waiting for transport includes the Slow Scan Television equipment, plus Kenwood D700 and Yeasu FT-100 radios and the Naval Academy's P C Sat 2 ham satellite. Bauer says that this equipment will be kept ready for any upcoming transport flight opportunities to the I-S-S.

The good news: Bauer says that the opportunities for school contacts will remain at the same. Look for them at a rate of at least two a week. Maybe more if the Expedition 7 crew finds itself with extra free time.

Right now, it appears as if ARISS operation from the I-S-S will continue on as it has since operations resumed. This, as investigators on the ground work to determine what caused the Columbia to disintegrate as it attempted to land last month and get ready to return the rest of the shuttle fleet to service later this year.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Roy Neal, K6DUE.

--

The only item not touched on by Bauer was open contacts with the ham radio public. These tend to occurr only when the crew has some unscheduled free time. (ARISS)

**
Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the W8WKY Sivercreek Amateur Radio Association repeater in Doylestown, Ohio.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: UK RADIO CLUB FIRE

Back on Earth, a radio club meeting is interupted by a fire. It happened in the U-K and Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, joins us from Nottingham Englanmd with the details:

--

The Bredhurst Receiving and Transmitting Society's quiz night on the 6th of March was interrupted by what all members present assumed to be a power cut. However, club member Terry Wheeler, G7MIM, went out to investigate and discovered that a fire had broken out in the room above the club. He calmly asked the members to leave the premises and the evacuation of the building took place in a swift, orderly and calm manner. Richard, G7PPE, tried to open the door of the flat above the club room where the fire had started as the occupant was still inside, but was unable to break down the door. Fire crews arrived in a matter of minutes and the occupant was rescued and taken to hospital. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH.

--

Jean Darley, G1DLL, the Secretary of the Bredhurst Receiving and Transmitting Society says -- and we quote: "It's never a dull moment if you're a member of our radio society." G1DLL is also now trying to find an alternative venue for the club to meet. (GB2RS)

**

RADIO LAW: ANTENNA PROTECTION - CALIFORNIA TRIES AGAIN

If at first you don’t succeed, try again. And that’s exactly what hams in California are doing as they try to convince the state legislature and the governor that its time to offer protection for their antennas and towers. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Bruce Tennant, K6PZW has more:

--
March 26th is the date for a legislative hearing on California's latest attempt to pass an Amateur Radio antenna protection bill. The ARRL Letter says that Assembly Bill 1228 was introduced February 21st by Assemblyman Bob Dutton. It has been referred to the Committee on Local Government for consideration.

ARRL Pacific Division Director Bob Vallio, W6RGG, and the League’s antenna expert Dean Straw, N6BV, are among those scheduled to testify on behalf of AB 1228. Several others also plan to attend.

Back in 2000, the California Legislature passed a bill incorporating the essence of PRB-1, but Governor Gray Davis vetoed the measure. At that time the Governor said his opposition stemmed from a lack of budgetary funds to complete the required studies and his personal belief that amateur antennas should be considered a local rather than a state issue. The earlier California measure had carried a price tag of between $70,000 and $100,000 to fund studies and a model ordinance that lawmakers required.

Organizers behind the current bill say the new measure, being called "The Emergency Communications Enhancement Act," will not carry any price tag. A copy of the current legislative proposal is available on-line the California State Legislature web site.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

So far, 16 states have incorporated the essence of PRB-1 into their laws or have approved Amateur Radio antenna legislation that includes minimum regulatory heights for antenna structures. (ARRL)

**

RADIO LAW: CALIFORNIA WORKING TO MOBILE CELL PHONE BAN

Still in the Golden State, a bill requiring cell phone users to use handsfree devices while driving has been adopted by a powerful California Assembly committee. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has been following the story and has the latest developments:

--

The measure passed the California Assembly Transportation Committee on a 14 to 5 vote on Monday March 10th. This, after falling a single vote short of passage for the past two legislative sessions.

The bill's author is Assemblyman Joe Simitian, of Palo Alto. He has called the committee's approval the first step to saving lives on California roads and highways.

Under the Simitian's bill a first offense for using a cell phone while driving a motor vehicle would result in a mandatory $20 fine. Subsequent violations would carry a maximum fine of $50. Drivers could use handsfree cell phones without threat of a penalty.

The measure is exclusive to mobile cellular telephone use. It reportedly excludes all other forms of two-way radio communications. The bill now heads to the state Appropriations Committee for further hearings.

Reporting from near the city of Valencia California, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

If the measure eventually becomes law, California will become the second state to require handsfree use of cell phones by drivers. New York was the first back in 2001. (ARNewsline™ from various reports and sources.)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC ALLEGES NUMEROUS VIOLATIONS ONB MICHIGAN REPEATER

A pair of Michigan repeater operators have been told to cease operating their systems under automatic control. This, as the FCC launches an investigation into charges of several rules violations. The agency's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, has more;

--

Duckworth: "The Detroit District Director issued an order to cease autonmatic control of Amateur repeater station K5YHA to Sheri Gilbert and an order to cease automatic control of Amateur repeater station K5EKP to William Gilbert, both of Lupton Michigan. Both stations are under review by the Enforcerment Bureau for apparent violations of the Commissions rules inccluding inadaquite station control and deliberate interference."

--

In a letter February 24th letter to the Gilberts, FCC Special Counsel Riley Hollingsworth alleges that numerous rule violations have taken place on the repeater. Also that the repeater is the source of interference to the K8GER system. He said that Violations on the repeater consisted of failure to identify by some users, use of false or misleading call signs by users and failure to have a control operator for the repeater. Hollingsworth alleges that back in January the Gilberts' apparently turned the operation of the repeater over to a car rally. During that time several of these type of rule violations occurred for more than 12 hours during a two-day period.

The letters warns the Gilberts' that that if they are unwilling or unable to prevent violations on their repeater, then their Amateur operator and station licenses will be subject to enforcement action by the Commission. This could include a fine, operator license suspension or station license revocation. The Gilbert's have since informed the FCC that the repeater has been taken off the air. (FCC)

**

AT THE FCC: NOW WE HAVE COALS

The acronym laden Federal Communications Commission has added COALS to its dictionary. This, as the regulatory agency begins implementation of the Cable Operations and Licensing System by Report and Order on March 13th.

With COALS the FCC has expanded its electronic filing capabilities to make it easier for multichannel video programming distributors to submit applications, reports, and other documents. The FCC says that COALS also makes license and cable operational information more accessible to FCC staff. This in turn makes for more efficiency in monitoring spectrum usage and competitive conditions in the cable and multichannel video marketplace. The FCC adds that the introduction of COALS represents more progress in the FCC’s own modernization initiative. (FCC)

**

RADIO RULES: MEDIA OWNERSHIP HEARINGS

It looks like there will be more public hearings on media ownership restrictions. A Democrat on the Federal Communications Commission plans to hold two more hearings, sidestepping the wishes of the agency's Republican chairman.

Commissioner Michael Copps says he will hold hearings at the University of Washington in Seattle and Duke University in Durham, North Carolina. Copps is seeking public input on the F-C-C's review of whether decades-old media ownership restrictions are appropriate in a market altered by the growth of the Internet, satellite boadcasting and cable television.

FCC chairman Michael Powell had previously said that the hearing he held in Richmond, Virginia, on February 27th is all that's needed. Powell said that the agency has received 13 thousand comments from the public, most filed electronically. (FCC)

**

HAM RADIO CUDOS: PAUL HARVEY HONORS HAMS

Radio commentator Paul Harvey dchose Wednesday, March 19th to honor ham radio. In his broadcast, Harvey described radio amateurs as America's quiet warriors. He said that there are 700,000 of them who are unpaid, uncelebrated, civilian, radio operators, who are there during and after floods, fires and tornadoes. And says Harvey, after the 911 attack hams were indispensable in reuniting families.

It was a very unexpected salute to the nations ham radio community. You can find it on the web at www.paulharvey.com. Look for the show dated March 19th. (W6RCL)

**

CHANGING OF THE GUARD: MARC TONNA, F9FT, - SK

A pioneer in antenna design has passed on. According to a notice on thew A.F.T. antenna wwebsite, company founder Marc Tonna, F9FT died on March 2nd at the age of 91.

Way back in 1946, Marc Tonna revisited the design described by the Japanese searchers Yagi and Uda in 1926. Tonna brought to the Yagi improvements that made his antennas famous among the radio-amateurs, as well as in the field of the then uprising commercial TV. He later went on to become the co-founder of the company Antennes Tonna which today is known as A.F.T.. (AFT)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: NEW ARKANSAS SM

Dennis Schaefer, W5RZ, has been appointed as the new Arkansas ARRL Section Manager. He succeeds Bob Ideker, WB5VUH, who first served as Section Manager from 1991 through 1995 and who returned to office in 2001.

And heres where it become rather uinteresting. Ideker had decided to not run for another term. Eldon Bryant, K7ZQR, was elected to replace him. But Bryant later decided not to assume the office and Schaefer was named as his replacement.

Schaefer’s term begins on April 1st. Arkansas ARRL members -- or anyone elser can contact him by e-mail to w5rz@arrl.org (ARRL)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: CALL IT MC INTERNET

Hungry? You may soon get a surprising bonus when you dine at the Golden Arches. This, with word that McDonald's restaurants in three U.S. cities will be offering one hour of free high-speed Internet access to anyone who buys a promotional meal.

Ten McDonald's in Manhattan New York began offering wireless WiFi, or 802.11b, Internet access on Wednesday, Matrch 12th. By the end of 2003 McDonald's plans to extend the access to 300 restaurant locations in New York City, Chicago and a yet to be announced California city. Window signs will alert customers to which restaurants have WiFi wireless access. After using the hour of free access that comes with a meal, customers can pay $3 for another hour online or get more time by purchasing another extra value meal

Besides McDonald's, Internet surfers will also be able to tote their laptops to 400 U.S. Borders book stores, hundreds of hotels and a pair of U.S. airports

where WiFi access will be available this summer. (Published news reports)

**

SPACE AND SCIENCE: MORE ON SETI@HOME

Last week Amater Radio Newsline’s Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, brought you the latest news on a project called seti@home. Henry is back this week with some background on the project and how it got stasrted:

--
SETI@home first offered its screensaver to the world in May of 1999 as the first example of wide-scale distributed computing. Its aim was to link idle computers through the Internet to tackle large computational problem involved in searching for intelligent signals from space.

The key to its success was the collaboration between two people who would become the principal architects of the project. David Anderson is a computer scientist who was one of the principal developers of distributed computing. Dan Werthimer is a physicist with two decades of experience collecting radio data and parsing it in search of unusual signals from space. Together, they have drawn in not only the computer community, but many others as well. This includes thousands of ham radio operators interested in offering use of their spare computer time to benefit worthwhile projects.

Werthimer, who serves as chief scientist for SETI@home has conducted his own Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence for the past 24 years. For 11 of those years he has been able to use the giant 1,000 foot diameter radiotelescope at Arecibo Puerto Rico to look again at promising locations and frequency ranges. This, to determine if a strong radio signal is more than random noise or a transmission from an orbiting satellite.

So far no luck but Werthimer is not disappointed. This is because SETI@home has mobilized so much more computing power than has ever before been thrown at signal analysis. Also, the team has been able to perform much more detailed and complicated computations on the radio data than now possible with Werthimer's own ongoing SETI project, called Search for Extraterrestrial Radio Emissions from Nearby Developed Intelligent Populations. Thats SERENDIP IV for short.

What is important is that SETI@home has performed the most sensitive and detailed SETI sky survey to date. It has also demonstrated the power of the Internet for doing scientific distributed computing, and has allowed the general public -- and the ham radio communuity to participate directly in an exciting research project.

And the success of SETI@home has also spawned numerous other distributed computing projects. These include Folding@home -- a distributed computing project to calculate the three-dimensional structure of proteins and climateprediction.net to improve scientific forecasts of 21st century climate. And scientists say that there is more to come.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ.

--

So far, 4,287,000-plus users have lent thir spare computing time to analyze radio data for the SETI@home team. You can become a part of the project by taking your web browser over to http://setiathome.ssl.berkeley.edu. And if you missed that U-R-L you will find it in the print edition of this weeks amateur Radio Newsline report. (W6RCL, Published Reports)

**

DX

In D-X, word that A35KB has gone QRT -- probably for good! Paul Kidd, A35RK, told the Ohio Penn D-X newsletter that he hasn't heard Father Kevin Burke, A35KB, on the air for some time. So, last week telephoned Father Kevin only to learn that he is very busy with his duties as parish priest on the Island of Eua. Because of this, he is no longer able to operate on the radio, has allowed his license to expire, his station is dismantled, he has no intention of getting back on the air any time soon. Nor can he any longer respond to QSL requests. (OPDX)

On a brighter note for D-X’ers, the OPDX also reports that SP9FIH will be active from Tonga through April 14th. He already has verbal permission to operate and his license will be given to him after arrival on the island. Activity will be SSB on 80 through 10 meters including the WARC Bands. QSL to P.O. Box 480, 44-100 Gliwice, Poland. (OPDX)

And lastly word that Meanguera Island in the Fonseca Gulf will ba activated by DL7IQ, DL7IO and YS1CF from march 27th to the 28th as HU1M. Modes used will be SSB, CW, SSTV and RTTY. On the 29th and 30th the same call letters will be from San Diego Beach El Salvador. Full information is on the web at www.dl7io.de. (The’ Modern DX’er)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: SWLFEST 2003

And finally this week, hams are not the only radio hobbiests who get together at conventions. Shortwave listeners recently had a major get-together in Pennsylvania that saw guests and presenters from around the world. Steve Coletti of WBCQ was among them and has this in-depth report on SWL Winterfest 2003:

--

The listening side of the radio hobby made its 16th pilgrimage through the snow to the little town of Kulpsville, PA., for the annual SWL Winterfest hosted by NASWA. Although SWL stands for short wave listeners, the fest activities cover DC to daylight as again there were the usual demonstrations of overseas TV via satellite, the activities of the group who we affectionately call the "Scanner Scum", and a demonstration of DRM, the European digital shortwave broadcast standard by Jan Peter Werkman of Radio Netherlands, James Briggs of Merlin Communications and Kim Elliot, KD9XB, of the Voice Of America with additional help of a PC loaned by attendee Eric Cottrell, WB1HBU, to decode the broadcasts beamed specifically to Kulpsville.

This year, Bill Whitacre of the International Broadcast Bureau, parent of the VOA and other US international broadcast ventures, was able to schedule it's annual meeting of radio monitors to coincide with the Winerfest and 26 professional listeners from around the world joined the crowd in Kulpsville to explain that their job was more than just making sure that the signal was heard in the target area.

Although the Fest has been a listener only event, over one third of the attendees every year are hams and this year new ground was broken as Skip Arey, N2EI, ran an introduction to Ham Radio forum. Not only the first time for this discussion, but it was also one of two first time evening forums held on Friday night.

The international broadcasters were represented this year by Adventist World Radio and Radio Free Asia in the forums as well as live broadcasts over WBCQ. In addition to some regularly scheduled programming that went remote on Friday night, WBCQ had a Saturday marathon broadcast by the station's engineering magician, "Tim Tron" Smith, WA1HLR.

Other forums featured reports on listening tips, a summation of a DXpedition to Australia, and a report on overseas SWL group, the European DX Council's annual meeting.

Last year, Bob Zenotti, HB9ASQ, co-host of the now gone Shortwave Merry-Go-Round on Swiss Radio International made his first appearance at the fest as a guest speaker. This year he came on his own as regular attendee.

--

Zenotti: “This is one of the best ones I can remember. Great bunch of people, fantastic discussions, and a lot of excitement here….and very little sleep.”

--

The fest was not without it's humor. The hotel has the Stockholm, Copenhagen, and Oslo meeting rooms. In honor of the delegation from Finland that attends every year, the hosts of the event, Richard Cuff and John Figliosi, unofficially named the fest's hospitality suite, the Helsinki room.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Steve Colletti a-k-a Big Steve Cole of WBCQ Radio reporting fot the Amateur Radio Newsline.
--

The 2004 S-W-L Winterfest is slated a year vfrom now on March 12th to the 13th at the same venue. You will find lots more about it on the web at www.swlfest.com. (Strve Coletti for ARNewsline™)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur

Radio Newsline™ Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's™only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline™ P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline™ is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

1178. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 02:12:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030322211249.10175.00000214@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63465

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/22/2003 7:47 AM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303220747.212ae02e@posting.google.com>

>I don't look a thing like Mr. Whipple

Acutally I was talking about the imprint on my roll of Charmin...

Steve, K4YZ

1179. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 02:15:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030322211527.10175.00000215@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63466

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/22/2003 7:54 AM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303220754.2747ffe8@posting.google.com>

>Seek professional help.

For what? Making a fool out of you, Lennie and Vippy? Heck, I can do that for FREE!

>Best of luck to you.

You don't need luck when you do it well. And I can de-rant you without breaking a sweat.

But you go on thinking that if it makes you feel better...

Steve, K4YZ

1180. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 03:49:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D2EC6.B7E6AAA4@att.net>
Source record: 63467

Brian Kelly wrote:

> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030321212900.25154.00000909@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> > In article <3E7AB2AC.EA5B8C6E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:

>mucho grande garbage<

>
>
> Don't you have ANYTHING better to do with your life you flaming PUTZ??
>

Truth is, he doesn't.

1181. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 03:51:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D2F4A.E6EDC94E@att.net>
Source record: 63468

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3E7BF058.18DC21A3@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:
>
> >> Get a grip, Vipul. Ham radio is about radio for its own sake, because
> >> people find it to be rewarding in ways other than being paid money. No
> >> 'sin' in that. Do what you find rewarding and let the rest go by.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Are you *SURE* that vshah isn't Cootie Boy in drag?
>
> Who knows? Vipul certainly has a much, much better command of English.
>
> Today is March 22. Just 11 days to go until ol' Masa has to make good on his
> promise of April 2, 1998. You know, the one where he promised to do something
> special if the number of hams was greater on April 2, 2003 than it was on April
> 2, 1998.

Ah, yes....he promised to "crap his hands".

1182. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 04:02:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D31E3.9309ED7C@att.net>
Source record: 63469

Dave Heil wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E7B3DD3.B13A8275@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E79FB19.29AAF4BC@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030319190735.23139.00001430@mb-da.aol.com>...
>
> > > > > Dave, I'm not asking to be pleased nor displeased. I want to know
> > > > > what is "proficient."
> > > >
> > > No you don't. There is no answer to your question which will
> > > please you.
> > >
> > Then there is no authoritative answer to the question. Your guesses
> > don't satisfy.
>
> What'd I tell you.
>
>
> > I'd certainly like to read the lines. Please quote the Title 47
> > paragraph and line number defining Morse Code proficiency.
>
> I didn't quote Title 47.
>
> > > > You may define proficiency using a wpm rate, and an accuracy level.
> > > >
> > > > Jim is on record at 10WPM.
> > >
> > > You must not have read any of my post. How is it possible for you
> > > respond without reading it?
> >
> > Of course I read your post. You said this much code is more
> > proficient than that much code. That's not much of an definition.
>
> You see, there is no answer which will please you.

If Poor Baby Brain had half a clue he'd look back just a FEW years to the time when FCC *did* define Morse proficiency, in the form of a Commercial Radiotelegraph Operator's test. Of course he'd find that definition to be 20WPM, not 10.

You can log that as just one more of the *very* many radio things that Slim never bothered to notice.

1183. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 04:08:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D3321.FA7F11F5@att.net>
Source record: 63470

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/22/2003 7:54 AM Pacific Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303220754.2747ffe8@posting.google.com>
>
> >Seek professional help.
>
> For what? Making a fool out of you, Lennie and Vippy? Heck, I can do that
> for FREE!
>
> >Best of luck to you.
>
> You don't need luck when you do it well. And I can de-rant you without
> breaking a sweat.
>
> But you go on thinking that if it makes you feel better...

If there's anyone here showing real need for professional help it would be The Brain and his bosom bud, The Pouting Putz.. We won't even discuss Dippy Vippy

1184. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 04:26:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D3765.99F496CB@att.net>
Source record: 63471

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <c2356669.0303210914.63337281@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >Proficiency starts at 10 wpm, therefore the Morse proficiency test is
> >already gone in the USA. Element 1 is not, repeat not, a Morse
> >proficiency test.
>
> Believe it or not, all of the FCC's license tests were
>
> NEVER
>
> any sort of "proficiency" tests.
>
> The FCC is a radio regulating agency, not an academic
> institution.
>
> ARRL has long IMPLIED the license tests were a "proficiency
> (in radio)" sort of test, but they were NEVER so.

Shows what you know! If there ever was a FCC proficiency test it was the (GASP!) Morse code test! for the Commercial Radiotelegraph licenses. Without proficiency in Morse code operation, an operator was less than useless.

Gee, one would think that a fella who had no more than a commercial radio license know that, even if only by accident!.. Of course in your case we all know better.

1185. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 04:26:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D3790.204D0828@att.net>
Source record: 63472

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <3E7AC03D.40B7CABF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >I thought you handled things well in my absence, Dick.
>
> Dick doesn't handle Dick.

I do a pretty darn good job on you.

1186. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 04:30:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D3855.6733EC38@att.net>
Source record: 63473

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <3E7AC2C4.5DD91D4A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Poor Heil's reading is fine. I can't read what hasn't been written.
>
> Poor Heil is fined.
>
> Radio gods have inabilities but self-define themselves not to
> have inabilities. Understood.
>
> >In comparing the examples I provided of some of your recent postings to
> >N2EY's profile of you, what proof of character assassination have you
> >found?
>
> The continuing Big Lie technique of constant repetition of an
> opinion by an unoriginal radio god incapable of accepting
> criticsm.
>
> Propaganda. Misdirection. Avoidance of the subject by
> attacking personalities.
>
> Radio gods are like that. It's that simple.

But,...but,... but......Gods by definition are professionals, not amateurs.
We're just a bunch of amateurs! You, on the other hand are the only one here
claiming God status.

1187. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 04:31:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D38AE.CD69604B@att.net>
Source record: 63474

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <f45722ac.0303210811.3ac805aa@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
> >news:<20030321042721.17322.00000115@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >> >Date: 3/20/2003 8:43 PM Pacific Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <20030320234320.03802.00000135@mb-cq.aol.com
> >>
> >> >I do not hate Hams...(SNIP)
> >>
> >> No, you just humiliate, criticize and denigrate them in several public
> >> forums for sport and recreation.
> >
> >How is this distinguishable from what you do?
>
> He is extra amateur and veteran of seven hostile actions!

And you're a veteran of rear area radio babysitting action, about 400 miles to the rear.

1188. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 04:32:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D38EE.E8DC4347@att.net>
Source record: 63475

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Is Ohm's Law too hard for a radio god to memorize? :-)
>

If it is you can always look it up.

1189. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 04:37:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030322233747.29016.00000933@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 63476

In article <b5gbbb$75o$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0303180928.4fe12a6d@posting.google.com...
>From: "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM>
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2003 12:28 PM
>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>
>
>> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<b56235avl1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>...
>>
>> (old stuff removed)

>> > > I recall reading somewhere that the majority of new US-made cars had
>> > > automatic transmissions starting in the late 1950s.
>> >
>> > True, and in today's market, less than 10% of new cars are manual.
>>
>> Is it really that low, Bill? I'd guess more like 25%. However, if it's
>> 10%, that simply reinforces my earlier statement that the percentage
>> of CW signals on the HF/MF ham bands is higher than the percentage of
>> manual transmission
>> cars on US roads. And much greater than the percentage of horses on
>> the road...
>
>I asked a friend of mine in the auto industry several years ago. He said it
>was
>probably only about 5%.

I'll take your/his word for it. I had no idea it was that low.

Amateur use of Morse on the HF bands is a much higher percentage (I'd estimate
around 40%). I know of only one current-production ham rig that cannot do CW.

>Some vehicles are not available with manual trans at all.

Like my Odyssey.

The manufacturers probably figured that the design and tooling cost is not
worth it for the few cars they would sell with manual transmissions.
>
>> > > > > It's a good idea for all drivers to have manual transmission
>driving

>> > > > > skills.
>> > > >
>> > > > Why???
>> > > >
>> > > Because it increases all drivers' opportunities and possibilities wrt
>> > > driving situations. For example, the choice of vehicle is greater.
>> >
>> > That's a "personal choice."
>>
>> Usually true.
>>
>> > There's NO value to society
>>
>> I disagree! Less fuel used and less pollution are definitely a value
>> to society.
>
>I'll rephrase...there's not enough value to society to justify
>requiring manual gearboxes.

I think you mean "manual gearbox testing".

>Additionally, there is an
>argument that manual gearboxes allow greater pollution because
>the driver can rev/race the engine while an auto gearbox
>can be computer controlled throughout the entire operating
>range.
>
It's also possible to rev/race the engine with an automatic by putting the
trans in the wrong gear. And a properly-designed engine control computer can
sense that a manual transmission engine is being improperly operated and limit
pollution.

>> So is the ability to choose the best driver from among
>> those available.
>
>When has anyone asked you or otherwise tried to determine
>who is the "best" driver for a partivular driving requirement?

Many times! Usually, the "best" driver is the one who is most alert, or most
sober, or least upset, etc., at the time.
>
>> Example: Some friends go out for dinner in a stick-shift car. The
>> person who drove has a big meal and feels sleepy afterwards, but has
>> to drive home anyway because the others 'can't drive stick'. Of course
>> it's easy to say they should have taken another car in the first
>> place, but in real life such situations do arise.
>
>So?

So if everyone knows how to drive stick, the "best" driver can drive home.
>
>> > and thus the states abondoned any testing.

>>
>> I disagree again!
>>
>> I think the reasons the states we know of
>
>Trust me...ALL states have no requirement for a manual
>gearbox test requirement.
>
I was disagreeing about the reasons. I'm convinced that no state in the USA requires manual transmission testing for a regular driver's license. CDL is a different story. Of course, the percentage of big trucks with automatics is much lower.

>> ...stopped being fussy about
>> what sort of vehicle was used for testing were:
>>
>> 1) it's a hassle to require a stick shift car for testing (in PA the
>> person being tested supplies the car).
>
>If the driver wanted a manual certification, the driver would
>provide a manual car.

'zactly
>
>> 2) lots of people wanted drivers licenses
>
>So?
>
Means that a manual-transmission-test requirement would be VERY unpopular.

>> 3) the perceived benefits to society of having lots of people licensed
>> to drive were greater than the perceived benefits of having all
>> drivers pass a stick-shift test.
>
>I've been licensed over 44 years and I have never seen any such
>logic put forth in articles regarding testing.

I think #3 sums up your position on the matter, Bill. Let me restate it this way:

The benefits of having every driver tested to drive stick do not outweigh the costs of such testing. Such costs include fewer people being licensed to drive.

>
>> > > No
>> > > problems with "we have to take/buy X's car because Y can't drive
>> > > stick", etc. (Been there, done that!)
>> >
>> > That's a personal problem.
>>
>> Not mine, because I drive all sorts of vehicles. Tested in a manual
>> transmission car, in fact, to avoid any possibility of the dreaded

>> "automatic transmission only" limitation on the license.
>
>Where and when was that limitation being applied?
>
1970s, here in PA. It was possible for the state trooper doing the test to tack
on the restriction "automatic transmission only" if he/she doubted the
stick-shift ability of a new driver. All changed now.

>> > All my kids learned to drive
>> > manuals.
>> >
>> Great!
>>
>> > > Manual transmission cars are simpler, cost less, use less fuel and
>> > > pollute less than their automatic-transmission equivalents.
>> >
>> > The fuel efficiency of automatics is very close to that of a manual
>> > gearbox these days.
>>
>> But there is still an advantage. The percentage varies with the
>> vehicle, of course.
>>
>> > Pollution wise, unless you are factoring the
>> > small mileage difference, the emissions shouldn't be any different.
>>
>> But there is a difference. 10% less fuel burned in equivalent engines
>> means 10% less pollution.
>
>Not always. The efficiencies can be different in terms of how
>power is applied during acceleration, etc.

Yes, a leadfoot driver with a stick may be outdone by a careful driver in an
equivalent automatic car. But when operated similarly, the stick is almost
always more efficient. Of course with modern lockup fourspeed automatics, the
difference is small, particularly in highway driving.
>
>> Returning to radio for a moment, the spectrum and power efficiency of
>> CW is much better than any analog voice mode. "Takes up less of the
>> road", so to speak.
>
>Less road, lower throughput.

More hams on a give bit of spectrum at one time. That's a good thing.

> In any case, it isn't required that
>any ham ever use CW so the argument has no significant value.
>
It isn't required that any licensed driver actually drive, either.

>> > > Note that we're talking about something being a "a good idea" not
>> > > being mandated by law.
>> >

>> > The ONLY reason manual transmissions are still be maded is
>> > because there's a market for them that is big enough
>> > to justify the continued availability.
>>
>> IOW, folks still want them. Even though some folks might call them
>> "luddites" or describe the manual transmission as "antique",
>> "obsolete", or "1930s technology".
>
>Yes. The point is no one MUST know how to drive one.

For regular driver's licenses, that's true.
>
>> Note how that market continues to exist even though there is no
>> stick-shift test nor mandatory stick-shift use requirement....
>
>Exactly...and the same will be the case for CW as long as hams
>choose to learn and use it.
>
Which will be for a long long time to come, test or no test.

>> > > Do you think it's not a good idea for all drivers to have manual
>> > > transmission driving skills?
>> >
>> > Nope.
>>
>> Why not? Remember, we're talking about it being "a good idea" only,
>> NOT a mandated requirement.
>
>I belive it is only a personal choice. In today's world,
>the NEED for manual knowledge is strictly personal.

That simply means you don't want to see it mandated by law. All good ideas
don't need to be mandated by law.

> Has anyone heard
>or read about anyone being in danger or worse because no
>one was available to drive a manual gearbox vehicle?

I'm sure it's happened. The question is, how often?
>
>> > I think it's a choice an individual makes. I could care
>> > less that anyone else knows how to drive my cars.
>>
>> > > > > But should such skills be mandated by law?
>> > > >
>> > > > Of course not.
>> > >
>> > > Well, that's one opinion.
>> >
>> > Would you rather manual transmission knowledge/skill be mandated?
>>
>> I'm not sure. I am sure that manual-transmission skill is a good thing

>> to have, and should be a goal of practically all drivers.
>
>Repeat my last comment: In today's world,
>the NEED for manual knowledge is strictly personal. Has anyone heard
>or read about anyone being in danger or worse because no
>one was available to drive a manual gearbox vehicle?

All I'm saying is that it's a good idea.
>
>> > > > > The current Morse test is akin to requiring all prospective
>drivers be
>> > > > > able to
>> > > > > drive across an empty parking lot with a manual-transmission car
>in
>> > > > > first gear,
>> > > > > starting and stopping without stalling the engine.
>> > > > >
>> > > > Exactly ... such a test should not be mandated because it isn't
>> > > > necessary
>> > > > and serves no legitimate regulatory purpose.
>> > > >
>> > > There's no S25.5 for clutches, anyway.
>> > >
>> > Fine by me.
>>
>> Not in NJ, PA, or NY, anyway. Any other states to be heard from?
>
>I've checked before. No state requires a manual gearbox
>certification.

I'll buy that.

>> > > > I'm glad you finally seem to agree :-)
>> > > >
>> > > You're inferring what I've neither stated nor implied. I haven't
>> > > stated any opinion other than "It's a good idea for all drivers to
>> > > have manual transmission driving skills."
>> > >
>> > > My point is simply that the transmission analogy is a much better and
>> > > more relevant one than the horse analogy.
>> >
>> > I agee also and have used this analogy myself many
>> > times.
>>
>> In fact, I think that's where I first saw it. Sorry if I did not
>> properly credit the source, Bill.
>
>No apology needed.

Always a reasonable gentleman, Bill. Even when someone disagrees with you on
practically every point, you behave in such a way as to earn the respect of all

who read your words.

Now if we were to talk about the 55 mph speed limit....*

>If I worried about credits in this
>forum I'd really have to be certified as a looney. :-)
>
HAW!

73 es happy motoring, Jim, N2EY

* An idea that was the wrong thing done for the right reasons. End result was less compliance and respect for traffic laws, particularly speed limits.

1190. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 04:37:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030322233747.29016.00000934@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 63477

In article <20030321210132.07005.00000197@mb-bk.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: "Bill Sohl"
>>I belive it is only a personal choice. In today's world,
>>the NEED for manual knowledge is strictly personal. Has anyone heard
>>or read about anyone being in danger or worse because no
>>one was available to drive a manual gearbox vehicle?
>
>You can understand the analogy.

Actually, I got the analogy from Bill.

>How come N2EY cannot understand the analogy
>HE gave? He proposed this analogy.

I understand it perfectly.
>
>Now he doesn't agree with the conclusion:

I don't agree with YOUR conclusion.

>There is no NEED for Morse code testing.

I think there is.

The percentage of amateur radio HF communications using Morse is much higher than the percentage of cars with manual transmissions.

A manual transmission car does not use up less road than its automatic transmission equivalent. A manual transmission car use slightly less fuel and pollutes slightly less than its automatic transmission equivalent. A Morse signal uses up much less spectrum than any analog voice signal.

Does any of that mean Morse MUST be tested? Nope. Does any of that mean Morse MUST NOT be tested? Nope. It all boils down to opinions, nothing more.

>It may be good to learn to communicate
>to others that use Morse code, but it is NOT essential.
>
Nor is it essential to know anyhting about how a radio works in order to use one.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1191. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 04:45:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D3C4D.AADE4B54@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63478

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E7AC4F2.C5E4BC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >No, that wouldn't be the reason. It'd be the thought of two attorneys
> >and a judge laughing hysterically just before your case was tossed.
> >No one can assassinate something which has already died.
>
> Dinosaur Heil is still into denial.

What's the denial, Leonard?

> Morse code is OBSOLETE. It hasn't died yet. It is kept on
> life-support by radio gods who cannot understand modern
> things.

You mean that thousands of radio amateurs worldwide use it in their
operations each day and that it honks you off that morse won't go away?
Well, doesn't that just ruin your day!

> Heil has no qualifications in US law.

I've never claimed to have qualifications in the law.

> He is an amateur.

Yes, I am--a radio amateur. If you work fast, you can become a neophyte
in amateur radio. You talk the talk but you've not walked the walk.

Dave K8MN

1192. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 04:50:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D3D2A.D7DAEDAE@att.net>
Source record: 63479

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <3E7ABC6A.A19C2527@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Heil thinks he is a radio god according to his remarks in here.
> > >
> > >Bad call, Len. I've never once written anything about being a god of
> > >anything. I even corrected Brian when he mistakenly believed me to be
> > >the greatest DXer in the world.
> >
> > Heil must have gotten a Dale Carneigie correspondence course
> > on ebay,

A, so you've been looking there for one. Sorry it takes more in your case. LOTS
more.
In fact I doubt success will ever occur under any circumstances.

> > Heil is an amateur. Heil is unqualified to talk about law.
> >

And YOUR law degree is from where? Dave was employed for a full career by
an agency that was very much involved in interpreteration of law. You, on the
other
hand, got no closer than rear guard in rural JA-land.

> > Gods are self-qualifying by definition.

Yeah, a bunchof professionals. Not an amateur among them.

> > Since Heil still talks
> > about radio law without being qualified, ergo, he is a radio god.
> >
> > It's that simple.
> >

It's YOU that is too simple for further need of explanation.

> >
> > >You don't get much right, do you? I didn't brag. There was no bad
> > >procedure--only a factual statement about what was used on a government
> > >circuit.
> >
> > What was used on a government circuit was BAD PROCEDURE.
> >

> It's that simple.
>

Lessee, government procedure stated that whan radioteletype circuits on
standard frequency
channels became unusable due to conditions that personnel were to use
radiotelegraphy to
establish alternate channels. This policy clearly came about because it was a
system that worked, as
evidenced by adequate experience. So what happened in your case? You miss out on
a few
FACTS in your *professional* career? No answer needed, we already know.

>
> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> >Now you have me confused, Len. Are you telling me that your wife IS a
> >psychologist?
>
> There is no sense in replying to Heil. He does not accept
> replies unless those replies kiss his royal TLC-needing
> tuches.
>

N2EY:
"Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>
>
> What does Heil know about cooperation and conciliation when
> he does neither? :-)
>

And YOU?????

>
> >How does pointing out that you've not taken a single step toward
> >obtaining an amateur radio license in the seven years you've posted here
> >much less in the several previous decades, turn into character
> >assassination.
>

> Radio gods cannot see their arrogance. They are self-defining.
> Radio gods are NEVER guilty of anything. They are never
> wrong. :-)

Yep, you professionals sometimes get on an arrogant streak that ultimately causes
you all sorts of grief. The really obtuse, idiotic ones, that is.

>
>
> >I read it. Nothing in there about any movement on your part toward
> >obtaining an amateur radio license.
>
> My advocacy in here was for the purpose of elimination of the
> morse code test for any US radio license.
>
> I've never stated any desire to obtain any amateur radio license
> except twice...and then in jest.
>
> What I certainly underestimated was the sheer quantity of radio
> gods in here! Far more than ancient days of Mount Olympus.
> All the morsemen are so Thor they cannot thit.
>

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>
> >Haven't you gotten the word? Morse testing is on the way out.
>
> Morse code testing is stll the LAW. It has NOT gone away.
>
> Dinosaurs don't die decently, they just argue away.
>

You're living proof of exactly that.

> >We still have licensing for children though.
>
> Heil has an amateur license. Heil is a mental child.
>

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic

slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >Your latest dilemma is: Do you try to snag that 5 wpm or do you try to
> >wait it out?
>
> No dilemma. My advocacy is simply the elimination of a
> morse code test for any radio license.
>
> As a mental childlike dinosaur, Heil doesn't understand.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

1193. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 04:54:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030322235438.19274.00001252@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 63480

In article <BAA1E362.14322%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
>> If you are for real...then vote the bum out
>> of office. But I think the damage is already
>> done. We, the USA, will NO LONGER TRUST
>> FRANCE. In fact you have become as irrelevant
>> as the UN.
>
>
> You do not represent, or speak for, the USA.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Dwight:

Maybe not, but Dan sure as heck spoke for ME! BTW, Dan and I
"represent" the USA just as much as you do! So why don't you join
in with your silly little French hairdresser butt-buddies, put on a nice
frilly tu-tu, find a room full of German soldiers, and bend over?

This is one American saying that France has now joined a new
geo-political alliance: The Axis of the Irrelevant.

73 de Larry, K3LT

*** Get the U.S. out of the UN, and the UN out of the U.S.!

1194. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 04:54:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D3E6A.6F8DA0F2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63481

Len Over 21 wrote:
have inabilities. Understood.

> The continuing Big Lie technique of constant repetition of an
> opinion by an unoriginal radio god incapable of accepting
> criticsm.
>
> Propaganda. Misdirection. Avoidance of the subject by
> attacking personalities.

You know, Len, it must trouble you that you can't make the "big lie"
claim work. For those who've read your postings here, the evidence is
clear. There is much, much more to be found at google.com.

Your character cannot be assassinated because you've actually done--not
just once but many times over the course of years--the things which
N2EY's profile says that you do.

You just can't help it.

Dave K8MN

1195. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 04:55:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D3ECD.4FB85BF5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63482

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E7AC03D.40B7CABF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >I thought you handled things well in my absence, Dick.
>
> Dick doesn't handle Dick.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

1196. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 05:03:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D4060.916F88A6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63483

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Heil must have gotten a Dale Carneigie correspondence course
> on ebay, noticed that radio gods are supposed to be self-effacing.
>
> Heil is an amateur. Heil is unqualified to talk about law.
>
> Gods are self-qualifying by definition. Since Heil still talks
> about radio law without being qualified, ergo, he is a radio god.

> What was used on a government circuit was BAD PROCEDURE.

> There is no sense in replying to Heil. He does not accept
> replies unless those replies kiss his royal TLC-needing
> tuches.

> What does Heil know about cooperation and conciliation when
> he does neither? :-)

> Radio gods cannot see their arrogance. They are self-defining.
> Radio gods are NEVER guilty of anything. They are never
> wrong. :-)

> What I certainly underestimated was the sheer quantity of radio
> gods in here! Far more than ancient days of Mount Olympus.
> All the morsemen are so Thor they cannot thit.

> Dinosaurs don't die decently, they just argue away.

> Heil has an amateur license. Heil is a mental child.

> As a mental childlike dinosaur, Heil doesn't understand.

Let's see. How much of the profile shows up in your latest.
We have references to job, government service, insults, name calling,
and the generally infantile behavior.

You didn't quite get all of them in, Len.

Dave K8MN

1197. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 05:24:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D44EA.5D524D6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63484

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E7AB2AC.EA5B8C6E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E7899CC.81F8D963@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >A radio amateur. You are some guy who has been standing on the
> >> >sidelines for decades.
> >>
> >> Not at all. I've been a radio and electronics professional for over
> >> a half century.
> >>
> >Sorry, Leonard. That doesn't count for squat in amateur radio except
> >that you might find it easier to pass the written exams.
>
> It worked in your case...but in an opposite direction. :-)

Opposite? The morse exam. I did just fine in both. I passed all of
the exams that they offered.

> DOS Tip: Amateur radio is RADIO.

...and amateur radio is a part of radio in which you are not licensed to
be a participant. You aren't involved. You're on the outside. You're
contribution is limited to talking and writing about it.

> Hello? Radio works by the same physical principals
> regardless of the human designation/laws differentiating
> the various radio services.

The FCC does not issue a one-size-fits-all generic radio license good
for all services. There is no blanket U.S. government radio license.

> >> Amateur radio does NOT represent the sum total of all radio
> >> communications. It is just a hobby activity, a recreation. It is also
> >> quite a minor activity in the whole field of radio communications
> >> worldwide.
> >>
> >Right. One in which you are not involved.
>
> Heil is not involved in the larger field of other radio.

Not now. I'm retired.

> Heil once held a title in a non-amateur field of radio but
> behaved like an amateur in it.

We'll put this one under "factual errors" for the profile. I worked in
the broadcast field, was a radio op in the military and had an entire
Department of State communications career.

> >> >Yet you tell us that you know best how amateur
> >> >radio should be regulated.
> >>
> >> No, I present my arguments for a modernization of US amateur
> >> radio regulations.
> >
> >Based upon what experience?
>
> A half century of other radio.

"Other radio" isn't amateur radio. Go modernize "other radio".

> Another tip, radio god: Maintenance of the Ancient
> Radiotelegraphy Society standards and practices is NO
> qualification for telling others about modernization.

This one falls under the "name calling", "ridicule" and "insults"
portions of the profile.

> Stopping snapping your buggy whip old-timers.

File under "insults" and "ridicule portions of the profile

> >> As an example, use of morse code as a communications mode
> >> IS obsolete. Worldwide. It is just not defunct, extinct.
> >
> >It is no more obsolete than AM or SSB. All are used currently by radio
> >amateurs. Shouldn't matter to you. You aren't involved.
>
> Morse code communications mode IS obsolete.

No, it isn't.

> It just isn't extinct yet.

No, it isn't.

> Dinosaur Heil is still into denial.

Now we're back to "name calling".

> His world is ending. Slowly but inexorably.

This one seems to fit "ridicule" and "insults".

> >Sure sounds like you're talking about the elimination of a mode rather
> >than the elimination of testing for a mode. It really doesn't matter
> >what other services use or don't use. Radio amateurs worldwide use

> >morse every day.
>
> Circular logic, like Micollis.
>
> Are you two going around together? :-)

Another one for the "ridicule" column.

> >> The FCC does not demand use of morse code over and above any
> >> other mode by US radio amateurs. All allocated modes are
> >> optional for use by all US amateur radio licensees, any class, any
> >> amateur band. Why does the morse code test remain other than
> >> the inertia and lobbying of old-timers at the ITU?
> >
> >We've been here and done this. No one will come up with a response
> >which will please you, a person not involved in amateur radio.
>
> Dinosaur Heil, intolerant of inferior beings, cannot understand
> a changing radio world. That is the doom of his radio existance.

You might place this under "insults", "name calling" and "ridcule".

> >Nooooooo, that isn't all you do. Would you like to fess up or would you
> >prefer to be Googled?
>
> Copying the entirety of Google will not erase or change anything.

Precisely the benefit of Google. You can't change or erase a single
word of your past.

> Stay with the current program.
>
> There is nothing to "confess," Dinosaur Heil.

Why, Len, there are years of your postings which indicate other than
what you are now telling us.

> Morse code communications mode is OBSOLETE.

Let's put this one under "factual errors". Morse is no obsolete than
any of the most used modes. It is used by thousands of radio amateurs
each and every day.

> Morse code is NOT mandated by the FCC over and above
> any other allocated mode by any US radio amateur licensee.

Who said it was?

> The FCC morse code test is OBSOLETE.

They didn't say anything about that when they turned it over to the
VEC's.

> Old-time morsemen are the dinosaurs of the radio world.
> They will die out. Goodbye pterodactyl, you never flew

> well when you did all that flapping.

Okay, we have more name calling, insults and ridicule. Not a perfect score this time, Len.

Dave K8MN

1198. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 05:27:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D45C0.258F32F7@att.net>
Source record: 63485

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <c2356669.0303211019.483d7d10@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >> Not at all. I've been a radio and electronics professional for over
> >> a half century.
> >
> >And standing on the sidelines of amateur radio for at least that long.
>
> Poor baby...doesn't realize that amateur radio is a small
> subset of the larger world of radio.

As opposed to you who don't realize that a quite large proportion of ham
radio
is comprised of active and FORMER professional radio people. Some people
such as yourself refuse to learn anything meaningful beyond your own narrow
interests.

> Those in that much
> larger world tend to look at amateurs as being "in the
> sidelines."
>

Shows how little you actually know. Most professionals I've known who were
also hams
viewed it entirely opposite. Ham radio is where we get to do what WE want with
radio,
not just what little the boss wants. But you never could understand that.

>
> >btw, "radio and electronics professional" covers a lot of ground.
> >Anybody who ever worked in a Radio Shack or circuit City store can
> >claim the same thing.
>
> I'm sure you do. :-)
>
> Let's just take a look at who I've worked for (in reverse order):
> Pinetree (at present), Rockwell International, Teledyne
> Electronics, Hughes Aircraft Company Missle Division,
> Communications Technology (contract), RCA Corporation,
> Electro-Optical Systems (a Xerox subsidiary), Birtcher
> Instruments, Micro-Radionics Inc. (microwave house), all
> as an electronics engineer.
>

Betcha Jim has no more than two or three employers in
radio/electronics/engineering in his
career of nearly thirty years. You've been in and out of more doors than an
elevator operator.
One could very reasonably conclude there might have been very good negative
reasons for that, expecially what with all the rumors floating around. :)

>
> Not a single "service" occupation (selling, bookkeeping,
> accounting, buying, etc.) there.
>

BUT all those are also Radio Professionals, when employed in the field. QED.

>
> I don't live in fear of discovery.

So you say. You also force feed your "professional" status like you had to
prove it
to yourself each hour of your existace. What should one think if such a goon?

> Why do you?
>

Obviously he sees no reason to provide you with another reason to have to
apply The Profile, ie

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>
> >> Amateur radio does NOT represent the sum total of all radio
> >> communications.
>

Hells bells Putz. for you NOTHING represents the sum total of all radio
communications.
You're not a ham, and you're no longer employed, at least according to your
signature under
all your posts in the .homebrew NG. Of course that may be yet another untruth
from you, as
you above list something like Pinetree as your "current employer". Pinetree?
You're now
a lumber professional?

> >I don't know anyone who claims it does.
>
> I doubt you know anyone working in any radio other than
> amateur or store selling. :-)
>

For sure you aren't working in radio. At least one of your versions of the facts says so.

> > >> It is just a hobby activity, a recreation.
> > >
> > >Incorrect.
> >
> > It isn't a hobby or recreation? Oh, my, then the FCC has
> > classified it wrong.
> >

"Without pecuniary interest" is what the FCC says. You lose again.

> >
> > Amateur radio is not referred to as Public Safety Radio
> > Service. It isn't Mass Media Radio Service. It isn't anything
> > else but AMATEUR radio service...i.e., not accepting money
> > for radio services rendered. It's NOT professional.
> >

Do tell!

> >
> > >> It is also
> > >> quite a minor activity in the whole field of radio communications
> > >> worldwide.
> > >
> > >Then why are you, a non-participant and bystander, so obsessed with
> > >it?
> >
> > I'm a radio hobbyist. I'm just not licensed in amateur radio.
> >
> > I'm not "obsessed." :-)
> >

ANY reasonable analysis will give that statement the lie. In fat you're nothing but.

> > >> I present my arguments for a modernization of US amateur
> > >> radio regulations.
> > >
> > >Once in a great while. The rest of the time you behave as described in
> > >my oft-quoted profile.
> >
> > Poor baby...engaged in indirect character assassination, are
> > you? :-)
> >

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.

Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>
> Character assassination is common among PCTAs when they
> can't get their way.
>

Can't kill that which doesn't exist. Sorry. I'd be pleased to help assinate
your character
if only you had any.

>
> >> use of morse code as a communications mode
> >> IS obsolete. Worldwide.
> >
> >Only if you define 'obsolete' to mean 'in daily use by many thousands
> >of radio operators'. Otherwise, you're flat-out WRONG, Len.
>
> OBSOLETE. The word has two meanings: "1. No longer in
> use,

Well, that one is invalid. Morse code is in full use by MANY radio stations on
a daily basis.
Of course most of them these days are ham radio stations. But not all, by a
long shot.
OF course you know that, but it plays against your Agenda, so there you have
it.

> 2. Out of date."
>

With you it never was IN date. That says nothing whatever about its routine,
daily use TODAY.

> FCC doesn't mandate morse code use over and above any other
> allocated mode. All allocated modes are optional to all US
> amateur licensees. The amateur morse code test IS obsolete
> and out of date to the FCC.
>

Hell, they didn't mandate any mode even way back when there was no other than
Radiotelegraphy!

>
> Except for Maritime Radio Service in the USA on the great lakes,
> morse code isn't needed or required by any other US radio
> service.

You've been reaching way out there in Internet land for information again.
Morse code is required at times when no other mode is available which will
fulfill
the need. As when Dave Heil used it to establish alternate radiotelegraph

circuits for
the Departmwent of State. Likely they don't need to do that anymore, but they could
if "required". QED.

> Those have either dropped it or never considered it in
> the first place.
>

Ah, yes, just like there never was an Interstate Police HF Radiotelegraph net in existance
right up into the 1970's. Right.

>
> The Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society keeps endorsing
> morsemanship to keep their living museum of amateurism
> going as it once was.
>

You might be surprised to know that opposition to Morse by people like you only give it a longer life than it would have ever had without it. The way you go
about "opposing" it draws recruits to it like bears to honey.

>
> >> It is just not defunct, extinct.
> >
> >Actually, it's alive and well. And growing. There are probably more
> >hams using Morse code today than there were hams back in the 1930s.
>
> Americans have much more time available for leisure pursuits
> today than the 72% who were able to keep working during the
> Great Depression of the 1930s.
>
> What is Miccollis' obsession with standards and practices of
> the 1930s?

Where is your intelligence, assuming that you actually have any? If you believe that
advances in electronics don't act to vastly improve radiotlegraphy just as it does other
modes it shows yet again just how uninformed you really are. Surprise, surprise!

1199. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 05:52:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D4BDC.57356F44@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63486

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E7AB2AC.EA5B8C6E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >We've been here and done this. No one will come up with a response
> >which will please you, a person not involved in amateur radio.
>
> Poor baby, still under delusions of grandeur and god-hood?

Okay, in this one we have "name calling", "insults" and "ridicule"

> Amateur is as amateur does. Heil is an amateur.

Just "ridicule" and "insults" here.

> Dinosaur Heil seems to think that the only "authority" to discuss
> US law is to be licensed in that law.

This one has "name calling".

We're on a level playing field here, Len. You aren't an authority in
the law and neither am I. We can discuss it all we want. That doesn't
make us expert in it and it makes it highly unlikely that either of us
would do very well in debating it with an attorney.

> FCC regulations are law.

You're well known for your masterful statements fo the obvious.

> Heil has NO qualifications in law to talk about law.

Heil is on equal footing with Anderson in this regard.

> It's as simple as that.

It surely is.

> Heil isn't involved in US law.

...just like Anderson.

> Ergo, Heil can't talk about it. Heil isn't qualified.

If we compare this to your distant encounter with amateur radio and its
regulations, you aren't an attorney. You aren't a radio amateur.
You've talked. You've written. You've petitioned your governent.
There don't seem to be many buying what you're selling. Ain't that a
bite?

> Why is Heil here?

I can think of a couple of reasons. Unlike you, I am a radio amateur. This newsgroup is about amateur radio. I have almost forty years direct experience in amateur radio. A better question would be--why are YOU here?

> >> Those who love, honor, and worship morse code are fixated on
> >> their enobled aptitude and resultant skill. Such do not hesitate
> >> to say they are the best in radio because of that single skill...
> >> long after morse code became obsolete.
> >
> >Love, honor and worship? How do you write this stuff without your face
> >reddening?
>
> No problem.
>
> Stating a simple fact of observation.

You may be experiencing some macular degeneration.

> >Now who wrote that the League is an arm of the U.S. government? Nobody
> >here wrote anything like that.
>
> Several in here have described ARRL as their "representative"
> with "democratic elections."

...and you believed that they meant that the ARRL is their governmental representative and that they saw the free election of ARRL board members as a replacement for the federal government? That's quite a talke you have going there, Leonard.

> Go live in Google and go around with buddy Micollis and his
> circular logic.

It must pain you that your words live to haunt you.

> >Are you watching the Sci-Fi Channel again?
>
> No, I'm watching the second Gulf War and seeing a parallel of
> old dictatorial morsemen getting theirs just as the Iraqi regime
> is getting theirs.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >The ARRL is America's biggest amateur radio membership
> >organization. Writing "at best a quarter" is piffle.
>
> ARRL gives out their membership totals periodically. That is

> found under the publisher's statement on the QST subpage.
>
> ARRL membership at about a quarter of all licensed US radio
> amateurs is FACT.

"About a quarter" isn't the same as "at best a quarter". I note that
you snipped your statement so you wouldn't have to see your words again.
The ARRL is the nation's largest amateur radio membership organization
by many magnitudes. Which other amateur radio organization's membership
totals approach a fraction of one quarter of all licensed hams in the
land?

> Dinosaur Heil is still into denial.

This one goes under the "name calling" column.

> >...and you probably wonder why ham radio ops all over the land aren't
> >putting up a statue in your honor after all you've done for them.
>
> ? Strange statement.

Is it? You're a self-appointed advocate, just straighening out and
"modernization" amateur radio for us. We should all be grateful for
your expertise in this avocation of which you are not a part.

> Is Heil thinking about erecting statues for himself? Or just erecting?

We can put this under "ridicule".

> >I can't envision amateur radio ever bringing you personal pleasure, Len.
> >As a matter of fact, I can't envision you ever taking the first step to
> >obtain a license.
>
> Radio god Heil simply cannot envision anyone taking first
> steps that His Highness never took.

That I never took? I took the steps, Len. I didn't sit around jawing
about something for years. I walked the walk. You just talk the talk.

By the way--we'll put this under "name calling"

> >You mean like guys who aren't participants in amateur radio who would
> >tell us how it should be regulated?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. They do every day. 24/7 in fact. :-)

You mean, "they" who are paid to do so? You aren't "they" and "they"
don't work 24/7.

I haven't decided under which column to place the "Tsk, tsk, tsk" yet.
We do have the excessive emoticons beginning here and running on below.

> Those telling you about regulation is the Federal Communications
> Commission commissioners and staff.
>

> "...and that's the way it is." :-)

You aren't "they". And THAT is the way it is.

> >In other words, you don't have any interest in amateur radio as long as
> >there are folks who won't kiss your professional ass?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Getting more snarly, your Highness? :-)

Not at all. As you'd say, just simple observation.

> Is it that your "amateur ass" hasn't gotten any TLC lately?

Aren't you getting personal?

> >*Poof!* That was your rant going up in blue smoke.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Dinosaur Heil imaging things again.

I note that you saw fit to snip it. Don't worry, Len. Google knows.

By the way--more for the "name calling" column in the profile.

> >The regs have changed numerous times since I was licensed.
>
> Oh, my, a QUALIFICATION! :-)
>
> >They changed again nearly three years ago.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, a more recent change unnoticed. Inattention
> to the LAW. No problem, Heil isn't qualified in law.

No, it isn't a problem. I'm on equal footing with you in matters of law
and psychology.

> >My self-esteem is intact.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Spelled "steam" wrong... :-)

Then you must have spelled it wrong. I was responding to what you
wrote.

Dave K8MN

1200. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 05:56:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D4CE2.525AB360@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63487

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3E7BF058.18DC21A3@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:
>
> >> Get a grip, Vipul. Ham radio is about radio for its own sake, because
> >> people find it to be rewarding in ways other than being paid money. No
> >> 'sin' in that. Do what you find rewarding and let the rest go by.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Are you *SURE* that vshah isn't Cootie Boy in drag?
>
> Who knows? Vipul certainly has a much, much better command of English.
>
> Today is March 22. Just 11 days to go until ol' Masa has to make good on his
> promise of April 2, 1998. You know, the one where he promised to do something
> special if the number of hams was greater on April 2, 2003 than it was on April
> 2, 1998.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I wouldn't mind seeing him carry out his promise from a suitably safe
distance!

Dave K8MN

1201. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 06:06:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7D4F58.238DB542@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63488

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Len Over 21 wrote:

> N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dick, I think you've gotten the idea. Len does not play well with
others.

Dave K8MN

1202. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 12:29:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030323072942.13011.00000132@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 63489

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 3/22/2003 8:54 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030322235438.19274.00001252@mb-fd.aol.com>

>This is one American saying that France has now joined a new
>geo-political alliance: The Axis of the Irrelevant.

Hard to believe that the same nation that prodiced the Statue of Liberty
and LaFayette is also the same country that has gotten American's killed in
it's defense (twice) in the last century and who now refuse to stand by us.

If I was French, I'd go fight just to get away from women who won't shave
thier armpits.

>*** Get the U.S. out of the UN, and the UN out of the U.S.!

Ditto. I am tired of thrid-world nations who never seem to have enough
money for food and medicine but have enough money for palaces and weaponry from
taking our charity then voting against us .

Steve

1203. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 13:02:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303230502.23efd054@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63490

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E7D31E3.9309ED7C@att.net>...
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E7B3DD3.B13A8275@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E79FB19.29AAF4BC@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030319190735.23139.00001430@mb-da.aol.com>...
>
> > > > > > Dave, I'm not asking to be pleased nor displeased. I want to know
> > > > > > what is "proficient."
> > > > >
> > > > > No you don't. There is no answer to your question which will
> > > > > please you.
> > > >
> > > > Then there is no authoritative answer to the question. Your guesses
> > > > don't satisfy.
> > >
> > > What'd I tell you.
> >
> >
> > > > I'd certainly like to read the lines. Please quote the Title 47
> > > > paragraph and line number defining Morse Code proficiency.
> >
> > I didn't quote Title 47.
> >
> > > > > > You may define proficiency using a wpm rate, and an accuracy level.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Jim is on record at 10WPM.
> > > > >
> > > > > You must not have read any of my post. How is it possible for you
> > > > > respond without reading it?
> > > >
> > > > Of course I read your post. You said this much code is more
> > > > proficient than that much code. That's not much of an definition.
> >
> > You see, there is no answer which will please you.

>
> If Poor Baby Brain had half a clue he'd look back just a FEW years to the time when
> FCC *did* define Morse proficiency, in the form of a Commercial Radiotelegraph Operator's
> test. Of course he'd find that definition to be 20WPM, not 10.
>
> You can log that as just one more of the *very* many radio things that Slim never
bothered
> to notice.

If Poor Baby DICK would live up to his promises, he wouldn't be so
tortured.

If Poor Baby DICK would mind dusting off his 1958 Commercial Radio
study guide, he might be able to show us where "Morse Proficiency" is
addressed at the FCC.

1204. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 13:27:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030323082703.25403.00001076@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 63491

In article <20030321183711.03396.00000136@mb-cr.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 21 Mar 2003 23:37:11 GMT
>
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>>Is someone who is goog at memorizing electronic formulae supposed to be
>>better than a good volleyball player?
>
>I have the ability to do realtime encoding/decoding also and enjoy that also.

Me too - it's called reading and writing.

>Neither skill is more important in society, but this is a technical hobby.

Where does the word "hobby" appear in Part 97?
>
>>> Note this is NOT a radio or electronics skill.

>>The only place I've used morse is on the radio.
>
>It is translating sounds into characters. This is not an electronics skill.

It's a radio operating skill. The reason to have an amateur radio license is so the licensee can legally operate amateur radio stations, not design/build/adjust/repair them.
>
>> I guess everything where people bond
>>together in a joint interest looks like a cult to someone who sees
>>himself as an outsider.
>
>Not when the mannerisms and traditions tend to follow certain conventions
>that are not required for radio operation.

Those mannerisms and traditions make radio operation easier if everyone follows them. For example, it used to be an FCC regulation that hams always give there own callsign last. "K8MN from N2EY" or "K8MN, this is N2EY" were legal, but "N2EY calling K8MN" was not allowed. This rule was dropped, but the procedure remains, because it makes things easier for everyone.

And when addressing someone, it helps to use their name/callsign first.

>Even Hams know this, thats why they say
>certain things are "true" Ham activities.
>

Like what?

>Here are some examples of cult activity. Excessive jargons,

Who is to say what is excessive?

>hatred of CB,

I don't know any hams who hate cb. I do know hams who do not wnat amateur radio
to become like cb. Is that wrong?
>
>>> Those occasional useful
>>> aspects then benefit you.
>>
>>What "occasional" aspects?
>
>Antenna setups, projects, new operating modes.

They could benefit you, too.
>
>>> A spouse/and our relative would give you a piece of their <unkind> words
>>>for
>>> that. I know.
>>
>>How do you know?
>
>Hard to justify going to a Hamfest or Ham meeting.

Sounds like a personal problem.

>There must be a useful
>topic
>(to other, not me) scheduled to justify going to a Ham meeting.
>
Like I said before - do what interests you.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1205. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 15:05:02 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0303230705.6ebb49a3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63492

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E7D2EC6.B7E6AAA4@att.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030321212900.25154.00000909@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> > > In article <3E7AB2AC.EA5B8C6E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > writes:
>
> >mucho grande garbage<
>
>
> >
> >
> > Don't you have ANYTHING better to do with your life you flaming PUTZ??
> >
>
>
>
> Truth is, he doesn't.

Sick pup - Who gives a (bleep)what he comes off with? He's about as
"effective" as a fart in a hurricane.

w3rv

1206. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 15:11:38 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <38626A4F701FEF93.DF878158AD55D9E7.22CB1ADAA130C53F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 63496

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:fmkfa.82532$gi1.10407@nwrdny02.gnilink.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> news:BAA1E362.14322%stewart@say.net...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
> >
> > > If you are for real...then vote the bum out
> > > of office. But I think the damage is already
> > > done. We, the USA, will NO LONGER TRUST
> > > FRANCE. In fact you have become as irrelevant
> > > as the UN.
> >
> >
> > You do not represent, or speak for, the USA.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> Actually, Dwight...he does. As do you, I, and every other citizen of the
> USA. He's just voicing his personal opinion, or in other words...his
portion
> of the word "we."
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

The KEY element of democracy and freedom is t-o-l-e-r-a-n-c-e. Many do not have the capacity for that KEY element and that is when democracy and freedom are at risk.

Kim W5TIT

1207. Re: Can't get any better publicity than Paul Harvey

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 15:21:57 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <pikfa.82492$gi1.29943@nwrdny02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 63493

"Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message news:b5fempdbn1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> Radio commentator Paul Harvey plugs ham radio's emergency communications
> role (Mar 21, 2003) -- Veteran ABC Radio Networks commentator Paul
> Harvey on March 19 offered some kind words for Amateur Radio. The
> mention was the second item on "page four" of his Paul Harvey Noon News
> and Comment program: "America's quiet warriors are the legion of ham
> radio operators, 700,000 of them, who are always at ready for backup
> duty in emergencies--amateur, unpaid, uncelebrated, civilian radio
> operators, during and after floods and fires and tornadoes. After the
> 9/11 attacks, hams were indispensable in reuniting friends and families.
> Most recently it was they who expedited the search for debris after the
> disaster to the space shuttle Columbia, and right now, at this moment,
> they are involved in homeland security to a greater degree than you
> would want me to make public." The commentary's enigmatic and mysterious
> final sentence --typical of Harvey's habit of leaving his listeners
> hanging--apparently refers to the fact that many Amateur Radio Emergency
> Service (ARES) and Radio Amateur Emergency Service (RACES) teams have
> ramped up their alert status as hostilities get under way in the Middle
> East. The entire Wednesday noon broadcast is available on Paul Harvey's
> Web site (http://www.paulharvey.com/). Click on the Wednesday noon link
> under "Listen Now."
>
>
> Paul Harvey is heard 3 times a day on over 700 radio stations across the
> US. Granted it's not printed medium so there are some who may dispute
> the article. But......

Very Nice. Thanks for sharing this, Steve. :-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1208. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 15:26:03 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <fmkfa.82532$gi1.10407@nwrdny02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 63494

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAA1E362.14322%stewart@say.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
> > If you are for real...then vote the bum out
> > of office. But I think the damage is already
> > done. We, the USA, will NO LONGER TRUST
> > FRANCE. In fact you have become as irrelevant
> > as the UN.
>
>
> You do not represent, or speak for, the USA.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Actually, Dwight...he does. As do you, I, and every other citizen of the USA. He's just voicing his personal opinion, or in other words...his portion of the word "we."

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1209. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 15:30:57 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Rqkfa.82577$gi1.24103@nwrdny02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 63495

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030322235438.19274.00001252@mb-fd.aol.com...
> In article <BAA1E362.14322%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
> writes:
>
> >"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
> >
> >> If you are for real...then vote the bum out
> >> of office. But I think the damage is already
> >> done. We, the USA, will NO LONGER TRUST
> >> FRANCE. In fact you have become as irrelevant
> >> as the UN.
> >
> >
> > You do not represent, or speak for, the USA.
> >
> >
> >Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
>
> Dwight:
>
> Maybe not, but Dan sure as heck spoke for ME! BTW, Dan and I
> "represent" the USA just as much as you do!

Ditto!

> So why don't you join
> in with your silly little French hairdresser butt-buddies, put on a nice
> frilly tu-tu, find a room full of German soldiers, and bend over?

No comment, however... ....

> This is one American saying that France has now joined a new
> geo-political alliance: The Axis of the Irrelevant.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> *** Get the U.S. out of the UN, and the UN out of the U.S.!

Double ditto!

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1210. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 17:44:03 UTC
From: "Chip G." <n.1.m.i.e@snet.net>
Message-ID: <2303200312440310 76%n.1.m.i.e@snet.net>
Source record: 63497

In article <C4EDF5MV37702.0407523148@usenet-nomads.com>, Holodeck
Remailer <no.spam.here@usenet-nomads.com> wrote:

> Many french ham operators would be glad to
> help the US and UK armies in their fight against
> Iraq.

Merci beaucoup mon ami.

Le plus je connais les hommes,
Le plus je t'aime mon chien.

--
--Chip
remove dots in prefix to fix email address

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1211. test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 18:06:54 UTC
From: "Chip G." <n.1.m.i.e@snet.net>
Message-ID: <230320031306543382%n.1.m.i.e@snet.net>
Source record: 63498

Ignore ...

--
--Chip
remove dots in prefix to fix email address

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1212. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 18:37:05 UTC
From: QRP <LowPower@anon.com>
Message-ID: <b5kusi$h13$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 63499

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:38626A4F701FEF93.DF878158AD55D9E7.22CB1ADAA130C53F@lp.airnews.net...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:fmkfa.82532$gi1.10407@nwrdny02.gnilink.net...
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> > news:BAA1E362.14322%stewart@say.net...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
> > >
> > > > If you are for real...then vote the bum out
> > > > of office. But I think the damage is already
> > > > done. We, the USA, will NO LONGER TRUST
> > > > FRANCE. In fact you have become as irrelevant
> > > > as the UN.
> > >
> > >
> > > You do not represent, or speak for, the USA.
> > >
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > Actually, Dwight...he does. As do you, I, and every other citizen of the
> > USA. He's just voicing his personal opinion, or in other words...his
> portion
> > of the word "we."
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
> >
>
> The KEY element of democracy and freedom is t-o-l-e-r-a-n-c-e. Many do
not
> have the capacity for that KEY element and that is when democracy and
> freedom are at risk.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
Tolerance is a nebulous thing, TIT. Your idea of tolerance does not define
the total aspect, shock that this must be to you. Now, how about you being
a bit t-o-l-e-r-a-n-t and just for now, just once in your Liberal life, shut
that egotistical trap of yours.
It is nice that God gave women mouths. It is too bad he taught them to talk.

1213. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 19:12:06 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303231112.53a55089@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63500

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0303211354.47ca34aa@posting.google.com>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0303210914.63337281@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0303201826.3a0a9b09@posting.google.com>...
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030320122706.25801.00000468@mb-mb.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <f45722ac.0303200510.37901e73@posting.google.com>,
> > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > >
> > > > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > > >news:<20030319190735.23139.00001430@mb-da.aol.com>...
> > > > >> In article <f45722ac.0303190403.1a509938@posting.google.com>,
> > > > >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > > >>
> > > > >> >State the WPM rate at which "proficiency" is achieved.
> > > > >> >
> > > > >> 10 WPM is the lowest speed that can be considered "proficient".
> > > > >>
> > > > >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > > > >
> > > > >Jim, thank you. Another question, please. How do you know 10wpm is
> > > > >the lowest speed which can be considered proficient?
> > > >
> > > > It's the lowest speed for which a proficiency award is available. So 10 wpm > >is
> > > > the very beginning - the lowest recognized level - of Morse code
> > > > proficiency.
> > >
> > > Are the awards called "proficiency" awards?
> >
> > Yes.
> >
> > > Who is issuing the
> > > awards, and are you assuming proficiency because that is what level at
> > > which the awards begin?
> >
> > The awards have been available for decades and are well-known in the
> > amateur community. I'm surprised you don't know all about them. The
> > lowest speed for which an award is available is 10 wpm, and there are
> > endorsements at 5 wpm intervals up to at least 40 wpm. I got to the 30
> > wpm level back in high school with pencil-and-paper copy. I'm better
> > than that these days.
>

> Then you should have another award.

Have to ask for it first.

> Who would issue it?

Same organization that issued the others to me.
>
> > > This is obviously not an FCC endeavor.
> >
> > FCC wasn't part of the discussion.
> > >
> > > > Of course much higher levels of proficiency are attainable, but that's another
> > > > story.
> > >
> > > Perhaps higher speeds are attainable, but isn't "proficient" really
> > > just proficient.
> >
> > No. Absolutely not.
>
> So proficient isn't proficient? If 0.02wpm code is done by proficient
> amateurs, then it is proficient? And if 0.02wpm is done by 5wpm
> coders, it is not proficient?
>
> > > > Thus, a 13 wpm code test is a code proficiency test because 13 is greater
> > > >than
> > > > 10, but a 5 wpm code test is not a code proficiency test because 5 is less
> > > > than
> > > > 10.
> > >
> > > In all of my years reading Part 97 and subsequent changes, I've never
> > > seen the word "proficiency" used to describe any of the exams. Why do
> > > you assign the term to what the FCC is doing?
> >
> > I didn't assign it. WK3C did. Here's a quote from a post of his from
> > March 7 of this year:
> >
> > WK3C>Reply-To: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
> > WK3C>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
> > WK3C>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > WK3C>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >
> > WK3C>The regional positions prepared so far, as well as the national
> > positions
> > WK3C>that are known, all indicate that the elimination of the Morse
> > proficiency WK3C>test requirement from the ITU ("International
> > Telecommunications Union") WK3C>Radio Regulations will be a "slam
> > dunk."
> >
> > Note that Carl calls it a "Morse proficiency test", not a "Morse code
> > test" or anything else. He came up with the term, not me, go argue

> > with him.
> >
> > He's almost certainly correct about the slam dunk aspect, too.
> >
> > Proficiency starts at 10 wpm, therefore the Morse proficiency test is
> > already gone in the USA. Element 1 is not, repeat not, a Morse
> > proficiency test.
>
> OK, Carl may have made a mistake.

Then argue with Carl.

> If we could only get to the bottom
> of what proficiency is.

I already told you that 10 wpm is the beginning of proficiency. The
bottom rung on the ladder, so to speak.
>
> How did you come by 10wpm being the lower margin for proficiency
> again?

I told you once.
>
> Did the FCC declare it so?

Why should I answer your questions when you won't answer mine?
>
> > > > So when someone says their goal is 'elimination of the Morse code
> > > > proficiency
> > > > test for any amateur radio license in the USA', it is accurate to reply
> > > > that
> > > > their goal has been accomplished.
> >
> > QED.
> >
> > > It is innacurate because none of the exams were ever touted as
> > > proficiency exams by the federal agency that issued them.
> >
> > No, it's completely accurate. "Elimination of the Morse proficiency
> > tests" and "elimination of all Morse code tests" are two different
> > things.
>
> Maybe. Depends on the word per minute rate for proficiency, doesn't
> it?

Already answered that one.
>
> > --
> >
> > Now, Brian, I've answered all of your questions on this subject.
>
> Thank you. But I still don't have an authoritative reference for what

> is Morse Code proficiency.

I say it's 10 wpm. YMMV.
>
> How
> > about answering the following questions about your claimed T5 amateur
> > radio operations:
> >
> > What callsign was used?
> >
> > What rigs and antennas were used?
> >
> > Who did the equipment belong to?
> >
> > What amateur bands and modes were used?
> >
> > What countries and continents were worked?
> >
> > How were the QSLs delivered?
> >
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim, those questions are just too hard.

No, they're easy. Here they are again:

What callsign was used?

What rigs and antennas were used?

Who did the equipment belong to?

What amateur bands and modes were used?

What countries and continents were worked?

How were the QSLs delivered?

Simple, easy questions. Why would the answers be hard?

> Dave asked them too, but I
> gave up.
>
Why not just answer them? I'm not questioning whether your alleged /T5
operation was "legal" or not.

You expect others to answer your questions but you won't answer
theirs. That's a double standard. Also illogical.

Just tell the truth.

1214. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 19:45:01 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303231145.69473695@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63401

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030321203035.07005.00000196@mb-bk.aol.com>...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
> >If you are going to try and dissuade any of the EE's here from Amateur
> >licensure, I think you're going to be sorely disappointed.
>
> I would like more EEs or people interested in electronics in Ham radio.

Me too!

> If an
> EE goes to a Ham meeting, and see what Ham radio is all about, then often they
> would be not be interested in Ham radio.

I'm an EE, and I disagree. What sort of radio are you really
interested in, Vipul?
>
> >>As an EE, Morse code should not be a priority.

I suppose EE's shouldn't spend time learning the phonetic alphabet,
either.
> >
> > Who said it's "it's a priority", Vippy? And who are YOU to make the
> >decision as to what should be what in another person's routine..???
>
> Its common sense. Real/time encoding/decoding takes away from the more
> important aspects.

What aspects are "more important"?

>Real EEs don't <Morse> code.

I'm a "Real EE", and I do use Morse code. You're simply mistaken.

> The General class license only proves you learned code.

When did the FCC drop the General written test?
>
> >Then you are two faced. You want to "have your cake and eat it too."
>
> No, there are various applications of amateur radio. I would like to find > those
> with similar interests.

Which are?
>
> >The American Radio Relay League already has programs that help to promote
> >Amateur Radio and the opportunities it affords.

>
> What is the chance of an experimenter's club gaining such resources?

I suggest you take a look at how many publications ARRL currently
sells. See how many are about technical subjects and how many are
about Morse code.

> Would such
> an organization be approved to be an "ARRL affiliated" club>

Do you know what the criteria are for affiliation?
>
> >Now...still on the thread, what actions will YOU take in order to help put
> >the advantages of Amature Radio in front of kids and new licensees,
> >Vipul.
>
> I'm in limbo now.

Limbo lower now...

> I cannot take action until a certain "situation" is
> resolved.

What "situation" is that?

> Perhaps this will change soon. Most likely amateur radio will be just
> a diversion, so I just don't care anymore. This may sound bad, but if I get
> something, I can give back.

Ah - there's your problem, Vipul! It all makes sense, now!

You want to get something first - then, if you get what you want, you
may give something back.

The way it works in real life is that you give something, and
hopefully get something in return.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1215. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 19:46:58 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303231146.7477747d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63402

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0303230705.6ebb49a3@posting.google.com>...
> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E7D2EC6.B7E6AAA4@att.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030321212900.25154.00000909@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <3E7AB2AC.EA5B8C6E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > writes:
>
> > > >mucho grande garbage<
> > > >
> > > > Don't you have ANYTHING better to do with your life you flaming PUTZ??
> > Truth is, he doesn't.
>
> Sick pup - Who gives a (bleep)what he comes off with? He's about as
> "effective" as a fart in a hurricane.
>
> w3rv

OK, Fart Expert, perhaps you could enlighten us on how effective a
fart is in a mere gale or an ordinary wind gust. And don't go
confusing proficiency with effectiveness.

1216. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 19:57:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303231157.7299f5a4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63403

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E7D3765.99F496CB@att.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > In article <c2356669.0303210914.63337281@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> > (N2EY) writes:
> >
> > >Proficiency starts at 10 wpm, therefore the Morse proficiency test is
> > >already gone in the USA. Element 1 is not, repeat not, a Morse
> > >proficiency test.
> >
> > Believe it or not, all of the FCC's license tests were
> >
> > NEVER
> >
> > any sort of "proficiency" tests.
> >
> > The FCC is a radio regulating agency, not an academic
> > institution.
> >
> > ARRL has long IMPLIED the license tests were a "proficiency
> > (in radio)" sort of test, but they were NEVER so.
>
> Shows what you know! If there ever was a FCC proficiency test it was
> the (GASP!) Morse code test! for the Commercial Radiotelegraph licenses.

If? You mean it's not? Show us in an old copy of Title 47 where it's
not. FWIW, I think you could get a telegraphy endorsement to the
present day GROL. Why not show us in present day regulations that the
Telegraphy Exam is or is not a proficiency exam.

Unless you admit that you don't know what you're talking about.

> Without proficiency in Morse code operation, an operator was less than
> useless.

You just said every emergency dispatcher across America is less than
useless.

You're simply wrong.

> Gee, one would think that a fella who had no more than a commercial radio
> license know that, even if only by accident!.. Of course in your case we all
> know better.

You're simple, too.

1217. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 22:12:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030323171243.25403.00001089@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 63404

In article <20030320164038.09808.00002573@mb-fk.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>
>>In article <f45722ac.0303200510.37901e73@posting.google.com>,
>>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>
>>So when someone says their goal is 'elimination of the Morse code
>proficiency
>>test for any amateur radio license in the USA', it is accurate to reply
>that
>>their goal has been accomplished.
>
> FLASH: This just in -
>
> FCC has not revoked or otherwise eliminated test element 1 for
> a US amateur radio license examination.
>
Element 1 is not, repeat not, a Morse code proficiency test.

1218. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 22:12:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030323171243.25403.00001090@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 63405

In article <20030321212901.25154.00000911@mb-cb.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0303210914.63337281@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:

>>Proficiency starts at 10 wpm, therefore the Morse proficiency test is
>>already gone in the USA. Element 1 is not, repeat not, a Morse
>>proficiency test.
>
> Believe it or not, all of the FCC's license tests were
>
> NEVER
>
> any sort of "proficiency" tests.

How do you know, Len? Were you there when the FCC was formed?

Are you an expert on Morse code proficiency?
>
> The FCC is a radio regulating agency, not an academic
> institution.

Non sequitir.

> ARRL has long IMPLIED the license tests were a "proficiency
> (in radio)" sort of test,

Where? Show us some proof of this assertion.

Or is it just another of your opinions?

> but they were NEVER so.
>
Sounds like the words of a god, pronouncing Absolute Truth upon us mere mortals
;-)

1219. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 22:25:16 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <D3340BA3E089B8A7.5A6A294E8A4F0D5E.8CF3A3459A07CBD5@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 63567

```
"QRP" <LowPower@anon.com> wrote in message news:b5kusi$h13$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:38626A4F701FEF93.DF878158AD55D9E7.22CB1ADAA130C53F@lp.airnews.net...
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:fmkfa.82532$gi1.10407@nwrdny02.gnilink.net...
> > > "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> > > news:BAA1E362.14322%stewart@say.net...
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > If you are for real...then vote the bum out
> > > > > of office. But I think the damage is already
> > > > > done. We, the USA, will NO LONGER TRUST
> > > > > FRANCE. In fact you have become as irrelevant
> > > > > as the UN.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > You do not represent, or speak for, the USA.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > > Actually, Dwight...he does. As do you, I, and every other citizen of
the
> > > USA. He's just voicing his personal opinion, or in other words...his
> > portion
> > > of the word "we."
> > >
> > > --
> > > 73 de Bert
> > > WA2SI
> > >
> > >
> >
> > The KEY element of democracy and freedom is t-o-l-e-r-a-n-c-e. Many do
> not
> > have the capacity for that KEY element and that is when democracy and
> > freedom are at risk.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> Tolerance is a nebulous thing, TIT. Your idea of tolerance does not define
> the total aspect, shock that this must be to you. Now, how about you
being
```

> a bit t-o-l-e-r-a-n-t and just for now, just once in your Liberal life,
shut
> that egotistical trap of yours.
> It is nice that God gave women mouths. It is too bad he taught them to
talk.
>
>
>
>

Well, your last statement lends how much credence I'd give you....

Kim W5TIT

1220. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-23 23:45:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E7E4746.8010204@adelphia.net>
Source record: 63406

N2EY wrote:
> vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030321203035.07005.00000196@mb-bk.aol.com>...
>
>>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>>
>>>If you are going to try and dissuade any of the EE's here from Amateur
>>>licensure, I think you're going to be sorely disappointed.
>>
>>I would like more EEs or people interested in electronics in Ham radio.
>
>
> Me too!

I would like more yak breeders in Amateur Radio.....

>>>>As an EE, Morse code should not be a priority.
>>>
>
> I suppose EE's shouldn't spend time learning the phonetic alphabet,
> either.

How about an ala-carte ham ticket. Just choose the portions you like?

<snippage>

>>No, there are various applications of amateur radio. I would like to find > those
>>with similar interests.
>
>
> Which are?
>
>>>The American Radio Relay League already has programs that help to promote
>>>Amateur Radio and the opportunities it affords.
>>
>>What is the chance of an experimenter's club gaining such resources?
>
>
> I suggest you take a look at how many publications ARRL currently
> sells. See how many are about technical subjects and how many are
> about Morse code.

Which make me wonder. What sort of experimentation does VP do? And how
does Morse code hinder that?

>>I cannot take action until a certain "situation" is
>>resolved.
>
>
> What "situation" is that?

Hmm. I have an idea and a challenge! If Vipul were to take the time he
spends posting on this newsgroup, and divert it to learning Morse code,
perhaps in a few months time he could get that ticket.....

>
>>Perhaps this will change soon. Most likely amateur radio will be just
>>a diversion, so I just don't care anymore. This may sound bad, but if I get
>>something, I can give back.
>
>
> Ah - there's your problem, Vipul! It all makes sense, now!
>
> You want to get something first - then, if you get what you want, you
> may give something back.

I want amateur radio to give me 500 dollars......

1221. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 00:20:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303231620.6583b92e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63407

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E7D38AE.CD69604B@att.net>...
>
> And you're a veteran of rear area radio babysitting action, about 400 miles to the
> rear.

Dick, wow. I guess everyone in the Army drives a tank, and everyone
in the Air Force flies an airplane, too.

Perhaps you missed that when you are subscripted or enlisted in the
service, not everyone goes into combat. But you did toss your hat in
the ring to go. So don't go putting down every REMF that supports the
combat troops.

Hey, while you're putting down all the REMF's, you might want to
detail your combat experience. I wonder if you've got a box full of
medals you didn't earn, like Steve has talked about.

1222. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 00:26:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303231626.25a06252@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63408

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030321191924.20623.00000288@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/21/2003 1:43 PM Pacific Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303211343.6a15967b@posting.google.com>
>
> >Please, not another new obsessive/compulsive thread.
>
> Since you felt compelled to respond to a thread not addressing you, I guess
> it WAS a compulsive thing for you, wasn't it...?!?!
>
> So I guess the answer is yes, you've made it another obsessive/compulsive
> thread.
>
> Steve

WHAT AN IDIOT! He's >>NOT<< obsessive/compulsive?

BBBWWWHHHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
AHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !

We'll have to start calling you "Obsessive/Compulsive Thread Starter!"

BBBWWWHHHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
AHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !

(There, that's obsessive/compulsive posting. Does it look familiar?)

1223. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 00:30:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303231630.520d8abd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63409

"QRP" <LowPower@anon.com> wrote in message news:<b5kusi$h13$0@pita.alt.net>...
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:38626A4F701FEF93.DF878158AD55D9E7.22CB1ADAA130C53F@lp.airnews.net...
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:fmkfa.82532$gi1.10407@nwrdny02.gnilink.net...
> > > "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> > > news:BAA1E362.14322%stewart@say.net...
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > If you are for real...then vote the bum out
> > > > > of office. But I think the damage is already
> > > > > done. We, the USA, will NO LONGER TRUST
> > > > > FRANCE. In fact you have become as irrelevant
> > > > > as the UN.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > You do not represent, or speak for, the USA.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > > Actually, Dwight...he does. As do you, I, and every other citizen of the
> > > USA. He's just voicing his personal opinion, or in other words...his
> portion
> > > of the word "we."
> > >
> > > --
> > > 73 de Bert
> > > WA2SI
> > >
> > >
> >
> > The KEY element of democracy and freedom is t-o-l-e-r-a-n-c-e. Many do
> not
> > have the capacity for that KEY element and that is when democracy and
> > freedom are at risk.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >

> Tolerance is a nebulous thing, TIT. Your idea of tolerance does not define
> the total aspect, shock that this must be to you. Now, how about you being
> a bit t-o-l-e-r-a-n-t and just for now, just once in your Liberal life, shut
> that egotistical trap of yours.

> It is nice that God gave women mouths. It is too bad he taught them to talk.

Hmmm? Is this Larry or Stebe?

Naw, neither one would post anonymously. Or would they?

1224. Re: test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 00:33:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303231633.1ebb211@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63410

"Chip G." <n.1.m.i.e@snet.net> wrote in message
news:<230320031306543382%n.1.m.i.e@snet.net>...
> Ignore ...

ryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryry

The quick brown fox jumped over the lazy dogs back.

1225. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 01:09:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7E5B11.777C38@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63411

Brian wrote:
>
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030321212847.25154.00000901@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> > In article <3E7B4376.4FA1BFBB@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> > >> In regards to Morse code -you are now the passive receiver/transmitter of an
> > >> AUDIOMOTOR skill.
> > >
> > >Being good at volleyball is a motor skill. Is volleyball a bad thing?
> >
> > This isn't a volleyball newsgroup.
> >
> > FCC doesn't require volleyball skills to pass licensing tests.
>
> Looks like Dave has poured hisself a glass of apple juice and expected
> it to taste like oranges.

My comparison was a valid one despite Leonard's comments. You need to
remember too that this isn't a "professional radio" newsgroup, or a
"there I was surrounded by 150 teletype machines with Bear bombers just
minutes away" newsgroup.

Looks like you got prune juice and it has begun to work.

Dave K8MN

1226. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 01:10:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7E5B55.EE2EB8E5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63412

Brian wrote:
>
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030322211249.10175.00000214@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
> > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >Date: 3/22/2003 7:47 AM Pacific Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303220747.212ae02e@posting.google.com>
> >
> > >I don't look a thing like Mr. Whipple
> >
> > Acutally I was talking about the imprint on my roll of Charmin...
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Do tell. Mine comes without imprints.

Those show up on application.

Dave K8MN

1227. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 01:43:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030323204347.09480.00000264@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 63413

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/23/2003 11:46 AM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303231146.7477747d@posting.google.com>

> And don't go
>confusing proficiency with effectiveness.

They are, for the most part, synonymous, Brain.

One cannot be effective at something without being proficient at it, nor
can one be proficient without being effective.

Unless you can prove otherwise?

Steve, K4YZ

1228. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 01:46:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030323204622.09480.00000265@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 63414

>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 3/23/2003 3:45 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E7E4746.8010204@adelphia.net>

>I would like more yak breeders in Amateur Radio.....

They're called Iraqi's!

=)

1229. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 01:55:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030323205503.09480.00000266@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 63415

>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/23/2003 4:26 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303231626.25a06252@posting.google.com>

First, Brian Burke said...

>> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >Date: 3/21/2003 1:43 PM Pacific Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303211343.6a15967b@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >Please, not another new obsessive/compulsive thread.

I responded with:

>> Since you felt compelled to respond to a thread not addressing you, I
>guess
>> it WAS a compulsive thing for you, wasn't it...?!?!
>>
>> So I guess the answer is yes, you've made it another
>obsessive/compulsive
>> thread.

Brain follows up with:

>WHAT AN IDIOT! He's >>NOT<< obsessive/compulsive?

Where, Brain, Did I say I WASN'T...?!?! (Which makes YOU the idiot for
not exercising some adult reading comprehension BEFORE yuo made your OWN
"obsessive/compulsive" response)

>We'll have to start calling you "Obsessive/Compulsive Thread Starter!"

What's funny, Brain, is that of the last 100 posts started, I only did
six of them.

So...HOW "obsessive/complusive" is that?

And by the way, I am STILL awaiting your response to my inquiry as to YOUR
credentials in psychiatry or psychology that qualify YOU to make any INFORMED
opinions on the subject of obsessive/compulsive disorders.

>(There, that's obsessive/compulsive posting. Does it look familiar?)

Well, Brain, you keep coming back with a response, so WHAT does that say
for YOU...?!?!
BBBWWWAAAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! !

Steve

1230. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 03:33:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E7E7CA2.4070107@adelphia.net>
Source record: 63416

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 3/23/2003 3:45 PM Pacific Standard Time
>>Message-id: <3E7E4746.8010204@adelphia.net>
>
>
>>I would like more yak breeders in Amateur Radio.....
>
>
> They're called Iraqi's!

ROFL......ewwwww! Thanks Steve, you trumped me, but I needed the laugh. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1231. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 04:32:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAA3F482.14565%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63417

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:

> And guess what Dwight? Neither do you. But I
> damn sure have the right to tell them what I
> think.

Than tell them in your name, not with "we, the USA." You are not "we, the USA." And I have never claimed or suggested to be that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1232. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 04:35:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAA3F52C.14567%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63418

"Bert Craig" wrote:

> Actually, Dwight...he does. As do you, I,
> and every other citizen of the USA. He's
> just voicing his personal opinion, or in
> other words...his portion of the word "we."

No single American is "We, the USA." If he wants to voice his personal opinion, he can do so in his own name (like everyone else does).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1233. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 04:39:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAA3F639.14569%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63419

"W5TIT" wrote:

> The KEY element of democracy and freedom is
> t-o-l-e-r-a-n-c-e. Many do not have the
> capacity for that KEY element and that is
> when democracy and freedom are at risk.

Sadly, this thread has now turned into childish pranks with a single individual posting using half a dozen names. And that is something I have no tolerance for, so I'm out of this discussion.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1234. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 04:43:19 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030323234319.16431.00000307@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 63420

From (N2EY)
>> If an
>> EE goes to a Ham meeting, and see what Ham radio is all about, then often
>they
>> would be not be interested in Ham radio.
>
>I'm an EE, and I disagree.

I've been to at least 4 clubs in MA. I can't find an EE friendly club. I know what Ham radio is.

>What aspects are "more important"?

Experimentation is more important that Morse code. Morse code is so much emphasized that it takes away from all other aspects.

>I suggest you take a look at how many publications ARRL currently
>sells. See how many are about technical subjects and how many are
>about Morse code.

True ARRL has technical publications. Most hams aren't interested in this, however. QST mag more represents current Ham interests.

>The way it works in real life is that you give something, and
>hopefully get something in return.

I'm still in limbo. That's something to consider.

From: Mike Coslo
>>>I would like more EEs or people interested in electronics in Ham radio.
>>
>>
>> Me too!
>
>I would like more yak breeders in Amateur Radio.....

I'd like more preety fems in Ham radio.

>How about an ala-carte ham ticket. Just choose the portions you like?

Sorry, but to get the good-tasting "General" dish, you must eat the bad-tasting "Morse code" dish in front of the waiter.

>Hmm. I have an idea and a challenge! If Vipul were to take the time he
>spends posting on this newsgroup, and divert it to learning Morse code,
>perhaps in a few months time he could get that ticket...

I don't want to learn <Morse> code. Why should I spend time learning something
I have no interest in?

1235. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 04:52:19 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030323235219.16431.00000310@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 63421

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>> I have the ability to do realtime encoding/decoding also and enjoy that
>also.
>
>On or off the volleyball court?
Off.

>> >The only place I've used morse is on the radio
It can be used with a flashlight.

>Why should mannerisms and traditions bother you?
Because Hams have the stereotype of being weird.

>I'm going to guess that you really have no idea of what takes place at a
>Wouff Hong ceremony.
I had a chance to attend one. I asked for my $2 back. I didn't want to wait 3
hrs to find out.

>Why should I be bound by your "occasional aspects"?
Why should amateur radio be bound by Morse code?

>Have you given
>control of your daily life to some sort of family cult?
Your spouse lets you go?

>We may even have a program
>which is of no interest to me whatever.
Find out the topic in advance from the newsletter. Only attend the interesting
ones, not the uninteresting ones.

1236. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 05:03:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7E918F.2062E659@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63422

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From (N2EY)
> >> If an
> >> EE goes to a Ham meeting, and see what Ham radio is all about, then often
> >they
> >> would be not be interested in Ham radio.
> >
> >I'm an EE, and I disagree.
>
> I've been to at least 4 clubs in MA. I can't find an EE friendly club. I know
> what Ham radio is.

Vipul, I have to believe that your approach is faulty. It is probably
best not to start with, "Why do you guys hate EE's?"

> >What aspects are "more important"?
>
> Experimentation is more important that Morse code. Morse code is so much emphasized that
it takes away from all other aspects.

Even though a lot of hams enjoy using morse code, SSB is in wider use.
I can't believe that you've only attended meetings where CW ops are in
the majority.

> >I suggest you take a look at how many publications ARRL currently
> >sells. See how many are about technical subjects and how many are
> >about Morse code.
>
> True ARRL has technical publications.

That's right.

> Most hams aren't interested in this, however.

How would you know what most hams find interesting? Even if your
statement was one of the eternal truths, what would stop you from
getting all the ARRL technical publications in existence?

> QST mag more represents current Ham interests.

What do you find wrong with that. QST is a general interest magazine or
at least it used to be.

> >The way it works in real life is that you give something, and
> >hopefully get something in return.
>

> I'm still in limbo. That's something to consider.

How long does limbo last? I think most folks figure out this basic
premise before reaching adulthood.

> I'd like more preety fems in Ham radio.

...with EE degrees?

> I don't want to learn <Morse> code. Why should I spend time learning something I have no
interest in?

How about to obtain the privileges which go with the license? It really
won't bother anyone else if you decide to try to sit and wait for morse
testing to go away.

Dave K8MN

1237. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 05:08:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E7E92CF.90309@adelphia.net>
Source record: 63423

Vshah101 wrote:
> From (N2EY)
>
>>>If an
>>>EE goes to a Ham meeting, and see what Ham radio is all about, then often
>>
>>they
>>
>>>would be not be interested in Ham radio.
>>
>>I'm an EE, and I disagree.
>
>
> I've been to at least 4 clubs in MA. I can't find an EE friendly club. I know
> what Ham radio is.
>
>
>>What aspects are "more important"?
>
>
> Experimentation is more important that Morse code. Morse code is so much
> emphasized that it takes away from all other aspects.
>
>
>>I suggest you take a look at how many publications ARRL currently
>>sells. See how many are about technical subjects and how many are
>>about Morse code.
>
>
> True ARRL has technical publications. Most hams aren't interested in this,
> however. QST mag more represents current Ham interests.
>
>
>>The way it works in real life is that you give something, and
>>hopefully get something in return.
>
>
> I'm still in limbo. That's something to consider.
>
> From: Mike Coslo
>
>>>>I would like more EEs or people interested in electronics in Ham radio.
>>>
>>>

>>>Me too!
>>
>>I would like more yak breeders in Amateur Radio.....
>
>
> I'd like more preety fems in Ham radio.

Well, that would be okay.

>
>>How about an ala-carte ham ticket. Just choose the portions you like?
>
>
> Sorry, but to get the good-tasting "General" dish, you must eat the bad-tasting
> "Morse code" dish in front of the waiter.
>
>
>>Hmm. I have an idea and a challenge! If Vipul were to take the time he
>>spends posting on this newsgroup, and divert it to learning Morse code,
>>perhaps in a few months time he could get that ticket...
>
>
> I don't want to learn <Morse> code. Why should I spend time learning something
> I have no interest in?

You don't have to. Depends on if you want the ticket or not. You are
missing a lot. We only have so many years on this earth, and every year
we wait for the requirement to go away is one less year to enjoy the
fun. I don't do much Morse. But learning it got me my license years
ahead of waiting for the requirement to go away.

What is wiser?

- Mike -

1238. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 05:16:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7E9476.9FA7B46B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63424

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >> I have the ability to do realtime encoding/decoding also and enjoy that
> >also.
> >
> >On or off the volleyball court?
> Off.
>
> >> >The only place I've used morse is on the radio

> It can be used with a flashlight.

...not on 20m, it can't. You don't need to pass a morse exam to use a
flashlight.

> >Why should mannerisms and traditions bother you?

> Because Hams have the stereotype of being weird.

It must be a regional thing. I see no evidence of hams being any more
weird than any other folks.

> >I'm going to guess that you really have no idea of what takes place at a
> >Wouff Hong ceremony.

> I had a chance to attend one. I asked for my $2 back. I didn't want to > wait 3 hrs to
find out.

...but you're willing to wait until morse code goes away before you
attempt a license exam which offers HF access. I don't know what the
two bucks is for. I didn't pay anything to participate.

So you had an opportunity to participate, didn't want to wait and you
make posts about the Royal Order of the Wouff Hong without really
knowing what it is all about.

> >Why should I be bound by your "occasional aspects"?

> Why should amateur radio be bound by Morse code?

...or written exams or band segments or power limits or anything else
you decide you don't feel should apply to you.

> >Have you given
> >control of your daily life to some sort of family cult?

> Your spouse lets you go?

What do you mean "lets"? She isn't a prison warden. Did you give control of your life to another person?

> >We may even have a program
> >which is of no interest to me whatever.

> Find out the topic in advance from the newsletter. Only attend the > interestingones, not the uninteresting ones.

Maybe others find them interesting. I can still enjoy the socializing, the business meeting, the comraderie, the coffee and the donuts. Why should it bother you if I choose to attend a meeting with a boring program? You have trouble even getting out of the house.

Dave K8MN

1239. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 05:21:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7E95D7.F461A487@att.net>
Source record: 63425

Dave Heil wrote:

> Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> > From (N2EY)
> > >> If an
> > >> EE goes to a Ham meeting, and see what Ham radio is all about, then often
> > >they
> > >> would be not be interested in Ham radio.
> > >
> > >I'm an EE, and I disagree.
> >
> > I've been to at least 4 clubs in MA. I can't find an EE friendly club. I know
> > what Ham radio is.
>
> Vipul, I have to believe that your approach is faulty. It is probably
> best not to start with, "Why do you guys hate EE's?"
>
> > >What aspects are "more important"?
> >
> > Experimentation is more important that Morse code. Morse code is so much emphasized
that it takes away from all other aspects.
>
> Even though a lot of hams enjoy using morse code, SSB is in wider use.
> I can't believe that you've only attended meetings where CW ops are in
> the majority.
>
> > >I suggest you take a look at how many publications ARRL currently
> > >sells. See how many are about technical subjects and how many are
> > >about Morse code.
> >
> > True ARRL has technical publications.
>
> That's right.
>
> > Most hams aren't interested in this, however.
>
> How would you know what most hams find interesting? Even if your
> statement was one of the eternal truths, what would stop you from
> getting all the ARRL technical publications in existence?
>
> > QST mag more represents current Ham interests.
>
> What do you find wrong with that. QST is a general interest magazine or

> at least it used to be.
>
> > >The way it works in real life is that you give something, and
> > >hopefully get something in return.
> >
> > I'm still in limbo. That's something to consider.
>
> How long does limbo last? I think most folks figure out this basic
> premise before reaching adulthood.
>
>
> > I'd like more preety fems in Ham radio.
>
> ...with EE degrees?
>
>
> > I don't want to learn <Morse> code. Why should I spend time learning something I have no interest in?
>
> How about to obtain the privileges which go with the license? It really
> won't bother anyone else if you decide to try to sit and wait for morse
> testing to go away.

That has GOT to be Cootie Boy. There can't be two like that on the planet.

1240. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 05:22:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324002236.16291.00000241@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 63426

>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/23/2003 8:43 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030323234319.16431.00000307@mb-mf.aol.com>

>I've been to at least 4 clubs in MA. I can't find an EE friendly club. I know
>what Ham radio is.

Personally, I just think you're either too picky, too smart-mouthed or
just lying. Or perhaps it's a blend of the three.

>Experimentation is more important that Morse code

...to YOU. Experimentation is more important to YOU.

>Morse code is so much
>emphasized that it takes away from all other aspects.

Morse Code is NOT "so much emphasized" that it takes away from anything.

>I'm still in limbo. That's something to consider.

Yes...You are DEFINATELY in limbo...Waaaaaaaay out in limbo.

>I'd like more preety fems in Ham radio.

"preety fems"...?!?! Is that the latest "fad term" in the singles
magazines?

>>How about an ala-carte ham ticket. Just choose the portions you like?
>
>Sorry, but to get the good-tasting "General" dish, you must eat the
>bad-tasting
>"Morse code" dish in front of the waiter.

Then whatever it is you want is obvioulsy NOT worth the effort needed to
obtain it. So why not just quit yer bellyachin' and just live with it until
the rules change?

But here's where you and Lennie show your TRUE colors...You whine and
snivvel so much about experimenting and what the EE element could bring to
Amateur Radio, however the ONLY thing you whine about is those few megahertz of
playground at HF...

"Experimenting" and "homebrewing" are the LAST things on either of your
minds.

>I don't want to learn <Morse> code. Why should I spend time learning
>something

>I have no interest in?

The point is you're not CAPABLE of learning Morse Code and you don't want anyone to realize your shortcoming.

No problem. There's thousands of people just like you. Just stand a little closer to the urinal and no one else will be able to tell.

Steve

1241. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 05:33:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324003309.16291.00000244@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 63427

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/23/2003 8:52 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030323235219.16431.00000310@mb-mf.aol.com>

>>> >The only place I've used morse is on the radio

>It can be used with a flashlight.

That's not what he said.

>>Why should mannerisms and traditions bother you?

>Because Hams have the stereotype of being weird.

From what CREDIBLE source do you get THAT idea?

>>I'm going to guess that you really have no idea of what takes place at a
>>Wouff Hong ceremony.

>I had a chance to attend one. I asked for my $2 back. I didn't want to wait 3
>hrs to find out.

So...You have spent MONTHS in this forum belittling Amateur Radio
operators for some INFREQUENTLY conducted fun event that you have NOT even
attended, yet claim is such an overwhelming "cult" activity...?!?!?

You insuferable putz!

>>Why should I be bound by your "occasional aspects"?

>Why should amateur radio be bound by Morse code?

It's not. As a No Code Technician you already have access to over 97% os
all Amateur Radio allocations. The Morse Code is only required for access to
about 3% of the remaining allocations and only then because of international
law.

>>Have you given
>>control of your daily life to some sort of family cult?

>Your spouse lets you go?

Your spouse won't? Oh...I forgot...You're hunting "preety fems"...

>>We may even have a program
>>which is of no interest to me whatever.

>Find out the topic in advance from the newsletter. Only attend the
>interesting

>ones, not the uninteresting ones.

Which means the club cannot expect you to support it. Since you seem to expect the rest of the club to listen to what YOU have to say (or are interested in), don't you think you should take YOUR turn sitting politely and listening to what others say or think?

Or should ALL clubs simply ignore the rest of their memberships and cater soley to you, Vipul?

The phrase "spoiled rotten brat" comes to mind.

Steve

1242. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 05:38:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7E99C2.2F9B798A@att.net>
Source record: 63428

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E7D31E3.9309ED7C@att.net>...
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E7B3DD3.B13A8275@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E79FB19.29AAF4BC@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030319190735.23139.00001430@mb-da.aol.com>...
> > >
> > > > > > > > Dave, I'm not asking to be pleased nor displeased. I want to know
> > > > > > > > what is "proficient."
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > No you don't. There is no answer to your question which will
> > > > > > > please you.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Then there is no authoritative answer to the question. Your guesses
> > > > > > don't satisfy.
> > > > >
> > > > > What'd I tell you.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > > > I'd certainly like to read the lines. Please quote the Title 47
> > > > > > paragraph and line number defining Morse Code proficiency.
> > > >
> > > > I didn't quote Title 47.
> > > >
> > > > > > > > You may define proficiency using a wpm rate, and an accuracy level.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Jim is on record at 10WPM.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You must not have read any of my post. How is it possible for you
> > > > > > respond without reading it?
> > > > >
> > > > > Of course I read your post. You said this much code is more
> > > > > proficient than that much code. That's not much of an definition.

> > >
> > > You see, there is no answer which will please you.
> >
> > If Poor Baby Brain had half a clue he'd look back just a FEW years to the time when
> > FCC *did* define Morse proficiency, in the form of a Commercial Radiotelegraph
Operator's
> > test. Of course he'd find that definition to be 20WPM, not 10.
> >
> > You can log that as just one more of the *very* many radio things that Slim never
bothered
> > to notice.
>
> If Poor Baby DICK would live up to his promises, he wouldn't be so
> tortured.
>

I told you long ago that I'd be back to jab you in the butt whenever I read some of your
drivel quoted in
someone else's post that had to be addressed. Well, here's the needle......Enjoy.

>

>
> If Poor Baby DICK would mind dusting off his 1958 Commercial Radio
> study guide, he might be able to show us where "Morse Proficiency" is
> addressed at the FCC.

You're the dingaling who can't understand that "official permission" needs more than just a
"yeah, go ahead", and yet you demand letter perfect clarification on the most accepted of
points.
When the FCC issued a radiotelegraph license to an applicant it was only after he
demonstrated
PROFICIENCY in the use of Morse code- at 20WPM.. Somehow they saw no need to spell it out
in explicit terms.

After all, they were confident that no one as clueless as you would ever show up to take
the test.
Those who did had no questions about any of it. Some people have no such trouble learning
things.

1243. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 05:39:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E7E9A1E.DB81C496@att.net>
Source record: 63429

Dave Heil wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> > No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> > government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> > amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> > Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> > slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Dick, I think you've gotten the idea. Len does not play well with
> others.

Whats more than clear also is the fact that he doesn't learn very well
either.

1244. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 05:40:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324004005.16326.00000220@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 63430

>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>Date: 3/23/2003 9:21 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E7E95D7.F461A487@att.net>

>That has GOT to be Cootie Boy. There can't be two like that on the planet.

Unfortunately Dick, I have to disagree...Even the foulest of amoebas can
split and multiply...seems it's happened here ! ! ! !

73

Steve, K4YZ

1245. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 12:01:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303240401.1743bd74@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63431

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030323205503.09480.00000266@mb-da.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/23/2003 4:26 PM Pacific Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303231626.25a06252@posting.google.com>

> Brain follows up with:
>
> >WHAT AN IDIOT! He's >>NOT<< obsessive/compulsive?
>
> Where, Brain, Did I say I WASN'T...?!?!

Are you now saying that you are?

1246. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 13:12:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303240512.7f526446@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63432

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030322211527.10175.00000215@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/22/2003 7:54 AM Pacific Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303220754.2747ffe8@posting.google.com>
>
> >Seek professional help.
>
> For what? Making a fool out of you, Lennie and Vippy? Heck, I can do that
> for FREE!

For your obsessive/compulsive behavior. Surely you have a medical
plan being a male nurse and all. Unless you're worried about losing
your security clearance and not getting to participate in your 8th
hostile action.

I wonder about that engineer that rolled 3 grenades into the tents in
Kuwait. Maybe he should have lost his clearance and shouldn't have
been there at all.

> >Best of luck to you.
>
> You don't need luck when you do it well. And I can de-rant you without
> breaking a sweat.

De-rant me? You've obviously transferred your guilt to me. I'm not
the one banging out all caps, exclamation points and "Bwahahahahaha"
for three lines.

> But you go on thinking that if it makes you feel better...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

It doesn't make me feel better. It kind of makes me sad to have to
point this out, but you do need help.

Best of luck to you.

1247. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 13:14:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303240514.411e6b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63433

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030323204347.09480.00000264@mb-da.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/23/2003 11:46 AM Pacific Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303231146.7477747d@posting.google.com>
>
> > And don't go
> >confusing proficiency with effectiveness.
>
> They are, for the most part, synonymous, Brain.
>
> One cannot be effective at something without being proficient at it, nor
> can one be proficient without being effective.
>
> Unless you can prove otherwise?

Talk to Dave about it. Bring up 0.02wpm having world record setting
effectiveness, but not being even close to proficient, whatever that
is.

1248. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 13:17:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303240517.3ed4e84a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63434

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E76D828.88478EC4@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > You're here, aren't you?
>
> I'm not the guy who wrote that I didn't have time.

So you obviously have the time for stupid games. Which is the road
you take with all of your posts here. Pure nonsense.

1249. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 13:19:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303240519.1603b28d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63435

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E7E99C2.2F9B798A@att.net>...

> I told you long ago that I'd be back to jab you in the butt whenever I read

So now you're playing male nurse? Why not just leave it to expert, Steve?

1250. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 14:58:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324095829.14527.00001055@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 63436

In article <20030323204347.09480.00000264@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>> And don't go
>>confusing proficiency with effectiveness.
>
> They are, for the most part, synonymous, Brain.
>
> One cannot be effective at something without being proficient at it, nor
>can one be proficient without being effective.
>
> Unless you can prove otherwise?
>
The hams using the 0.02 wpm Morse were effective, but not necessarily proficient. I'm almost certain the sending and receiving were done by computer, not by the hams themselves, so their proficiency is unknown and irrelevant.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1251. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 14:58:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324095830.14527.00001056@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 63437

In article <20030323234319.16431.00000307@mb-mf.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From (N2EY)

Get your attributions right, Vipul. You wrote the following, not me.

>>> If an
>>> EE goes to a Ham meeting, and see what Ham radio is all about, then often
>>>they would be not be interested in Ham radio.
>>
>>I'm an EE, and I disagree.
>
>I've been to at least 4 clubs in MA. I can't find an EE friendly club.

What would "an EE friendly club" be like? Do you expect all hams to have EE level knowledge?

>I know what Ham radio is.

Your statements here don't indicate that.
>
>>What aspects are "more important"?
>
>Experimentation is more important that Morse code.

So what experimentation are you doing?

>Morse code is so much
>emphasized that it takes away from all other aspects.

How? There's one morse code test element and three written test elements. No morse code test for all of amateur VHF-UHF.

What HF/MF experiments do you wish to do?
>
>>I suggest you take a look at how many publications ARRL currently
>>sells. See how many are about technical subjects and how many are
>>about Morse code.
>
>True ARRL has technical publications.

Not just ARRL, either. RSGB does some great stuff.

How many amateur radio technical publications do you have? How many have you read?

>Most hams aren't interested in this, however.

Our licenses are for operating, not building.

>QST mag more represents current Ham interests.

That's good. It's a general-interest amateur radio magazine.

Have you ever read QEX?
>
>>The way it works in real life is that you give something, and
>>hopefully get something in return.
>
>I'm still in limbo.

What the heck does that mean?

>That's something to consider.
>
First you have to explain what it means.

>From: Mike Coslo
>>>>I would like more EEs or people interested in electronics in Ham radio.
>>>
>>> Me too!
>>
>>I would like more yak breeders in Amateur Radio.....
>
>I'd like more preety fems in Ham radio.

What are "preety fems"??
>
>>How about an ala-carte ham ticket. Just choose the portions you like?
>
>Sorry, but to get the good-tasting "General" dish, you must eat the
>bad-tasting
>"Morse code" dish in front of the waiter.

It's only bad-tasting to some.
>
>>Hmm. I have an idea and a challenge! If Vipul were to take the time he
>>spends posting on this newsgroup, and divert it to learning Morse code,
>>perhaps in a few months time he could get that ticket...

You mean "a few days time", Mike.
>
>I don't want to learn <Morse> code.

Then you can't get a General or Extra amateur radio license until the rules
change. Sorry. I don;t make the rules, FCC does. Argue with them.

>Why should I spend time learning
>something I have no interest in?

Same reason others spent time learning things they were not interested in to
pass the written tests.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1252. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 15:37:54 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5n8o2$9lh$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63438

No....I'll tell you what Dwight....you go stand and protest with the other gutless pukes that give hope to the Baghdad butcher. And Ill stand with real Americans.

As far as Im concerned those that help the enemy are not Americans. Stick that in your pipe and blow a contact high.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:BAA3F482.14565%stewart@say.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
> > And guess what Dwight? Neither do you. But I
> > damn sure have the right to tell them what I
> > think.
>
>
> Than tell them in your name, not with "we, the USA." You are not "we, the
> USA." And I have never claimed or suggested to be that.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>
> ------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1253. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 15:38:57 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5n8q0ngd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63439

Good plan Dwight. Run when your wipped.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAA3F639.14569%stewart@say.net...
> "W5TIT" wrote:
>
> > The KEY element of democracy and freedom is
> > t-o-l-e-r-a-n-c-e. Many do not have the
> > capacity for that KEY element and that is
> > when democracy and freedom are at risk.
>
>
> Sadly, this thread has now turned into childish pranks with a single
> individual posting using half a dozen names. And that is something I have
no
> tolerance for, so I'm out of this discussion.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>
> ------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

1254. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 17:27:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324122725.27873.00001324@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63440

In article <J%Rea.31$iP3.17@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Heck, I know some EEs and some ASEEs as well as BSETs with tickets.

Jim,

Count me in - BSEE and MSEE.

I also use Morse ;-)

>I have
>a serious doubt by many of your posts that you seriously care about any of
>the tests other than you perceive them as 'hard'. I don't care about Morse
>one way or the other ... the next thing, I suspect a lot of folks will be
>whining about the theory.

Well, consider the fact that there are three written tests totalling 120 questions to get a full-privileges license. Why does a ham need to learn all that stuff just to operate a QRP CW transmitter on 7005 kHz? (I don't agree with this argument at all - it's just a common anti-Morse-test argument applied to the writtens).

> If you even possess algebra and trig you know how
>easy the tests are.

Ahh - but what about those who don't know algebra and trig? Why should they have to learn something they're not interested in, just to get a ham license?

>BTW, ...ummmm... Scott, interogative, WTF? Snip a cap
>here and add a jumper there ... I doubt that adds too much to the book of
>knowledge, right?
>
Some of us still build rigs from scratch. But I betcha we're a smaller minority than Morse-using hams!

And our licenses are primarily for operating, not building.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1255. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 17:57:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7F478F.7CD2CB5E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63441

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E7E5B11.777C38@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030321212847.25154.00000901@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <3E7B4376.4FA1BFBB@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > writes:
> > > >
> > > > >Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> > > > > >> In regards to Morse code -you are now the passive receiver/transmitter of an
> > > > > >> AUDIOMOTOR skill.
> > > > >
> > > > > >Being good at volleyball is a motor skill. Is volleyball a bad thing?
> > > >
> > > > This isn't a volleyball newsgroup.
> > > >
> > > > FCC doesn't require volleyball skills to pass licensing tests.
> > >
> > > Looks like Dave has poured hisself a glass of apple juice and expected
> > > it to taste like oranges.
> >
> > My comparison was a valid one despite Leonard's comments.
>
> Why didn't you use Cecil's "can you dunk a basketball" analogy?

Because it wasn't applicable. I would have thought that you'd have been
able to figure that out.

> You need to
> > remember too that this isn't a "professional radio" newsgroup, or a
> > "there I was surrounded by 150 teletype machines with Bear bombers just
> > minutes away" newsgroup.
>
> Is this a sand volleyball newsgroup?

I didn't launch into tales of volleyball fifty years back or give Vipul
a history lesson of specific volleyball leagues. I didn't tell him that
his volleyball procedures were bad practice. I compared two separate
types of "audio motor" skills. You and Len have wasted twice as much
time injecting your input as my comparison took--and it has gotten you
nowhere.

> > Looks like you got prune juice and it has begun to work.
>
> No luck there.

Check again. That output of yours is coming from somewhere.

Dave K8MN

1256. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 18:00:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7F4813.9CBE19C4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63442

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E7E5B55.EE2EB8E5@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030322211249.10175.00000214@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> > > > >Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
> > > > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > > > >Date: 3/22/2003 7:47 AM Pacific Standard Time
> > > > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303220747.212ae02e@posting.google.com>
> > >
> > > > > >I don't look a thing like Mr. Whipple
> > > > >
> > > > > Acutally I was talking about the imprint on my roll of Charmin...
> > > > >
> > > > > Steve, K4YZ
> > > >
> > > Do tell. Mine comes without imprints.
> > >
> > Those show up on application.

> You've been looking at Steve's toilet paper? Eeeewwww!

Steve didn't write that his came without imprints.

Dave K8MN

1257. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 18:04:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7F4938.CE9CDD74@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63443

Brian wrote:
>
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030323204347.09480.00000264@mb-da.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >Date: 3/23/2003 11:46 AM Pacific Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303231146.7477747d@posting.google.com>
> >
> > > And don't go
> > >confusing proficiency with effectiveness.
> >
> > They are, for the most part, synonymous, Brain.
> >
> > One cannot be effective at something without being proficient at it, nor
> > can one be proficient without being effective.
> >
> > Unless you can prove otherwise?
>
> Talk to Dave about it. Bring up 0.02wpm having world record setting
> effectiveness, but not being even close to proficient, whatever that
> is.

Someday you'll get something right. I didn't use "effective" or
"effectiveness". I wrote that you confuse "proficient" with
"efficient". Now you're confusing "efficiency" with "effectiveness".
They do not mean the same thing.

Dave K8MN

1258. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 18:06:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7F49A2.9AEC342@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63444

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E76D828.88478EC4@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > You're here, aren't you?
> >
> > I'm not the guy who wrote that I didn't have time.
>
> So you obviously have the time for stupid games. Which is the road
> you take with all of your posts here. Pure nonsense.

Yes, I have the time for your stupid games. You told us that you didn't
but then showed that you did. It's another "Alec Baldwin" reversal.

Dave K8MN

1259. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 18:09:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324130928.17357.00000299@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63445

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/24/2003 5:19 AM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303240519.1603b28d@posting.google.com>

>So now you're playing male nurse? Why not just leave it to expert, Steve?

Depends what you're jabbing and where...some of that is best left to you,
Lennie and Markie-pooh.

Steve

1260. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 18:11:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324131140.17357.00000300@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63446

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/24/2003 5:17 AM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303240517.3ed4e84a@posting.google.com>

>So you obviously have the time for stupid games. Which is the road
>you take with all of your posts here. Pure nonsense.

Whew! Yet ANOTHER page from the Lennie-the-Lame's "Pot/Kettle/Black" cook book...! ! !

Steve

1261. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 18:16:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324131655.17357.00000301@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63447

>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/24/2003 4:01 AM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303240401.1743bd74@posting.google.com>

>> >WHAT AN IDIOT! He's >>NOT<< obsessive/compulsive?
>>
>> Where, Brain, Did I say I WASN'T...?!?!
>
>Are you now saying that you are?

Nope. Not at all. Simply pointing out that you are yet again "quoting" things that no one else said.

Insinutating that someone "said" somthing they did niot say is lying.

Are you a liar, Brain?

BTW: You continue to insist that >>I<< am an "obsessive/compulsive", but YOU continue to perpetuate this thread with newer and even more rediculous insinuations. Now who's the "obsessive/compulsive", Brain...? ? ?

Steve

1262. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 18:32:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324133231.17357.00000302@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63448

>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 3/24/2003 6:58 AM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030324095830.14527.00001056@mb-cc.aol.com>

>Get your attributions right, Vipul. You wrote the following, not me.

For a guy who claims college level education, he seems to have a problem
with basic computer skills and English comprehension, doesn't he..?!?!

>What would "an EE friendly club" be like?

Members on thier knees, bowing in rhythm to a bulbous-bellied
pocket-protector/horn-rimmed glasses wearing brass effigy of him while chanting
"ohmmmm ohmmmm ohmmmm"...

Of course THAT "cult" would be OK......

>>Experimentation is more important that Morse code.
>
>So what experimentation are you doing?

Seeing how ticked off he can make us with his assinine assertions, no
doubt.

>>Morse code is so much
>>emphasized that it takes away from all other aspects.
>
>How? There's one morse code test element and three written test elements. No
>morse code test for all of amateur VHF-UHF.

I think "multi-tasking" is not one of his more robust skills, Jim.

>What HF/MF experiments do you wish to do?

Working DX, no doubt!

>>I'm still in limbo.
>
>What the heck does that mean?

Let me take a whack at that one, Jim: "I have alienated myself from
almost everyone in the local area that might have otherwise been interested in
this idea, so I have to find new excuses for not being able to have my way..."

Or something to that effect...

>>I'd like more preety fems in Ham radio.
>

>What are "preety fems"??

Babes...chicks...skirts....dames...You know...anyother adjective he can find to offensively refer to women. Heaven forbid he'd call them ladies. Wrong culture.

>>Sorry, but to get the good-tasting "General" dish, you must eat the
>>bad-tasting
>>"Morse code" dish in front of the waiter.
>
>It's only bad-tasting to some.

The lazy, the lame and the excuse ridden, mostly...

73

Steve, K4YZ

1263. Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 19:58:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324145805.17324.00000074@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 63449

I always get a laugh from those who insist that because Amateur Radio is not always "page one" in the major media that we are somehow insignificant or that our contributions to our country or communities, at whatever level, don't count.

And I laugh a bit harder when we get a bit of that "page one exposure" on CNN, the front page of local papers, or in this case, syndicated radio personality Paul Harvey's commentary.

Quoted from the ARRL website:

Radio commentator Paul Harvey plugs ham radio's emergency communications role (Mar 21, 2003) -- Veteran ABC Radio Networks commentator Paul Harvey on March 19 offered some kind words for Amateur Radio. The mention was the second item on "page four" of his Paul Harvey Noon News and Comment program: "America's quiet warriors are the legion of ham radio operators, 700,000 of them, who are always at ready for backup duty in emergencies--amateur, unpaid, uncelebrated, civilian radio operators, during and after floods and fires and tornadoes. After the 9/11 attacks, hams were indispensable in reuniting friends and families. Most recently it was they who expedited the search for debris after the disaster to the space shuttle Columbia, and right now, at this moment, they are involved in homeland security to a greater degree than you would want me to make public." The commentary's enigmatic and mysterious final sentence --typical of Harvey's habit of leaving his listeners hanging--apparently refers to the fact that many Amateur Radio Emergency Service (ARES) and Radio Amateur Emergency Service (RACES) teams have ramped up their alert status as hostilities get under way in the Middle East. The entire Wednesday noon broadcast is available on Paul Harvey's Web site. Click on the Wednesday noon link under "Listen Now."

Unquote.

I think we can all agree Mr. Harvey's comments reach a pretty sizeable percentage of the population of the United States, let alone the world.

Nothing like an unimpeachable source to make a fool out of the naysayers and Chicken Little's of Amateur Radio's past, present or future.

Thanks, Paul.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1264. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 20:22:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E7F6905.2010901@psu.edu>
Source record: 63450

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> I think we can all agree Mr. Harvey's comments reach a pretty sizeable
> percentage of the population of the United States, let alone the world.
>
> Nothing like an unimpeachable source to make a fool out of the naysayers
> and Chicken Little's of Amateur Radio's past, present or future.

I can hardly wait for the foam flecked mouths trying to put their spin
on this one! This may be the grandmother of all threads.....

Good to see some publicity from a source that millions of people listen to.

good day?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1265. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 21:01:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324160113.12972.00000198@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 63351

>Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 3/24/2003 12:22 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E7F6905.2010901@psu.edu>

>I can hardly wait for the foam flecked mouths trying to put their spin
>on this one! This may be the grandmother of all threads.....

Of course...it's an "obsessive/compulsive" thread!

>good day?

Nope....GREAT day!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1266. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 21:27:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324162728.23139.00001608@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 63352

In article <b5n8o2$9lh$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>No....I'll tell you what Dwight....you go stand and protest with the other
>gutless pukes that give hope to the Baghdad butcher. And Ill stand with
>real Americans.

There are combat veterans protesting the war. Are they "gutless pukes" and "not real Americans"? Are we all supposed to blindly agree with everything the govt. tells us?
>
>As far as Im concerned those that help the enemy are not Americans.

I'm afraid you're off the mark on this one, Dan.

One of the most important things about any free country is the right of all citizens to nonviolently oppose government policies and protest things they don't like without fear of reprisals. The fact that protesters can march in NYC but not in Bagdad proves the strength of this country and our system. It is precisely that kind of openness and freedom that scares the heck out of tyrants, because they know they wouldn't last ten minutes in a truly free country.

The protesters in this country are merely exercising their rights as free Americans. They're not helping the other side in any way - in fact, they're showing how different the USA is from the other side. Our president is not afraid of opposition protests, but the other side's leader sure is. That's the story that needs to be told.

During WW2, Korea and Vietnam, elections were still held, even though doing so meant that opposition parties had a chance to change the government. The opposition parties succeeded in 1968, too. Did that hurt the USA? I don't think so.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1267. Re: test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 21:30:53 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <hOKfa.1$%T5.0@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 63353

SGSGSGSGSGSG
Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of their country.

:)

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0303231633.1ebb211@posting.google.com...
> "Chip G." <n.1.m.i.e@snet.net> wrote in message
news:<230320031306543382%n.1.m.i.e@snet.net>...
> > Ignore ...
>
> ryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryryry
>
> The quick brown fox jumped over the lazy dogs back.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.463 / Virus Database: 262 - Release Date: 3/17/03

1268. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 22:02:29 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5nvagvsu1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63354

OK Jim Ill give you the point about the 'Combat Vets' opposing the war.
They are just mis-guided. The rest are gutless pukes.

And I certainly do think they have the right AND RESPONSIBILITY to protest.
The key word is the Responsibility one. Protesting does not give them the
right to disrupt entire cities and take away from its ability to protect its
citizens from terrorist activities. And it certainly doesnt give them the
right to bring aid and confort to the enemy. You got your opinion, and I
got mine.

Nope....been through it before. And guess what? Still hate the long haired
hippies and their offspring.

Dan/W4NTI

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030324162728.23139.00001608@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <b5n8o2$9lh$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >No....I'll tell you what Dwight....you go stand and protest with the
other
> >gutless pukes that give hope to the Baghdad butcher. And Ill stand with
> >real Americans.
>
> There are combat veterans protesting the war. Are they "gutless pukes" and
"not
> real Americans"? Are we all supposed to blindly agree with everything the
govt.
> tells us?
> >
> >As far as Im concerned those that help the enemy are not Americans.
>
> I'm afraid you're off the mark on this one, Dan.
>
> One of the most important things about any free country is the right of
all
> citizens to nonviolently oppose government policies and protest things
they
> don't like without fear of reprisals. The fact that protesters can march
in NYC
> but not in Bagdad proves the strength of this country and our system. It
is
> precisely that kind of openness and freedom that scares the heck out of
> tyrants, because they know they wouldn't last ten minutes in a truly free

> country.
>
> The protesters in this country are merely exercising their rights as free
> Americans. They're not helping the other side in any way - in fact,
they're
> showing how different the USA is from the other side. Our president is not
> afraid of opposition protests, but the other side's leader sure is. That's
the
> story that needs to be told.
>
> During WW2, Korea and Vietnam, elections were still held, even though
doing so
> meant that opposition parties had a chance to change the government. The
> opposition parties succeeded in 1968, too. Did that hurt the USA? I don't
think
> so.
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

1269. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-24 23:16:14 UTC
From: #1 <#1@smell.com>
Message-ID: <NsadnRgbQqpTDOKjXTWcow@comcast.com>
Source record: 63355
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030324112336.995$xf@newsreader.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
> > Good plan Dwight. Run when your wipped.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> Right on!

> Go#40 42 12

Are you now a Ham moped? What are you doing in this NG?

1270. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 01:09:35 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5oad6thd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63357

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030322233747.29016.00000934@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <20030321210132.07005.00000197@mb-bk.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
> (Vshah101) writes:
>
> >From: "Bill Sohl"
> >>I belive it is only a personal choice. In today's world,
> >>the NEED for manual knowledge is strictly personal. Has anyone heard
> >>or read about anyone being in danger or worse because no
> >>one was available to drive a manual gearbox vehicle?
> >
> >You can understand the analogy.
>
> Actually, I got the analogy from Bill.

And the anology is the fact that no test is required to be able
to learn, use and drive a manual gearbox vehicle.

> >How come N2EY cannot understand the analogy
> >HE gave? He proposed this analogy.
>
> I understand it perfectly.
> >
> >Now he doesn't agree with the conclusion:
>
> I don't agree with YOUR conclusion.
>
> >There is no NEED for Morse code testing.
>
> I think there is.

Then the anology as I put it forth is NOT consistent
with morse. Are you suggesting the anlogy as you propose
(i.e. N2EY) would be to require manual gearbox testing?

> The percentage of amateur radio HF communications using Morse is much
higher
> than the percentage of cars with manual transmissions.

The percent of manual gearboxes was once high and even then
many states did NOT require a manual gearbox certification.
EG: NY as far back as 1958.

> A manual transmission car does not use up less road than its automatic
> transmission equivalent. A manual transmission car use slightly less fuel
and

> pollutes slightly less than its automatic transmission equivalent. A Morse
> signal uses up much less spectrum than any analog voice signal.
>
> Does any of that mean Morse MUST be tested? Nope. Does any of that mean
Morse
> MUST NOT be tested? Nope. It all boils down to opinions, nothing more.

We all have them...opinions.

> >It may be good to learn to communicate
> >to others that use Morse code, but it is NOT essential.
> >
> Nor is it essential to know anyhting about how a radio works in order to
use
> one.

Are you proposing a non-technical license?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1271. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 01:10:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324201059.29016.00000957@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 63356

In article <20030321212848.25154.00000902@mb-cb.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 22 Mar 2003 02:28:48 GMT
>
>In article <c2356669.0303211019.483d7d10@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>> I negatively criticize ARRL for exaggerated spin
>>> on amateur radio's alleged importance during national
>>> emergencies.
>>
>>"Exaggerated spin"? Where? Show us where an ARRL document was
>>exaggerated.
>
> It's all in Google. Go back to your newsgroup homeland there.

In other words, you can't provide any examples.
>
>>The fact is that you dismiss the idea that radio amateurs play ANY
>>communications role in emergencies of any size or scope.
>
> Incorrect.
>
In other words, you can't provide any examples.

>>I have never presented myself as an expert on anything.
>
> Of course you have! [that's all in Google, too!] :-)

Where?
>
> Try "renowned amateur historian" for one... :-)

No such claim by me.
>
>>Yet you are
>>liberal with insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
>>ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and general
>>infantile behavior towards me. All because I dare to disagree.
>
> Poor baby...a radio god not being agreed with? Heavens!

Yep, that's how you react.

>>> Their procedures are fixed to the standards and
>>> practices of six decades ago.
>>>
>>Six decades ago was the 1940s.
>
> 2003 - 60 = 1943.
>
> Was the radio god (Miccollis) alive then? No.

Who is this "Miccollis" you keep referring to?
>
>>> Those who love, honor, and worship morse code are fixated on
>>> their enobled aptitude and resultant skill.
>>
>>All of them?
>
> Just about. :-) Gods are gods. What can I say? :-)

Not much that has any rationality connected to it ;-) ;-)
>
>>> Such do not hesitate
>>> to say they are the best in radio because of that single skill...
>>> long after morse code became obsolete.
>>>
>>Incorrect on all counts.
>
> Just "your opinion." :-)

No, facts.
>
>>> >You insult and impugn those who work for the ARRL.
>>>
>>> Incorrect again. I've engaged ARRL staff in open debate in
>>> public on certain matters of radio amateurism.
>>
>>You've accused them of fraud and dishonesty, then denied that you ever
>>wrote the accusations.
>
> Incorrect.

No, correct. First you accused the ARRL of "fraud". Then when confronted, you
said you'd never accused ARRL of "dishonesty".

> ARRL practices a form of fraud common to bunco
> artists and confidence men.

What sort of fraud is that? Be specific.

> They also charge heavily for
> shipping on items purchased directly from Newington. :-)

So? How many ARRL publications do you own?
>
>>> >Why would such an individual want to become a radio amateur?

>>>
>>> For personal pleasure, to engage in a hobby recreation involving
>>> radio.
>>
>>News flash: There's been an amateur radio license available in the USA
>>with no code test for more than 12 years. Full privileges license with
>>only a 5 wpm code test for almost 3 years.
>
> News flash: I've been aware and informed of FCC regulations
> since 1956.

Yet you haven't acted on your "interest".

>>> A problem with certain individuals is their perverse
>>> definition of "personal pleasure."
>>
>>Sounds like you're talking about yourself, Len. ;-)
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Another radio god engaged in denial, accusations,
> and general character assassination.

That pretty much describes your behavior here. Not mine.

1272. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 01:55:04 UTC
From: cheesecutter@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <fef386d5.0303241755.297c0275@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63358

"Chip G." <n.1.m.i.e@snet.net> wrote in message
news:<230320031244031076%n.1.m.i.e@snet.net>...
> In article <C4EDF5MV37702.0407523148@usenet-nomads.com>, Holodeck
> Remailer <no.spam.here@usenet-nomads.com> wrote:
>
> > Many french ham operators would be glad to
> > help the US and UK armies in their fight against
> > Iraq.
>
> Merci beaucoup mon ami.
>
> Le plus je connais les hommes,
> Le plus je t'aime mon chien.

hey look phil.....it is european aaron.....hey voobnutts how you
been doing pally?????

1273. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 02:29:43 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324212943.27651.00000278@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 63359

From (N2EY)
>What would "an EE friendly club" be like?
One thats open to projects, antenna setups (clubs have this now),
troubleshooting, learning operator skills and modes.

One that does not pressure everyone to learn Morse code.

Also skill building activities instead of just meetings.

>Do you expect all hams to have EE
>level knowledge?
No.

>How many amateur radio technical publications do you have?
2+ standard size boxes of amateur radio publications, 2 boxes of (non amateur
radio) EE books.

>Have you ever read QEX?
Yes, and "Ham Radio" magazine also.

>>I don't want to learn <Morse> code.
>
>Then you can't get a General or Extra amateur radio license until the rules
>change. Sorry. I don;t make the rules, FCC does. Argue with them.

I'm good, thanks. I don't need to get on HF. Morse test as a barrier for
General class does not make Ham radio look good, however.

>>Why should I spend time learning
>>something I have no interest in?
>
>Same reason others spent time learning things they were not interested in to
>pass the written tests.

Test can be learned in a day. Some sacrifice.

1274. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 03:35:49 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324223549.27651.00000279@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 63360

From (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>>I've been to at least 4 clubs in MA. I can't find an EE friendly club.
>
> Personally, I just think you're either too picky, too smart-mouthed or
>just lying.

I don't think so. I've been courteous and patient. At first I thought it was the club I went to, so foolishly I tried another. All Ham clubs were same.

>Experimentation is more important to YOU.

And other EEs.

>Morse Code is NOT "so much emphasized" that it takes away from anything.

What about No code=No Ham? Without Morse code, Ham radio is CB? The no-code class is called, "technician", to emphacize that it is inferior to General or Extra class.

The nature of the clubs is operating, contesting, and CW. Hams don't like experimentation.

>"Experimenting" and "homebrewing" are the LAST things on either of your
>minds.

I brought up homebrewing at meetings. No interest by Hams in clubs.

>The point is you're not CAPABLE of learning Morse Code and you don't want
>anyone to realize your shortcoming.

Not everyone is capable of learning a real-time encoding scheme, and such persons can be intelligent in other areas, so I would not feel bad if I could not learn <Morse> code.

>>What would "an EE friendly club" be like?
>
> Members on thier knees, bowing in rhythm to a bulbous-bellied
>pocket-protector/horn-rimmed glasses wearing brass effigy of him while
>chanting
>"ohmmmm ohmmmm ohmmmm"...
>
> Of course THAT "cult" would be OK......

No, I would have more social activities, rather than cookouts, brunch, or other eating events.

>>What HF/MF experiments do you wish to do?
>

> Working DX, no doubt!

Very funny.

>>>I'm still in limbo.
>>
>>What the heck does that mean?
>
> Let me take a whack at that one, Jim: "I have alienated myself from
>almost everyone in the local area that might have otherwise been interested
>in
>this idea, so I have to find new excuses for not being able to have my
>way..."
>
> Or something to that effect...

Good one! After I "reinvent myself", I may be able to try again.

>>>I'd like more preety fems in Ham radio.
>>
>>What are "preety fems"??
>
> Babes...chicks...skirts....dames...You know...anyother adjective he can
>find to offensively refer to women.

Beautiful female. What's offensive about that?

> you must eat the
>>>bad-tasting
>>>"Morse code" dish in front of the waiter.
>>
>>It's only bad-tasting to some.
>
> The lazy, the lame and the excuse ridden, mostly...

How about those with common sense, perspective, balance, pride, or <other>
priorities?

1275. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 03:51:36 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324225136.27651.00000280@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 63361

From: Dave Heil k8mn
>> Because Hams have the stereotype of being weird.
>
>It must be a regional thing. I see no evidence of hams being any more
>weird than any other folks.

Hams are weird. Its not regional.Heard several Hams in several states with 2m radio. Also, been to Hamfests in MA,NH,CT. . Curious to go to Dayton Hamfest.

>> I had a chance to attend one. I asked for my $2 back. I didn't want to >
>wait 3 hrs to find out.
>
>...but you're willing to wait until morse code goes away

I bought the "ticket". I was going to go to Wouff Hong ceremony. But, with no activities for 3 hrs before ceremony, I asked for my money back.

1276. Re: test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 04:01:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030324230123.03943.00002664@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63362

RYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRY

THE QUICK BROWN FOX JUMPED OVER THE LAZY DOGS BACK
123457890 TIMES

NOW IS THE TIME FOR ALL GOOD MEN TO COME TO THE AID OF
THEIR PARTY

73 DE LARRY K3LT

NNNN

REAL TELETYPE MACHINES DONT HAVE UPPER CASE CHARACTERS

1277. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 04:01:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030324230124.03943.00002666@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63363

In article <f45722ac.0303231630.520d8abd@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Tolerance is a nebulous thing, TIT. Your idea of tolerance does not define
>> the total aspect, shock that this must be to you. Now, how about you being
>> a bit t-o-l-e-r-a-n-t and just for now, just once in your Liberal life,
>shut
>> that egotistical trap of yours.
>> It is nice that God gave women mouths. It is too bad he taught them to
>talk.
>
>Hmmm? Is this Larry or Stebe?
>
>Naw, neither one would post anonymously. Or would they?

Brian:

I won't presume to speak for Stebe (whoever that is), but no, I do not post
anonymously.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1278. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 04:01:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030324230124.03943.00002665@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63364

In article <38626A4F701FEF93.DF878158AD55D9E7.22CB1ADAA130C53F@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>The KEY element of democracy and freedom is t-o-l-e-r-a-n-c-e. Many do not
>have the capacity for that KEY element and that is when democracy and
>freedom are at risk.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Just exactly WHAT is it we are supposed to "tolerate?" I, for one American,
have absolutely no problem "tolerating" the fact that my fellow Americans
come from all over the world. However, it is up to them to behave as LOYAL
Americans, and to support what our country is doing when we make
the sacrifices necessary to export freedom and democracy to the innocent
victims of vicious dictators around the world.

No, I do NOT "tolerate" Americans who live in peace and prosperity, yet
feel the need to criticize the policies of our President when his objective is
to end the suffering of an imprisoned and enslaved nation. And I'll tell
you one more thing: If this war isn't about oil, I hope that George W. finds
a way to MAKE it about oil! We've just experienced an unusually cold
Winter here in this country, and if you don't think that the free flow of oil
at market prices is an important national goal of the United States, I
suggest that you volunteer for duty on an Antarctic expedition!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1279. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 04:06:13 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324230613.27651.00000282@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 63365

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

>Hams have the stereotype of being weird.
>
> From what CREDIBLE source do you get THAT idea?

I could come up with more credible sources, but that would take too much
effort. And, how would I convince such source to attend a Hamfest?

>You have spent MONTHS in this forum belittling Amateur Radio
>operators for some INFREQUENTLY conducted fun event that you have NOT even
>attended, yet claim is such an overwhelming "cult" activity...?!?!?

When they wore costumes (and it was not Halloween),
and had a stick they were banging to the ground,
and in a line chanting "Wouff Hong, Wouff Hong...",
this sort of made it obvious to me (and non-Ham bystanders), that some kind of
cult was involved.

>>Find out the topic in advance from the newsletter. Only attend the
>>interesting
>>ones, not the uninteresting ones.
>
> Which means the club cannot expect you to support it.

No, not at all.

>Since you seem to
>expect the rest of the club to listen to what YOU have to say (or are
>interested in), don't you think you should take YOUR turn sitting politely
>and
>listening to what others say or think?

This is the topic of presentation for the meeting, not what someone has to say.
I could always arrive after the presentation during break if I want to skip
the topic and still hear what others have to say. If I know the topic is
something I'm not interested in, it makes no sense to sit through it and
listen.

1280. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 04:31:09 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030324233109.27651.00000283@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 63366

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>> I think we can all agree Mr. Harvey's comments reach a pretty sizeable
>> percentage of the population of the United States, let alone the world.
>>
>> Nothing like an unimpeachable source to make a fool out of the
>naysayers
>> and Chicken Little's of Amateur Radio's past, present or future.

Paul Harvey is known for style of <not very entertaining> entertainment, not news. You listen to him because he's on.

His style is such that the content is not memorable. His style is often monotone and delivered without passion, like he is reading off pages. His delivery of the Amatuer radio "warriors" was in the same tone.

Also, simply stating something <without offering any proof> does not convince the <non-Ham> general public. Besides the Columbia shuttle example, there was no examples or factual support.

I would like positive press for Ham radio - something credible, respected, with examples, and factually supported. Unfortunately, this is not it.

1281. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 04:53:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAA54B15.1471C%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63367

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:

> (snip) No....I'll tell you what Dwight....you
> go stand and protest with the other gutless
> pukes that give hope to the Baghdad butcher.
> And Ill stand with real Americans.

Try to remember the topic, Dan. This is about your comments about France,
not protesters.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1282. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 04:59:57 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b5pk5a$2bnerp$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 63374

(hope this goes thru the server!)

Basically, another way to say it, "I defend your right to say whatever you want, not necessarily what you say!"

Any suppression of personal freedoms (what the republicrats wanna do) is exactly what we are fighting for allegedly. Hell... I don't agree with most of what Lenny and Bruce have to say in these groups, but I will fight to the death for their right to say it. Only exception in any case is if it legally falls under libel or slander but aside from that I will defend another American's right to freedoms that people like Dan and others have fought for.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030324162728.23139.00001608@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <b5n8o2$9lh$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >No....I'll tell you what Dwight....you go stand and protest with the
other
> >gutless pukes that give hope to the Baghdad butcher. And Ill stand with
> >real Americans.
>
> There are combat veterans protesting the war. Are they "gutless pukes" and
"not
> real Americans"? Are we all supposed to blindly agree with everything the
govt.
> tells us?
> >
> >As far as Im concerned those that help the enemy are not Americans.
>
> I'm afraid you're off the mark on this one, Dan.
>
> One of the most important things about any free country is the right of
all
> citizens to nonviolently oppose government policies and protest things
they
> don't like without fear of reprisals. The fact that protesters can march

in NYC
> but not in Bagdad proves the strength of this country and our system. It
is
> precisely that kind of openness and freedom that scares the heck out of
> tyrants, because they know they wouldn't last ten minutes in a truly free
> country.
>
> The protesters in this country are merely exercising their rights as free
> Americans. They're not helping the other side in any way - in fact,
they're
> showing how different the USA is from the other side. Our president is not
> afraid of opposition protests, but the other side's leader sure is. That's
the
> story that needs to be told.
>
> During WW2, Korea and Vietnam, elections were still held, even though
doing so
> meant that opposition parties had a chance to change the government. The
> opposition parties succeeded in 1968, too. Did that hurt the USA? I don't
think
> so.
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

1283. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 05:11:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAA54F49.1471E%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63368

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:

> (snip) it is up to them to behave as LOYAL
> Americans (snip)

How does one behave as a loyal American, Larry? Blindly follow the President without question like we're now accusing the Iraqi people of doing with Saddam? Never question the actions of the military like the German people did during Hitler's time? Say one supports the actions of this country when one honestly does not? Only speak when what is said agrees with your views? Do define how a loyal American is supposed to behave, Larry.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1284. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 05:27:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7FE89E.28550A53@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63369

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >> I think we can all agree Mr. Harvey's comments reach a pretty sizeable
> >> percentage of the population of the United States, let alone the world.

> Paul Harvey is known for style of <not very entertaining> entertainment, not
> news. You listen to him because he's on.

You've obviously not been around very long. Paul Harvey has been on
radio for something like fifty years. Paul Harvey is known for his
great set of pipes and sparkling delivery. Most people connect with
him.

> His style is such that the content is not memorable.

You don't get to remain in broadcast radio for fifty years without
having style.

> His style is often
> monotone and delivered without passion, like he is reading off pages. His
> delivery of the Amatuer radio "warriors" was in the same tone.

Paul Harvey's delivery is anything but monotone. He is an expert in his
use of inflection.

> Also, simply stating something <without offering any proof> does not convince
> the <non-Ham> general public. Besides the Columbia shuttle example, there was
> no examples or factual support.

You don't believe that news sources are checked for accuracy? Vipul, I
sense that not much about anything satisfies you.

> I would like positive press for Ham radio - something credible, respected, with examples,
and factually supported. Unfortunately, this is not it.

Paul Harvey is credible. Paul Harvey is respected. Unfortunately, you
don't seem to know the difference.

Dave K8MN

1285. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 05:34:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7FEA4E.F3AA6457@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63370

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>
> >Hams have the stereotype of being weird.
> >
> > From what CREDIBLE source do you get THAT idea?
>
> I could come up with more credible sources, but that would take too much
> effort. And, how would I convince such source to attend a Hamfest?

To quote you (from a recent post):

"I would like...something credible, respected, with examples, and
factually supported. Unfortunately, this is not it."

> >You have spent MONTHS in this forum belittling Amateur Radio
> >operators for some INFREQUENTLY conducted fun event that you have NOT even
> >attended, yet claim is such an overwhelming "cult" activity...?!?!?
>
> When they wore costumes (and it was not Halloween),
> and had a stick they were banging to the ground,
> and in a line chanting "Wouff Hong, Wouff Hong...",
> this sort of made it obvious to me (and non-Ham bystanders), that some kind of
> cult was involved.

Granted, it was made "obvious" to you. Take some free advice--don't go
to Mardi Gras in New Orleans or Rio de Janeiro. Don't go to any event
sponsored by Shriners. Don't visit Santa in a department store. Don't
attend a Broadway musical. The costumes and chanting will only leave
you confused.

Dave K8MN

1286. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 05:38:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7FEB65.361614CB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63371

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
> >> Because Hams have the stereotype of being weird.
> >
> >It must be a regional thing. I see no evidence of hams being any more
> >weird than any other folks.
>
> Hams are weird. Its not regional.Heard several Hams in several states with 2m
> radio. Also, been to Hamfests in MA,NH,CT. . Curious to go to Dayton Hamfest.

Sorry. To quote from one of your recent posts:
"I would like...something credible, respected, with examples, and
factually supported. Unfortunately, this is not it."

How are you obtaining permission to attend Dayton? I thought you
weren't allowed to attend ham radio functions.

> >> I had a chance to attend one. I asked for my $2 back. I didn't want to >
> >wait 3 hrs to find out.
> >
> >...but you're willing to wait until morse code goes away
>
> I bought the "ticket". I was going to go to Wouff Hong ceremony. But, with no
> activities for 3 hrs before ceremony, I asked for my money back.

So you have not had the experience of a Wouff Hong ceremony since you
did not attend. To quote from one of your recent posts:
"I would like...something credible, respected, with examples, and
factually supported. Unfortunately, this is not it."

Dave K8MN

1287. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 05:50:35 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <L6Sfa.18706$jA2.1666586@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 63372

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message

:
: The KEY element of democracy and freedom is t-o-l-e-r-a-n-c-e. Many do
not
: have the capacity for that KEY element and that is when democracy and
: freedom are at risk.

My t-o-l-e-r-a-n-c-e of despots such as Saddam is z-e-r-o. Deal with it.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--

Five day forecast for Baghdad:

Two days

1288. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 05:58:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E7FF003.4EF5D18A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63373

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
> >>I've been to at least 4 clubs in MA. I can't find an EE friendly club.

> I don't think so. I've been courteous and patient. At first I thought it was
> the club I went to, so foolishly I tried another. All Ham clubs were same.

That's strange. I've lived in places where there were repeater clubs,
general interest clubs, VHF weak signal clubs, DX clubs and contesting
clubs. They were not all the same. Sorry your answer is not really
supported by the facts you've presented and you've made another blanket
statement about all clubs being the same.

> >Experimentation is more important to YOU.
>
> And other EEs.

All of them? A few of them? Two of them?

> >Morse Code is NOT "so much emphasized" that it takes away from anything.
>
> What about No code=No Ham? Without Morse code, Ham radio is CB? The no-code
> class is called, "technician", to emphacize that it is inferior to General or
> Extra class.

The no-code class is called "Technician" because that is its name. They
had to call it something. You'll note that you need to pass additional
elements to obtain a higher class license. You choose not to do that.

> The nature of the clubs is operating, contesting, and CW.

That's much of what some clubs do. The nature of clubs is SSB, FM,
building, instructing, emergency preparedness, message traffic and
antennas. I'm sorry that you don't find anything of much interest.
Maybe you could hang around with some TV repairmen.

> Hams don't like experimentation.

You've just made another blanket statement which is unsupported by fact.

> >"Experimenting" and "homebrewing" are the LAST things on either of your
> >minds.
>
> I brought up homebrewing at meetings. No interest by Hams in clubs.
>
> >The point is you're not CAPABLE of learning Morse Code and you don't want
> >anyone to realize your shortcoming.

>
> Not everyone is capable of learning a real-time encoding scheme, and such persons can be intelligent in other areas, so I would not feel bad if I could not learn <Morse> code.

That's great and you are correct to a point. Not everyone who finds it difficult to learn morse code sets about issuing statements that hams are weird, hams are cultlike, hams aren't interested in experimenting, hams don't want EE's in their clubs or that morse code is merely and audiomotor skill of no importance. On looking at your list of complaints, I have to believe that the problem is you.

> No, I would have more social activities, rather than cookouts, brunch, or
> other eating events.

Sure, we could have dances, bob for apples and sponsor a boxing match or have a trip to a WWF (World Wrestling Federation or World Wildlife Federation, take your pick) event.

> >>What HF/MF experiments do you wish to do?
> >
> > Working DX, no doubt!
>
> Very funny.

...but no examples are given by you.

> >>>I'd like more preety fems in Ham radio.
> >>
> >>What are "preety fems"??
> >
> > Babes...chicks...skirts....dames...You know...anyother adjective he can
> >find to offensively refer to women.
>
> Beautiful female. What's offensive about that?

That's something I've not seen much of at ham radio club meetings. You'll have better luck at a nightclub.

> > you must eat the
> >>>bad-tasting
> >>>"Morse code" dish in front of the waiter.
> >>
> >>It's only bad-tasting to some.
> >
> > The lazy, the lame and the excuse ridden, mostly...
>
> How about those with common sense, perspective, balance, pride, or <other>
> priorities?

You want the privileges associated with a higher class license but you are unwilling to learn the material required to pass such an exam. What does that say for your common sense, perspective or priorities. I guess you do have your pride though. Don't learn morse and really teach us a

lesson.

Dave K8MN

1289. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 13:05:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303250505.1c073e76@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63375

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030324131655.17357.00000301@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/24/2003 4:01 AM Pacific Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303240401.1743bd74@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >WHAT AN IDIOT! He's >>NOT<< obsessive/compulsive?
> >>
> >> Where, Brain, Did I say I WASN'T...?!?!
> >
> >Are you now saying that you are?
>
> Nope. Not at all. Simply pointing out that you are yet again "quoting"
> things that no one else said.
>
> Insinutating that someone "said" somthing they did niot say is lying.
>
> Are you a liar, Brain?
>
> BTW: You continue to insist that >>I<< am an "obsessive/compulsive", but
> YOU continue to perpetuate this thread with newer and even more rediculous
> insinuations. Now who's the "obsessive/compulsive", Brain...? ? ?
>
> Steve

Obviously you are obsessive/compulsive, and you are lying to yourself.
Admitting that you have a problem is the first step, and I thought
you were approaching it with your previous comment. My mistake.

1290. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 13:06:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303250506.dd30e3b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63376

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030324230124.03943.00002666@mb-fj.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0303231630.520d8abd@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> Tolerance is a nebulous thing, TIT. Your idea of tolerance does not define
> >> the total aspect, shock that this must be to you. Now, how about you being
> >> a bit t-o-l-e-r-a-n-t and just for now, just once in your Liberal life,
> shut
> >> that egotistical trap of yours.
> >> It is nice that God gave women mouths. It is too bad he taught them to
> >talk.
> >
> >Hmmm? Is this Larry or Stebe?
> >
> >Naw, neither one would post anonymously. Or would they?
>
> Brian:
>
> I won't presume to speak for Stebe (whoever that is), but no, I do not post
> anonymously.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

(Typo). OK, I believe you.

1291. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 13:14:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303250514.f3aaad1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63377

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030324145805.17324.00000074@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> I always get a laugh from those

Must be another new thread. I wonder what causes it?

1292. Re: test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 13:16:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303250516.49fddaff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63378

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030324230123.03943.00002664@mb-fj.aol.com>...
> RYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRY
>
> THE QUICK BROWN FOX JUMPED OVER THE LAZY DOGS BACK
> 123457890 TIMES
>
> NOW IS THE TIME FOR ALL GOOD MEN TO COME TO THE AID OF
> THEIR PARTY
>
> 73 DE LARRY K3LT
>
> NNNN
>
> REAL TELETYPE MACHINES DONT HAVE UPPER CASE CHARACTERS

Darn it. Wished I has some of those old paper tapes to send across.
Some of those Christmas Eve PIREPS were classic.

1293. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 13:19:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303250519.47871ed4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63379

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b5oad6thd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030322233747.29016.00000934@mb-fy.aol.com...

> > Actually, I got the analogy from Bill.
>
> And the anology is the fact that no test is required to be able
> to learn, use and drive a manual gearbox vehicle.

> > >There is no NEED for Morse code testing.
> >
> > I think there is.
>
> Then the anology as I put it forth is NOT consistent
> with morse. Are you suggesting the anlogy as you propose
> (i.e. N2EY) would be to require manual gearbox testing?

I think Heil wants Volleyball Testing.

1294. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 13:20:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303250520.769f98db@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63380

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E7F4938.CE9CDD74@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030323204347.09480.00000264@mb-da.aol.com>...
> > > >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> > > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > > >Date: 3/23/2003 11:46 AM Pacific Standard Time
> > > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303231146.7477747d@posting.google.com>
>
> > > > And don't go
> > > >confusing proficiency with effectiveness.
> > >
> > > They are, for the most part, synonymous, Brain.
> > >
> > > One cannot be effective at something without being proficient at it, nor
> > > can one be proficient without being effective.
> > >
> > > Unless you can prove otherwise?
> >
> > Talk to Dave about it. Bring up 0.02wpm having world record setting
> > effectiveness, but not being even close to proficient, whatever that
> > is.
>
> Someday you'll get something right. I didn't use "effective" or
> "effectiveness". I wrote that you confuse "proficient" with
> "efficient". Now you're confusing "efficiency" with "effectiveness".
> They do not mean the same thing.
>
> Dave K8MN

I'm right about you, and I'm not confused.

1295. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 13:25:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303250525.23761b81@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63381

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030324095829.14527.00001055@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> In article <20030323204347.09480.00000264@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
> >> And don't go
> >>confusing proficiency with effectiveness.
> >
> > They are, for the most part, synonymous, Brain.
> >
> > One cannot be effective at something without being proficient at it, nor
> >can one be proficient without being effective.
> >
> > Unless you can prove otherwise?
> >
> The hams using the 0.02 wpm Morse were effective, but not necessarily
> proficient. I'm almost certain the sending and receiving were done by computer,
> not by the hams themselves, so their proficiency is unknown and irrelevant.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Heil is certain that they are proficient, but doesn't define that proficiency, and disagrees with you and your source for the lowest level of proficiency. He is certain the amateurs involved in this event are proficient because only proficient hams could set a world record using machine sent and received Morse Code at 0.02wpm.

It becomes crystal clear that Heil cannot be rational about the code.

1296. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 13:30:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303250530.57b3ae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63382

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030324130928.17357.00000299@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/24/2003 5:19 AM Pacific Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303240519.1603b28d@posting.google.com>
>
> >So now you're playing male nurse? Why not just leave it to expert, Steve?
>
> Depends what you're jabbing and where...some of that is best left to you,
> Lennie and Markie-pooh.
>
> Steve

I don't administer drugs. And you're right, DICK's use of the word
"needle" may have been a metaphor for something else, but I'd rather
not think of it.

1297. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 14:16:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325091606.12355.00000338@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63383

>Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/24/2003 8:31 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030324233109.27651.00000283@mb-df.aol.com>

>Paul Harvey is known for style of <not very entertaining> entertainment, not
>news. You listen to him because he's on

Oh?

I guess his 50+ years in broadcasting that "not very interesting" stuff
was just a fluke, huh?

>His style is such that the content is not memorable. His style is often
>monotone and delivered without passion, like he is reading off pages. His
>delivery of the Amatuer radio "warriors" was in the same tone.

And regardless of the tone, it STILL reached some "millions" of homes and
listeners, which STILL supports my original contention.

>Also, simply stating something <without offering any proof> does not convince
>the <non-Ham> general public. Besides the Columbia shuttle example, there was
>no examples or factual support.

Uh huh. I reiterate my statement above. Regardless of HOW it was
delivered, it was STILL heard in millions of homes the world over. THAT is a
fact supported by A. P. Nielsen ratings, commercial advertisers and just good
old "word-of-mouth".

You don't keep the kind of reputation (and listenership) that Mr. Harvey
has without accomplishing something.

>I would like positive press for Ham radio - something credible, respected,
>with
>examples, and factually supported. Unfortunately, this is not it.

You ARE an assinine idiot! I KNEW IT!

Vipul Shah, you are one incredibly stupid, irreverent and uninformed
IDIOT.

Not POSITIVE...?!?!

Not CREDIBLE...?!?!

Not RESPECTED...?!?!

Paul Harvey is one of the FEW broadcasters who, when he says something,
people trust because he's EARNED that reputation.

You...well...you're just a JERK, and I dare say I am being liberal with praise when I use THAT term.

Steve

1298. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 14:17:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325091743.12355.00000339@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63384

>Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 3/24/2003 9:27 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E7FE89E.28550A53@earthlink.net>

>You don't believe that news sources are checked for accuracy? Vipul, I
>sense that not much about anything satisfies you.

I reiterate my assertion that "spoiled brat" is an appropriate adjective
for this punk.

Steve

1299. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 14:20:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325092024.12355.00000340@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63385

>Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/25/2003 5:14 AM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303250514.f3aaad1@posting.google.com>

>Must be another new thread. I wonder what causes it?

Uhhhh.....paying attention to the news and getting a laugh from how
idiotic it makes you, Vippy and Lennie look.

An event that seems to happen more an more often lately, I might add.

Steve

1300. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 14:41:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325094117.12355.00000341@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63386

>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/24/2003 7:35 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030324223549.27651.00000279@mb-df.aol.com>

>From (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>>>I've been to at least 4 clubs in MA. I can't find an EE friendly club.
>>
>> Personally, I just think you're either too picky, too smart-mouthed or
>>just lying.
>
>I don't think so. I've been courteous and patient. At first I thought it was
>the club I went to, so foolishly I tried another. All Ham clubs were same.

No...they are not.

And I STILL think you're either too picky, too smart-mouthed, or lying.

>>Experimentation is more important to YOU.
>
>And other EEs.

Not when it comes to Amateur Radio, obviously, Vippy. Otherwise this "All
EE" club you'd like to start would be a no-brainer.

>>Morse Code is NOT "so much emphasized" that it takes away from anything.
>
>What about No code=No Ham? Without Morse code, Ham radio is CB? The no-code
>class is called, "technician", to emphacize that it is inferior to General or
>Extra class.

What ABOUT "know code = know ham", Vippy...?!?! I got no problem with
that.

And HOW does the word "Technician" make a class of radio licensure
subserviant ? If they were called "Class A", "Class B", etc, you MIGHT have a
point. However there is NO reference in ANY dictionary ANYWHERE that the word
"Technician" in any way/shape/form is "inferior" to any other word.

>The nature of the clubs is operating, contesting, and CW. Hams don't like
>experimentation.

You have been provided examples that DISprove this assertion, Vippy. To
continue to propagate a mistruth once the facts have been shown to contradict
it is to LIE.

Are YOU a LIAR, Vippy?

>>"Experimenting" and "homebrewing" are the LAST things on either of your
>>minds.
>
>I brought up homebrewing at meetings. No interest by Hams in clubs.

That's not what I said...It's not even CLOSE.

>>The point is you're not CAPABLE of learning Morse Code and you don't want
>>anyone to realize your shortcoming.
>
>Not everyone is capable of learning a real-time encoding scheme, and such
>persons can be intelligent in other areas, so I would not feel bad if I could
>not learn <Morse> code.

If you did indeed earn an EE you have the mental faculties to learn Morse
Code.

>>>What would "an EE friendly club" be like?
>>
>> Members on thier knees, bowing in rhythm to a bulbous-bellied
>>pocket-protector/horn-rimmed glasses wearing brass effigy of him while
>>chanting
>>"ohmmmm ohmmmm ohmmmm"...
>>
>> Of course THAT "cult" would be OK......
>
>No, I would have more social activities, rather than cookouts, brunch, or
>other eating events.

There are only 12 months in a year, and except for "clubs" in elementary,
junior and high school, I don;t know of ANY Amateur Radio Club that meets more
than once a month (committee's of the club notwithstanding. What other "social
activities" would you have them do?

Run singles-ads in the club newsletters for lonely EE's looking for
"preety fems"?

>>>What HF/MF experiments do you wish to do?
>>
>> Working DX, no doubt!
>
>Very funny.

I am not laughing. What would YOU do with your HF privileges that you
cannot already do on VHF+, Vippy...?!?

>>>>I'd like more preety fems in Ham radio.
>>>
>>>What are "preety fems"??
>>
>> Babes...chicks...skirts....dames...You know...anyother adjective he can
>>find to offensively refer to women.
>
>Beautiful female. What's offensive about that?

What's wrong with calling them "ladies", Vippy? Or "women"...?!?! Afraid someone might make you walk side-by-side with one in public?

>>>It's only bad-tasting to some.
>>
>> The lazy, the lame and the excuse ridden, mostly...
>
>How about those with common sense, perspective, balance, pride, or <other>
>priorities?

How about the lazy, the lame, and the excuse ridden...?!?! Seems to fit you pretty well, actually. Any EE worth his salt would simply see the code test as yet another challenge to master.

You simply see it as taking away from your "preety fem" chasing time...

Steve

Steve, K4YZ

1301. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 14:49:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325094911.12355.00000342@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63387

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/24/2003 7:51 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030324225136.27651.00000280@mb-df.aol.com>

>From: Dave Heil k8mn
>>> Because Hams have the stereotype of being weird.
>>
>>It must be a regional thing. I see no evidence of hams being any more
>>weird than any other folks.
>
>Hams are weird. Its not regional.Heard several Hams in several states with 2m
>radio. Also, been to Hamfests in MA,NH,CT. . Curious to go to Dayton Hamfest.

Hey Vippy...MA, NH and CT>>ARE<< "regional" to you...In the United States it's called NEW ENGLAND. Everything north of New Jersey and east of the Erie panhandle of Pennsylvania is New England...it's one of the REGIONS of the United States.

And I don't think you'll want to go to Dayton this year...At least not and wear anything that has your real name on it. You've made such a complete and utter fool of yourself, all the stares and fingerpointing might "get" to you...

>>> I had a chance to attend one. I asked for my $2 back. I didn't want to >
>>wait 3 hrs to find out.
>>
>>...but you're willing to wait until morse code goes away
>
>I bought the "ticket". I was going to go to Wouff Hong ceremony. But, with no
>activities for 3 hrs before ceremony, I asked for my money back.

And I REITERATE my utter disbelief that you rant and rave in this forum over the going's-on at a Wouff Hong ceremony and you've NEVER EVEN BEEN TO ONE!

Yet another foolish admission.

Sheeesh. This is getting too easy.

Steve, K4YZ

1302. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 15:32:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325103202.27873.00001354@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63388

In article <20030324212943.27651.00000278@mb-df.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 25 Mar 2003 02:29:43 GMT
>
>From (N2EY)
>>What would "an EE friendly club" be like?

>One thats open to projects, antenna setups (clubs have this now),
>troubleshooting, learning operator skills and modes.

I don't know any clubs that are not open to such things.

I think your problem may be that you want to be the "idea guy" who comes up with suggestions which the others act on. You don't seem to understand that the way to get others interested is to lead by example.

Here's one idea: Although it's late March and still cool in the northeast, Field Day is just three months away. Why not volunteer to provide one station for a local club? Maybe you could provide a solar-powered VHF/UHF setup and contribute some points.
>
>One that does not pressure everyone to learn Morse code.
>
Never seen a club that "pressures" anyone to learn Morse. How do they "pressure" you?

>Also skill building activities instead of just meetings.

Are you volunteering to teach them?
>
>>Do you expect all hams to have EE
>>level knowledge?
>No.
>
Good.

>>How many amateur radio technical publications do you have?
>2+ standard size boxes of amateur radio publications, 2 boxes of (non amateur
>radio) EE books.

What's a "standard size box"?
>
>>Have you ever read QEX?
>Yes, and "Ham Radio" magazine also.

QEX is current. Do you have a subscription?
>
>>>I don't want to learn <Morse> code.
>>
>>Then you can't get a General or Extra amateur radio license until the rules
>>change. Sorry. I don;t make the rules, FCC does. Argue with them.
>
>I'm good, thanks. I don't need to get on HF.

Then WHAT is your PROBLEM?

>Morse test as a barrier for
>General class does not make Ham radio look good, however.
>
It's not a barrier. Just a requirement.

>>>Why should I spend time learning
>>>something I have no interest in?
>>
>>Same reason others spent time learning things they were not interested in to
>>pass the written tests.
>
>Test can be learned in a day.

By some. Others take longer.

And you have criticized the ease of the writtens. If someone without an electronics background really wants to learn the written test material, it takes a lot more than a day.

EEs should have little trouble with the theory, and need only a bit of info on the regs.

> Some sacrifice.

It's not about sacrifice. It's about qualifications.

1303. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 15:36:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325103657.18435.00000311@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63389

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/24/2003 10:06 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030324230613.27651.00000282@mb-df.aol.com>

>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>
>>Hams have the stereotype of being weird.
>>
>> From what CREDIBLE source do you get THAT idea?
>
>I could come up with more credible sources, but that would take too much
>effort. And, how would I convince such source to attend a Hamfest?

No, no, nooooooooooooo Vippy!

A "source" in this context is a pre-exisiting, knowledgeable or
experienced point-of-reference.

Dragging some ner-do-well off the street to go along with you and then
offer testimony to your opinion is NOT a "source".

And if you ahev to "convince" them to attend, they ahve NO pre-exisiting
experience or knowledgebase from which to make an INFORMED opinion.

>>You have spent MONTHS in this forum belittling Amateur Radio
>>operators for some INFREQUENTLY conducted fun event that you have NOT even
>>attended, yet claim is such an overwhelming "cult" activity...?!?!?
>
>When they wore costumes (and it was not Halloween),
>and had a stick they were banging to the ground,
>and in a line chanting "Wouff Hong, Wouff Hong...",
>this sort of made it obvious to me (and non-Ham bystanders), that some kind
>of
>cult was involved.

WHOA VIPPY!

First you tell us what a waste of time and how "cult" like the Wouff Hong
ceremony is supposed to be.

THEN you publically state that you never attended, choosing rather to not
wait for teh ceremony and asking for your money back.

NOW you are citing specific things they DID there!

Either you LIED about attending or you LIED about NOT attending, but
somehwere in there you LIED! Or worse yet, you are spamming this forum with

your "opinion" on the Wouff Hong ceremony based solely upon third party tellings of the tale. In that case you are LYING about whose experience you are drawing these events from in order to tell yuor tale!

>>>Find out the topic in advance from the newsletter. Only attend the
>>>interesting
>>>ones, not the uninteresting ones.
>>
>> Which means the club cannot expect you to support it.
>
>No, not at all.

Yes, that's it exactly. If you don't attend the meetings, you ae NOT supporting the club. Many clubs have points-of-order that require the memberships advice-and-consent in order to effect into club policy or regulations. If you are not there, you cannot participate. If you do not participate, you are NOT supporting the club!

>>Since you seem to
>>expect the rest of the club to listen to what YOU have to say (or are
>>interested in), don't you think you should take YOUR turn sitting politely
>>and
>>listening to what others say or think?
>
>This is the topic of presentation for the meeting, not what someone has to
>say.
> I could always arrive after the presentation during break if I want to skip
>the topic and still hear what others have to say. If I know the topic is
>something I'm not interested in, it makes no sense to sit through it and
>listen.

Sure it does...it's called "supporting the club".

Someone else took some amount of time to put together a presentation about what he/she likes, and that may often be something you DON'T like...So if you want those folks to pay some attention to YOU, don't you think it's incumbent upon YOU to pay some attention to THEM...?!?!

Or are we back on Vippy Street?...You know...the one that says "ONE WAY"...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1304. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 15:41:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325104127.18435.00000312@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63390

>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/25/2003 7:05 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303250505.1c073e76@posting.google.com>

>Obviously you are obsessive/compulsive, and you are lying to yourself.

Lying to myself about what, Brian? That you are inadequately prepared for this exchange? I don't think so. It's clear you are NOT prepared, otherwise you'd not be caught trying to play catch-up so often.

>Admitting that you have a problem is the first step, and I thought
>you were approaching it with your previous comment

You might be warranted to heed your own advice, Brain.

>My mistake.

Yes. It was.

Steve

1305. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 15:44:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325104433.18435.00000313@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63391

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/25/2003 7:25 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303250525.23761b81@posting.google.com>
>
>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030324095829.14527.00001055@mb-cc.aol.com>...
>> In article <20030323204347.09480.00000264@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>>
>> >> And don't go
>> >>confusing proficiency with effectiveness.
>> >
>> > They are, for the most part, synonymous, Brain.
>> >
>> > One cannot be effective at something without being proficient at it,
>nor
>> >can one be proficient without being effective.
>> >
>> > Unless you can prove otherwise?
>> >
>> The hams using the 0.02 wpm Morse were effective, but not necessarily
>> proficient. I'm almost certain the sending and receiving were done by
>computer,
>> not by the hams themselves, so their proficiency is unknown and irrelevant.
>
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Heil is certain that they are proficient, but doesn't define that
>proficiency, and disagrees with you and your source for the lowest
>level of proficiency. He is certain the amateurs involved in this
>event are proficient because only proficient hams could set a world
>record using machine sent and received Morse Code at 0.02wpm.
>
>It becomes crystal clear that Heil cannot be rational about the code.

You quoted Jim Miccolis and I.

At no point is Dave Heil mentioned in either quote, nor did he participate
in that particular exchange.

What an idiot, Burke. Thanks for the laughs!

Steve

1306. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 15:49:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325104952.18435.00000314@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63392

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/25/2003 7:30 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303250530.57b3ae@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
>news:<20030324130928.17357.00000299@mb-mj.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >Date: 3/24/2003 5:19 AM Pacific Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303240519.1603b28d@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >So now you're playing male nurse? Why not just leave it to expert, Steve?
>>
>> Depends what you're jabbing and where...some of that is best left to
>you,
>> Lennie and Markie-pooh.
>>
>> Steve
>
>I don't administer drugs. And you're right, DICK's use of the word
>"needle" may have been a metaphor for something else, but I'd rather
>not think of it.

DID IT AGAIN!

You insist I am "right" about Dick's use of a word. You even quote the post where I was alleged to have said it, yet nothing of the kind was said by me.

You're either making this stuff up (lying), or you're mixing the attributes from other posts together in your already pointed head (an idiot).

In either case, you accentuate your already infamous profile by making yourself even MORE idiotic.

Thanks, Brian.

Steve

1307. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 16:04:40 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E807E18.6070800@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 63396

Dave Heil wrote:
> Vshah101 wrote:
>
>>Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>
>>
>>>> I think we can all agree Mr. Harvey's comments reach a pretty sizeable
>>>>percentage of the population of the United States, let alone the world.
>>>
>
>>Paul Harvey is known for style of <not very entertaining> entertainment, not
>>news. You listen to him because he's on.
>
>
> You've obviously not been around very long. Paul Harvey has been on
> radio for something like fifty years. Paul Harvey is known for his
> great set of pipes and sparkling delivery. Most people connect with
> him.
>
>
>>His style is such that the content is not memorable.
>
>
>
> You don't get to remain in broadcast radio for fifty years without
> having style.
>
>
>>His style is often
>>monotone and delivered without passion, like he is reading off pages. His
>>delivery of the Amatuer radio "warriors" was in the same tone.
>
>
> Paul Harvey's delivery is anything but monotone. He is an expert in his
> use of inflection.
>
>
>>Also, simply stating something <without offering any proof> does not convince
>>the <non-Ham> general public. Besides the Columbia shuttle example, there was
>>no examples or factual support.
>
>
> You don't believe that news sources are checked for accuracy? Vipul, I
> sense that not much about anything satisfies you.

>
>
>>I would like positive press for Ham radio - something credible, respected, with examples, and factually supported. Unfortunately, this is not it.
>
>
> Paul Harvey is credible. Paul Harvey is respected. Unfortunately, you
> don't seem to know the difference.
>
> Dave K8MN

What else do you expect from a no nothing kid?

1308. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 16:06:20 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E807E7C.1040508@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 63397

Mike Coslo wrote:

>
> Ahh, the opening round!
>
> Discredit the source. Problem is, a lot of people *do* respect him.
> That you don't is consistent.

And totally of no importance.

1309. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 16:18:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E808157.5080407@psu.edu>
Source record: 63393

Vshah101 wrote:
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
>
>>> I think we can all agree Mr. Harvey's comments reach a pretty sizeable
>>>percentage of the population of the United States, let alone the world.
>>>
>>> Nothing like an unimpeachable source to make a fool out of the
>>
>>naysayers
>>
>>>and Chicken Little's of Amateur Radio's past, present or future.
>>
>
> Paul Harvey is known for style of <not very entertaining> entertainment, not
> news. You listen to him because he's on.

Huh? He does the news and commentary, and a lot of people like him. The
only place where you would listen to him just because he's on is if you
are in an area with only one station.

> His style is such that the content is not memorable. His style is often
> monotone and delivered without passion, like he is reading off pages. His
> delivery of the Amatuer radio "warriors" was in the same tone.

I hear people quoting him fairl often. They seem to remember what he says.

> Also, simply stating something <without offering any proof> does not convince
> the <non-Ham> general public. Besides the Columbia shuttle example, there was
> no examples or factual support.

What on earth are you talking about? What is proof? If I'm pressed fot
it, I won't believe anything I haven't personally witnessed. But under
normal circumstances, Paul Harvey has a pretty good believability index.

> I would like positive press for Ham radio - something credible, respected, with
> examples, and factually supported. Unfortunately, this is not it.

Ahh, the opening round!

Discredit the source. Problem is, a lot of people *do* respect him.
That you don't is consistent.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1310. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 16:38:02 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5q0kjmqi1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63394

Well said Larry.

Dan/W4NTI

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030324230124.03943.00002665@mb-fj.aol.com...
> In article
<38626A4F701FEF93.DF878158AD55D9E7.22CB1ADAA130C53F@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >The KEY element of democracy and freedom is t-o-l-e-r-a-n-c-e. Many do
not
> >have the capacity for that KEY element and that is when democracy and
> >freedom are at risk.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Just exactly WHAT is it we are supposed to "tolerate?" I, for one
American,
> have absolutely no problem "tolerating" the fact that my fellow Americans
> come from all over the world. However, it is up to them to behave as
LOYAL
> Americans, and to support what our country is doing when we make
> the sacrifices necessary to export freedom and democracy to the innocent
> victims of vicious dictators around the world.
>
> No, I do NOT "tolerate" Americans who live in peace and prosperity, yet
> feel the need to criticize the policies of our President when his
objective is
> to end the suffering of an imprisoned and enslaved nation. And I'll tell
> you one more thing: If this war isn't about oil, I hope that George W.
finds
> a way to MAKE it about oil! We've just experienced an unusually cold
> Winter here in this country, and if you don't think that the free flow of
oil
> at market prices is an important national goal of the United States, I
> suggest that you volunteer for duty on an Antarctic expedition!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

1311. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 17:27:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325122742.27873.00001368@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 63395

In article <20030324225136.27651.00000280@mb-df.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: Dave Heil k8mn
>>> Because Hams have the stereotype of being weird.
>>
>>It must be a regional thing. I see no evidence of hams being any more
>>weird than any other folks.
>
>Hams are weird.

All of them?

> Its not regional.Heard several Hams in several states with 2m
>radio. Also, been to Hamfests in MA,NH,CT. .

All within an hour or two of Boston, I bet. That's not much of an area.

Here's a clue, Vipul: Not all hams go to the few hamfests and club meetings you've attended.

>Curious to go to Dayton Hamfest.
>
One of these years I'll get there. Biggest 'fests I've been to are Rochester, NY, Gaithersburg, MD and Timonium, MD. Basically huge flea markets with some interesting programs and social events.

>>> I had a chance to attend one. I asked for my $2 back. I didn't want to >
>>wait 3 hrs to find out.

So you don't really know what one is like, but you already have an opinion.

I've never been to a Wouff Hong ceremony, either, so I don't have an opinion about 'em one way or the other. From what I've heard, they're a lot of fun.
>>
>>...but you're willing to wait until morse code goes away
>
>I bought the "ticket". I was going to go to Wouff Hong ceremony. But, with no
>activities for 3 hrs before ceremony, I asked for my money back.
>
Did you get it?

1312. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 18:20:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E809E61.59E22CDD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63398

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E7F478F.7CD2CB5E@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E7E5B11.777C38@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030321212847.25154.00000901@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> > > > > > In article <3E7B4376.4FA1BFBB@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > > > writes:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> > > > > > >> In regards to Morse code -you are now the passive receiver/transmitter of an
> > > > > > >> AUDIOMOTOR skill.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >Being good at volleyball is a motor skill. Is volleyball a bad thing?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > This isn't a volleyball newsgroup.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > FCC doesn't require volleyball skills to pass licensing tests.
> > > > >
> > > > > Looks like Dave has poured hisself a glass of apple juice and expected
> > > > > it to taste like oranges.
> > > >
> > > > My comparison was a valid one despite Leonard's comments.
> > >
> > > Why didn't you use Cecil's "can you dunk a basketball" analogy?
> >
> > Because it wasn't applicable. I would have thought that you'd have been
> > able to figure that out.
>
> I figured it out. It is applicable if you want to bring in
> non-amateur and non-radio related activitied. You just didn't want an
> example that doesn't work for you POV, so yes, I figured it out.

If you figured out that it wasn't applicable, end of that discussion.

> > > You need to
> > > > remember too that this isn't a "professional radio" newsgroup, or a
> > > > "there I was surrounded by 150 teletype machines with Bear bombers just

> > > > minutes away" newsgroup.
> > >
> > > Is this a sand volleyball newsgroup?
> >
> > I didn't launch into tales of volleyball fifty years back or give Vipul
> > a history lesson of specific volleyball leagues. I didn't tell him that
> > his volleyball procedures were bad practice. I compared two separate
> > types of "audio motor" skills. You and Len have wasted twice as much
> > time injecting your input as my comparison took--and it has gotten you
> > nowhere.
>
> I don't care what you did or didn't claim to do.

Then why are you asking about it?

> I simply asked if this were the volleyball newsgroup.

Look it up.

> When the FCC is prepared to substitute a volleyball motor skill exam
> for the Morse Code motor skill exam, let us know.

Do your own research.

Dave K8MN

1313. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 18:26:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E809F3B.A5E68C22@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63399

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E7F4938.CE9CDD74@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030323204347.09480.00000264@mb-da.aol.com>...
> > > > >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> > > > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > > > >Date: 3/23/2003 11:46 AM Pacific Standard Time
> > > > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303231146.7477747d@posting.google.com>
> > >
> > > > > And don't go
> > > > >confusing proficiency with effectiveness.
> > > >
> > > > They are, for the most part, synonymous, Brain.
> > > >
> > > > One cannot be effective at something without being proficient at it, nor
> > > > can one be proficient without being effective.
> > > >
> > > > Unless you can prove otherwise?
> > >
> > > Talk to Dave about it. Bring up 0.02wpm having world record setting
> > > effectiveness, but not being even close to proficient, whatever that
> > > is.
> >
> > Someday you'll get something right. I didn't use "effective" or
> > "effectiveness". I wrote that you confuse "proficient" with
> > "efficient". Now you're confusing "efficiency" with "effectiveness".
> > They do not mean the same thing.

> I'm right about you, and I'm not confused.

So far, you've not been right about much of anything. Why should this
occasion be different?

Dave K8MN

1314. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 18:28:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E809FC6.10B90795@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63400

Brian wrote:
>
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030324095829.14527.00001055@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> > In article <20030323204347.09480.00000264@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> > Robeson K4YZ) writes:
> >
> > >> And don't go
> > >>confusing proficiency with effectiveness.
> > >
> > > They are, for the most part, synonymous, Brain.
> > >
> > > One cannot be effective at something without being proficient at it, nor
> > >can one be proficient without being effective.
> > >
> > > Unless you can prove otherwise?
> > >
> > The hams using the 0.02 wpm Morse were effective, but not necessarily
> > proficient. I'm almost certain the sending and receiving were done by computer,
> > not by the hams themselves, so their proficiency is unknown and irrelevant.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Heil is certain that they are proficient, but doesn't define that
> proficiency, and disagrees with you and your source for the lowest
> level of proficiency. He is certain the amateurs involved in this
> event are proficient because only proficient hams could set a world
> record using machine sent and received Morse Code at 0.02wpm.

See what I mean about your not being right? I've never stated that I'm
certain that those achieving the 136 KHz record are proficient, yet
you've stated that I am certain. You don't get anything right.

> It becomes crystal clear that Heil cannot be rational about the code.

What is crystal clear is that you really do have a problem with reading
comprehension.

Dave K8MN

1315. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 18:35:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E80A168.B2528EEA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63551

JJ wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> >>Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>> I think we can all agree Mr. Harvey's comments reach a pretty sizeable
> >>>>percentage of the population of the United States, let alone the world.
> >>>
> >
> >>Paul Harvey is known for style of <not very entertaining> entertainment, not
> >>news. You listen to him because he's on.
> >
> >
> > You've obviously not been around very long. Paul Harvey has been on
> > radio for something like fifty years. Paul Harvey is known for his
> > great set of pipes and sparkling delivery. Most people connect with
> > him.
> >
> >
> >>His style is such that the content is not memorable.
> >
> >
> >
> > You don't get to remain in broadcast radio for fifty years without
> > having style.
> >
> >
> >>His style is often
> >>monotone and delivered without passion, like he is reading off pages. His
> >>delivery of the Amatuer radio "warriors" was in the same tone.
> >
> >
> > Paul Harvey's delivery is anything but monotone. He is an expert in his
> > use of inflection.
> >
> >
> >>Also, simply stating something <without offering any proof> does not convince
> >>the <non-Ham> general public. Besides the Columbia shuttle example, there was
> >>no examples or factual support.
> >
> >

> > You don't believe that news sources are checked for accuracy? Vipul, I
> > sense that not much about anything satisfies you.
> >
> >
> >>I would like positive press for Ham radio - something credible, respected, with
examples, and factually supported. Unfortunately, this is not it.
> >
> >
> > Paul Harvey is credible. Paul Harvey is respected. Unfortunately, you
> > don't seem to know the difference.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> What else do you expect from a no nothing kid?

He likes to talk about learning. I guess I expected a sharp kid like
him to be a quick study.

Dave K8MN

1316. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 20:42:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E80BF51.4080709@psu.edu>
Source record: 63552

Dave Heil wrote:
> Vshah101 wrote:
>
>>From: Dave Heil k8mn
>>
>>>>Because Hams have the stereotype of being weird.
>>>
>>>It must be a regional thing. I see no evidence of hams being any more
>>>weird than any other folks.
>>
>>Hams are weird. Its not regional.Heard several Hams in several states with 2m
>>radio. Also, been to Hamfests in MA,NH,CT. . Curious to go to Dayton Hamfest.
>
>
> Sorry. To quote from one of your recent posts:
> "I would like...something credible, respected, with examples, and
> factually supported. Unfortunately, this is not it."
>
> How are you obtaining permission to attend Dayton? I thought you
> weren't allowed to attend ham radio functions.
>
>
>>>>I had a chance to attend one. I asked for my $2 back. I didn't want to >
>>>
>>>wait 3 hrs to find out.
>>>
>>>...but you're willing to wait until morse code goes away
>>
>>I bought the "ticket". I was going to go to Wouff Hong ceremony. But, with no
>>activities for 3 hrs before ceremony, I asked for my money back.
>
>
> So you have not had the experience of a Wouff Hong ceremony since you
> did not attend. To quote from one of your recent posts:
> "I would like...something credible, respected, with examples, and
> factually supported. Unfortunately, this is not it."

Dve, Don't forget that it was also posted:

> When they wore costumes (and it was not Halloween),
> and had a stick they were banging to the ground,
> and in a line chanting "Wouff Hong, Wouff Hong...",
> this sort of made it obvious to me (and non-Ham bystanders), that some kind of
> cult was involved.

Hmmm, looks like he saw a ceremony he didn't see.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

1317. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 20:48:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E80C0B7.1030002@psu.edu>
Source record: 63553

Dave Heil wrote:

> He likes to talk about learning. I guess I expected a sharp kid like
> him to be a quick study.

Bowling balls come to mind.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1318. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 21:22:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E80C8E3.9C8E7F9F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63554

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> >>From: Dave Heil k8mn
> >>
> >>>>Because Hams have the stereotype of being weird.
> >>>
> >>>It must be a regional thing. I see no evidence of hams being any more
> >>>weird than any other folks.
> >>
> >>Hams are weird. Its not regional.Heard several Hams in several states with 2m
> >>radio. Also, been to Hamfests in MA,NH,CT. . Curious to go to Dayton Hamfest.
> >
> >
> > Sorry. To quote from one of your recent posts:
> > "I would like...something credible, respected, with examples, and
> > factually supported. Unfortunately, this is not it."
> >
> > How are you obtaining permission to attend Dayton? I thought you
> > weren't allowed to attend ham radio functions.
> >
> >
> >>>>I had a chance to attend one. I asked for my $2 back. I didn't want to >
> >>>
> >>>wait 3 hrs to find out.
> >>>
> >>>...but you're willing to wait until morse code goes away
> >>
> >>I bought the "ticket". I was going to go to Wouff Hong ceremony. But, with no
> >>activities for 3 hrs before ceremony, I asked for my money back.
> >
> >
> > So you have not had the experience of a Wouff Hong ceremony since you
> > did not attend. To quote from one of your recent posts:
> > "I would like...something credible, respected, with examples, and
> > factually supported. Unfortunately, this is not it."
>
> Dve, Don't forget that it was also posted:
>
> > When they wore costumes (and it was not Halloween),
> > and had a stick they were banging to the ground,
> > and in a line chanting "Wouff Hong, Wouff Hong...",

> > this sort of made it obvious to me (and non-Ham bystanders), that some kind of
> > cult was involved.
>
> Hmmm, looks like he saw a ceremony he didn't see.....

Mike, Those people may have been the Rockettes.

Dave K8MN

1319. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 21:33:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303251333.2f8e1b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63555

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030325104952.18435.00000314@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/25/2003 7:30 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303250530.57b3ae@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
> >news:<20030324130928.17357.00000299@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
> >> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >> >Date: 3/24/2003 5:19 AM Pacific Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303240519.1603b28d@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >So now you're playing male nurse? Why not just leave it to expert, Steve?
> >>
> >> Depends what you're jabbing and where...some of that is best left to
> you,
> >> Lennie and Markie-pooh.
> >>
> >> Steve
> >
> >I don't administer drugs. And you're right, DICK's use of the word
> >"needle" may have been a metaphor for something else, but I'd rather
> >not think of it.
>
> DID IT AGAIN!
>
> You insist I am "right" about Dick's use of a word. You even quote the
> post where I was alleged to have said it, yet nothing of the kind was said by
> me.

Well then define what it is you're jabbing and where you're jabbing
it. My interpretation of your open statement is legitimate.

> You're either making this stuff up (lying), or you're mixing the
> attributes from other posts together in your already pointed head (an idiot).
>
> In either case, you accentuate your already infamous profile by making
> yourself even MORE idiotic.
>
> Thanks, Brian.
>
> Steve

My comment stands.

1320. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 21:34:32 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E80CB68.1030605@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 63562

KB9TMP wrote:

>
> Vipal why don't you go down to the local Wal-Mart and GET A LIFE!
> --

Maybe even a job and contribute something useful to society for a
change.

1321. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 21:42:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303251342.6248f517@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63556

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030325104433.18435.00000313@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/25/2003 7:25 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303250525.23761b81@posting.google.com>
> >
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20030324095829.14527.00001055@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> >> In article <20030323204347.09480.00000264@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve
> >> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
> >>
> >> >> And don't go
> >> >>confusing proficiency with effectiveness.
> >> >
> >> > They are, for the most part, synonymous, Brain.
> >> >
> >> > One cannot be effective at something without being proficient at it,
> nor
> >> >can one be proficient without being effective.
> >> >
> >> > Unless you can prove otherwise?
> >> >
> >> The hams using the 0.02 wpm Morse were effective, but not necessarily
> >> proficient. I'm almost certain the sending and receiving were done by
> computer,
> >> not by the hams themselves, so their proficiency is unknown and irrelevant.
>
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Heil is certain that they are proficient, but doesn't define that
> >proficiency, and disagrees with you and your source for the lowest
> >level of proficiency. He is certain the amateurs involved in this
> >event are proficient because only proficient hams could set a world
> >record using machine sent and received Morse Code at 0.02wpm.
> >
> >It becomes crystal clear that Heil cannot be rational about the code.
>
> You quoted Jim Miccolis and I.

Yes, I did. You're very observant.

> At no point is Dave Heil mentioned in either quote, nor did he participate
> in that particular exchange.

Wow, a master of the obvious! Just pretend that I started a new thread.

> What an idiot, Burke. Thanks for the laughs!
>
> Steve

We pity you, Steve.

1322. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 21:45:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303251345.4496038e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63557

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030325104127.18435.00000312@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/25/2003 7:05 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303250505.1c073e76@posting.google.com>
>
> >Obviously you are obsessive/compulsive, and you are lying to yourself.
>
> Lying to myself about what, Brian? That you are inadequately prepared for
> this exchange? I don't think so. It's clear you are NOT prepared, otherwise
> you'd not be caught trying to play catch-up so often.
>
> >Admitting that you have a problem is the first step, and I thought
> >you were approaching it with your previous comment
>
> You might be warranted to heed your own advice, Brain.
>
> >My mistake.
>
> Yes. It was.
>
> Steve

Steve, nobody is prepared for your lunacy. We accept it.

You should do likewise.

1323. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 21:51:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303251351.48d55746@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63558

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030325092024.12355.00000340@mb-cs.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/25/2003 5:14 AM Pacific Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303250514.f3aaad1@posting.google.com>
>
> >Must be another new thread. I wonder what causes it?
>
> Uhhhh.....paying attention to the news and getting a laugh from how
> idiotic it makes you, Vippy and Lennie look.
>
> An event that seems to happen more an more often lately, I might add.
>
> Steve

Steve, just saying it doesn't make it true. But you go ahead and
delude yourself. More's the pity.

Must be time for you to start another new thread.

1324. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 22:55:53 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E80DE79.11E4C88D@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 63559

Holodeck Remailer wrote:

> Many french ham operators would be glad to
> help the US and UK armies in their fight against
> Iraq.
>
>
> More, Chirac is involved in more than 10
> criminal affairs actually and he might be put in
> jail quite for life if Justice did his job correctly in
> France.
>

We've had presidents in scandals too. Not just Clinton
getting a blow job in the White House, but Nixon essentially
rigging an election. Rigging elections is never tolerated
in the USA. (Election rigging in foreign countries by our
CIA is another issue.....). Nail Chirac if those charges
are serious.

1325. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 23:28:57 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <v81pgs27eqmv12@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 63560

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030324233109.27651.00000283@mb-df.aol.com...
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >> I think we can all agree Mr. Harvey's comments reach a pretty
sizeable
> >> percentage of the population of the United States, let alone the world.
> >>
> >> Nothing like an unimpeachable source to make a fool out of the
> >naysayers
> >> and Chicken Little's of Amateur Radio's past, present or future.
>
> Paul Harvey is known for style of <not very entertaining> entertainment,
not
> news. You listen to him because he's on.
>
> His style is such that the content is not memorable. His style is often
> monotone and delivered without passion, like he is reading off pages. His
> delivery of the Amatuer radio "warriors" was in the same tone.
>

Maybe you would like to tell Mr. Harvey all about his "problems" and offer
some of your "EE" experence to help him out. He can be contacted here-
http://www.paulharvey.com/email_form.shtml

> Also, simply stating something <without offering any proof> does not
convince
> the <non-Ham> general public. Besides the Columbia shuttle example, there
was
> no examples or factual support.
>
> I would like positive press for Ham radio - something credible, respected,
with
> examples, and factually supported. Unfortunately, this is not it.

You wouldn't be happy if ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN and Fox news all carried
"front page" stories about amateur radio. You would just say it was a slow
news day!

Vipal why don't you go down to the local Wal-Mart and GET A LIFE!
--
KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/
kb9tmp "at" juno.com

1326. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-25 23:30:23 UTC
From: boyzgonebadpork@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <95890a23.0303251530.761ccbc1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63561
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

heres the rest of the post now this is a laugh considering the source
"W5TIT" wrote:

> The KEY element of democracy and freedom is
> t-o-l-e-r-a-n-c-e. Many do not have the
> capacity for that KEY element and that is
> when democracy and freedom are at risk.

Sadly, this thread has now turned into childish pranks with a single
individual posting using half a dozen names. And that is something I have no
tolerance for, so I'm out of this discussion.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

"#1" <#1@smell.com> wrote in message news:<NsadnRgbQqpTDOKjXTWcow@comcast.com>...
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20030324112336.995$xf@newsreader.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
> > > Good plan Dwight. Run when your wipped.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > Right on!
>
> > Go#40 42 12
>
>
> Are you now a Ham moped? What are you doing in this NG?

1327. OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 02:19:33 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <V68ga.19832$jA2.1781504@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 63563

I see a lot of people yelling for peace but I have not heard of one plan for peace. " Books, not Bombs" won't work. The head mullahs won't let anyone read them. If they do, they poke their eyes out.

Here's the plan:

1) The US will apologize to the world for our "interference" in their affairs, past & present. You know, Hitler, Mussolini, Arafat, Sharon, Saddam, and the rest of them 'good old boy's. We will never "interfere"again.

2) We will withdraw our troops from all over the world, starting with Germany, South Korea, Israel, and the Philippines. They don't want us there anyway. We would station troops at our borders and airports. No more sneaking through holes in the (Bureaucratic) fence.

3) All illegal aliens have 90 days to get their affairs together and leave. We'll give them a free trip home. After 90 days the remainder will be gathered up and sent on a DXpedition, regardless of who or where they are.

4) All future visitors will be thoroughly checked and strictly limited to 90 days (unless given a special permit). No one from a terrorist nation would be allowed in. If you don't like it there, change it yourself, don't hide here. Asylum would not ever be available to anyone. We don't need any more cab drivers.

5) No "students" over age 21. The older ones are the usually bombers. If they don't attend classes, or if they get a "D" and it's back home baby.

6) The US will make a strong effort to become self sufficient energy wise. This will include developing non polluting sources of energy but will require a temporary drilling of oil in the Alaskan wilderness. The caribou will have to cope for a while.

7) Offer Saudi Arabia and all other oil producing countries $10 a barrel for their oil. If they don't like it, they can go someplace else.

8) If there is a famine or other natural catastrophe in the world, we will not "interfere". They can pray to Allah, Buddha or whomever, for seeds, rain, cement or whatever they need. Besides' most of what we give them is stolen or given to the army. The people who need it most get very little, if any anyway.

9) Ship the UN Headquarters to an island some place. We don't need the spies and fair weather friends here. Besides, it would make a good homeless shelter or lockup for illegal aliens.

10) All Americans must go to charm and beauty school. That way, no one can call us "Ugly Americans" any longer.

Walk softly and carry a big fish.

Hans, K0HB
--
"If you don't go fishing because you thought it might rain you will never go fishing. This applies to more than fishing."

1328. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 02:25:22 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325212522.10838.00000429@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 63564

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>And regardless of the tone, it STILL reached some "millions" of homes and
>listeners, which STILL supports my original contention.

Thats true. Lets hope for more positive press.

1329. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 02:25:27 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325212527.10838.00000430@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 63565

From: "KB9TMP"

>Maybe you would like to tell Mr. Harvey all about his "problems" and offer
>some of your "EE" experence to help him out.

No, thats fine. Its Paul Harvey's program. Lets hope for more amateur radio
stories.

This is one story. EE experience irrelevant for radio show.

>You wouldn't be happy if ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN and Fox news all carried
>"front page" stories about amateur radio. You would just say it was a slow
>news day!

No, I would be happy if that occured.

1330. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 02:35:35 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325213535.10838.00000431@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 63566

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>That's strange. I've lived in places where there were repeater clubs,
>general interest clubs, VHF weak signal clubs, DX clubs and contesting
>clubs. They were not all the same.

Repeater club sounds promising. I should try that.

>> Beautiful female. What's offensive about that?
>
>That's something I've not seen much of at ham radio club meetings.
>You'll have better luck at a nightclub.

True.

>You want the privileges associated with a higher class license but you
>are unwilling to learn the material required to pass such an exam.

Participation and inclusion is more important.

1331. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 02:40:42 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <738AF60786AA8F77.FBDF13936F210835.7E03E47281600BCF@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 63568

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAA54F49.1471E%stewart@say.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> > (snip) it is up to them to behave as LOYAL
> > Americans (snip)
>
>
> How does one behave as a loyal American, Larry? Blindly follow the
> President without question like we're now accusing the Iraqi people of
doing
> with Saddam? Never question the actions of the military like the German
> people did during Hitler's time? Say one supports the actions of this
> country when one honestly does not? Only speak when what is said agrees
with
> your views? Do define how a loyal American is supposed to behave, Larry.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>

Thanks, Dwight. Absolutely!!!

Kim W5TIT

1332. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 03:17:51 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325221751.10838.00000432@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 63569

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>>>Experimentation is more important to YOU.
>>
>>And other EEs.
>
> Not when it comes to Amateur Radio, obviously, Vippy. Otherwise this
>"All
>EE" club you'd like to start would be a no-brainer.

I have not been "marketing" amateur radio to EEs. Probably, EEs would be interested.

>And HOW does the word "Technician" make a class of radio licensure
>subserviant ?

Technician implies troubleshooting only, not homebrewing. Some no-coders homebrew more often than General class ticket people.

>If you did indeed earn an EE you have the mental faculties to learn Morse
>Code.

<Morse> code is a different kind of skill. Just because something is generally easier does not mean anyone can do it. It involves audiomotor skills, which not everyone can do. You must admit that being a different kind of skill some people cant learn it.

One should not feel superior for real-time encoding/decoding. Nor should one feel inferior for not being able to learn it.

I have translated encoded symbols in real-time. I can understand those that find real-time encoding/decoding to be fun. I know I have the ability to learn Morse code. I personally can do Morse code. I choose not to.

>I don;t know of ANY Amateur Radio Club that meets more
>than once a month

Once a week club meets for brunch. Plenty of time for more <social> activities.

>Run singles-ads in the club newsletters for lonely EE's looking for
>"preety fems"?
>

Foxhunting!

> Any EE worth his salt would simply see the code
>test as yet another challenge to master.

Opposite may be true. Misplaced priorities.

1333. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 03:26:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325222601.28757.00000258@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63571

>Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
>From: JJ radiobuff0@mailcity.moc
>Date: 3/25/2003 10:06 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E807E7C.1040508@mailcity.moc>

>> Discredit the source. Problem is, a lot of people *do* respect him.
>> That you don't is consistent.
>
>And totally of no importance.

Respect and believeability are of no importance...?!?!

Steve

1334. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 03:26:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325222632.25154.00000954@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63570

In article <b5oad6thd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030322233747.29016.00000934@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> In article <20030321210132.07005.00000197@mb-bk.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
>> (Vshah101) writes:
>>
>> >From: "Bill Sohl"
>> >>I belive it is only a personal choice. In today's world,
>> >>the NEED for manual knowledge is strictly personal. Has anyone heard
>> >>or read about anyone being in danger or worse because no
>> >>one was available to drive a manual gearbox vehicle?
>> >
>> >You can understand the analogy.
>>
>> Actually, I got the analogy from Bill.
>
>And the anology is the fact that no test is required to be able
>to learn, use and drive a manual gearbox vehicle.

That's one interpretation, yes. Of course manual transmissions are not as
common in passenger cars as Morse code is on the ham bands.

The whole reason I brought it up was to provide a better analogy than the "ride
a horse" analogy that was being discussed.
>
>> >How come N2EY cannot understand the analogy
>> >HE gave? He proposed this analogy.
>>
>> I understand it perfectly.
>> >
>> >Now he doesn't agree with the conclusion:
>>
>> I don't agree with YOUR conclusion.
>>
>> >There is no NEED for Morse code testing.
>>
>> I think there is.
>
>Then the anology as I put it forth is NOT consistent
>with morse. Are you suggesting the anlogy as you propose
>(i.e. N2EY) would be to require manual gearbox testing?

If manual transmissions were as common in American cars as Morse transmissions
are in the ham bands.....
>
>> The percentage of amateur radio HF communications using Morse is much
>> higher
>> than the percentage of cars with manual transmissions.
>
>The percent of manual gearboxes was once high and even then
>many states did NOT require a manual gearbox certification.
>EG: NY as far back as 1958.

Sure. Other states were different. Today that's all gone - but manual
transmissions survive.
>
>> A manual transmission car does not use up less road than its automatic
>> transmission equivalent. A manual transmission car use slightly less fuel
>> and
>> pollutes slightly less than its automatic transmission equivalent. A Morse
>> signal uses up much less spectrum than any analog voice signal.
>>
>> Does any of that mean Morse MUST be tested? Nope. Does any of that mean
>>Morse
>> MUST NOT be tested? Nope. It all boils down to opinions, nothing more.
>
>We all have them...opinions.
>
'zactly. And the choice of what should and should not be a test requirement
ultimately comes down to the FCC's opinion.

>> >It may be good to learn to communicate
>> >to others that use Morse code, but it is NOT essential.
>> >
>> Nor is it essential to know anyhting about how a radio works in order to
>> use one.
>
>Are you proposing a non-technical license?
>
Heck no!

But if someone or some group did want a non-technical ham license, they could
use the same arguments against almost all of the written tests that have been
used against the code tests. And how would we counter those arguments?

Look at the UK's "Foundation" license, for an example of what could happen.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1335. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 03:28:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325222818.28757.00000259@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63572

>Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/25/2003 3:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303251351.48d55746@posting.google.com>

>> Uhhhh.....paying attention to the news and getting a laugh from how
>> idiotic it makes you, Vippy and Lennie look.
>>
>> An event that seems to happen more an more often lately, I might add.

>Steve, just saying it doesn't make it true. But you go ahead and
>delude yourself. More's the pity.

It's not what I say, Brain. It's what YOU do. And yes, THAT's more the
pity.

>Must be time for you to start another new thread.

You'd rather we just had ONE thread discussing ALL topics?

Steve

1336. Re: FCC nails k1man yet again...??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 03:30:32 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E811ED8.107@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 63589
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

```
Barney Bignose wrote:
> Gee folks, you would think by now this pack-
> mule up there in maine would have 'got the message'
> by now, after bein smacked upside the head
> with a 2-by-4 for....how may times has it been....??
>
> Read all about it: http://users.adelphia.net/~k3vr/boy.htm

He is dumber that a box of rocks.
```

1337. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 03:30:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325223055.28757.00000260@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63573

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/25/2003 3:33 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303251333.2f8e1b@posting.google.com>

>Well then define what it is you're jabbing and where you're jabbing
>it. My interpretation of your open statement is legitimate.

I think there's very little legitimate about you, Brain.

>My comment stands.

....as a tribute to your inconsistency and incompetence.

Steve

1338. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 03:33:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325223311.28757.00000261@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63574

>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/25/2003 3:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303251345.4496038e@posting.google.com>

>Steve, nobody is prepared for your lunacy. We accept it.
>
>You should do likewise.

Ahhhh, but I HAVE, Brain! I accept that you (and Vippy, Lennie and Markie)
ARE lunatics. Your inconsistencies and rhetoric have proven this repeatedly.

But thanks for your concern.

Steve

1339. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 03:36:26 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325223626.10838.00000433@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 63575

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>Hams are weird.
>
>All of them?

"Ham" radio is a subset focus of amateur radio activites. The activities, in itself, are fine (even code!). Its the "culture" that makes it weird.

Correlation is high, but not all Hams are weird. Two amateurs can participate in same activities. One may be weird, other is not.

Call sign hats,excessive jargon, hatred of CB, is weird, for example.

>Here's a clue, Vipul: Not all hams go to the few hamfests and club meetings
>you've attended.

This doesn't explain what the Ham radio demographic is.

>I've never been to a Wouff Hong ceremony, either, so I don't have an opinion
>about 'em one way or the other. From what I've heard, they're a lot of fun.

Could be fun.

>>I bought the "ticket". I was going to go to Wouff Hong ceremony. But, with
>no
>>activities for 3 hrs before ceremony, I asked for my money back.
>>
>Did you get it?

Yes, graciously they refunded the $2 I paid.

1340. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 03:38:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325223819.28757.00000262@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63576

>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/25/2003 8:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030325213535.10838.00000431@mb-cr.aol.com>

>>You want the privileges associated with a higher class license but you
>>are unwilling to learn the material required to pass such an exam.
>
>Participation and inclusion is more important

You cannot "participate" and be "included" in ANYTHING without the correct preparation.

For a job as an engineer, it includes sufficient collegiate level education and some period as an apprentice.

To get into the right night club, it means dressing right, doing your hair the right way, and being able to dance.

For an Amateur Radio license bestowing HF operating privileges, it means taking a Morse Code examination at five words per minute.

Get over it.

Steve

1341. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 03:38:25 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E8120B1.3050501@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 63590

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
> The protesters
> here are simply indulging in a knee-jerk reaction to war itself, without
> any thought to the fact that there are things far worse than war. How
> could they have seen the World Trade Center crumble and the Pentagon
> be attacked without thinking that we, as a nation, would have to make
> sacrifices to ensure that such a thing never happened again?

Amen. Too many of the protesters are simply career protesters.
They look for the day they have something to protest about, to
disrupt and cause annoyance. They have no particular agenda, they
just want to protest something. They must be kin to Jessie Jackson.

>
> War is a bad thing -- a very bad thing. Nobody in his right mind wants
> to see young men and women placed in harm's way -- but this is the only
> way that freedom and democracy has ever been achieved. Diplomacy
> does not work against maniacal, dictatorial tyrants like Hussein. Twelve
> years was enough of a test. We are now doing what must be done.

Yup.

1342. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 03:43:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325224348.28757.00000263@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63577

>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/25/2003 9:17 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030325221751.10838.00000432@mb-cr.aol.com

>>And HOW does the word "Technician" make a class of radio licensure
>>subserviant ?
>
>Technician implies troubleshooting only, not homebrewing. Some no-coders
>homebrew more often than General class ticket people.

So it would appear that THEY were able to GET OVER IT. Why haven't you?

>I have translated encoded symbols in real-time. I can understand those that
>find real-time encoding/decoding to be fun. I know I have the ability to
>learn
>Morse code. I personally can do Morse code. I choose not to.

Then your problem is evident.

>>Run singles-ads in the club newsletters for lonely EE's looking for
>>"preety fems"?
>>
>
>Foxhunting!

Oooooh! Vippy made a funny!

>> Any EE worth his salt would simply see the code
>>test as yet another challenge to master.
>
>Opposite may be true. Misplaced priorities.

The way I see it, Vippy, you have a 1/300,000,000 chance of getting
priorities right.

Steve, K4YZ

1343. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 03:53:52 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E812450.5080700@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 63593

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> I see a lot of people yelling for peace but I have not heard of one plan for
> peace. " Books, not Bombs" won't work. The head mullahs won't let anyone
> read them. If they do, they poke their eyes out.
>
> Here's the plan:

Sounds good. Ship it to Washington.

1344. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 04:14:18 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325231418.10838.00000435@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 63578

From K4YZ

I says:
>>I could come up with more credible sources, but that would take too much
>>effort. And, how would I convince such source to attend a Hamfest?
Then K4YZ says:
> A "source" in this context is a pre-exisiting, knowledgeable or
>experienced point-of-reference.

>And if you ahev to "convince" them to attend, they ahve NO pre-exisiting
>experience or knowledgebase from which to make an INFORMED opinion.

A credible source should be unbiased. Therefore, a non-Ham can visit a Hamfest.
Then, this person can decide if Hams are weird to them or not.

Another possible credible source is the radio professional or rf professor.

True, one cannot understand everything right away. One must be explained what
certain things mean. Then, one can have an informed opinion. Certain things
are apparent right away however.

>Either you LIED about attending or you LIED about NOT attending, but
>somehwere in there you LIED!

No, I did not. The chanting was not part of the ceremony (as far as I know).
The costumes and chanting occured during the dinner buffet. This was NOT the
Wouff Hong ceremony, but an "advertisement" for the ceremony.
There were non-Ham bystanders. I would guess they found it weird and could have
suspected some kind of cult.

>First you tell us what a waste of time and how "cult" like the Wouff Hong
>ceremony is supposed to be.

From the chanting "advertisement", it looked like a cult.

>THEN you publically state that you never attended, choosing rather to not
>wait for the ceremony and asking for your money back.

True, I did not attend it. I did not want to wait until midnight, so I asked
for my money back. It was not too expensive, just $2. Would have been worth it
if I did not have to wait 3 hrs to see the ceremony (there were no other
activities planned in between). I asked for a refund and they graciously
refunded my money.

Of course, if I did attend, I would be a "traitor". I may possibly get punished
with the strange looking torture device. I heard that the ceremony had to do
with Morse code and operating properly by some other people that claimed to
have attended one before.

>Many clubs have points-of-order that require the
>memberships advice-and-consent in order to effect into club policy or
>regulations.

Then I don't get a vote that meeting.

If you are not there, you cannot participate. If you do not
>participate, you are NOT supporting the club!

Again, I disagree. Also, 2-3 hrs sitting through a topic of no interest is foolish and does not show support. I can attend those meetings after break, if I want to. Often enough there are topics of interest. Those I can attend the whole meeting. That should be fair.

1345. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 04:24:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E812B70.BB8DA85B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63579

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

> >You want the privileges associated with a higher class license but you
> >are unwilling to learn the material required to pass such an exam.
>
> Participation and inclusion is more important.

Work on learning morse for a couple of weeks. Pass the exam. Go forth
and participate.

Dave K8MN

1346. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 04:26:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E812C0B.15A0D085@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63580

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
> >From: JJ radiobuff0@mailcity.moc
> >Date: 3/25/2003 10:06 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3E807E7C.1040508@mailcity.moc>
>
> >> Discredit the source. Problem is, a lot of people *do* respect him.
> >> That you don't is consistent.
> >
> >And totally of no importance.
>
> Respect and believeability are of no importance...?!?!
>
> Steve

I think you missed this one, Steve. Vipul's schpiel is totally
unimportant.

Dave K8MN

1347. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 04:36:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030325233651.00929.00000628@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 63583

Hansl:

Seems like a perfectly reasonable plan to me. However, we also need
to round up all those who have been oppressed by slavery -- for the
last two centuries -- and send them back to their ancestral homeland as
well. I'm sure that once they return to Africa, they will find their way of
life much more to their liking than here in the oppressive United States.

73 de Larry, K3LT

In article <V68ga.19832$jA2.1781504@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>Here's the plan:
>
>1) The US will apologize to the world for our "interference" in their
>affairs, past & present. You know, Hitler, Mussolini, Arafat, Sharon,
>Saddam, and the rest of them 'good old boy's. We will never
>"interfere"again.
>
>2) We will withdraw our troops from all over the world, starting with
>Germany, South Korea, Israel, and the Philippines. They don't want us there
>anyway. We would station troops at our borders and airports. No more
>sneaking through holes in the (Bureaucratic) fence.
>
>3) All illegal aliens have 90 days to get their affairs together and leave.
>We'll give them a free trip home. After 90 days the remainder will be
>gathered up and sent on a DXpedition, regardless of who or where they are.
>
>4) All future visitors will be thoroughly checked and strictly limited to 90
>days (unless given a special permit). No one from a terrorist nation would
>be allowed in. If you don't like it there, change it yourself, don't hide
>here. Asylum would not ever be available to anyone. We don't need any more
>cab drivers.
>
>5) No "students" over age 21. The older ones are the usually bombers. If
>they don't attend classes, or if they get a "D" and it's back home baby.
>
>6) The US will make a strong effort to become self sufficient energy wise.
>This will include developing non polluting sources of energy but will
>require a temporary drilling of oil in the Alaskan wilderness. The caribou
>will have to cope for a while.
>
>7) Offer Saudi Arabia and all other oil producing countries $10 a barrel for
>their oil. If they don't like it, they can go someplace else.

>
>8) If there is a famine or other natural catastrophe in the world, we will
>not "interfere". They can pray to Allah, Buddha or whomever, for seeds,
>rain, cement or whatever they need. Besides' most of what we give them is
>stolen or given to the army. The people who need it most get very little, if
>any anyway.
>
>9) Ship the UN Headquarters to an island some place. We don't need the spies
>and fair weather friends here. Besides, it would make a good homeless
>shelter or lockup for illegal aliens.
>
>10) All Americans must go to charm and beauty school. That way, no one can
>call us "Ugly Americans" any longer.
>
>Walk softly and carry a big fish.
>
>Hans, K0HB

1348. Re: test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 04:36:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030325233652.00929.00000630@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 63581

In article <20030324230123.03943.00002664@mb-fj.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>RYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRY
>
>THE QUICK BROWN FOX JUMPED OVER THE LAZY DOGS BACK
>123457890 TIMES
>
>NOW IS THE TIME FOR ALL GOOD MEN TO COME TO THE AID OF
>THEIR PARTY
>
>73 DE LARRY K3LT
>
>NNNN
>
>REAL TELETYPE MACHINES DONT HAVE UPPER CASE CHARACTERS
>

TO RRAP

FM K3LT

INFO N0IMD

OOOPS -- I MEANT TO SAY LOWER CASE CHARACTERS.

I GOT MOST OF MY TELETYPE EXPERIENCE ON THE AFLC LOGAIR
COMNET -- AND I USED TO DO A LOT OF RTTY ON A TELETYPE
MACHINE WHEN I WAS IN AF MARS X RIPPING GOOD STUFF X
REGARDS

73 DE LARRY K3LT

NNNN

1349. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 04:36:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030325233652.00929.00000629@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 63582

In article <20030324145805.17324.00000074@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>
> I think we can all agree Mr. Harvey's comments reach a pretty sizeable
>percentage of the population of the United States, let alone the world.
>
> Nothing like an unimpeachable source to make a fool out of the naysayers
>and Chicken Little's of Amateur Radio's past, present or future.
>
> Thanks, Paul.

Steve:

While the Paul Harvey piece does do a great service to ham radio, it is just one piece and will not stay in the public conscience for very long, if at all. We won't be seeing any significant spike in newcomers to our hobby/service as a result of it. What is needed is a continuous, wide-ranging, national media campaign. There are literally hundreds of public service announcements on TV every day -- why can't a few of them be about amateur radio -- produced with the help of our ham radio celebrities with connections in the mass media industry? We're now seeing Joe Walsh, WB6ACU, plugging ham radio products in the magazines -- why can't he plug ham radio itself on TV? I'm sure he has the connections and influence to get this done!

I just had a horrible thought: I hope none of the Dixie Chicks are licensed Amateur Radio operators!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1350. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 04:36:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030325233653.00929.00000631@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 63584

In article <BAA54F49.1471E%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>
> How does one behave as a loyal American, Larry? Blindly follow the
>President without question like we're now accusing the Iraqi people of doing
>with Saddam? Never question the actions of the military like the German
>people did during Hitler's time? Say one supports the actions of this
>country when one honestly does not? Only speak when what is said agrees with
>your views? Do define how a loyal American is supposed to behave, Larry.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Dwight:

An important thing for loyal Americans to do is to be well informed. Any
reasonably attentive student of history will be able to draw the conclusion
that appeasement of dictators through diplomacy does not put an end to
vicious, totalitarian regimes. They must be confronted with sufficient force
to put them out of power, in order for a free and democratic society to
flourish after they are gone. The United States, as part of it's generous
nature, exports freedom and democracy at great cost to our own citizens --
including the lives of our young men and women in the armed forces.
Loyal, informed Americans simply can not justify the actions of the present-
day anti-war protesters. They certainly have the right to protest, but in
this case, all they're doing is proving their ignorance of world affairs, or
worse, displaying their cowardice.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1351. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 04:36:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030325233654.00929.00000632@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 63585

In article <738AF60786AA8F77.FBDF13936F210835.7E03E47281600BCF@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> How does one behave as a loyal American, Larry? Blindly follow the
>> President without question like we're now accusing the Iraqi people of
>doing
>> with Saddam? Never question the actions of the military like the German
>> people did during Hitler's time? Say one supports the actions of this
>> country when one honestly does not? Only speak when what is said agrees
>with
>> your views? Do define how a loyal American is supposed to behave, Larry.
>>
>>
>> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>>
>>
>>
>
>Thanks, Dwight. Absolutely!!!
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim/Dwight:

The problem with the present situation is that to protest the actions
of President Bush in Iraq is to say that you do support the cruel,
viscous, murderous regime of Saddam Hussein, and support his goal
of producing weapons of mass destruction to be used to terrorize
the rest of the world. The current-day anti-war protestors seek to
continue the use of non-interventionist diplomacy, which has already
been proven to have failed at altering the course of the Saddam Hussein
regime of terror, murder, and exportation of WMD's. The protesters
here are simply indulging in a knee-jerk reaction to war itself, without
any thought to the fact that there are things far worse than war. How
could they have seen the World Trade Center crumble and the Pentagon
be attacked without thinking that we, as a nation, would have to make
sacrifices to ensure that such a thing never happened again?

War is a bad thing -- a very bad thing. Nobody in his right mind wants
to see young men and women placed in harm's way -- but this is the only
way that freedom and democracy has ever been achieved. Diplomacy
does not work against maniacal, dictatorial tyrants like Hussein. Twelve
years was enough of a test. We are now doing what must be done.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1352. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 04:40:11 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030325234011.10838.00000436@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 63586

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>But if someone or some group did want a non-technical ham license,
<snip>

You mean like the Technician license? Thats a non-technical license. (No knowledge of material required to pass the test).

> the same arguments against almost all of the written tests that have been
>used against the code tests.

Morse code is irrelavant. The written material is not. There, that's not the same argument.

If you don't understand a safety reg, a rig blows up. Understanding antennas helps you transmit and receive. If you don't understand Morse, you miss out on <one> "fun" activity.

1353. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 05:23:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E813962.B6385804@att.net>
Source record: 63587

N2EY wrote:

> In article <20030324212943.27651.00000278@mb-df.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
> (Vshah101) writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>
> >>>I don't want to learn <Morse> code.
> >>
> >>Then you can't get a General or Extra amateur radio license until the rules
> >>change. Sorry. I don;t make the rules, FCC does. Argue with them.
> >
> >I'm good, thanks. I don't need to get on HF.
>
> Then WHAT is your PROBLEM?
>
> >Morse test as a barrier for
> >General class does not make Ham radio look good, however.
> >
> It's not a barrier. Just a requirement.

Well, there you have it.

Morse code, the requirement, is only a barrier to those who "don't want to learn
it".

QED.

1354. FCC nails k1man yet again...??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 05:24:43 UTC
From: Barney Bignose <barneybnsnor@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e813992@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 63588
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

```
Gee folks, you would think by now this pack-
mule up there in maine would have 'got the message'
by now, after bein smacked upside the head
with a 2-by-4 for....how may times has it been....??

Read all about it: http://users.adelphia.net/~k3vr/boy.htm
```

1355. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 05:43:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E813DEC.4678CC3F@att.net>
Source record: 63591

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:

> I see a lot of people yelling for peace but I have not heard of one plan for
> peace. " Books, not Bombs" won't work. The head mullahs won't let anyone
> read them. If they do, they poke their eyes out.
>
> Here's the plan:
>
> 1) The US will apologize to the world for our "interference" in their
> affairs, past & present. You know, Hitler, Mussolini, Arafat, Sharon,
> Saddam, and the rest of them 'good old boy's. We will never
> "interfere"again.
>
> 2) We will withdraw our troops from all over the world, starting with
> Germany, South Korea, Israel, and the Philippines. They don't want us there
> anyway. We would station troops at our borders and airports. No more
> sneaking through holes in the (Bureaucratic) fence.
>
> 3) All illegal aliens have 90 days to get their affairs together and leave.
> We'll give them a free trip home. After 90 days the remainder will be
> gathered up and sent on a DXpedition, regardless of who or where they are.
>
> 4) All future visitors will be thoroughly checked and strictly limited to 90
> days (unless given a special permit). No one from a terrorist nation would
> be allowed in. If you don't like it there, change it yourself, don't hide
> here. Asylum would not ever be available to anyone. We don't need any more
> cab drivers.
>
> 5) No "students" over age 21. The older ones are the usually bombers. If
> they don't attend classes, or if they get a "D" and it's back home baby.
>
> 6) The US will make a strong effort to become self sufficient energy wise.
> This will include developing non polluting sources of energy but will
> require a temporary drilling of oil in the Alaskan wilderness. The caribou
> will have to cope for a while.
>
> 7) Offer Saudi Arabia and all other oil producing countries $10 a barrel for
> their oil. If they don't like it, they can go someplace else.
>
> 8) If there is a famine or other natural catastrophe in the world, we will
> not "interfere". They can pray to Allah, Buddha or whomever, for seeds,
> rain, cement or whatever they need. Besides' most of what we give them is
> stolen or given to the army. The people who need it most get very little, if
> any anyway.

>
> 9) Ship the UN Headquarters to an island some place. We don't need the spies
> and fair weather friends here. Besides, it would make a good homeless
> shelter or lockup for illegal aliens.
>
> 10) All Americans must go to charm and beauty school. That way, no one can
> call us "Ugly Americans" any longer.
>
> Walk softly and carry a big fish.
>
> Hans, K0HB
> --
> "If you don't go fishing because you thought it might rain you will never go
> fishing. This applies to more than fishing."

Hans, just in case your had tounge in cheek you can take it out. That's a plan that we
really need and one I'd vote for anytime.

1356. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 05:43:47 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns934A760B86C4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 63592

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in
news:20030325233651.00929.00000628@mb-fo.aol.com:

> Hansl:
>
> Seems like a perfectly reasonable plan to me. However, we also need
> to round up all those who have been oppressed by slavery -- for the
> last two centuries -- and send them back to their ancestral homeland as
> well. I'm sure that once they return to Africa, they will find their
> way of life much more to their liking than here in the oppressive
> United States.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> In article <V68ga.19832$jA2.1781504@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
> "K&#65533;HB" <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>
>>Here's the plan:
>>
>>1) The US will apologize to the world for our "interference" in their
>>affairs, past & present. You know, Hitler, Mussolini, Arafat, Sharon,
>>Saddam, and the rest of them 'good old boy's. We will never
>>"interfere"again.
>>
>>2) We will withdraw our troops from all over the world, starting with
>>Germany, South Korea, Israel, and the Philippines. They don't want us
>>there anyway. We would station troops at our borders and airports. No
>>more sneaking through holes in the (Bureaucratic) fence.
>>
>>3) All illegal aliens have 90 days to get their affairs together and
>>leave. We'll give them a free trip home. After 90 days the remainder
>>will be gathered up and sent on a DXpedition, regardless of who or
>>where they are.
>>
>>4) All future visitors will be thoroughly checked and strictly limited
>>to 90 days (unless given a special permit). No one from a terrorist
>>nation would be allowed in. If you don't like it there, change it
>>yourself, don't hide here. Asylum would not ever be available to
>>anyone. We don't need any more cab drivers.
>>
>>5) No "students" over age 21. The older ones are the usually bombers.
>>If they don't attend classes, or if they get a "D" and it's back home
>>baby.

>>
>>6) The US will make a strong effort to become self sufficient energy
>>wise. This will include developing non polluting sources of energy but
>>will require a temporary drilling of oil in the Alaskan wilderness. The
>>caribou will have to cope for a while.
>>
>>7) Offer Saudi Arabia and all other oil producing countries $10 a
>>barrel for their oil. If they don't like it, they can go someplace
>>else.
>>
>>8) If there is a famine or other natural catastrophe in the world, we
>>will not "interfere". They can pray to Allah, Buddha or whomever, for
>>seeds, rain, cement or whatever they need. Besides' most of what we
>>give them is stolen or given to the army. The people who need it most
>>get very little, if any anyway.
>>
>>9) Ship the UN Headquarters to an island some place. We don't need the
>>spies and fair weather friends here. Besides, it would make a good
>>homeless shelter or lockup for illegal aliens.
>>
>>10) All Americans must go to charm and beauty school. That way, no one
>>can call us "Ugly Americans" any longer.
>>
>>Walk softly and carry a big fish.
>>
>>Hans, K0HB
>
>

Why stop there. Why not send everyone descended from immigrants back home?

1357. Re: FCC nails k1man yet again...??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 12:38:51 UTC
From: r2000swler@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <d17275c.0303260438.6eb21d61@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63594
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Barney Bignose" <barneybnsnor@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<3e813992@snipnews.snip.net>...

> with a 2-by-4 for....how may times has it been....??

Or as a friend says "hit upside the head with a clue by four".

Terry

1358. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 12:43:14 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5s7dn$c8j$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63595

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030325222632.25154.00000954@mb-cb.aol.com...
> In article <b5oad6thd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030322233747.29016.00000934@mb-fy.aol.com...
> >> In article <20030321210132.07005.00000197@mb-bk.aol.com>,
vshah101@aol.com
> >> (Vshah101) writes:
> >>
> >> >From: "Bill Sohl"
> >> >>I belive it is only a personal choice. In today's world,
> >> >>the NEED for manual knowledge is strictly personal. Has anyone
> >> >>heard or read about anyone being in danger or worse because
> >> >>no one was available to drive a manual gearbox vehicle?
> >> >
> >> >You can understand the analogy.
> >>
> >> Actually, I got the analogy from Bill.
> >
> >And the anology is the fact that no test is required to be able
> >to learn, use and drive a manual gearbox vehicle.
>
> That's one interpretation, yes. Of course manual transmissions are not
> as common in passenger cars as Morse code is on the ham bands.
>
> The whole reason I brought it up was to provide a better analogy than
> the "ride a horse" analogy that was being discussed.
> >
> >> >How come N2EY cannot understand the analogy
> >> >HE gave? He proposed this analogy.
> >>
> >> I understand it perfectly.
> >> >
> >> >Now he doesn't agree with the conclusion:
> >>
> >> I don't agree with YOUR conclusion.
> >>
> >> >There is no NEED for Morse code testing.
> >>
> >> I think there is.
> >>
> >Then the anology as I put it forth is NOT consistent

> >with morse. Are you suggesting the anlogy as you propose
> >(i.e. N2EY) would be to require manual gearbox testing?
>
> If manual transmissions were as common in American cars as
> Morse transmissions are in the ham bands.....

But even when that was the case, the states (many of them anyway)
did NOT require testing on a manual gearbox in order to be allowed to
drive a car with a manual trans.

> >> The percentage of amateur radio HF communications using Morse
> >> is much higher
> >> than the percentage of cars with manual transmissions.
> >
> >The percent of manual gearboxes was once high and even then
> >many states did NOT require a manual gearbox certification.
> >EG: NY as far back as 1958.
>
> Sure. Other states were different.

A handful at best.

> Today that's all gone - but manual transmissions survive.

And such will be the case for Morse. There will be a group
of folks that use morse, advocate its use, and recruit new hams
to the use of morse....without any need for a test requirement.

> >> A manual transmission car does not use up less road than its automatic
> >> transmission equivalent. A manual transmission car use slightly less
fuel
> >> and
> >> pollutes slightly less than its automatic transmission equivalent. A
Morse
> >> signal uses up much less spectrum than any analog voice signal.
> >>
> >> Does any of that mean Morse MUST be tested? Nope. Does that mean Morse
> >> MUST NOT be tested? Nope. It all boils down to opinions, nothing more.
> >
> >We all have them...opinions.
> >
> 'zactly. And the choice of what should and should not be a test
requirement
> ultimately comes down to the FCC's opinion.

Agreed. And the writing is on the wall in that court of opinion.

> >> >It may be good to learn to communicate
> >> >to others that use Morse code, but it is NOT essential.
> >> >
> >> Nor is it essential to know anyhting about how a radio works in order
to
> >> use one.

> >
> >Are you proposing a non-technical license?
> >
> Heck no!

Good.

> But if someone or some group did want a non-technical ham license, they could
> use the same arguments against almost all of the written tests that have been
> used against the code tests.
> And how would we counter those arguments?

The counter argument is clear. ALL hams are responsible for their signal transmissions meeting FCC requirements. To allow a non-technical ham license the FCC would have to change/add many rules. For example:

1. A non-technical license would require operation with commercial equipment only.
2. Such commercially spec'd ham equipment would have to have a heavy emphasis on such equipment not being modifiable.
3. Someone setting up a station uder such a license would require some type of "certification" by a technical license holder as to their station being compliant with signal power strength limits for themselves and for public space adjacent to their property.

> Look at the UK's "Foundation" license, for an example of what
> could happen.

Isn't that more like a "lerner's permit" type of license which requires a full license holder to be providing oversight and guidance?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1359. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 12:46:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5s7k4$tm2$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63597

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030325234011.10838.00000436@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >But if someone or some group did want a non-technical ham license,
> <snip>
>
> You mean like the Technician license? Thats a non-technical license. (No
> knowledge of material required to pass the test).
>
> > the same arguments against almost all of the written tests that have
been
> >used against the code tests.
>
> Morse code is irrelavant. The written material is not. There, that's not
the
> same argument.
>
> If you don't understand a safety reg, a rig blows up.

It can be far worse than just a smoking rig.
It can be death of the individual (wiring error leading to electrocution),
It can be a transmitted signal into public space that exceeds
permitted levels.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1360. Re: FCC nails k1man yet again...??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 12:47:55 UTC
From: Lloyd <14313@tollfreenets14313.net>
Message-ID: <b5s7g2mur0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 63596
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Barney Bignose" <barneybnsnor@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3e813992@snipnews.snip.net...
> Gee folks, you would think by now this pack-
> mule up there in maine would have 'got the message'
> by now, after bein smacked upside the head
> with a 2-by-4 for....how may times has it been....??

You are missing the Big Picture of what is really
going on in the larger scheme of things.

Lloyd

1361. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 12:52:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5s7vj$9uq$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63598

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030325122742.27873.00001368@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <20030324225136.27651.00000280@mb-df.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
> (Vshah101) writes:
>
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn
> >>> Because Hams have the stereotype of being weird.
> >>
> >>It must be a regional thing. I see no evidence of hams being any more
> >>weird than any other folks.
> >
> >Hams are weird.
>
> All of them?

Probably...BUT!

The one thing I've noticed with any person that actively engages
in a hobby that the public doesn't consider "mainstream" is that
the person is viewed as "weird" or different, etc. Unless you are
a golfer or tennis player, the rest of the world thinks those
of us interested in ham radio, model airplanes, antique cars,
(the list goes on), are viewed as weird.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK, weird and proud of it :-)

1362. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 13:18:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303260518.12b1e484@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63599

"Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<V68ga.19832$jA2.1781504@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
>
> Walk softly and carry a big fish.
>
> Hans, K0HB

I've only seen Howard Stern on television once, and he used a big
fish. Very imaginative.

Brian

1363. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 13:20:09 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303260520.6cda258e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63600

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030325234011.10838.00000436@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >But if someone or some group did want a non-technical ham license,
> <snip>
>
> You mean like the Technician license?

No. I mean a license with no technical questions and just a few
regulations questions.

> Thats a non-technical license. (No
> knowledge of material required to pass the test).

Sounds like you're arguing for a non-technical license.
>
> > the same arguments against almost all of the written tests that have been
> >used against the code tests.
>
> Morse code is irrelavant.

That's simply not true. Obviously you have not actually listened to
the non-voice parts of the HF/MF amateur bands.

> The written material is not.

Why does a new ham have to be tested on theory material beyond that
necessary to understand the regs?

> There, that's not the
> same argument.
>
> If you don't understand a safety reg, a rig blows up.

Maybe.

And so what? Is it the government's job to protect hams from their own
stupidity?

If you try to operate a high-wattage appliance (say, a toaster oven or
space heater) through an inadequately-rated extension cord, you can
burn your house down. Try to drive a manual-shift car without a basic
understanding of how the gearshift and clutch are supposed to be used
and you'll chew up the transmission, clutch or both in short order.
Government doesn't protect people against those things.

> Understanding antennas
> helps you transmit and receive.

So you think such knowledge should be forced down the throats of all new hams, whether they are interested in it or not.

Why not replace the Morse code test with a soldering test? Or a Smith chart test?

> If you don't understand Morse, you miss out on
> <one> "fun" activity.

Actually, you miss out on a lot of fun activities, with a mode that uses less bandspace, simpler equipment and is more effective than many other modes.

Here's your anticodetest argument turned around:

Since no radio amatuer is required to build equipment or even know how it works, why should all hams have to be tested on technical subjects? FCC grants full privileges above 30 MHz to Technicians - why is more theory testing required to work HF/MF?

Answer those in a way that will convince someone who just wants to operate, not learn theory. Can you?

1364. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 13:22:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303260522.3a4e61dd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63501

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns934A760B86C4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>
> Why stop there. Why not send everyone descended from immigrants back home?

I think they are referring to those who fail to assimilate. In the
military its called, "non-adaptability," and it's punishable.

1365. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 13:25:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303260525.2331f021@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63502

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030325223311.28757.00000261@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/25/2003 3:45 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303251345.4496038e@posting.google.com>
>
> >Steve, nobody is prepared for your lunacy. We accept it.
> >
> >You should do likewise.
>
> Ahhhh, but I HAVE, Brain! I accept that you (and Vippy, Lennie and Markie)
> ARE lunatics. Your inconsistencies and rhetoric have proven this repeatedly.
>
> But thanks for your concern.
>
> Steve

You're nuts.

1366. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 13:28:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303260528.653f7662@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63503

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030325234011.10838.00000436@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >But if someone or some group did want a non-technical ham license,
> <snip>
>
> You mean like the Technician license? Thats a non-technical license. (No
> knowledge of material required to pass the test).

??? You're nuts. Its probably the most technical "entry-level" exam ever.

> > the same arguments against almost all of the written tests that have been
> >used against the code tests.
>
> Morse code is irrelavant. The written material is not. There, that's not the
> same argument.
>
> If you don't understand a safety reg, a rig blows up. Understanding antennas
> helps you transmit and receive. If you don't understand Morse, you miss out on
> <one> "fun" activity.

No one at the ARRL or FCC ever checked to see if I could make packet go.

1367. Re: test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 13:33:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303260533.541e5f3f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63504

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030325233652.00929.00000630@mb-fo.aol.com>...
> In article <20030324230123.03943.00002664@mb-fj.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >RYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRYRY
> >
> >THE QUICK BROWN FOX JUMPED OVER THE LAZY DOGS BACK
> >123457890 TIMES
> >
> >NOW IS THE TIME FOR ALL GOOD MEN TO COME TO THE AID OF
> >THEIR PARTY
> >
> >73 DE LARRY K3LT
> >
> >NNNN
> >
> >REAL TELETYPE MACHINES DONT HAVE UPPER CASE CHARACTERS
> >
>
> TO RRAP
>
> FM K3LT
>
> INFO N0IMD
>
> OOOPS -- I MEANT TO SAY LOWER CASE CHARACTERS.
>
> I GOT MOST OF MY TELETYPE EXPERIENCE ON THE AFLC LOGAIR
> COMNET -- AND I USED TO DO A LOT OF RTTY ON A TELETYPE
> MACHINE WHEN I WAS IN AF MARS X RIPPING GOOD STUFF X
> REGARDS
>
> 73 DE LARRY K3LT
>
> NNNN

Larry, no-sweatty-dah. We knew what you meant and saved ourselves a
skinned knee rather than choosing to trip over it. FWIW, I had to use
the uppers and lowers switch, but not for case. I think I had to
switch to uppers for the digits.

1368. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 13:39:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303260539.35e9d2c3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63505

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030325223055.28757.00000260@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/25/2003 3:33 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303251333.2f8e1b@posting.google.com>
>
> >Well then define what it is you're jabbing and where you're jabbing
> >it. My interpretation of your open statement is legitimate.
>
> I think there's very little legitimate about you, Brain.

Ahem, you need to back up your previous accusation. Define what you
meant by "Depends what you're jabbing and where."

> >My comment stands.
>
> ....as a tribute to your inconsistency and incompetence.
>
> Steve

You incompetently replied. Say exactly what you meant by the above
quotation, and why my interpretation was wrong. If you can.

1369. Re: FCC nails k1man yet again...??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 14:41:10 UTC
From: Lloyd/N0VFP <lloyd_vfp@NOmsn.NOSPAMMMM.com>
Message-ID: <3e81b839_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 63506
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

```
"Lloyd" <14313@tollfreenets14313.net> wrote in message
news:b5s7g2$mur$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Barney Bignose" <barneybnsnor@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:3e813992@snipnews.snip.net...
> > Gee folks, you would think by now this pack-
> > mule up there in maine would have 'got the message'
> > by now, after bein smacked upside the head
> > with a 2-by-4 for....how may times has it been....??
>
>
> You are missing the Big Picture of what is really
> going on in the larger scheme of things.
>
> Lloyd
>
>
>
============= FAKE LLOYD ALERT =====================

another lame attempt to discredit my name!

--
Lloyd/N0VFP
"And that's just the way it is"
R-75 FT-817

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----
```

1370. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 15:09:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030326100917.18435.00000368@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63507

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/25/2003 10:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030325234011.10838.00000436@mb-cr.aol.com>

>You mean like the Technician license? Thats a non-technical license. (No
>knowledge of material required to pass the test).

ALL Amateur Radio licenses are "non-technical" byt that standard, Vippy.
Wether ot not it is "technical" is by the implementation of the holder.

>Morse code is irrelavant. The written material is not.

That's pretty stupid, Vipul.

The written material can be memorized for complete rote memorization,
however even some material will be assimilated by sheer volume.

>There, that's not the same argument.

Sure it is.

>If you don't understand a safety reg, a rig blows up.

Bull.

>Understanding antennas helps you transmit and receive.

So what "understanding" does someone have to have other than reading the
label and making sure the radio you are about to screw the PL-259 onto is the
same wavelength band as the antenna it is intended for?

Do I need proficiency in Smith Charts in order to read the instructions
and bolt any antenna together? Even the most elaborate of Amateur antennas
comes with instructions that anyone with a 10th grade reading comprehension
should be able to accomplish.

>If you don't understand Morse, you miss out on <one> "fun" activity.

No, you miss out on MANY fun activites. Too bad you don't take the time
to learn it (the Code) and find out.

Steve, K4YZ

1371. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 15:24:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030326102422.11366.00000272@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 63508

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/26/2003 7:39 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303260539.35e9d2c3@posting.google.com>

>You incompetently replied.

"...incompetently replied"...?!?!

BBBWWWWHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! !

>Say exactly what you meant by the above
>quotation, and why my interpretation was wrong. If you can.

If you'd said anything I could "interpret", I'd be glad to. All I see was your insulting reference to my professional skills. Of course I also know that when YOU are "jabbing" anything anywhere, it's to intimidate, humiliate or denigrate.

Steve

1372. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 15:25:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030326102553.11366.00000273@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 63509

>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/26/2003 7:25 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303260525.2331f021@posting.google.com>

>You're nuts.

That was a meaningful retort. About 3rd-gradeish, I'd surmise.

Steve

1373. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 15:35:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030326103559.11366.00000277@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 63510

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/25/2003 9:36 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030325223626.10838.00000433@mb-cr.aol.com>

>"Ham" radio is a subset focus of amateur radio activites.

Bull.

>The activities, in
>itself, are fine (even code!). Its the "culture" that makes it weird.

Amateur Radio is what it is. That you are the square peg trying to fit
into the round hole does NOT make Amateur Radio "weird". It make YOU weird.

>Correlation is high, but not all Hams are weird. Two amateurs can participate
>in same activities. One may be weird, other is not.

Using your posts as evidence I would ahve to say that this is true.

>Call sign hats,excessive jargon, hatred of CB, is weird, for example

"Call sign hats"..."Excessive jargon"..."hatred of CB"...

You STILL have yet to tell us who is empowered to make the determinations
as to who may decide what is weird and what is "OK".

So far all we have is your opinon, but so far you've been proven pretty
wrong.

>>Here's a clue, Vipul: Not all hams go to the few hamfests and club meetings
>>you've attended.
>
>This doesn't explain what the Ham radio demographic is.

There is no ONE "demographic" of Amateur Radio participants. It is a
multicultural, multifaceted, multipurpose thing. There is no one right or
wrong as to what makes a good Amateur operator, what makes good Amateur
practice, or how Amateur Radio can be utilized or applied.

Steve

1374. Re: test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 15:36:40 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <cOjga.25931$ja4.1754155@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 63511

> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>> REAL TELETYPE MACHINES DONT HAVE UPPER CASE CHARACTERS

> OOOPS -- I MEANT TO SAY LOWER CASE CHARACTERS.

Actually, REAL TELETYPE machines have <LTRS> and <FIGS> keys.

All the others are just wasting bits.

K7JEB

1375. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 15:57:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030326105738.11366.00000278@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 63512

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/25/2003 10:14 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030325231418.10838.00000435@mb-cr.aol.com>

>I says:

=) What did I say about English being a second language to this guy?

>>>I could come up with more credible sources, but that would take too much
>>>effort. And, how would I convince such source to attend a Hamfest?
>Then K4YZ says:
>> A "source" in this context is a pre-exisiting, knowledgeable or
>>experienced point-of-reference.

>>And if you have to "convince" them to attend, they have NO pre-exisiting
>>experience or knowledgebase from which to make an INFORMED opinion.

>A credible source should be unbiased. Therefore, a non-Ham can visit a
>Hamfest.
>Then, this person can decide if Hams are weird to them or not.

You're still having comprehension problems, Vipul.

I asked you from what credible sources you developed the opinions you
already hold.

I did not ask you about taking someone to a hamfest to try and create a
corroborating opinion.

>Another possible credible source is the radio professional or rf professor.

You mean like Lennie? A documented pathological liar? Oooooh yeah...I'd
consider THAT "credible"... ! ! !

>True, one cannot understand everything right away. One must be explained what
>certain things mean. Then, one can have an informed opinion. Certain things
>are apparent right away however.

One only manifests an "informed opinon" after having unfettered access to
and practical knowledge of a subject. You seek to take someone who you think
will have a predisposition to your opinion in order to say "I told you so".

>NOT attending, but
>>somehwere in there you LIED!
>
>No, I did not. The chanting was not part of the ceremony (as far as I know).
>The costumes and chanting occured during the dinner buffet. This was NOT the

>Wouff Hong ceremony, but an "advertisement" for the ceremony.
>There were non-Ham bystanders. I would guess they found it weird and could
>have
>suspected some kind of cult.

I think you lied. Period. You got caught up in your own tales and forgot
WHAT you said you believed in and couldn't keep the story straight.

>>First you tell us what a waste of time and how "cult" like the Wouff Hong
>>ceremony is supposed to be.
>
>From the chanting "advertisement", it looked like a cult.

So far all you have been able to "document" for us is that you once bought
a ticket to a banquet where a Wouff Hong "ceremony" was to be held. You
elected to not go for whatever reason, yet all of your rantings and railings in
THIS forum have been based on third party tellings and some "advertisement" you
saw.

In other words, it was NOT an INFORMED opinion. Youa re just running off
at the mouth.

>True, I did not attend it. I did not want to wait until midnight, so I asked
>for my money back. It was not too expensive, just $2. Would have been worth
>it
>if I did not have to wait 3 hrs to see the ceremony (there were no other
>activities planned in between). I asked for a refund and they graciously
>refunded my money.

And thank-you for validating MY opinions over the last few days, Vippy.
You didn't go. You have NO basis of fact from which to make your assertions.
You are expressing an opinion based on thrid party innuendo and guessing on
your part.

Not every impressive for a person alleged to be an engineer.

>Of course, if I did attend, I would be a "traitor".

A "traitor"..?!?! To whom? Sheesh! And Lennie accuses ME of being in
some goosestepping Amateur Radio "Service" (of the military ilk).

>I may possibly get punished with the strange looking torture device.

...Or you may be forced to read your own posts.

>I heard that the ceremony had to do
>with Morse code and operating properly by some other people that claimed to
>have attended one before.

More third party innuendo. No facts.

>>Many clubs have points-of-order that require the
>>memberships advice-and-consent in order to effect into club policy or
>>regulations.
>

>Then I don't get a vote that meeting.

Exactly. Which means while you are in THIS forum bellyaching, you COULD be participating in the local club using the democratic processes that most clubs follow in order to effect teh changes you seem to think are needed.

However I feel you'll probably not do that since it would be embarrasssing to see just how little support your "ideas" have. It also requires some strength of character and "work" in order to work within a democratic framework, and I personally don't think you have it in you.

>If you are not there, you cannot participate. If you do not
>>participate, you are NOT supporting the club!
>
>Again, I disagree. Also, 2-3 hrs sitting through a topic of no interest is
>foolish and does not show support. I can attend those meetings after break,
>if
>I want to. Often enough there are topics of interest. Those I can attend the
>whole meeting. That should be fair.

If you are not there, you cannot participate. If you do not participate, you are NOT supporting the club.

Steve

1376. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 17:46:17 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303260946.5b8a00e0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63513

"Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<V68ga.19832$jA2.1781504@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
>
> Here's the plan:
>
> 1) The US will apologize to the world for our "interference" in their
> affairs, past & present. You know, Hitler, Mussolini, Arafat, Sharon,
> Saddam, and the rest of them 'good old boy's.

The Kaiser, Castro, Noriega, the Shah of Iran, Ho Chi Minh, Slobodan
Milosevic......

> We will never
> "interfere"again.
>
> 2) We will withdraw our troops from all over the world, starting with
> Germany, South Korea, Israel, and the Philippines.

And the Balkans, South America, Central America....

> They don't want us there
> anyway. We would station troops at our borders and airports. No more
> sneaking through holes in the (Bureaucratic) fence.
>
> 3) All illegal aliens have 90 days to get their affairs together and leave.
> We'll give them a free trip home. After 90 days the remainder will be
> gathered up and sent on a DXpedition, regardless of who or where they are.

And nobody will complain about rising food prices due to the lack of
farm workers...
>
> 4) All future visitors will be thoroughly checked and strictly limited to 90
> days (unless given a special permit). No one from a terrorist nation would
> be allowed in. If you don't like it there, change it yourself, don't hide
> here. Asylum would not ever be available to anyone.

Just like the ship St. Louis was turned back in 1939, huh?

> We don't need any more
> cab drivers.
>
> 5) No "students" over age 21. The older ones are the usually bombers. If
> they don't attend classes, or if they get a "D" and it's back home baby.

Also need to keep an eye on what subjects they study. If they want to
be doctors or modern farmers, fine. Nuclear physicists? Sorry.
>

> 6) The US will make a strong effort to become self sufficient energy wise.
> This will include developing non polluting sources of energy

It will also have to include lots of conservation, recycling,
alternative energy sources and utilizations, and lifestyle changes. No
more office workers using a three ton 10 MPG truck as a single person
commuting vehicle, for example. More transit, more telecommuting, more
insulation, less waste. Fewer SUVs, more windmills, more biodiesel.

> but will
> require a temporary drilling of oil in the Alaskan wilderness. The caribou
> will have to cope for a while.

Already being done.

USA imports about half of our oil. How many Americans are willing and
able to cut their petroleum product usage by half, and pay more for
the petrol products they do use?
>
> 7) Offer Saudi Arabia and all other oil producing countries $10 a barrel for
> their oil. If they don't like it, they can go someplace else.

Better have those alternatives in place first.
>
> 8) If there is a famine or other natural catastrophe in the world, we will
> not "interfere". They can pray to Allah, Buddha or whomever, for seeds,
> rain, cement or whatever they need. Besides' most of what we give them is
> stolen or given to the army. The people who need it most get very little, if
> any anyway.

Nah. Ship them everything they need as long as it's not a weapon.
Stamp "Humanitarian Gift From The USA" in all sorts of languages all
over everything sent, so they know where it all came from, and what it
really is.
Cost of such aid is far below what is now spent on "defense" of those
countries.

However:

No weapons or weapons-technology sales to any country that does not
have a truly non-repressive, elected form of government, and which
does not sell, loan, give or resell weapons or weapons-technology to
countries the USA won't deal with.
>
> 9) Ship the UN Headquarters to an island some place.

Greenland.

Neutral country, easily accessible, nothing to do there but work out
solutions to the world's problems.

> We don't need the spies
> and fair weather friends here. Besides, it would make a good homeless
> shelter or lockup for illegal aliens.

>
> 10) All Americans must go to charm and beauty school.

Including getting their BMIs down to the normal range.

> That way, no one can
> call us "Ugly Americans" any longer.

I dunno, I still see the same face in the mirror....
>
> Walk softly and carry a big fish.
>
Works for me.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1377. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 17:51:02 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303260951.6eb848f8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63514

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030325223626.10838.00000433@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >>Hams are weird.
> >
> >All of them?
>
> "Ham" radio is a subset focus of amateur radio activites.

Only to you. To everyone else, ham radio = amateur radio. Equivalent
sets.

> The activities, in
> itself, are fine (even code!). Its the "culture" that makes it weird.

See K2UNK's excellent post on this.
>
> Correlation is high, but not all Hams are weird. Two amateurs can participate
> in same activities. One may be weird, other is not.

Uh-huh.
>
> Call sign hats, excessive jargon, hatred of CB, is weird, for example.

Whoa - call sign hats? What is weird about call sign hats?

I don't know any hams who use excessive jargon or who hate CB, so that
just leaves the hats.
>
> >Here's a clue, Vipul: Not all hams go to the few hamfests and club meetings
> >you've attended.
>
> This doesn't explain what the Ham radio demographic is.

Your statements all sound like you know what the demographics are. But
you don't know.

That's really weird.

1378. Re: test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 18:07:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303261007.4637ac77@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63515

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:<c0jga.25931$ja4.1754155@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >> REAL TELETYPE MACHINES DONT HAVE UPPER CASE CHARACTERS
>
> > OOOPS -- I MEANT TO SAY LOWER CASE CHARACTERS.
>
> Actually, REAL TELETYPE machines have <LTRS> and <FIGS> keys.
>
> All the others are just wasting bits.
>
> K7JEB

There you go. Mine had a bell, too, but didn't play the "Windows" theme song.

1379. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 18:08:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303261008.2e3902a5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63516

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030326102553.11366.00000273@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/26/2003 7:25 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303260525.2331f021@posting.google.com>
>
> >You're nuts.
>
> That was a meaningful retort. About 3rd-gradeish, I'd surmise.
>
> Steve

Even a 3rd grader could tell that you're nuts.

1380. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 18:11:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303261011.661f809f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63517

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030326102422.11366.00000272@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/26/2003 7:39 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303260539.35e9d2c3@posting.google.com>
>
> >You incompetently replied.
>
> "...incompetently replied"...?!?!
>
> BBBWWWWHHAHAHA

1381. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 18:15:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303261015.6efe1b16@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63518

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E809FC6.10B90795@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030324095829.14527.00001055@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> > > In article <20030323204347.09480.00000264@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> > > Robeson K4YZ) writes:
> > >
> > > >> And don't go
> > > >>confusing proficiency with effectiveness.
> > >
> > > They are, for the most part, synonymous, Brain.
> > >
> > > One cannot be effective at something without being proficient at it, nor
> > > >can one be proficient without being effective.
> > >
> > > Unless you can prove otherwise?
> > >
> > > The hams using the 0.02 wpm Morse were effective, but not necessarily
> > > proficient. I'm almost certain the sending and receiving were done by computer,
> > > not by the hams themselves, so their proficiency is unknown and irrelevant.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Heil is certain that they are proficient, but doesn't define that
> > proficiency, and disagrees with you and your source for the lowest
> > level of proficiency. He is certain the amateurs involved in this
> > event are proficient because only proficient hams could set a world
> > record using machine sent and received Morse Code at 0.02wpm.
>
> See what I mean about your not being right? I've never stated that I'm
> certain that those achieving the 136 KHz record are proficient, yet
> you've stated that I am certain.

You're not certain about what?

That the 0.02wpm coders are proficient?

Or that you don't know what Morse Proficiency is?

1382. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 20:08:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E8208B1.9090408@psu.edu>
Source record: 63519

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <20030324145805.17324.00000074@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve

> Steve:
>
> While the Paul Harvey piece does do a great service to ham radio, it
> is just one piece and will not stay in the public conscience for very
> long, if at all. We won't be seeing any significant spike in newcomers
> to our hobby/service as a result of it. What is needed is a continuous,
> wide-ranging, national media campaign. There are literally hundreds of
> public service announcements on TV every day -- why can't a few of
> them be about amateur radio -- produced with the help of our ham radio
> celebrities with connections in the mass media industry? We're now
> seeing Joe Walsh, WB6ACU, plugging ham radio products in the
> magazines -- why can't he plug ham radio itself on TV? I'm sure he
> has the connections and influence to get this done!

Anyone know what he is like in person? I used to watch him on Johnny Carson, and he came off like kind of a stoner. I think it was an act. He was a riot in any event.

> I just had a horrible thought: I hope none of the Dixie Chicks are licensed
> Amateur Radio operators!

I'm not certain that the "Dixie Chicks are chicks!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1383. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 20:18:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E820B11.9010606@psu.edu>
Source record: 63520

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030325122742.27873.00001368@mb-mj.aol.com...
>
>>In article <20030324225136.27651.00000280@mb-df.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
>>(Vshah101) writes:
>>
>>
>>>From: Dave Heil k8mn
>>>
>>>>>Because Hams have the stereotype of being weird.
>>>>
>>>>It must be a regional thing. I see no evidence of hams being any more
>>>>weird than any other folks.
>>>
>>>Hams are weird.
>>
>>All of them?
>
>
> Probably...BUT!
>
> The one thing I've noticed with any person that actively engages
> in a hobby that the public doesn't consider "mainstream" is that
> the person is viewed as "weird" or different, etc. Unless you are
> a golfer or tennis player, the rest of the world thinks those
> of us interested in ham radio, model airplanes, antique cars,
> (the list goes on), are viewed as weird.

And they themselves are the wierd ones.

"If 100 million people believe a wrong thing, it is still a wrong thing."

Opus the Penguin

1384. Re: FCC nails k1man yet again...??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 21:39:50 UTC
From: hotfilaments@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ba37c287.0303261339.59bb33cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63521
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

```
"Lloyd/N0VFP" <lloyd_vfp@NOmsn.NOSPAMMMM.com> wrote in message
news:<3e81b839_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>...
> "Lloyd" <14313@tollfreenets14313.net> wrote in message
> news:b5s7g2$mur$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "Barney Bignose" <barneybnsnor@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:3e813992@snipnews.snip.net...
> > > Gee folks, you would think by now this pack-
> > > mule up there in maine would have 'got the message'
> > > by now, after bein smacked upside the head
> > > with a 2-by-4 for....how may times has it been....??
> >
> >
> > You are missing the Big Picture of what is really
> > going on in the larger scheme of things.
> >
> > Lloyd
> >
> >
> >
> ============ FAKE LLOYD ALERT =====================
>
> another lame attempt to discredit my name!
>
>
> --
> Lloyd/N0VFP
> "And that's just the way it is"
> R-75 FT-817
>
>
>
>
> ------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

You do quite well enough on your own to discredit your name old chap.

"================= FAKE LLOYD ALERT ================="

Isn't that redundant??

Cheerio.............
```

James

1385. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 22:29:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E8229D5.189C12D1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63522

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E809FC6.10B90795@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030324095829.14527.00001055@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <20030323204347.09480.00000264@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> > > > Robeson K4YZ) writes:
> > > >
> > > > >> And don't go
> > > > >>confusing proficiency with effectiveness.
> > > > >
> > > > > They are, for the most part, synonymous, Brain.
> > > > >
> > > > > One cannot be effective at something without being proficient at it, nor
> > > > >can one be proficient without being effective.
> > > > >
> > > > > Unless you can prove otherwise?
> > > > >
> > > > The hams using the 0.02 wpm Morse were effective, but not necessarily
> > > > proficient. I'm almost certain the sending and receiving were done by computer,
> > > > not by the hams themselves, so their proficiency is unknown and irrelevant.
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > > Heil is certain that they are proficient, but doesn't define that
> > > proficiency, and disagrees with you and your source for the lowest
> > > level of proficiency. He is certain the amateurs involved in this
> > > event are proficient because only proficient hams could set a world
> > > record using machine sent and received Morse Code at 0.02wpm.
> >
> > See what I mean about your not being right? I've never stated that I'm
> > certain that those achieving the 136 KHz record are proficient, yet
> > you've stated that I am certain.
>
> You're not certain about what?

Thanks for yet another example of your reading comprehension
difficulties.

> That the 0.02wpm coders are proficient?

I wrote (quote)
Dig back in the thread a little, Brian. That's one of the points I made--that we don't know the code proficiency of either ham. We don't know that their maximum morse receiving speed is higher than .02 wpm. I have an idea that it it. You seem to have made an assumption that it is on the order of .02 wpm and then asked if that was "proficient". Such comments just make you look like a dullard. (unquote)

You can dig back in the thread for similar items posted by me.

> Or that you don't know what Morse Proficiency is?

Your problem is reading comprehension.

Dave K8MN

1386. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 22:32:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030326173236.18435.00000377@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63523

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/26/2003 7:45 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303260545.29e54e11@posting.google.com>

>Are you obsessive/compulsive?

As compared to you, Brain? I don't think so.

Steve

1387. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 22:37:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030326173756.18435.00000378@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63524

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/26/2003 12:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303261011.661f809f@posting.google.com>

>Yes, I see. Change the subject.

There's no "change the subject", Brain.

Your own obsessive/compulsive need to try and discredit myself and otehrs
leaves your "posts" devoid of anything meaningful to respond to save for even
more silliness and innuendo.

>We aren't trying to decipher what I meant, Steve, we are trying to
>decipher what you meant, so as to determine if my subsequent comment
>was valid or not.

How can there be anything to "decipher" when all I can do is piecemeal
respond to silly innuendo, sleights and irrelevent tripe?

Steve

1388. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 23:12:27 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <b5tc67$js8$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63525

In article <20030326105738.11366.00000278@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
says...
> >Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 3/25/2003 10:14 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030325231418.10838.00000435@mb-cr.aol.com>
>
> >I says:

>
> >Another possible credible source is the radio professional or rf professor.
>

Not to get caught up in this..BUT..I do believe that this person was
taught his "EE" skills by the East coast equiv. of the LLC none other
than K1OIK Burt Fisher. He parrots the phrases that Burt uses and is a
"radio professor"

Would that make you know who the Rockbottom to Burt's Professor?

(apologizes to Felix the Cat)

1389. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-26 23:59:24 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <b5tess$2kaj$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 63526

N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>"K�HB" <k�hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
>news:<V68ga.19832$jA2.1781504@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
>> but will
>> require a temporary drilling of oil in the Alaskan wilderness. The caribou
>> will have to cope for a while.

Don't forget off-shore Florida, where the current administration banned
drilling for reasons that couldn't possibly be related to the last name
of the governor there.

>Already being done.
>
>USA imports about half of our oil. How many Americans are willing and
>able to cut their petroleum product usage by half, and pay more for
>the petrol products they do use?

Actually, US domestic oil production currently amounts to 5.8 million
barrels per day (see, e.g.

http://www.ott.doe.gov/facts/archives/fotw249supp.shtml

) while domestic oil consumption is near or above 20 million barrels
per day. Worse, the US only has reserves to sustain this production
level for 7 years or so, though that can probably be fixed if the
price of oil goes substantially higher and stays there.

Despite this, I have seen the 50% import number quoted quite often. My
best guess is that it may include production by domestic oil companies
in nearby countries, like Canada and Mexico, in the "not-import" category.
I wouldn't want to count on the security of that production, however, if
they get screwed over by things like increased border restrictions...

>> 7) Offer Saudi Arabia and all other oil producing countries $10 a barrel for
>> their oil. If they don't like it, they can go someplace else.
>
>Better have those alternatives in place first.

It does seem that the US no longer has the leverage it once had. Oil
consumption in the rest of the world has grown to about 60 million
barrels per day, which means that US imports account for no more than
20% of that business. There are lots of other places to go. And even
now the US imports only 2.5 million barrels per day from all Persian Gulf
countries combined, an amount small enough that reducing it to zero
probably wouldn't bother them much.

Dennis Ferguson

1390. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 00:10:55 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <AFD0EE56BE6B4F8C.CC3FDF9A8774DCC9.EDB8B5345B2D887F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 63527

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030325233654.00929.00000632@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article
<738AF60786AA8F77.FBDF13936F210835.7E03E47281600BCF@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> How does one behave as a loyal American, Larry? Blindly follow the
> >> President without question like we're now accusing the Iraqi people of
> >doing
> >> with Saddam? Never question the actions of the military like the German
> >> people did during Hitler's time? Say one supports the actions of this
> >> country when one honestly does not? Only speak when what is said agrees
> >with
> >> your views? Do define how a loyal American is supposed to behave,
Larry.
> >>
> >>
> >> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >>
> >> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >
> >Thanks, Dwight. Absolutely!!!
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim/Dwight:
>
> The problem with the present situation is that to protest the actions
> of President Bush in Iraq is to say that you do support the cruel,
> viscous, murderous regime of Saddam Hussein, and support his goal
> of producing weapons of mass destruction to be used to terrorize
> the rest of the world.
>

I quite disagree with your observation that to dissent=agreement or support,
in this case, with Saddam Hussein. However, this debate is out of the realm
of what I was responding to in this thread.

The original post that started this thread was from someone expressing
disdain with the French president's position on the war against Iraq. Dan,
W4NTI was the first to respond with the message that [paraphrased] if the
person disagreed with the French president, then he/she should vote them out

of office. Dwight then stated to Dan that he (Dan) did not represent or speak for the USA. Then there's the usual exchange of snips back and forth...and my first entry into the thread was to respond to a post from Bert Craig, where he [paraphrased] that everyone has the right to their own opinion and to express it. My response was that the KEY element to democracy and freedom is tolerance. As an aside, it seems that Dwight took some exception to this, since he promptly stated that he was exiting from the thread.

However, my original statement/response stands. It is for the reason of intolerance from some of our own US citizens that we often lose sight of the fact that we are, as US citizens, allowed a diverse set of opinion and we also have the right to express them--without fear.

I refer back to your paragraph, above, Larry, and won't even engage you on the rest of your post, below. Do you really think you are not passing judgement on someone's beliefs when you insinuate that dissent=support or agreement with something others may disagree with? If so, do you *really* think you are being tolerant?

>
> The current-day anti-war protestors seek to
> continue the use of non-interventionist diplomacy, which has already
> been proven to have failed at altering the course of the Saddam Hussein
> regime of terror, murder, and exportation of WMD's. The protesters
> here are simply indulging in a knee-jerk reaction to war itself, without
> any thought to the fact that there are things far worse than war. How
> could they have seen the World Trade Center crumble and the Pentagon
> be attacked without thinking that we, as a nation, would have to make
> sacrifices to ensure that such a thing never happened again?
>
> War is a bad thing -- a very bad thing. Nobody in his right mind wants
> to see young men and women placed in harm's way -- but this is the only
> way that freedom and democracy has ever been achieved. Diplomacy
> does not work against maniacal, dictatorial tyrants like Hussein. Twelve
> years was enough of a test. We are now doing what must be done.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Kim W5TIT

1391. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 01:43:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030326204339.23598.00001090@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63530

In article <f45722ac.0303260528.653f7662@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
>news:<20030325234011.10838.00000436@mb-cr.aol.com>...
>> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>
>> >But if someone or some group did want a non-technical ham license,
>> <snip>
>>
>> You mean like the Technician license? Thats a non-technical license. (No
>> knowledge of material required to pass the test).
>
>??? You're nuts.

No comment.

>> Its probably the most technical "entry-level" exam ever.

Not at all.

Back before the 1951 restructuring, all new US hams started out with either a Class C or Class B license. 13 wpm code, send and receive, plus a written test of about fifty questions that included calculations, drawing schematic and block diagrams, and essays. No Q&A pools or one-day classes, either.

I can post some of the questions from the 1948 study guide. I doubt ol' Vipul could answer them without some research.

1392. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 01:43:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030326204340.23598.00001091@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63528

In article <b5s7k4$tm2$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com>
>Date: Wed, 26 Mar 2003 07:46:37 -0500
>
>
>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030325234011.10838.00000436@mb-cr.aol.com...
>> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>
>> >But if someone or some group did want a non-technical ham license,
>> <snip>
>>
>> You mean like the Technician license? Thats a non-technical license. (No
>> knowledge of material required to pass the test).
>>
>> > the same arguments against almost all of the written tests that have
>been
>> >used against the code tests.
>>
>> Morse code is irrelavant. The written material is not. There, that's not
>the
>> same argument.
>>
>> If you don't understand a safety reg, a rig blows up.
>
>It can be far worse than just a smoking rig.
>It can be death of the individual (wiring error leading to electrocution),

Sure. But the same thing can happen, and does, when homeowners do their own
electrical wiring or appliance repair. No test for doing that kind of work to
your own property.

>It can be a transmitted signal into public space that exceeds
>permitted levels.
>
True - but all that's required to prevent that is a lower power limit and a few
RF exposure questions on the test.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1393. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 01:43:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030326204342.23598.00001092@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63529

```
In article <b5s7dn$c8j$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com>
>Date: Wed, 26 Mar 2003 07:43:14 -0500
>
>
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030325222632.25154.00000954@mb-cb.aol.com...
>> In article <b5oad6$thd$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20030322233747.29016.00000934@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> >> In article <20030321210132.07005.00000197@mb-bk.aol.com>,
>vshah101@aol.com
>> >> (Vshah101) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >From: "Bill Sohl"
>> >> >>I belive it is only a personal choice. In today's world,
>> >> >>the NEED for manual knowledge is strictly personal. Has anyone
>> >> >>heard or read about anyone being in danger or worse because
>> >> >>no one was available to drive a manual gearbox vehicle?
>> >> >
>> >> >You can understand the analogy.
>> >>
>> >> Actually, I got the analogy from Bill.
>> >
>> >And the anology is the fact that no test is required to be able
>> >to learn, use and drive a manual gearbox vehicle.
>>
>> That's one interpretation, yes. Of course manual transmissions are not
>> as common in passenger cars as Morse code is on the ham bands.
>>
>> The whole reason I brought it up was to provide a better analogy than
>> the "ride a horse" analogy that was being discussed.
>> >
>> >> >How come N2EY cannot understand the analogy
>> >> >HE gave? He proposed this analogy.
>> >>
>> >> I understand it perfectly.
>> >> >
>> >> >Now he doesn't agree with the conclusion:
```

>> >>
>> >> I don't agree with YOUR conclusion.
>> >>
>> >> >There is no NEED for Morse code testing.
>> >>
>> >> I think there is.
>> >
>> >Then the anology as I put it forth is NOT consistent
>> >with morse. Are you suggesting the anlogy as you propose
>> >(i.e. N2EY) would be to require manual gearbox testing?
>>
>> If manual transmissions were as common in American cars as
>> Morse transmissions are in the ham bands.....
>
>But even when that was the case, the states (many of them anyway)
>did NOT require testing on a manual gearbox in order to be allowed to
>drive a car with a manual trans.

But at least some states DID require such a test.
>
>> >> The percentage of amateur radio HF communications using Morse
>> >> is much higher
>> >> than the percentage of cars with manual transmissions.
>> >
>> >The percent of manual gearboxes was once high and even then
>> >many states did NOT require a manual gearbox certification.
>> >EG: NY as far back as 1958.
>>
>> Sure. Other states were different.
>
>A handful at best.
>
It would be interesting to know how big that handful was, back in the days when
manual trans in cars were as common as Morse signals on amateur HF/MF.

>> Today that's all gone - but manual transmissions survive.
>
>And such will be the case for Morse. There will be a group
>of folks that use morse, advocate its use, and recruit new hams
>to the use of morse....without any need for a test requirement.

Exactly!
>
>> >> A manual transmission car does not use up less road than its automatic
>> >> transmission equivalent. A manual transmission car use slightly less
>> >>fuel
>> >> and
>> >> pollutes slightly less than its automatic transmission equivalent. A
>> >>Morse
>> >> signal uses up much less spectrum than any analog voice signal.
>> >>

>> >> Does any of that mean Morse MUST be tested? Nope. Does that mean >> >>
Morse
>> >> MUST NOT be tested? Nope. It all boils down to opinions, nothing more.
>> >
>> >We all have them...opinions.
>> >
>> 'zactly. And the choice of what should and should not be a test
>> requirement
>> ultimately comes down to the FCC's opinion.
>
>Agreed. And the writing is on the wall in that court of opinion.
>
In fact, it's only because of the writing of S25.5 that we have Element 1.

>> >> >It may be good to learn to communicate
>> >> >to others that use Morse code, but it is NOT essential.
>> >> >
>> >> Nor is it essential to know anyhting about how a radio works in order
>> >> to
>> >> use one.
>> >
>> >Are you proposing a non-technical license?
>> >
>> Heck no!
>
>Good.
>
Of course the definition of "technical" is largely a matter of opinion. An EE's
opinion of a "technical license test" may be quite different from, say, an
accountant's.

>> But if someone or some group did want a non-technical ham license, they
>>could
>> use the same arguments against almost all of the written tests that have
>> been
>> used against the code tests.
>> And how would we counter those arguments?
>
>The counter argument is clear. ALL hams are responsible for their
>signal transmissions meeting FCC requirements.

Sure. So are all users of radio transmitters.

(Devil's Advocate Mode = ON)

But there's no test for, say, a cell phone, or an FRS or GMRS radio. Or a CB.

Does anyone really think that the current writtens test for all the info a ham
needs to insure that his/her transmitters meet all FCC requirements?

>To allow a non-technical
>ham license the FCC would have to change/add many rules. For

>example:
>
>1. A non-technical license would require operation with
>commercial equipment only.

What % of US hams today homebrew their rigs?
What % of US hams today use rigs that require tuneup/adjustment to insure purity/quality of transmitted signal?

I'd venture to say that the percentage of hams using Morse is much higher than the percentage of hams doing either of the above.

>2. Such commercially spec'd ham equipment would have
>to have a heavy emphasis on such equipment not being modifiable.

Why?

>3. Someone setting up a station uder such a license would
>require some type of "certification" by a technical license
>holder as to their station being compliant with signal power
>strength limits for themselves and for public space adjacent to
>their property.

Not really. If the power level of the non-technical license were kept low enough (say, 100 W on HF/MF and 25 W on VHF/UHF), and if there were a few RF safety questions on the test, all would be fine.

There's no test for a microwave oven.
>
>> Look at the UK's "Foundation" license, for an example of what
>> could happen.
>
>Isn't that more like a "learner's permit" type of license which requires
>a full license holder to be providing oversight and guidance?

Nope. Basically it's a reduced-requirement license. Foundation hams take a "Morse assessment" test and a very simplified written. Foundation hams must also attend an approved course. (The Brits are very big on having new hams take formal courses in ham radio rather than do all self-study).

They are allowed low power (100 W on HF, as I recall) and must use "approved" rigs. The list of approved rigs is extensive, and includes kits as complex as the Elecraft K2.

The fact of the matter is that right now FCC allows Technician class hams of any age, experience, or education to design/build/repair/modify/adjust and operate rigs of up to 1500 W output on all amateur bands and modes above 30 MHz. Except for rules and propagation specific to HF/MF, why must Generals and Extras learn more theory and take more written tests to get HF privs?

(Devil's Advocate Mode = OFF)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1394. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 01:50:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030326205026.01930.00001727@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 63532

In article <f45722ac.0303260522.3a4e61dd@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>
>I think they are referring to those who fail to assimilate. In the
>military its called, "non-adaptability," and it's punishable.

"Failure to adapt to military service" is "punished" only with a General Discharge, which can be easily upgraded to Honorable at the former servicemember's request. It is not "punished" unless the individual commits offenses against the UCMJ as a result of his "inadaptability."

Most of the people Hans is talking about have "assimilated" into American society just fine. They have learned to work the system and live off the Welfare State -- and they are the willing pawns of liberal, socialist, Democrat politicians who create and prolong their misery as a means of developing their power base. These politicans have created crimes against society, and need to be dealt with as criminals should be.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1395. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 01:50:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030326205027.01930.00001728@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 63531

In article <Xns934A760B86C4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>
>Why stop there. Why not send everyone descended from immigrants back home?

Fine. Ship me back to Austria at government expense!

73 de Larry, K3LT

I wonder if OE3LT is taken?

1396. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 01:58:54 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <v84mm0paqnob8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 63533

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3E8208B1.9090408@psu.edu...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > In article <20030324145805.17324.00000074@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve
>
> > Steve:
> >
> > While the Paul Harvey piece does do a great service to ham radio, it
> > is just one piece and will not stay in the public conscience for very
> > long, if at all. We won't be seeing any significant spike in newcomers
> > to our hobby/service as a result of it. What is needed is a continuous,
> > wide-ranging, national media campaign. There are literally hundreds of
> > public service announcements on TV every day -- why can't a few of
> > them be about amateur radio -- produced with the help of our ham radio
> > celebrities with connections in the mass media industry? We're now
> > seeing Joe Walsh, WB6ACU, plugging ham radio products in the
> > magazines -- why can't he plug ham radio itself on TV? I'm sure he
> > has the connections and influence to get this done!
>
> Anyone know what he is like in person? I used to watch him on Johnny
> Carson, and he came off like kind of a stoner. I think it was an act. He
> was a riot in any event.
>
>
> > I just had a horrible thought: I hope none of the Dixie Chicks are
licensed
> > Amateur Radio operators!
>
>
> I'm not certain that the "Dixie Chicks are chicks!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

One thing for sure, one of them sure knows
what her own shoe tastes like! Talk about
putting your foot in your mouth!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."

-Groucho Marx

http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/
kb9tmp "at" juno.com

1397. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 02:27:35 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <v84obohjr0rsb0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 63534

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030325233653.00929.00000631@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <BAA54F49.1471E%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewart@say.net>
> writes:
>
> >
> > How does one behave as a loyal American, Larry? Blindly follow the
> >President without question like we're now accusing the Iraqi people of
doing
> >with Saddam? Never question the actions of the military like the German
> >people did during Hitler's time? Say one supports the actions of this
> >country when one honestly does not? Only speak when what is said agrees
with
> >your views? Do define how a loyal American is supposed to behave, Larry.
> >
> >
> >Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> Dwight:
>
> An important thing for loyal Americans to do is to be well informed. Any
> reasonably attentive student of history will be able to draw the
conclusion
> that appeasement of dictators through diplomacy does not put an end to
> vicious, totalitarian regimes. They must be confronted with sufficient
force
> to put them out of power, in order for a free and democratic society to
> flourish after they are gone. The United States, as part of it's generous
> nature, exports freedom and democracy at great cost to our own citizens --
> including the lives of our young men and women in the armed forces.
> Loyal, informed Americans simply can not justify the actions of the
present-
> day anti-war protesters. They certainly have the right to protest, but in
> this case, all they're doing is proving their ignorance of world affairs,
or
> worse, displaying their cowardice.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I was sent this in an email and thought it fit in really well here at this
time.

--
'73' From KB9TMP

The Shelby County Alabama Legislative Delegation hosted a "Stand Up for America Rally. " More than 1,200 people attended including featured speakers Chief Justice Roy Moore, Adjutant General Mark Bowen and Alabama State Auditor Beth Chapman. Attached is a copy of Mrs. Chapman's speech, which resulted in five standing ovations, tremendous applause and an encore. It's a short read and well worth it. I hope you enjoy it as we continue to "Stand up for America!"

Stand Up for America Rally Speech By: Beth Chapman

I'm here tonight because men and women of the United States military have given their lives for my freedom. I am NOT here tonight because Sheryl Crowe, Rosie O'Donnell, Martin Sheen, George Clooney, Jane Fonda or Phil Donahue, sacrificed their lives for me.

If my memory serves me correctly, it was not movie stars or musicians, but the United States Military who fought on the shores of Iwo Jima, the jungles of Vietnam, and the beaches of Normandy. Tonight, I say we should support the President of the United States and the U. S. Military and tell the liberal, tree-hugging, Birkenstock-wearing, hippy, tie-dyed liberals to go make their movies and music and whine somewhere else.

After all, if they lived in Iraq, they wouldn't be allowed the freedom of speech they're being given here today. Ironically, they would be put to death at the hands of Sadam Hussein or Osama Bin Laden. I want to know how the very people who are against war because of the loss of life, can possibly be the same people who are for abortion?

They are the same people who are for animal rights but against the rights of the unborn. The movie stars say they want to go to Iraq and serve as "human shields" for the Iraqis. I say let them buy a one-way ticket and go.

No one likes war. I hate war! But the one thing I hate more is the fact that this country has been forced into war - - innocent people have lost their lives - - and there but for the grace of God, it could have been my brother, my husband, or even worse my own son.

On December 7, 1941, there are no records of movie stars treading the blazing waters of Pearl Harbor.

On September 11, 2001; there are no photos of movie stars standing as "human shields" against the debris and falling bodies descending from the World Trade Center. There were only policemen and firemen - -underpaid civil servants who gave their all with nothing expected in return.

When the USS Cole was bombed, there were no movie stars guarding the ship - - where were the human shields then?

If America's movie stars want to be human shields, let them shield the gang-ridden streets of Los Angeles, or New York City, let them shield the lives of the children of North Birmingham whose mothers lay them down to

sleep on the floor each night to shelter them from stray bullets.

If they want to be human shields, I say let them shield the men and women of honesty and integrity that epitomizes courage and embody the spirit of freedom by wearing the proud uniforms of the United States Military. Those are the people who have earned and deserve shielding!

Throughout the course of history, this country has remained free, not because of movie stars and liberal activists, but because of brave men and women who hated war too. However, they lay down their lives so that we all may live in freedom. After all - "What greater love hath no man, that he lay down his life for his friend," or in this case a country.

We should give our military honor, and acknowledgement, and not let their lives be in vain. If you want to see true human shields, walk through Arlington Cemetery. There lie human shields, heroes, and the BRAVE Americans who didn't get on television and talk about being a human shield - they were human shields.

1 thank God tonight for freedom - - those who bought and paid for it with their lives in the past - - those who will protect it in the present and defend it in the future.

America has remained silent too long! God-fearing people have remained silent too long!

We must lift our voices united in a humble prayer to God for guidance and the strength and courage to sustain us throughout whatever the future may hold.

After the tragic events of Sept. 11th, my then eleven -year-old son said terrorism is a war between them and us, and if you're not one of us, then you're one of them.

So in closing tonight, let us be of one accord, let us stand proud, and let us be the human shields of prayer, encouragement and support for the President, our troops and their families and our country.

May God bless America, the land of the free, the home of the brave and the greatest country on the face of this earth

1398. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 02:36:37 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E8263B5.4000409@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 63544

Mike Coslo wrote:

>
> I'm not certain that the "Dixie Chicks are chicks!

More like clucks

1399. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 03:32:49 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030326223249.18599.00000362@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 63535

From: Dave Heil, k8mn
>Work on learning morse for a couple of weeks. Pass the exam. Go forth
>and participate.

Thanks, but I don't want to learn Morse code. I am an EE, and I like putting circuits together and making them work.

I designed and built some transmitters. I like seeing the output on the scope or spectrum analyzer. This could be a fun actvity. Cool- waveform appears when you talk into transmitter!

Sometimes I have to run back and forth. (This is not funny). If someone with similar interests helps me, it would be easier.

1400. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 03:41:22 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030326224122.18599.00000363@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 63536

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>There is no ONE "demographic" of Amateur Radio participants. It is a
>multicultural, multifaceted, multipurpose thing. There is no one right or
>wrong as to what makes a good Amateur operator, what makes good Amateur
>practice, or how Amateur Radio can be utilized or applied.

Ideally that would be true. The hobby needs to be strong in each area.

Technically a wide range of activites are possible. Realistically, Hams participate in some of these activties, as a group, more than others.

The QST magazine gives a good indication of today's Ham radio demographics. (Yes, I am aware that once in a while they have circuit design articles). It is heavily operator oriented, many articles on antennas, radio accessories, political news, product reviews, and contest scores. There are few articles on homebrewing.

1401. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 03:43:11 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030326224311.18599.00000364@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 63537

From N2EY
>Your statements all sound like you know what the demographics are. But
>you don't know.

I know what the demographics are. I was asking you to state what you believe
the demographics to be.

QST magazine give a fair representation of Ham radio demographics.

1402. Re: FCC nails k1man yet again...??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 03:48:30 UTC
From: Lloyd/N0VFP <lloyd_vfp@NOmsn.NOSPAMMMM.com>
Message-ID: <3e8270ad$1_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 63538
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"James Bond" <hotfilaments@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:ba37c287.0303261339.59bb33cc@posting.google.com...
>
> You do quite well enough on your own to discredit your name old chap.
>
> "================= FAKE LLOYD ALERT ================="
>
> Isn't that redundant??
>
> Cheerio.............
>
> James

If you are "James Bond" I'm Dr. Who......

--
Lloyd/N0VFP
"And that's just the way it is"
R-75 FT-817

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1403. Re: FCC nails k1man yet again...??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 03:58:04 UTC
From: Brenda Ann <brendad@shinbiro.com>
Message-ID: <b5tr16$a7n$1@news1.kornet.net>
Source record: 63539
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Can I borrow the T.A.R.D.I.S.??

"Lloyd/N0VFP" <lloyd_vfp@NOmsn.NOSPAMMMM.com> wrote in message
news:3e8270ad$1_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com...
>
>
> "James Bond" <hotfilaments@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:ba37c287.0303261339.59bb33cc@posting.google.com...
> >
> > You do quite well enough on your own to discredit your name old chap.
> >
> > "================= FAKE LLOYD ALERT ================="
> >
> > Isn't that redundant??
> >
> > Cheerio.............
> >
> > James
>
> If you are "James Bond" I'm Dr. Who......
>
> --
> Lloyd/N0VFP
> "And that's just the way it is"
> R-75 FT-817
>
>
>
>
> ------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

1404. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 04:00:02 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030326230002.18599.00000366@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 63540

From K4YZ:
> I did not ask you about taking someone to a hamfest to try and create a
>corroborating opinion.

In determining whether Hams are weird, it makes perfect sense to invite a non-Ham to a Hamfest and compare Hams with their experiences.

You're right that some explaination is needed. A person introduced to Ham radio will not be able to understand the terminology used by Hams.

Even if the most strong Ham Radio advocate explains what Ham radio is about, after the person learns the Hams ways, the person will believe Ham radio is weird.

I was introduced to a Hamfest. I went there unbiased and open to new ideas. At first, I believed I didn't like it because I didn't understand the terminology. Then after I understood it, I thought it was weird.

I was open to new ideas. I refused to believe Ham radio was not for me, so I tried another club. Unfortunately, each club disappointed me. Few liked to build circuits and experiment. The few that did were hard to contact. Some made promises, but they never materialized. Yet, others will make every effort not to miss a Hamfest. I know what the priorities are in Ham radio.

>I think you lied. Period. You got caught up in your own tales and forgot
>WHAT you said you believed in and couldn't keep the story straight.

Now YOU ARE being silly. I explained the whole Wuoff Hong situation in complete detail.

>If you are not there, you cannot participate. If you do not participate,
>you are NOT supporting the club.

I participate. Just not EVERY meeting.

1405. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 04:32:23 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns934AEF6A2266Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 63541

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in
news:f45722ac.0303260522.3a4e61dd@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns934A760B86C4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>>
>> Why stop there. Why not send everyone descended from immigrants back
>> home?
>
> I think they are referring to those who fail to assimilate. In the
> military its called, "non-adaptability," and it's punishable.
>

Another good reason for not joining the military. Gettting shot at would
bother me much less than the disciplinary aspects.

1406. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 04:33:40 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns934AEFA1F3812elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 63542

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in
news:20030326205027.01930.00001728@mb-mq.aol.com:

> In article <Xns934A760B86C4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>
>>Why stop there. Why not send everyone descended from immigrants back
>>home?
>
> Fine. Ship me back to Austria at government expense!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> I wonder if OE3LT is taken?
>
>
>

Nice place Austria. Beautiful valleys.

1407. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 04:35:54 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030326233554.18599.00000367@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 63543

From N2EY

>> If you don't understand a safety reg, a rig blows up.
>
>Maybe.
>
>And so what? Is it the government's job to protect hams from their own
>stupidity?

Yes, definately in the case of amateur radio. Otherwise what is the purpose of being licensed? Would you get a driver's license if you kept crashing? Safety questions are important. Its part of operating a radio correctly.

>If you try to operate a high-wattage appliance (say, a toaster oven or
>space heater) through an inadequately-rated extension cord, you can
>burn your house down. Try to drive a manual-shift car without a basic
>understanding of how the gearshift and clutch are supposed to be used
>and you'll chew up the transmission, clutch or both in short order.
>Government doesn't protect people against those things.

Yes, but you don't need a license to do those things. By the way, please stick to amateur radio. Once in a while analogies clarify. Too many analogies gets <more> confusing.

>Why not replace the Morse code test with a soldering test?
That would be more relavant.
Or a Smith
>chart test?
Not needed. Most antenna matching problems are solved by other methods.

>Since no radio amatuer is required to build equipment or even know how
>it works, why should all hams have to be tested on technical subjects?

True.

>FCC grants full privileges above 30 MHz to Technicians - why is more
>theory testing required to work HF/MF?

Because FCC has to make policy changes that work with their previous regulations. They can't fix it so people are tested properly for relavant skill because this would mean taking away existing priveledges - and that is unfair to those who have gotten those privaledges.

>Answer those in a way that will convince someone who just wants to
>operate, not learn theory. Can you?

A better idea would be to create a seperate path for Morse. Then, no need to pass Morse test to get General or Extra class license. However, no HF

privileges for only passing written test. With a minimum of Technician class, passing Morse test gets HF priveleges. Sole purpose of Morse code would be for HF access. Understand the idea?

For someone that just wants to operate and not learn theory, they wouldn't have to be burdened with the General written test to get HF priveledges.

And, lets face it The Technician test can be passed easily by most in one or two tries. Many, including children (I know because they passed when I took the test), with no technical background, can pass the test in one 8 hour "license in a day" class. It was scheduled for 8 hours, but it was more like 6 with all the breaks taken. 75% of those who took the test passed it the first time.

The class gave the questions and the answers to those questions. No wonder why so many passed so easily! I would say that many of them did not learn the theory.

Anyway, for someone that just wants to operate and not learn theory, this is not much of a sacrifice at all.

1408. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 04:44:46 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030326234446.18599.00000368@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 63545

From K4YZ:
>>Understanding antennas helps you transmit and receive.
>
> So what "understanding" does someone have to have other than reading the
>label and making sure the radio you are about to screw the PL-259 onto is the
>same wavelength band as the antenna it is intended for?
>
> Do I need proficiency in Smith Charts in order to read the instructions
>and bolt any antenna together? Even the most elaborate of Amateur antennas
>comes with instructions that anyone with a 10th grade reading comprehension
>should be able to accomplish.

Steve, antennas are much more complicated than that. Sure one can just follow the directions to put an antenna together. But there is alot of things with antennas that require understanding. Things such as checking for SWR, modifying for other bands, knowing which antennas are good for which bands, matching antennas, and many other things.

I have to give Hams credit for their skill in this area. I have heard Hams explain some of the things they do and it does take skill to do that. They are able to make interpretations that are not exactly common sense as you seem to imply. It is a technical skill and many Hams are quite good in this area.

1409. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 06:00:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E8293F8.109C598F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63546

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil, k8mn
> >Work on learning morse for a couple of weeks. Pass the exam. Go forth
> >and participate.
>
> Thanks, but I don't want to learn Morse code.

Fine. Then stop complaining.

> I am an EE, and I like putting
> circuits together and making them work.

You can do that all day long without any amateur radio license. There
are people who will even pay you to do so. You don't have to endure
what you perceive as a cult, ham radio weirdness, morse code, boring
club meetings--none of it.

> I designed and built some transmitters. I like seeing the output on the scope
> or spectrum analyzer. This could be a fun actvity. Cool- waveform appears when
> you talk into transmitter!

Great. You can build anything you like with nothing more than the
license you already have.

> Sometimes I have to run back and forth. (This is not funny). If someone with
> similar interests helps me, it would be easier.

You goal is in sight. You don't need a club. You only need to convince
one person of how much fun he can have.

Dave K8MN

1410. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 06:07:19 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b626sh$125rv$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 63727

> While the Paul Harvey piece does do a great service to ham radio, it
> is just one piece and will not stay in the public conscience for very
> long, if at all. We won't be seeing any significant spike in newcomers
> to our hobby/service as a result of it. What is needed is a continuous,
> wide-ranging, national media campaign. There are literally hundreds of
> public service announcements on TV every day -- why can't a few of
> them be about amateur radio -- produced with the help of our ham radio
> celebrities with connections in the mass media industry? We're now
> seeing Joe Walsh, WB6ACU, plugging ham radio products in the
> magazines -- why can't he plug ham radio itself on TV? I'm sure he
> has the connections and influence to get this done!

Let's see some of our larger organizations start working for the publicizing
and promotion of amateur radio! Not just "famous" hams. Let's start
pressuring these organizations to push radio and television to run "PSA's"
as the radio station and television stations are supposed to as part of
their broadcast licensure.

Dunno if print media is required to run PSA type of ads, but that would be
good too.....

>
> I just had a horrible thought: I hope none of the Dixie Chicks are
licensed
> Amateur Radio operators!
>

Don't know if you have issues with women, but I can think of a much better
"bad example....." How about Eminem?

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

1411. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 06:21:57 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b626sj$125rv$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 63726

Okay... I'll bite on this one..... What about the millions of gallons flowing through our Alaska pipeline that is sold to other countries other than us?? (sold to Germany, France, Japan etc.) What about the thousands of oil well rigs across the country pumping out oil etc. on a daily basis? Oh... and this one I love, most of what is coming out of these wells as a by-product or waste product is being (at least here in Michigan) upped thirty percent when it is something that the basically get for free! Hmmm propane and gas for heating is going up that much around here....

There's enough oil underneath us to last longer than even our grandkids would need to worry about.... but our big oil corporations are working WITH OPEC in my own opinion, not against them.... Can't prove that but I bet I am not too far from the mark on that one...

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

(snippage)
>
> No, I do NOT "tolerate" Americans who live in peace and prosperity, yet
> feel the need to criticize the policies of our President when his
objective is
> to end the suffering of an imprisoned and enslaved nation. And I'll tell
> you one more thing: If this war isn't about oil, I hope that George W.
finds
> a way to MAKE it about oil! We've just experienced an unusually cold
> Winter here in this country, and if you don't think that the free flow of
oil
> at market prices is an important national goal of the United States, I
> suggest that you volunteer for duty on an Antarctic expedition!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

1412. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 11:11:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303270311.21a8ddd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63547

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030326204339.23598.00001090@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0303260528.653f7662@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
> >news:<20030325234011.10838.00000436@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> >> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >>
> >> >But if someone or some group did want a non-technical ham license,
> >> <snip>
> >>
> >> You mean like the Technician license? Thats a non-technical license. (No
> >> knowledge of material required to pass the test).
> >
> >??? You're nuts.
>
> No comment.
>
> >> Its probably the most technical "entry-level" exam ever.
>
> Not at all.
>
> Back before the 1951 restructuring, all new US hams started out with either a
> Class C or Class B license. 13 wpm code, send and receive, plus a written test
> of about fifty questions that included calculations, drawing schematic and
> block diagrams, and essays. No Q&A pools or one-day classes, either.

I wasn't born last night nor yesterday, but 1951 was a little before my time.

> I can post some of the questions from the 1948 study guide. I doubt ol' Vipul
> could answer them without some research.

1948 was before my time also. Did you actually use that study guide to test?

1413. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 11:14:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303270314.324b4b14@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63548

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E8229D5.189C12D1@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E809FC6.10B90795@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030324095829.14527.00001055@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> > > > > In article <20030323204347.09480.00000264@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> > > > > Robeson K4YZ) writes:
> > > > >
> > > > >> And don't go
> > > > >>confusing proficiency with effectiveness.
> > > > >
> > > > > They are, for the most part, synonymous, Brain.
> > > > >
> > > > > One cannot be effective at something without being proficient at it, nor
> > > > >can one be proficient without being effective.
> > > > >
> > > > > Unless you can prove otherwise?
> > > > >
> > > > The hams using the 0.02 wpm Morse were effective, but not necessarily
> > > > proficient. I'm almost certain the sending and receiving were done by computer,
> > > > not by the hams themselves, so their proficiency is unknown and irrelevant.
> > > > >
> > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > > >
> > > Heil is certain that they are proficient, but doesn't define that
> > > proficiency, and disagrees with you and your source for the lowest
> > > level of proficiency. He is certain the amateurs involved in this
> > > event are proficient because only proficient hams could set a world
> > > record using machine sent and received Morse Code at 0.02wpm.
> > >
> > See what I mean about your not being right? I've never stated that I'm
> > certain that those achieving the 136 KHz record are proficient, yet
> > you've stated that I am certain.
> >
> > You're not certain about what?
>
> Thanks for yet another example of your reading comprehension
> difficulties.
>
> > That the 0.02wpm coders are proficient?

>
> I wrote (quote)
> Dig back in the thread a little, Brian. That's one of the points I
> made--that we don't know the code proficiency of either ham. We don't
> know that their maximum morse receiving speed is higher than .02 wpm. I
> have an idea that it it. You seem to have made an assumption that it is
> on the order of .02 wpm and then asked if that was "proficient". Such
> comments just make you look like a dullard. (unquote)
>
> You can dig back in the thread for similar items posted by me.
>
>
> > Or that you don't know what Morse Proficiency is?
>
> Your problem is reading comprehension.
>
> Dave K8MN

Since you don't know what their top end is, and you cannot define
Morse Proficiency without floating numbers, why don't you simply admit
that you don't know what you're talking about?

1414. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 11:21:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303270321.3c5936dc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63549

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030325222818.28757.00000259@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/25/2003 3:51 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303251351.48d55746@posting.google.com>

> You'd rather we just had ONE thread discussing ALL topics?
>
> Steve

I'd rather you stop littering. $50 fine.

And I'm not sure that new threads, most with a subject line calling
out one individual, and text with lots of s p a c e s, and lots of
ALL CAPS, and lines and lines of "Bwahahaha..." is the way to go
either.

1415. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 11:26:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327062629.05048.00001337@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63550

In article <v84mm0paqnob8@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP"
<NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com> writes:

>One thing for sure, one of them sure knows
>what her own shoe tastes like! Talk about
>putting your foot in your mouth!

"Nice girl, but about as sharp as a sack o' wet mice" - Foghorn Leghorn

---

Seems to me that one of the oddest things about American culture is the idea
that because a person is talented in some form of show business (singing songs,
acting out parts on stage, in movies or TV shows, playing professional sports),

that the person is also some sort of role model or leader.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1416. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 11:33:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303270333.324ba6c0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63601

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030326173756.18435.00000378@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/26/2003 12:11 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303261011.661f809f@posting.google.com>
>
> >Yes, I see. Change the subject.
>
> There's no "change the subject", Brain.
>
> Your own obsessive/compulsive need to try and discredit myself and otehrs
> leaves your "posts" devoid of anything meaningful to respond to save for even
> more silliness and innuendo.

You did change the subject. Try to remember what it was.

Get back to me.

> >We aren't trying to decipher what I meant, Steve, we are trying to
> >decipher what you meant, so as to determine if my subsequent comment
> >was valid or not.
>
> How can there be anything to "decipher" when all I can do is piecemeal
> respond to silly innuendo, sleights and irrelevent tripe?

Yes. You changed the subject.

1417. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 12:26:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327072610.24033.00000004@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63602

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/26/2003 10:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030326233554.18599.00000367@mb-fx.aol.com>

>>And so what? Is it the government's job to protect hams from their own
>>stupidity?
>
>Yes, definately in the case of amateur radio. Otherwise what is the purpose
>of
>being licensed? Would you get a driver's license if you kept crashing? Safety
>questions are important. Its part of operating a radio correctly.

Absolutely NOT. One of the biggest problems in America is abbrogating our
responsibilities to the government. "Someone" has to be responsible as long as
it's not "us".

>Yes, but you don't need a license to do those things. By the way, please
>stick
>to amateur radio.

I missed the post from the USENET God that appointed Vipul as moderator.

>Once in a while analogies clarify. Too many analogies gets
><more> confusing.

I suppose it does is English is a second language to you.

>A better idea would be to create a seperate path for Morse. Then, no need to
>pass Morse test to get General or Extra class license. However, no HF
>privileges for only passing written test. With a minimum of Technician class,
>passing Morse test gets HF priveleges. Sole purpose of Morse code would be
>for
>HF access. Understand the idea?

Do YOU understand that YOU at first say it's unnecessary to test for Morse
Code then trun around and say it is...?!?!

Sheeesh!

>For someone that just wants to operate and not learn theory, they wouldn't
>have
>to be burdened with the General written test to get HF priveledges.

And then they wouldn't meet the criteria as set out in 47CFR97.1, Basis
and Purpose of the Amatuer Radio Service.

>The class gave the questions and the answers to those questions. No wonder
>why
>so many passed so easily! I would say that many of them did not learn the
>theory.

Come up with that theory all on your own?

>Anyway, for someone that just wants to operate and not learn theory, this is
>not much of a sacrifice at all.

It is when you consider the Basis and Purpose of the Amateur Radio
Service.

Steve

1418. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 12:32:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327073219.24033.00000005@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63603

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/26/2003 10:44 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030326234446.18599.00000368@mb-fx.aol.com>

>Steve,...(SNIP)

WHOA! you called me by my given name! let's put THIS day on the
calendar!

>...antennas are much more complicated than that.

The designing and modelling of antennas is much more complicated than
that, Vipul, but using them is not. If it were, 11 million CBer's and 100
million cell phone userds would be off-the-air.

>Things such as checking for SWR, modifying
>for other bands, knowing which antennas are good for which bands, matching
>antennas, and many other things.

I can instruct almost anyone how to do a preliminary SWR check in only
minutes. It does not make them a technician.

>I have to give Hams credit for their skill in this area. I have heard Hams
>explain some of the things they do and it does take skill to do that. They
>are
>able to make interpretations that are not exactly common sense as you seem to
>imply. It is a technical skill and many Hams are quite good in this area.

Yes, many Amatuers are very good at it. Because between the time they are
chanting at Wouff Hong ceremonies in the middle of the night or wasting thier
time over a visceral audiomotor skill such as Morse Code they actually are able
to learn and apply what they learn.

Amazing, huh...?!?!?

Steve

1419. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 12:33:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327073334.24033.00000006@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63604

>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/26/2003 9:32 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030326223249.18599.00000362@mb-fx.aol.com>

>Sometimes I have to run back and forth. (This is not funny). If someone with
>similar interests helps me, it would be easier.

Try roller skates.

Steve

1420. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 12:42:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327074233.24033.00000007@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 63605

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/26/2003 10:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030326230002.18599.00000366@mb-fx.aol.com>

>From K4YZ:
>> I did not ask you about taking someone to a hamfest to try and create a
>>corroborating opinion.
>
>In determining whether Hams are weird, it makes perfect sense to invite a
>non-Ham to a Hamfest and compare Hams with their experiences.

That's NOT what you were asked, Vipul.

I asked you from what source you made your EXISTING opinion.

>You're right that some explaination is needed. A person introduced to Ham
>radio
>will not be able to understand the terminology used by Hams.

Nor would a person introduced to NASCAR, or Formula-V aircraft racing, nor
Quarterhorse showing, nor to Pokemon card collecting...

You keep trying to make a point that there is some difference between
Amatuer Radioand every other pursuit in normal human endeavour. It's foolish,
Vipul.

>Even if the most strong Ham Radio advocate explains what Ham radio is about,
>after the person learns the Hams ways, the person will believe Ham radio is
>weird.

Uh huh...I can make brain surgery look really foolish too, but I bet if
you just got hit in the head you'd like to know a good neurosergon.

>I was introduced to a Hamfest. I went there unbiased and open to new ideas.
>At
>first, I believed I didn't like it because I didn't understand the
>terminology.
>Then after I understood it, I thought it was weird.

The problem is, Vipul, based upon your posts here, you DON'T understand
Amatuer Radio.

>Now YOU ARE being silly. I explained the whole Wuoff Hong situation in
>complete
>detail.

Yes, you have. You explained that you have been making your claims based upon a complete lack of first hand experience from which to be making those claims. Not very engineer like, Vipul.

>I participate. Just not EVERY meeting.

Which club?

Steve

1421. Re: FCC nails k1man yet again...??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 12:48:46 UTC
From: hotfilaments@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ba37c287.0303270448.2917788a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63606
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Lloyd/N0VFP" <lloyd_vfp@NOmsn.NOSPAMMMM.com> wrote in message
news:<3e8270ad$1_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>...
> "James Bond" <hotfilaments@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:ba37c287.0303261339.59bb33cc@posting.google.com...
> >
> > You do quite well enough on your own to discredit your name old chap.
> >
> > "================= FAKE LLOYD ALERT ================="
> >
> > Isn't that redundant??
> >
> > Cheerio.............
> >
> > James
>
> If you are "James Bond" I'm Dr. Who......
>
> --
> Lloyd/N0VFP
> "And that's just the way it is"
> R-75 FT-817
>
>
>
>
> ------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

You are a dumb one aren't you? My actual name is James R. Bond. If you had a clue to where I reside, you could see my name in the telephone book.

After searching the archives, it appears to me that you are a sheep/follower. You attach yourself to any kind of club etc., that you think will listen to you and or let you join.

Most everyone here has you pegged correctly.

The funniest one was where you claimed to be the Chief of Communications for some organization called B.A.R.F., after perusing those archives, it would appear that you appointed yourself to that "position", a fellow named Herb who was the head of the B.A.R.F. said that you were nothing more than a lacky.

Cheerio,

James

1422. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 13:07:47 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303270507.4877c09a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63607

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030326233554.18599.00000367@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> From N2EY
>
> >> If you don't understand a safety reg, a rig blows up.
> > >
> > >Maybe.
> > >
> > >And so what? Is it the government's job to protect hams from their own
> > >stupidity?
> >
> > Yes, definately in the case of amateur radio.

Incorrect.

Perhaps that's part of your problem, Vipul. You think the govt. should
protect you from your own stupidity.

> Otherwise what is the purpose of
> being licensed?

There are two main purposes for radio licenses:

- To insure orderly use of a limited public resource
- To protect third parties from the stupidity of those who use the
resource.

It's NOT to protect you from yourself.

> Would you get a driver's license if you kept crashing? Safety
> questions are important. Its part of operating a radio correctly.

So is using the correct operating procedures, which you describe as
"excessive jargon" and "weird".

The driving test is to insure that drivers can operate a vehicle
safely, not that they know how a car works. The DMV will not revoke
your license if you ruin your car's engine because you never change
the oil.
>
> >If you try to operate a high-wattage appliance (say, a toaster oven or
> > >space heater) through an inadequately-rated extension cord, you can
> > >burn your house down. Try to drive a manual-shift car without a basic
> > >understanding of how the gearshift and clutch are supposed to be used
> > >and you'll chew up the transmission, clutch or both in short order.
> > >Government doesn't protect people against those things.
> >

> Yes, but you don't need a license to do those things.

That's the whole point. Licenses are NOT meant to protect you from
yourself. They are to protect others.

> By the way, please stick
> to amateur radio. Once in a while analogies clarify. Too many analogies gets
> <more> confusing.

Analogies illustrate the principle. There are far more dangerous
things than a burned-up transmitter, but the govt. doesn't try to
protect us from them by means of licenses. Licenses are to protect
third parties.
>
> >Why not replace the Morse code test with a soldering test?
> That would be more relavant.

Why? No ham is required to solder.

> Or a Smith
> >chart test?
> Not needed. Most antenna matching problems are solved by other methods.
>
> >Since no radio amatuer is required to build equipment or even know how
> >it works, why should all hams have to be tested on technical subjects?
>
> True.

Then there's no NEED for most of what's on the written test.
>
> >FCC grants full privileges above 30 MHz to Technicians - why is more
> >theory testing required to work HF/MF?
>
> Because FCC has to make policy changes that work with their previous
> regulations.

Not at all. FCC could have just one license class. 5 wpm code as long
as it is required by treaty, and a single written similar to the
Technician. Or two classes - one with HF and one without.

The point is that the same arguments used against the code can be used
against the written.

> They can't fix it so people are tested properly for relavant

RELEVANT. Turn on your spell checker!

> skill
> because this would mean taking away existing priveledges - and that is unfair
> to those who have gotten those privaledges.

Nope.

>
> >Answer those in a way that will convince someone who just wants to
> >operate, not learn theory. Can you?
>
> A better idea would be to create a seperate path for Morse.

You can't answer the questions, can you?

> Then, no need to
> pass Morse test to get General or Extra class license. However, no HF
> privileges for only passing written test. With a minimum of Technician class,
> passing Morse test gets HF priveleges. Sole purpose of Morse code would be for
> HF access. Understand the idea?

So you want more written testing for full VHF/UHF privileges? Because
that's what your plan means.
>
> For someone that just wants to operate and not learn theory, they wouldn't have
> to be burdened with the General written test to get HF priveledges.
>
> And, lets face it The Technician test can be passed easily by most in one or
> two tries. Many, including children (I know because they passed when I took the
> test), with no technical background, can pass the test in one 8 hour "license
> in a day" class. It was scheduled for 8 hours, but it was more like 6 with all
> the breaks taken. 75% of those who took the test passed it the first time.

Is that a bad thing? Are those new hams blowing up transmitters
because of technical ignorance?
>
> The class gave the questions and the answers to those questions. No wonder why
> so many passed so easily! I would say that many of them did not learn the
> theory.

They did not learn it at the level you would like, that's all.
>
> Anyway, for someone that just wants to operate and not learn theory, this is
> not much of a sacrifice at all.

Half an hour of study per day for a month will permit most people
(including children) to learn enough Morse to pass Element 1. Free
software that will run on most computers is widely available. For
someone that just wants to build or experiment and not learn Morse,
this is not much of a sacrifice at all.

1423. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 14:13:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E8306F2.5020304@psu.edu>
Source record: 63608

N2EY wrote:

> Back before the 1951 restructuring, all new US hams started out with either a
> Class C or Class B license. 13 wpm code, send and receive, plus a written test
> of about fifty questions that included calculations, drawing schematic and
> block diagrams, and essays. No Q&A pools or one-day classes, either.
>
> I can post some of the questions from the 1948 study guide. I doubt ol' Vipul
> could answer them without some research.

Could you Jim? Of course we have to look at the questions from their context. But it will be interesting nontheless.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1424. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 17:03:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E832F4C.A40F64BF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63609

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8229D5.189C12D1@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E809FC6.10B90795@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030324095829.14527.00001055@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> > > > > > In article <20030323204347.09480.00000264@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> > > > > > Robeson K4YZ) writes:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >> And don't go
> > > > > > >>confusing proficiency with effectiveness.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > They are, for the most part, synonymous, Brain.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > One cannot be effective at something without being proficient at it, nor
> > > > > > >can one be proficient without being effective.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Unless you can prove otherwise?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > The hams using the 0.02 wpm Morse were effective, but not necessarily
> > > > > > proficient. I'm almost certain the sending and receiving were done by computer,
> > > > > > not by the hams themselves, so their proficiency is unknown and irrelevant.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > > > >
> > > > > Heil is certain that they are proficient, but doesn't define that
> > > > > proficiency, and disagrees with you and your source for the lowest
> > > > > level of proficiency. He is certain the amateurs involved in this
> > > > > event are proficient because only proficient hams could set a world
> > > > > record using machine sent and received Morse Code at 0.02wpm.
> > > >
> > > > See what I mean about your not being right? I've never stated that I'm
> > > > certain that those achieving the 136 KHz record are proficient, yet
> > > > you've stated that I am certain.
> > >
> > > You're not certain about what?
> >
> > Thanks for yet another example of your reading comprehension

> > difficulties.
> >
> > > That the 0.02wpm coders are proficient?
> >
> > I wrote (quote)
> > Dig back in the thread a little, Brian. That's one of the points I
> > made--that we don't know the code proficiency of either ham. We don't
> > know that their maximum morse receiving speed is higher than .02 wpm. I
> > have an idea that it it. You seem to have made an assumption that it is
> > on the order of .02 wpm and then asked if that was "proficient". Such
> > comments just make you look like a dullard. (unquote)
> >
> > You can dig back in the thread for similar items posted by me.
> >
> >
> > > Or that you don't know what Morse Proficiency is?
> >
> > Your problem is reading comprehension.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Since you don't know what their top end is, and you cannot define
> Morse Proficiency without floating numbers, why don't you simply admit
> that you don't know what you're talking about?

Why? That'd be because I do know what I'm talking about. I do know
that we don't have a handle on the morse proficiency of the ops in
question. I do know that I am not confusing the .02 wpm used to achieve
a record with the maximum speed of which the ops are capable.
I do know that "proficient" means "expert, skilled". I do know that
five word per minute morse speed cannot by any stretch be considered
"expert" or "skilled". I knew what I wrote previously and quoted
above. I knew from your reponse that you didn't comprehend what you'd
read. I know from your dodge on your latest response that you'd like to
gloss over your mistaken comments about what I've previously written. I
do know that, despite your earlier claim, you do have time for silly
games. That's why.

Dave K8MN

1425. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 17:18:42 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303270918.1f9f604f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63610

dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) wrote in message
news:<b5tess$2kaj$1@heap.juniper.net>...
> N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
> >"Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
> >news:<V68ga.19832$jA2.1781504@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> >> but will
> >> require a temporary drilling of oil in the Alaskan wilderness. The caribou
> >> will have to cope for a while.
> >
> > Don't forget off-shore Florida, where the current administration banned
> > drilling for reasons that couldn't possibly be related to the last name
> > of the governor there.

Of course!
> >
> > >Already being done.
> > >
> > >USA imports about half of our oil. How many Americans are willing and
> > >able to cut their petroleum product usage by half, and pay more for
> > >the petrol products they do use?
> >
> > Actually, US domestic oil production currently amounts to 5.8 million
> > barrels per day (see, e.g.
> >
> > http://www.ott.doe.gov/facts/archives/fotw249supp.shtml
> >
> >) while domestic oil consumption is near or above 20 million barrels
> > per day. Worse, the US only has reserves to sustain this production
> > level for 7 years or so, though that can probably be fixed if the
> > price of oil goes substantially higher and stays there.

Fascinating page! Here are some more links to that info:

Top Ten Petroleum Importing Countries:

http://www.ott.doe.gov/facts/archives/fotw248.shtml

Where Does Our Oil come From?

http://www.ott.doe.gov/facts/archives/fotw192.shtml

(note that #6 on the list is IRAQ!)

World Oil Reserves, Production, and Consumption

http://www.ott.doe.gov/facts/archives/fotw220.shtml

None of which is very encouraging for US energy independence.
>
> Despite this, I have seen the 50% import number quoted quite often. My
> best guess is that it may include production by domestic oil companies
> in nearby countries, like Canada and Mexico, in the "not-import" category.
> I wouldn't want to count on the security of that production, however, if
> they get screwed over by things like increased border restrictions...

Probably not a big problem because of the long term friendly relations
between countries. However, doing without other imported oil sources
will take more than drilling in Alaska.

And it takes years to bring a distant facility into full production.
>
> >> 7) Offer Saudi Arabia and all other oil producing countries $10 a barrel for
> >> their oil. If they don't like it, they can go someplace else.
> >
> >Better have those alternatives in place first.
>
> It does seem that the US no longer has the leverage it once had. Oil
> consumption in the rest of the world has grown to about 60 million
> barrels per day, which means that US imports account for no more than
> 20% of that business. There are lots of other places to go. And even
> now the US imports only 2.5 million barrels per day from all Persian Gulf
> countries combined, an amount small enough that reducing it to zero
> probably wouldn't bother them much.

That's the loss of leverage - it would bother us a lot more than them.

So I'll ask the hard question: What changes are Americans willing to
make in their lives to reduce/eliminate dependence on imported oil?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1426. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 17:25:40 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303270925.74e0cffc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63611

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030326223249.18599.00000362@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> From: Dave Heil, k8mn
> >Work on learning morse for a couple of weeks. Pass the exam. Go forth
> >and participate.
>
> Thanks, but I don't want to learn Morse code.

Then don't complain.

> I am an EE, and I like putting
> circuits together and making them work.

Me too. On both counts.
>
> I designed and built some transmitters.

Bands? Modes? Power Level?

> I like seeing the output on the scope
> or spectrum analyzer. This could be a fun actvity. Cool- waveform appears when
> you talk into transmitter!
>
Here's an even more fun activity: Use the transmitter to communicate
with other hams!

Designing and building does not require a license. Operating does. You
may not like it, but that's the way things are. And they are that way
for a very good reason.

> Sometimes I have to run back and forth. (This is not funny). If someone with
> similar interests helps me, it would be easier.

Why do you have to "run back and forth"?

1427. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 17:32:03 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303270932.77b45136@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63612

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0303270311.21a8ddd@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030326204339.23598.00001090@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0303260528.653f7662@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
> > >news:<20030325234011.10838.00000436@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> > >> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > >>
> > >> >But if someone or some group did want a non-technical ham license,
> > >> <snip>
> > >>
> > >> You mean like the Technician license? Thats a non-technical license. (No
> > >> knowledge of material required to pass the test).
> > >
> > >??? You're nuts.
> >
> > No comment.
> >
> > >> Its probably the most technical "entry-level" exam ever.
> >
> > Not at all.
> >
> > Back before the 1951 restructuring, all new US hams started out with either a
> > Class C or Class B license. 13 wpm code, send and receive, plus a written test
> > of about fifty questions that included calculations, drawing schematic and
> > block diagrams, and essays. No Q&A pools or one-day classes, either.
>
> I wasn't born last night nor yesterday, but 1951 was a little before my time.

You stated that the Technician license test is "probably the most
technical "entry-level" exam ever.". I simply proved that it isn't.
>
> > I can post some of the questions from the 1948 study guide. I doubt ol' Vipul
> > could answer them without some research.
>
> 1948 was before my time also. Did you actually use that study guide to test?

How does one "use a study guide to test"?

The point is simply that the "entry level" tests today are not nearly
as technical as they once were. And that's a GOOD thing.

1428. Re: test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 20:18:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327151823.04776.00001239@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 63616

In article <cOjga.25931$ja4.1754155@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:

>> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
>>> REAL TELETYPE MACHINES DONT HAVE UPPER CASE CHARACTERS
>
>> OOOPS -- I MEANT TO SAY LOWER CASE CHARACTERS.
>
>Actually, REAL TELETYPE machines have <LTRS> and <FIGS> keys.
>
>All the others are just wasting bits.

The old 5-level teleprinter codings were obsolete over 30 years ago.

"REAL TELETYPE" machines (by Teletype Corporation) use an 8-level
code and have done so for over two decades. The MILLIONTH
Teletype Corporation teleprinter was made some time close to 1980;
It was an 8-level code ASR-33 and displayed at trade shows.

The epitome of amateur radio skill is proficiency in morse code. That
is what all those amateur extras tell me. :-)

1429. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 20:18:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327151823.04776.00001240@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 63619

In article <c2356669.0303270918.1f9f604f@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>So I'll ask the hard question: What changes are Americans willing to
>make in their lives to reduce/eliminate dependence on imported oil?

Give up their SUVs and drive manual-transmission old autos.

Adopting manual transmissions in vehicles is supposed to be
the same as using morse code for fast, effective
communications, right? :-)

1430. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 20:18:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327151824.04776.00001241@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 63613

In article <f45722ac.0303260539.35e9d2c3@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
>news:<20030325223055.28757.00000260@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >Date: 3/25/2003 3:33 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303251333.2f8e1b@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >Well then define what it is you're jabbing and where you're jabbing
>> >it. My interpretation of your open statement is legitimate.
>>
>> I think there's very little legitimate about you, Brain.
>
>Ahem, you need to back up your previous accusation. Define what you
>meant by "Depends what you're jabbing and where."
>
>> >My comment stands.
>>
>> ....as a tribute to your inconsistency and incompetence.
>>
>> Steve
>
>You incompetently replied. Say exactly what you meant by the above
>quotation, and why my interpretation was wrong. If you can.

Brian, the Rules of Engagement in here according to the Gang of Four,
is that one MUST agree with the Gang on all opinions. Disagree and
you are inconsistent, incompetent, a liar, a putz, and smell bad.

:-)

1431. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 20:18:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327151825.04776.00001242@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 63620

In article <3E832F4C.A40F64BF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E8229D5.189C12D1@earthlink.net>...
>> > Brian wrote:
>> > >
>> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E809FC6.10B90795@earthlink.net>...
>> > > > Brian wrote:
>> > > > >
>> > > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030324095829.14527.00001055@mb-cc.aol.com>...
>> > > > > > In article <20030323204347.09480.00000264@mb-da.aol.com>,
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve
>> > > > > > Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > > >> And don't go
>> > > > > > >>confusing proficiency with effectiveness.
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > They are, for the most part, synonymous, Brain.
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > One cannot be effective at something without being
>proficient at it, nor
>> > > > > > >can one be proficient without being effective.
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > Unless you can prove otherwise?
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > The hams using the 0.02 wpm Morse were effective, but not
>necessarily
>> > > > > > proficient. I'm almost certain the sending and receiving were
>done by computer,
>> > > > > > not by the hams themselves, so their proficiency is unknown and
>irrelevant.
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Heil is certain that they are proficient, but doesn't define that
>> > > > > proficiency, and disagrees with you and your source for the lowest
>> > > > > level of proficiency. He is certain the amateurs involved in this
>> > > > > event are proficient because only proficient hams could set a world
>> > > > > record using machine sent and received Morse Code at 0.02wpm.

>> > > >
>> > > > See what I mean about your not being right? I've never stated that
>I'm
>> > > > certain that those achieving the 136 KHz record are proficient, yet
>> > > > you've stated that I am certain.
>> > >
>> > > You're not certain about what?
>> >
>> > Thanks for yet another example of your reading comprehension
>> > difficulties.
>> >
>> > > That the 0.02wpm coders are proficient?
>> >
>> > I wrote (quote)
>> > Dig back in the thread a little, Brian. That's one of the points I
>> > made--that we don't know the code proficiency of either ham. We don't
>> > know that their maximum morse receiving speed is higher than .02 wpm. I
>> > have an idea that it it. You seem to have made an assumption that it is
>> > on the order of .02 wpm and then asked if that was "proficient". Such
>> > comments just make you look like a dullard. (unquote)
>> >
>> > You can dig back in the thread for similar items posted by me.
>> >
>> >
>> > > Or that you don't know what Morse Proficiency is?
>> >
>> > Your problem is reading comprehension.
>> >
>> > Dave K8MN
>>
>> Since you don't know what their top end is, and you cannot define
>> Morse Proficiency without floating numbers, why don't you simply admit
>> that you don't know what you're talking about?
>
>Why? That'd be because I do know what I'm talking about. I do know
>that we don't have a handle on the morse proficiency of the ops in
>question. I do know that I am not confusing the .02 wpm used to achieve
>a record with the maximum speed of which the ops are capable.
>I do know that "proficient" means "expert, skilled". I do know that
>five word per minute morse speed cannot by any stretch be considered
>"expert" or "skilled". I knew what I wrote previously and quoted
>above. I knew from your reponse that you didn't comprehend what you'd
>read. I know from your dodge on your latest response that you'd like to
>gloss over your mistaken comments about what I've previously written. I
>do know that, despite your earlier claim, you do have time for silly
>games. That's why.

There we have it. Das Oberst has issued Daily Orders.

The Chief of the Gang of Four has spoken... :-)

1432. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 20:18:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327151826.04776.00001243@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 63615

In article <c2356669.0303270932.77b45136@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(N2EY) writes:

>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>news:<f45722ac.0303270311.21a8ddd@posting.google.com>...
>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030326204339.23598.00001090@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>> > In article <f45722ac.0303260528.653f7662@posting.google.com>,
>> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> >
>> > >vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
>> > >news:<20030325234011.10838.00000436@mb-cr.aol.com>...
>> > >> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>> > >>
>> > >> >But if someone or some group did want a non-technical ham license,
>> > >> <snip>
>> > >>
>> > >> You mean like the Technician license? Thats a non-technical license.
>(No
>> > >> knowledge of material required to pass the test).
>> > >
>> > >??? You're nuts.
>> >
>> > No comment.
>> >
>> > >> Its probably the most technical "entry-level" exam ever.
>> >
>> > Not at all.
>> >
>> > Back before the 1951 restructuring, all new US hams started out with
>either a
>> > Class C or Class B license. 13 wpm code, send and receive, plus a written
>test
>> > of about fifty questions that included calculations, drawing schematic
>and
>> > block diagrams, and essays. No Q&A pools or one-day classes, either.
>>
>> I wasn't born last night nor yesterday, but 1951 was a little before my
>time.
>
>You stated that the Technician license test is "probably the most
>technical "entry-level" exam ever.". I simply proved that it isn't.

We know. You took them all. :-)

>> > I can post some of the questions from the 1948 study guide. I doubt ol'
>Vipul
>> > could answer them without some research.
>>
>> 1948 was before my time also. Did you actually use that study guide to
>test?
>
>How does one "use a study guide to test"?

How does one have such deep, intimate knowledge of testing without
taking all those tests? :-)

>The point is simply that the "entry level" tests today are not nearly
>as technical as they once were. And that's a GOOD thing.

There we have it. Recording secretary of the Gang of Four has
stated it. So must it be... :-)

1433. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 20:18:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327151827.04776.00001244@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 63617

In article <f45722ac.0303270321.3c5936dc@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> >Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
>> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >Date: 3/25/2003 3:51 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303251351.48d55746@posting.google.com>
>
>> You'd rather we just had ONE thread discussing ALL topics?
>>
>> Steve
>
>I'd rather you stop littering. $50 fine.
>
>And I'm not sure that new threads, most with a subject line calling
>out one individual, and text with lots of s p a c e s, and lots of
>ALL CAPS, and lines and lines of "Bwahahaha..." is the way to go
>either.

Brian, remember the RoE in this newsgroup. Whatever the Gang of
Four* write is perfectly acceptible. Anything in disagreement with
them and you are "putz medel," lie, and have underarm odor. They
have the authority to defame, disgrace, and make nasty to anyone
not honoring and respecting their sacred writings.

Up CW. :-)

* Gang of Four: K8MN, N2EY, K4YZ, K3LT.

1434. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 20:18:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327151828.04776.00001246@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 63614

In article <20030326224311.18599.00000364@mb-fx.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From N2EY
>>Your statements all sound like you know what the demographics are. But
>>you don't know.
>
>I know what the demographics are. I was asking you to state what you believe
>the demographics to be.
>
>QST magazine give a fair representation of Ham radio demographics.

US amateur radio demographics are whatever the Gang of Four think is right and proper. They know what is good for everyone everywhere on anything and have the right to say so. :-)

1435. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 20:18:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327151828.04776.00001245@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 63618

In article <20030327062629.05048.00001337@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <v84mm0paqnob8@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP"
><NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com> writes:
>
>>One thing for sure, one of them sure knows
>>what her own shoe tastes like! Talk about
>>putting your foot in your mouth!
>
>----
>
>Seems to me that one of the oddest things about American culture is the idea
>that because a person is talented in some form of show business (singing
songs,
>acting out parts on stage, in movies or TV shows, playing professional
sports),
>that the person is also some sort of role model or leader.

You mean like Paul Harvey? :-)

Walter Cronkhite? Arthur Godfrey? Donny Osmond?

1436. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 20:18:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327151829.04776.00001247@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 63621

In article <20030327074233.24033.00000007@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 3/26/2003 10:00 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030326230002.18599.00000366@mb-fx.aol.com>
>
>>From K4YZ:
>>> I did not ask you about taking someone to a hamfest to try and create a
>>>corroborating opinion.
>>
>>In determining whether Hams are weird, it makes perfect sense to invite a
>>non-Ham to a Hamfest and compare Hams with their experiences.
>
> That's NOT what you were asked, Vipul.

You don't deserve an answer. You aren't an amateur NCO.

> I asked you from what source you made your EXISTING opinion.

You don't have a right to know...

>>You're right that some explaination is needed. A person introduced to Ham radio
>>will not be able to understand the terminology used by Hams.
>
> Nor would a person introduced to NASCAR, or Formula-V aircraft racing, nor
>Quarterhorse showing, nor to Pokemon card collecting...

This isn't a newsgroup for NASCAR or aircraft competition or about equine interests. Except to the Gang of Four.

> You keep trying to make a point that there is some difference between
>Amatuer Radioand every other pursuit in normal human endeavour. It's
>foolish, Vipul.

There we have it. :-)

"Amatuer Radioand?"

>>Even if the most strong Ham Radio advocate explains what Ham radio is about,
>>after the person learns the Hams ways, the person will believe Ham radio is
>>weird.
>
> Uh huh...I can make brain surgery look really foolish too, but I bet if

>you just got hit in the head you'd like to know a good neurosergon.

Although this isn't a newsgroup about neurosurgery or even anything
about the practice of medicine, the front man of the Gang of Four has
spoken!

Interesting that an amateur radio license grant suddenly enables all-
knowing powers of the medical profession! Must be some powerful
juju in 20 WPM morse!

>>I was introduced to a Hamfest. I went there unbiased and open to new ideas.
>>At
>>first, I believed I didn't like it because I didn't understand the
>>terminology.
>>Then after I understood it, I thought it was weird.
>
> The problem is, Vipul, based upon your posts here, you DON'T understand
>Amatuer Radio.

Nobody does. Not until they pass the "Amatuer" test. :-)

The unlicensed cannot possibly know anything at all. It's a big secret
revealed only by the receipt of a pretty certificate.

US amateur radio is all about Working DX on HF with CW.

>>Now YOU ARE being silly. I explained the whole Wuoff Hong situation in
>>complete
>>detail.
>
> Yes, you have. You explained that you have been making your claims based
>upon a complete lack of first hand experience from which to be making those
>claims. Not very engineer like, Vipul.

Here we go again! Doctor Kildare II, having "worked in engineering,"
knows Everything about engineering!

Yes, a half-year as a PURCHASING AGENT in a small company making
modems, set-top boxes, and LAN electronics KNOWS ALL ABOUT
ENGINEERING! Filled out purchase forms and thinks he signed off
design drawings...chatted with others during lunch and thought he was
in a design review meeting! He absorbed all engineering knowledge
and experience by osmosis?

Not a long "career" in "professional radio," was it? Why?

>>I participate. Just not EVERY meeting.
>
> Which club?

The club you try to hit everyone with when they don't honor, respect, or
salute your mighty accomplishments...

1437. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 21:23:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E836BBA.2E45916E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63622

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030327074233.24033.00000007@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> Although this isn't a newsgroup about neurosurgery or even anything
> about the practice of medicine, the front man of the Gang of Four has
> spoken!

> US amateur radio is all about Working DX on HF with CW.

Why not go the next step as you did earlier? Try to state that one of
us wrote it.

> Here we go again! Doctor Kildare II, having "worked in engineering,"
> knows Everything about engineering!
>
> Yes, a half-year as a PURCHASING AGENT in a small company making
> modems, set-top boxes, and LAN electronics KNOWS ALL ABOUT
> ENGINEERING! Filled out purchase forms and thinks he signed off
> design drawings...chatted with others during lunch and thought he was
> in a design review meeting! He absorbed all engineering knowledge
> and experience by osmosis?
>
> Not a long "career" in "professional radio," was it? Why?

> > Which club?
>
> The club you try to hit everyone with when they don't honor, respect, or
> salute your mighty accomplishments...

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

So much for your character, Leonard.

Dave K8MN

1438. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 21:24:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E836BF6.61AB913C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63623

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Brian, remember the RoE in this newsgroup. Whatever the Gang of
> Four* write is perfectly acceptible. Anything in disagreement with
> them and you are "putz medel," lie, and have underarm odor. They
> have the authority to defame, disgrace, and make nasty to anyone
> not honoring and respecting their sacred writings.
>
> Up CW. :-)
>
> * Gang of Four: K8MN, N2EY, K4YZ, K3LT.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

1439. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 21:25:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E836C4B.492B175F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63624

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0303270932.77b45136@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:

>
> >The point is simply that the "entry level" tests today are not nearly
> >as technical as they once were. And that's a GOOD thing.
>
> There we have it. Recording secretary of the Gang of Four has
> stated it. So must it be... :-)

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

1440. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 21:27:25 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b5vqbfjbv1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63625

Excellent....the only problem is I doubt most of the present day
'peace-nicks' would be able to comprehend it.

Dan/W4NTI

"KB9TMP" <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com> wrote in message
news:v84obohjr0rsb0@corp.supernews.com...

> I was sent this in an email and thought it fit in really well here at this
> time.
>
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP
> --
>
> The Shelby County Alabama Legislative Delegation hosted a "Stand Up for
> America Rally. " More than 1,200 people attended including featured
speakers
> Chief Justice Roy Moore, Adjutant General Mark Bowen and Alabama State
> Auditor Beth Chapman. Attached is a copy of Mrs. Chapman's speech, which
> resulted in five standing ovations, tremendous applause and an encore.
It's
> a short read and well worth it. I hope you enjoy it as we continue to
"Stand
> up for America!"
>
> Stand Up for America Rally Speech By: Beth Chapman
>
> I'm here tonight because men and women of the United States military have
> given their lives for my freedom. I am NOT here tonight because Sheryl
> Crowe, Rosie O'Donnell, Martin Sheen, George Clooney, Jane Fonda or Phil
> Donahue, sacrificed their lives for me.
>
> If my memory serves me correctly, it was not movie stars or musicians, but
> the United States Military who fought on the shores of Iwo Jima, the
jungles
> of Vietnam, and the beaches of Normandy. Tonight, I say we should support
> the President of the United States and the U. S. Military and tell the
> liberal, tree-hugging, Birkenstock-wearing, hippy, tie-dyed liberals to go
> make their movies and music and whine somewhere else.
>
> After all, if they lived in Iraq, they wouldn't be allowed the freedom of
> speech they're being given here today. Ironically, they would be put to
> death at the hands of Sadam Hussein or Osama Bin Laden. I want to know how
> the very people who are against war because of the loss of life, can

> possibly be the same people who are for abortion?
>
> They are the same people who are for animal rights but against the rights
of
> the unborn. The movie stars say they want to go to Iraq and serve as
"human
> shields" for the Iraqis. I say let them buy a one-way ticket and go.
>
> No one likes war. I hate war! But the one thing I hate more is the fact
that
> this country has been forced into war - - innocent people have lost their
> lives - - and there but for the grace of God, it could have been my
brother,
> my husband, or even worse my own son.
>
> On December 7, 1941, there are no records of movie stars treading the
> blazing waters of Pearl Harbor.
>
> On September 11, 2001; there are no photos of movie stars standing as
"human
> shields" against the debris and falling bodies descending from the World
> Trade Center. There were only policemen and firemen - -underpaid civil
> servants who gave their all with nothing expected in return.
>
> When the USS Cole was bombed, there were no movie stars guarding the
ship -
> - where were the human shields then?
>
> If America's movie stars want to be human shields, let them shield the
> gang-ridden streets of Los Angeles, or New York City, let them shield the
> lives of the children of North Birmingham whose mothers lay them down to
> sleep on the floor each night to shelter them from stray bullets.
>
> If they want to be human shields, I say let them shield the men and women
of
> honesty and integrity that epitomizes courage and embody the spirit of
> freedom by wearing the proud uniforms of the United States Military. Those
> are the people who have earned and deserve shielding!
>
> Throughout the course of history, this country has remained free, not
> because of movie stars and liberal activists, but because of brave men and
> women who hated war too. However, they lay down their lives so that we all
> may live in freedom. After all - "What greater love hath no man, that he
lay
> down his life for his friend," or in this case a country.
>
> We should give our military honor, and acknowledgement, and not let their
> lives be in vain. If you want to see true human shields, walk through
> Arlington Cemetery. There lie human shields, heroes, and the BRAVE
Americans

> who didn't get on television and talk about being a human shield
> - they were human shields.
>
> 1 thank God tonight for freedom - - those who bought and paid for it with
> their lives in the past - - those who will protect it in the present and
> defend it in the future.
>
> America has remained silent too long! God-fearing people have remained
> silent too long!
>
> We must lift our voices united in a humble prayer to God for guidance and
> the strength and courage to sustain us throughout whatever the future may
> hold.
>
> After the tragic events of Sept. 11th, my then eleven -year-old son said
> terrorism is a war between them and us, and if you're not one of us, then
> you're one of them.
>
> So in closing tonight, let us be of one accord, let us stand proud, and
let
> us be the human shields of prayer, encouragement and support for the
> President, our troops and their families and our country.
>
> May God bless America, the land of the free, the home of the brave and the
> greatest country on the face of this earth
>
>
>

1441. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 21:27:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E836CC4.B5EBE8DD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63626

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E832F4C.A40F64BF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:

> >> Since you don't know what their top end is, and you cannot define
> >> Morse Proficiency without floating numbers, why don't you simply admit
> >> that you don't know what you're talking about?
> >
> >Why? That'd be because I do know what I'm talking about. I do know
> >that we don't have a handle on the morse proficiency of the ops in
> >question. I do know that I am not confusing the .02 wpm used to achieve
> >a record with the maximum speed of which the ops are capable.
> >I do know that "proficient" means "expert, skilled". I do know that
> >five word per minute morse speed cannot by any stretch be considered
> >"expert" or "skilled". I knew what I wrote previously and quoted
> >above. I knew from your reponse that you didn't comprehend what you'd
> >read. I know from your dodge on your latest response that you'd like to
> >gloss over your mistaken comments about what I've previously written. I
> >do know that, despite your earlier claim, you do have time for silly
> >games. That's why.
>
> There we have it. Das Oberst has issued Daily Orders.

What orders, Leonard? I answered Brian's question.
Who is "Das Oberst"?

> The Chief of the Gang of Four has spoken... :-)

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

For examples, see Len's comments above.

Dave K8MN

1442. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 21:29:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E836D20.52616BE9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63627

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Brian, the Rules of Engagement in here according to the Gang of Four,
> is that one MUST agree with the Gang on all opinions. Disagree and
> you are inconsistent, incompetent, a liar, a putz, and smell bad.
>
> :-)

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

I'm thankful that I have no idea of whether or not you smell bad.

Dave K8MN

1443. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 22:01:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303271401.61fc6a1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63628

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0303270932.77b45136@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0303270311.21a8ddd@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030326204339.23598.00001090@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> > > In article <f45722ac.0303260528.653f7662@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
> > > >news:<20030325234011.10838.00000436@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> > > >> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > > >>
> > > >> >But if someone or some group did want a non-technical ham license,
> > > >> <snip>
> > > >>
> > > >> You mean like the Technician license? Thats a non-technical license. (No
> > > >> knowledge of material required to pass the test).
> > > >
> > > >??? You're nuts.
> > >
> > > No comment.
> > >
> > > >> Its probably the most technical "entry-level" exam ever.
> > >
> > > Not at all.
> > >
> > > Back before the 1951 restructuring, all new US hams started out with either a
> > > Class C or Class B license. 13 wpm code, send and receive, plus a written test
> > > of about fifty questions that included calculations, drawing schematic and
> > > block diagrams, and essays. No Q&A pools or one-day classes, either.
> >
> > I wasn't born last night nor yesterday, but 1951 was a little before my time.
>
> You stated that the Technician license test is "probably the most
> technical "entry-level" exam ever.". I simply proved that it isn't.

I'm not certain that youproved anything, only that in your opinion
you've seen more technical entry level exams.

> > > I can post some of the questions from the 1948 study guide. I doubt ol' Vipul
> > > could answer them without some research.
> >
> > 1948 was before my time also. Did you actually use that study guide to test?
>

> How does one "use a study guide to test"?

People in the know would review it.

> The point is simply that the "entry level" tests today are not nearly
> as technical as they once were. And that's a GOOD thing.

Perhaps.

1444. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-27 22:04:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303271404.1a4b5ce7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63629

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns934AEF6A2266Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in
> news:f45722ac.0303260522.3a4e61dd@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns934A760B86C4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >>
> >> Why stop there. Why not send everyone descended from immigrants back
> >> home?
> >
> > I think they are referring to those who fail to assimilate. In the
> > military its called, "non-adaptability," and it's punishable.
> >
>
> Another good reason for not joining the military. Gettting shot at would
> bother me much less than the disciplinary aspects.

Luckily for you we don't use conscription anymore. Then you could
enjoy both discipline and bullets.

1445. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 00:26:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b604qp$dp6$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63630

Thats good Brian....it is true too.

Dan/W4NTI

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0303271404.1a4b5ce7@posting.google.com...

> Luckily for you we don't use conscription anymore. Then you could
> enjoy both discipline and bullets.

1446. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 02:26:03 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0303271826.59fe8ac5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63631

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3E8306F2.5020304@psu.edu>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > Back before the 1951 restructuring, all new US hams started out with either a
> > Class C or Class B license. 13 wpm code, send and receive, plus a written test
> > of about fifty questions that included calculations, drawing schematic and
> > block diagrams, and essays. No Q&A pools or one-day classes, either.
> >
> > I can post some of the questions from the 1948 study guide. I doubt ol' Vipul
> > could answer them without some research.
>
>
> Could you Jim? Of course we have to look at the questions from their
> context. But it will be interesting nontheless.
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

All right, here's a sample. Remember that these are not the exact
questions on the old tests, and they are for the "entry level"
license:

1. Name the basic units of electrical resistance, inductance,
capacitance, current, electromotive force or potential difference,
power, energy, quantity, magneto-motive force, and frequency.

6. Why is it advisable to use a plate power supply for the oscillator
of a transmitter separate from the final amplifier plate power supply?

20. Describe the adjustment procedure for proper neutralization in a
radio-frequency amplifier using an r.f. indicator coupled to the plate
tank circuit.

26. What is the purpose of a Faraday (electrostatic) shield between
the output circuit of an r.f. power amplifier and antenna coupling
system.

34. A low-drift crystal for the 3500-4000 kc. amateur band is
guaranteed by the manufacturer to be calibrated to within 0.04% of its
specified frequency. Desiring to operate as close to the lower band
limit of 3500 kc. as possible, for what whole-number kilocycle
frequency should you order your crystal, allowing 1 kc. additional for
variation from temperature and circuit constants?

36. Draw a schematic diagram of a full-wave single-phase power supply
using a center-tapped high-voltage secondary with a filter circuit for

best regulation, showing a bleeder resistor providing two different output voltages and a method of suppressing "hash" interference from the mercury-vapor rectifier tubes. Give the names of the component parts and approximate values of of filter components suitable for either amateur radiotelephone or radiotelegraph operation

40. Draw a schematic diagram of two r.f. amplifier stages using triode tubes, showing neutralizing circuits, link coupling between stages and between output and antenna system, and a keying connection in the negative high-voltage lead including a key-click filter.

66. What operating characteristics distinguish the electron-coupled type oscillator with regard to frequency stability?

Just a sample...

1447. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 02:36:52 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E83B544.6050002@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 63713

Dwight Stewart wrote:

>
>
> Because they, and I, know Saddam Hussein had nothing whatsoever to do with
> the attack on the WTC. If Saddam wanted to attack this country, he has had
> twelve years to do so. He hasn't.

You may believe that, but you don't know that. Just because
evidence has not been presented so far that shows he had nothing
to do with the WTC attack, is not an absolute that he had nothing
to do with it. It is yet to be proven if he did or did not.

1448. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 02:43:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303271843.571d5821@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63632

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E836C4B.492B175F@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <c2356669.0303270932.77b45136@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> > (N2EY) writes:
>
> >
> > >The point is simply that the "entry level" tests today are not nearly
> > >as technical as they once were. And that's a GOOD thing.
> >
> > There we have it. Recording secretary of the Gang of Four has
> > stated it. So must it be... :-)
>
> N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Dave K8MN

Incapable of original thought? The mileage has run out on the Jim quote.

1449. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 02:45:39 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327214539.18829.00000010@mb-fn.aol.com>
Source record: 63633

From K4YZ
>I asked you from what source you made your EXISTING opinion.
From the knowledge gained by attending Ham radio club meetings and Hamfests and asking questions to understand.

The "source" is the current Hams. This is a valid method. This is how prospective new Hams will form their opinion.

I would like to invite someone to a Hamfest or Field Day and see what their opinion is. Lack of females, older population, generally overweight would be apparent upon first visit to a Hamfest. Then, they would notice that Hams are weird.

>Uh huh...I can make brain surgery look really foolish too,

If you did it, it would be foolish.

>The problem is, Vipul, based upon your posts here, you DON'T understand
>Amatuer Radio.

Its pointless to make claims on what one understands. Problem with this approach is that prospective new Hams, particularly EEs, will see Hams as weird and not join.

>>Now YOU ARE being silly. I explained the whole Wuoff Hong situation in
>>complete
>>detail.
>
> Yes, you have. You explained that you have been making your claims based
>upon a complete lack of first hand experience from which to be making those
>claims. Not very engineer like, Vipul.

Wuoff Hong is NOT typical of Ham radio. It is just one very small segment. I apologize.

>>I participate. Just not EVERY meeting.
>
> Which club?

Why?

1450. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 02:50:49 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303271850.6c867b99@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63634

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E832F4C.A40F64BF@earthlink.net>...

> Why? That'd be because I do know what I'm talking about.

Claiming ignorance would buy you an out for your untenable position.

I do know
> that we don't have a handle on the morse proficiency of the ops in
> question. I do know that I am not confusing the .02 wpm used to achieve
> a record with the maximum speed of which the ops are capable.
> I do know that "proficient" means "expert, skilled". I do know that
> five word per minute morse speed cannot by any stretch be considered
> "expert" or "skilled". I knew what I wrote previously and quoted
> above. I knew from your reponse that you didn't comprehend what you'd
> read. I know from your dodge on your latest response that you'd like to
> gloss over your mistaken comments about what I've previously written. I
> do know that, despite your earlier claim, you do have time for silly
> games. That's why.

Then state at what minimum word per minute rate and accuracy level, a
user of Morse Code can be considered proficient, and why. Back it up
with references to any FCC regulation or any US regulation prior to
the formation of the FCC.

Best of luck (because I don't plan on hearing from you on this matter
again).

Sayonara.

Brian

1451. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 02:55:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303271855.363e2dbc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63635

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E836CC4.B5EBE8DD@earthlink.net>...
>
> I answered Brian's question.

You don't know the answer.

You merely type words.

1452. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 02:58:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303271858.7e6b73d2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63636

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E836D20.52616BE9@earthlink.net>...
>
> I'm thankful that I have no idea of whether or not you smell bad.
>
> Dave K8MN

Hardly relevant on rrap.

Nor do you know what Morse Proficient is, or at least you cannot put it in words.

1453. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 03:02:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303271902.54645e07@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63637

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E836BF6.61AB913C@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > Brian, remember the RoE in this newsgroup. Whatever the Gang of
> > Four* write is perfectly acceptible. Anything in disagreement with
> > them and you are "putz medel," lie, and have underarm odor. They
> > have the authority to defame, disgrace, and make nasty to anyone
> > not honoring and respecting their sacred writings.
> >
> > Up CW. :-)
> >
> > * Gang of Four: K8MN, N2EY, K4YZ, K3LT.
>
> N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Dave K8MN

Apparently, Dave has no mind of his own.

1454. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 03:12:20 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327221220.18829.00000014@mb-fn.aol.com>
Source record: 63638

From K4YZ
>Do YOU understand that YOU at first say it's unnecessary to test for Morse
>Code then trun around and say it is...?!?!

Actually, Morse code is not needed for HF. Also, the Morse-loving culture of Ham radio makes the hobby look bad. The heavy emphasis on Morse code is embarrassing.

Morsers tend to take over clubs and ruin my enjoyment of the hobby. It is clear many were pressured into Morse code. A few in the club told me they were initially pressured into Morse code.

I was just trying to come up with a compromise that would be acceptable for code lovers.

Tying the General class to Morse code is unfair. The suggestion I made is <more> fair to everyone.

>>For someone that just wants to operate and not learn theory, they wouldn't
>>have
>>to be burdened with the General written test to get HF priveledges.
>
> And then they wouldn't meet the criteria as set out in 47CFR97.1, Basis
>and Purpose of the Amatuer Radio Service.

What? This is an amazingly illogical comment. Morse code is NOT listed in the "Basis and Purpose" of Amateur radio.

>>Anyway, for someone that just wants to operate and not learn theory, this is
>>not much of a sacrifice at all.
>
> It is when you consider the Basis and Purpose of the Amateur Radio
>Service.

One can get a no-code license. One can also pass this test without learning the theory (just memorizing the questions and answers). This seems to satisfy the FCC for now. Are you saying the current Technician class license violates the "Basis and Purpose"?

1455. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 03:15:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327221523.01698.00000007@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63639

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/27/2003 5:25 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303270325.4b8a2eb6@posting.google.com>

>You could start with spelling my name correctly. The road to recovery
>starts with the first small step.

I didn't? You're no Brain...???

1456. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 03:17:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303271917.7037bf5c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63640

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0303270925.74e0cffc@posting.google.com>...
> vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030326223249.18599.00000362@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> > From: Dave Heil, k8mn
> > >Work on learning morse for a couple of weeks. Pass the exam. Go forth
> > >and participate.
> >
> > Thanks, but I don't want to learn Morse code.
>
> Then don't complain.

Sounds like you're trying to limit Vips' Civil Liberties.

> > I am an EE, and I like putting
> > circuits together and making them work.
>
> Me too. On both counts.

Count again.

You'd need three fingers there, Dave.

One finger would be that you're also an EE. Are you an EE?

The second finger would be for putting cicuits together.

The third finger would be for making those circuits work.

Take a stab and guess at what word per minute rate Morse Code use is
considered proficient. Forget about any accuracy standard as I don't
want you to get confused.

Brian

1457. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 03:17:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327221722.01698.00000008@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63641

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/27/2003 5:33 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303270333.324ba6c0@posting.google.com>

>> How can there be anything to "decipher" when all I can do is piecemeal
>> respond to silly innuendo, sleights and irrelevent tripe?
>
>Yes.

"Yes"...That was your answer to the question posed?

>You changed the subject

If you insist.

Steve

1458. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 03:18:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303271918.751f7dd2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63642

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E813962.B6385804@att.net>...
>
> Morse code, the requirement, is only a barrier to those who "don't want to learn
> it".
>
> QED.

QED, if you wanted to, could you dunk a basketball?

1459. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 03:33:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327223326.01698.00000009@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63643

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/27/2003 2:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030327151829.04776.00001247@mb-ct.aol.com>

>>That's NOT what you were asked, Vipul.
>
>You don't deserve an answer.

Sure I so. YOUR rules. If you post something to a public forum, it
becomes fair game.

> I asked you from what source you made your EXISTING opinion.
>
> You don't have a right to know.

Sure I do. YOUR rules. If you post something to a public forum, it
becomes fair game.

>This isn't a newsgroup for NASCAR or aircraft competition or about
>equine interests

I'm sorry. If forgot that only YOU may make an analogy or designate what
is and is not proper for discussion.

Many pardons...NOT!

>Except to the Gang of Four.

Who? In what Amateur Radio publication will we find this "gang of four"
you make reference to?

>US amateur radio is all about Working DX on HF with CW.

I'll go ahead and put this in the "List of things Lennie the Liar Will
Never Answer", but WHO said this (otehr than you) and WHERE is it published?

>Not very engineer like, Vipul.
>
> Here we go again! Doctor Kildare II, having "worked in engineering,"
> knows Everything about engineering!

Nope. Just know enough to know what's expected of an engineer.

>Yes, a half-year as a PURCHASING AGENT...(SNIP)

Once again, half cocked and ill-prepared, Lennie launches off on yet
another windmill assault.

Sorry Lennie. You're underpowered again.

>Not a long "career" in "professional radio," was it?

If that was my only professioanl experience, you MIGHT be right. As usual, you only ahve half the story. But that's OK...you go right ahead.

>The club you try to hit everyone with when they don't honor, respect, or
> salute your mighty accomplishments.

Which club would that be, Lennie?

Steve

1460. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 03:36:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327223617.01698.00000010@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63644

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/27/2003 9:04 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303271904.76adf606@posting.google.com>

>> So much for your character, Leonard.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>So much for your ability to create an original thought.

Here's a new one:

"Leonard H Anderson is a known and documented pathological liar with a penchant for character assassination and newsgroup antagonism."

Not as civil as Jim's, but every bit as accurate.

Steve

1461. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 03:40:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030327224013.19751.00004340@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 63645

In article <3E8208B1.9090408@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>> I just had a horrible thought: I hope none of the Dixie Chicks are
>licensed
>> Amateur Radio operators!
>
>
> I'm not certain that the "Dixie Chicks are chicks!

Perhaps the Dixie Chicks are chicks that lick!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1462. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 03:40:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030327224014.19751.00004341@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 63646

In article <AFD0EE56BE6B4F8C.CC3FDF9A8774DCC9.EDB8B5345B2D887F@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>However, my original statement/response stands. It is for the reason of
>intolerance from some of our own US citizens that we often lose sight of the
>fact that we are, as US citizens, allowed a diverse set of opinion and we
>also have the right to express them--without fear.

Kim:

You have my complete assurance that any of my fellow Americans who freely express their opinions have nothing to fear from me. All they have to fear is what I'll say about them if what they're saying is a bunch of foolishly unpatriotic
liberal malarkey.

>I refer back to your paragraph, above, Larry, and won't even engage you on
>the rest of your post, below. Do you really think you are not passing
>judgement on someone's beliefs when you insinuate that dissent=support or
>agreement with something others may disagree with? If so, do you *really*
>think you are being tolerant?

Of course I'm passing judgment -- and as an intelligent, educated, and informed American, this is a judgment I'm qualified to make! Making judgments is a normal part of the human intellectual process, and one thing I cannot understand about liberals is your stated aversion to being "judgmental" when you, in fact, make some of the most severe judgments about other people that have ever been entered into mankind's historical record.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1463. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 03:44:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E83C510.7CE51E78@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63647

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E836C4B.492B175F@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <c2356669.0303270932.77b45136@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> > > (N2EY) writes:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > >The point is simply that the "entry level" tests today are not nearly
> > > > >as technical as they once were. And that's a GOOD thing.
> > > >
> > > > There we have it. Recording secretary of the Gang of Four has
> > > > stated it. So must it be... :-)
> > >
> > > N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> > >
> > > No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> > > government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> > > amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> > > Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> > > slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Incapable of original thought?

As you've already found, I'm quite capable of original thought.

> The mileage has run out on the Jim quote.

No, it hasn't. I intend to use it each time Len exhibits the qualities
which the quote expresses. Leonard doesn't play well with others.

Dave K8MN

1464. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 03:44:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAA92F63.14A71%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63648

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> An important thing for loyal Americans to do is
> to be well informed. Any reasonably attentive
> student of history will be able to draw the
> conclusion that appeasement of dictators
> through diplomacy does not put an end to
> vicious, totalitarian regimes. They must be
> confronted with sufficient force to put them
> out of power, (snip)

And there are well informed Americans who disagree with the use of force
to solve problems. Does that make them less loyal?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1465. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 03:46:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327224624.01698.00000011@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63649

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/27/2003 8:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030327214539.18829.00000010@mb-fn.aol.com>

>From the knowledge gained by attending Ham radio club meetings and Hamfests
>and
>asking questions to understand.

This is YOUR opinion, and one NOT held by any significant number of
persons with CREDIBLE credentials.

>Day and see what their
>opinion is. Lack of females, older population, generally overweight would be
>apparent upon first visit to a Hamfest. Then, they would notice that Hams are
>weird.

You still have yet to explain to me how Amateur Radio is any more "weird"
than any other sport, pastime or avocation, Vipul.

I can apply the above "demographics" to a Shriner's Convention. SO WHAT?

>>The problem is, Vipul, based upon your posts here, you DON'T understand
>>Amatuer Radio.
>
>Its pointless to make claims on what one understands. Problem with this
>approach is that prospective new Hams, particularly EEs, will see Hams as
>weird and not join.

Uh huh...If an EE is looking for "preety fems" he's going to be very
disappointed for the most part. Most of them are either very young, married or
....uhhhh...."mature". Better he hang out at Hooters.

>Wuoff Hong is NOT typical of Ham radio. It is just one very small segment. I
>apologize.

Well then...well done.

>>>I participate. Just not EVERY meeting.
>>
>> Which club?
>
>Why?

You claim you are active in a club and that you "support" it, yet you show
no understanding of what support is. You claim the club places Morse Code in
priority above all else. I wonder what club it is.

You can keep it a secret if you want, but you see what good keeping YOUR identity a secret was, don't you?

Steve, K4YZ

1466. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 03:48:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327224845.01698.00000012@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63650

>Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/27/2003 9:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303271902.54645e07@posting.google.com>

>> N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>>
>> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>> amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>> Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>> slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>Apparently, Dave has no mind of his own.

Hey...what ever works. You can't argue with the truth.

Steve

1467. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 03:55:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327225554.01698.00000013@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63702

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/27/2003 8:58 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303271858.7e6b73d2@posting.google.com>

>Nor do you know what Morse Proficient is, or at least you cannot put it in
>words.

I can. "To be able to competently send by hand and receive by ear Amateur Radio signals using Morse Code without the use of interpretive encoding or decoding devices".

I am Morse Proficient. I can "rag chew", pass traffic or operate in contests comfortably to 25 WPM, and in contests up to 40WPM...WITHOUT the use of a keyboard or any electronic or mechanical encoding or decoding device.

Can YOU, Brain?

Steve

1468. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 03:55:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E83C7B4.1CF1AC3C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63701

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E832F4C.A40F64BF@earthlink.net>...
>
> > Why? That'd be because I do know what I'm talking about.
>
> Claiming ignorance would buy you an out for your untenable position.

I don't have an untenable position. All we have is you, playing the
silly games for which you earlier claimed that you had no time.

> I do know
> > that we don't have a handle on the morse proficiency of the ops in
> > question. I do know that I am not confusing the .02 wpm used to achieve
> > a record with the maximum speed of which the ops are capable.
> > I do know that "proficient" means "expert, skilled". I do know that
> > five word per minute morse speed cannot by any stretch be considered
> > "expert" or "skilled". I knew what I wrote previously and quoted
> > above. I knew from your reponse that you didn't comprehend what you'd
> > read. I know from your dodge on your latest response that you'd like to
> > gloss over your mistaken comments about what I've previously written. I
> > do know that, despite your earlier claim, you do have time for silly
> > games. That's why.
>
> Then state at what minimum word per minute rate and accuracy level, a
> user of Morse Code can be considered proficient, and why.

I've provided you with a definition of what it means to be proficient.
I'll leave it for you to explain why it would be that when many are
capable of 20, 25, 30, 35 and 40 wpm copy, anyone would consider an
excruciatingly slow 5 wpm as proficient.

> Back it up
> with references to any FCC regulation or any US regulation prior to
> the formation of the FCC.

Did you believe that morse proficiency was codified by the U.S.
government?

> Best of luck (because I don't plan on hearing from you on this matter
> again).

The best laid plans...

> Sayonara.

boa noite.

Dave K8MN

1469. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 03:57:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E83C83A.AC593364@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63703

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E836CC4.B5EBE8DD@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > I answered Brian's question.
>
> You don't know the answer.

I provide not only one answer. I provided a number of answers. Any of
them would be a suitable reply to your question.

> You merely type words.

That seems to have been what makes up your response.

Dave K8MN

1470. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 03:59:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E83C87E.3D06A962@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63704

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E836D20.52616BE9@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > I'm thankful that I have no idea of whether or not you smell bad.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Hardly relevant on rrap.

Then you'll want to address your comment to Leonard H. Anderson. He
brought it up.

> Nor do you know what Morse Proficient is, or at least you cannot put it in words.

I have put it into words. There is no answer which will satisfy you.

Dave K8MN

1471. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 04:00:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E83C8CE.D183441D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63705

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E836BF6.61AB913C@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > > Brian, remember the RoE in this newsgroup. Whatever the Gang of
> > > Four* write is perfectly acceptible. Anything in disagreement with
> > > them and you are "putz medel," lie, and have underarm odor. They
> > > have the authority to defame, disgrace, and make nasty to anyone
> > > not honoring and respecting their sacred writings.
> > >
> > > Up CW. :-)
> > >
> > > * Gang of Four: K8MN, N2EY, K4YZ, K3LT.
> >
> > N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> > No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> > government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> > amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> > Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> > slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Apparently, Dave has no mind of his own.

Who did you think made the post? In my judgement, Leonard just hit the
profile jackpot.

Dave K8MN

1472. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 04:07:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327230710.01698.00000014@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63707

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/27/2003 9:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030327221220.18829.00000014@mb-fn.aol.com

>Actually, Morse code is not needed for HF.

Nor is SSB, FM, AM or any other mode.

>Also, the Morse-loving culture of
>Ham radio makes the hobby look bad. The heavy emphasis on Morse code is
>embarrassing.

To whom?

>Morsers tend to take over clubs and ruin my enjoyment of the hobby.

BWWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! !
! ! ! !

>It is clear many were pressured into Morse code.

Yeah..The Radio Police dragged themout in the street in the middle of the
night and tortured them until they signed statements professing thier undying
loyalty to Morse Code...

(just puked on my shoes laughing so hard.......)

>I was just trying to come up with a compromise that would be acceptable for
>code lovers.

Here's one. You don't pee in their shoes, they won't pee in yours.

Fair?

>Tying the General class to Morse code is unfair. The suggestion I made is
><more> fair to everyone.

No it's not.

>>>For someone that just wants to operate and not learn theory, they wouldn't
>>>have
>>>to be burdened with the General written test to get HF priveledges.
>>
>> And then they wouldn't meet the criteria as set out in 47CFR97.1, Basis
>>and Purpose of the Amatuer Radio Service.
>
>What? This is an amazingly illogical comment. Morse code is NOT listed in the
>"Basis and Purpose" of Amateur radio.

"Illogical comment"...?!?!

Vipul, you recommend trashing the technical written tests and then say MY comments about that suggestion then failing to meet Part 97 is "illogical"...?!?!

Son...YOU are confused!

>One can get a no-code license. One can also pass this test without learning
>the
>theory (just memorizing the questions and answers). This seems to satisfy the
>FCC for now. Are you saying the current Technician class license violates the
>"Basis and Purpose"?

Are you actively participating in the consumption of controlled substances or DEA schedule 2-4 narcotics, Vipul?

Steve

1473. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 04:07:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E83CA6C.CEA2E243@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63706

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From K4YZ
> >Do YOU understand that YOU at first say it's unnecessary to test for Morse
> >Code then trun around and say it is...?!?!
>
> Actually, Morse code is not needed for HF. Also, the Morse-loving culture of
> Ham radio makes the hobby look bad. The heavy emphasis on Morse code is
> embarrassing.

To whom?

> Morsers tend to take over clubs and ruin my enjoyment of the hobby.

Morsers? Your enjoyment? Lots of things ruin your enjoyment of ham radio--clubs, morse code, hamfests, hams' weight, jargon, cults. You should seek out those few remaining TV repairmen. You guys could get together and look at cool wave forms.

> Tying the General class to Morse code is unfair.

To whom?

I see that I've misjudged you, Vipul. I've been attempting to treat you as a rational human being.

Dave K8MN

1474. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 04:08:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAA934F1.14A73%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63708

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> The problem with the present situation is
> that to protest the actions of President
> Bush in Iraq is to say that you do support
> the cruel, viscous, murderous regime of
> Saddam Hussein, and support his goal of
> producing weapons of mass destruction to
> be used to terrorize the rest of the
> world. (snip)

Be serious, Larry. No issue can be defined in such polar terms. I oppose our involvement in a war with Iraq, which says nothing whatsoever about Saddam Hussein, much less support for his actions (real, imagined, or inflated).

> (snip) How could they have seen the World
> Trade Center crumble and the Pentagon be
> attacked without thinking that we, as a
> nation, would have to make sacrifices to
> ensure that such a thing never happened
> again? (snip)

Because they, and I, know Saddam Hussein had nothing whatsoever to do with the attack on the WTC. If Saddam wanted to attack this country, he has had twelve years to do so. He hasn't. Indeed, his country is under massive attack at this very moment by the forces of this country and he has still not attacked this country or used weapons of mass destruction. That tells me either Saddam is not as bad as we're being told or he has no weapons of mass destruction. And, if either of those is true, this war is not justified.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1475. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 04:09:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E83CAE9.D066F9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63709

Brian wrote:
>
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0303270925.74e0cffc@posting.google.com>...
> > vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030326223249.18599.00000362@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> > > From: Dave Heil, k8mn
> > > >Work on learning morse for a couple of weeks. Pass the exam. Go forth
> > > >and participate.
> > >
> > > Thanks, but I don't want to learn Morse code.
> >
> > Then don't complain.
>
> Sounds like you're trying to limit Vips' Civil Liberties.
>
> > > I am an EE, and I like putting
> > > circuits together and making them work.
> >
> > Me too. On both counts.
>
> Count again.
>
> You'd need three fingers there, Dave.
>
> One finger would be that you're also an EE. Are you an EE?
>
> The second finger would be for putting cicuits together.
>
> The third finger would be for making those circuits work.
>
> Take a stab and guess at what word per minute rate Morse Code use is
> considered proficient. Forget about any accuracy standard as I don't
> want you to get confused.
>
> Brian

You're already confused. You're addressing me about what N2EY wrote.
Good luck on that comprehension problem.

Dave K8MN

1476. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 04:14:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E83CC39.30407@adelphia.net>
Source record: 63710

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <3E8208B1.9090408@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>>I just had a horrible thought: I hope none of the Dixie Chicks are
>>
>>licensed
>>
>>>Amateur Radio operators!
>>
>>
>> I'm not certain that the "Dixie Chicks are chicks!
>
>
> Perhaps the Dixie Chicks are chicks that lick!

I wouldn't doubt it!

I'm proud to say I didn't like them even before they stepped in their
own mess.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1477. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 04:18:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030327231857.01698.00000015@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63711

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: Dwight Stewart stewart@say.net
>Date: 3/27/2003 10:08 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <BAA934F1.14A73%stewart@say.net>

>Because they, and I, know Saddam Hussein had nothing whatsoever to do with
>the attack on the WTC. If Saddam wanted to attack this country, he has had
>twelve years to do so. He hasn't.

You know this as a "fact" Dwight? You know beyond a shadow of a doubt
that SH didn't help fund, support, promote or othrwise give confort or
assistance to those murdering bastards?

>He hasn't. Indeed, his country is under massive
>attack at this very moment by the forces of this country and he has still
>not attacked this country or used weapons of mass destruction.

Again...You KNOW this for sure? There's NO DOUBT in your mind that SH
didn't help as noted above???

And SH HAS used "weapons of mass destruction" on his own people, the Kurds
and Iranians.

>That tells me
>either Saddam is not as bad as we're being told or he has no weapons of mass
>destruction. And, if either of those is true, this war is not justified.

Twelve years of "debate" in the UN and a continuing thumbing of the nose
at UN resolutions and sanctions was all the justification needed.

Steve, K4YZ

1478. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 04:20:19 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAA937B2.14A75%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63712

"W5TIT" wrote:

> (snip) As an aside, it seems that Dwight took
> some exception to this, since he promptly stated
> that he was exiting from the thread. (snip)

Sorry for the misunderstanding, Kim. I didn't take exception to anything you said. Instead, a message was posted with my name as the sender which was not written by me. I took exception to that and decided to leave the thread. That now appears to have stopped (at least for the moment), so I will continue with the discussion.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1479. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 05:13:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E83D9FA.9BC1229A@att.net>
Source record: 63714

Dave Heil wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> >
> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0303270925.74e0cffc@posting.google.com>...
> > > vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030326223249.18599.00000362@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> > > > From: Dave Heil, k8mn
> > > > >Work on learning morse for a couple of weeks. Pass the exam. Go forth
> > > > >and participate.
> > > >
> > > > Thanks, but I don't want to learn Morse code.
> > >
> > > Then don't complain.
> >
> > Sounds like you're trying to limit Vips' Civil Liberties.
> >
> > > > I am an EE, and I like putting
> > > > circuits together and making them work.
> > >
> > > Me too. On both counts.
> >
> > Count again.
> >
> > You'd need three fingers there, Dave.
> >
> > One finger would be that you're also an EE. Are you an EE?
> >
> > The second finger would be for putting cicuits together.
> >
> > The third finger would be for making those circuits work.
> >
> > Take a stab and guess at what word per minute rate Morse Code use is
> > considered proficient. Forget about any accuracy standard as I don't
> > want you to get confused.
> >
> > Brian
>
> You're already confused. You're addressing me about what N2EY wrote.
> Good luck on that comprehension problem.

Good Grief, is The Magpie still chirping about Morse proficiency speed? Can't he read?
FCC defined Morse proficiency very clearly long ago. He was told that and still he resists.
He just can't understand the futility of it. Never could.

1480. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 05:16:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAA944E1.14A77%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63715

"KB9TMP" wrote:
>
> Stand Up for America Rally Speech By: Beth Chapman
>
> (snip) After the tragic events of Sept. 11th, my
> then eleven -year-old son said terrorism is a war
> between them and us, and if you're not one of us,
> then you're one of them. (snip)

And it is hoped most Americans have more sense than an eleven-year-old boy. Sadly, Beth Chapman (the writer) obviously doesn't.

She mentioned that she is not here "because Sheryl Crowe, Rosie O'Donnell, Martin Sheen, George Clooney, Jane Fonda or Phil Donahue, sacrificed their lives for me." Perhaps she (Beth Chapman) needs to be reminded that we are also not here because she gave her life for us. Beth Chapman neither treaded "the blazing waters of Pearl Harbor" or stood as a human shield "against the debris and falling bodies descending from the World Trade Center." Nor has she ever offered to lay down her life so "we all may live in freedom." Nor is she included in "the men and women of honesty and integrity that epitomizes courage and embody the spirit of freedom by wearing the proud uniforms of the United States Military." By attacking others with such rhetoric, she only attacks herself (she is "guilty" of same).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1481. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 10:30:29 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0303280230.3455a88b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63716

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BAA3F52C.14567%stewart@say.net>...
> "Bert Craig" wrote:
>
> > Actually, Dwight...he does. As do you, I,
> > and every other citizen of the USA. He's
> > just voicing his personal opinion, or in
> > other words...his portion of the word "we."
>
>
> No single American is "We, the USA." If he wants to voice his personal
> opinion

I very much disagree. While we're all individuals, we are also a part
of the larger "united" collective, "We, the people." You need only
read the replies to your response to Dan's post to gauge the popular
feeling of "we, the people." That's part of democracy, Dwight.

> , he can do so in his own name (like everyone else does).

;-)

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1482. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 16:46:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030328114636.03943.00002872@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63717

In article <20030326224311.18599.00000364@mb-fx.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 27 Mar 2003 03:43:11 GMT
>
>From N2EY
>>Your statements all sound like you know what the demographics are. But
>>you don't know.
>
>I know what the demographics are.

How do you know?

>I was asking you to state what you believe
>the demographics to be.
>
They're hard to define. I know hams of all shapes, sizes, ages, colors, genders, education, license classes, technical ability, experience, Morse skill, etc. I know hams who are EE university professors and hams who are seventh-graders. And everything in between. Most are really nice folks. Only a few bad apples.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>QST magazine give a fair representation of Ham radio demographics.
>

1483. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 17:26:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030328122653.14527.00001115@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 63718

In article <BAA92F63.14A71%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
>Date: Thu, 27 Mar 2003 22:44:51 -0500
>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> An important thing for loyal Americans to do is
>> to be well informed. Any reasonably attentive
>> student of history will be able to draw the
>> conclusion that appeasement of dictators
>> through diplomacy does not put an end to
>> vicious, totalitarian regimes. They must be
>> confronted with sufficient force to put them
>> out of power, (snip)

That's one point of view.

But consider the fact that the former Soviet Union was not defeated militarily.
And we're now big friends and trading partners with the People's Republic of
China.

The bloodiest war the USA ever fought was from 1861 to 1865. Americans against
other Americans.

> And there are well informed Americans who disagree with the use of force
>to solve problems. Does that make them less loyal?
>
Of course not.

Pro-war or anti-war, nonviolent protests and demonstrations are a good thing,
because they demonstrate that free expression still exists in the USA. The time
to worry is when differences of political opinion cannot be freely expressed.

President Bush isn't afraid of dissenting opinions. Neither should any of us
be.

Saddam Hussein is terrified of dissenting opinion, and brutally suppresses
them.

What does this tell us?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1484. ARNewsline 1337 - March 28 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 17:27:41 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030328122741.16667.00000078@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 63719

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1337 March 28, 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1337 with a release date of Friday, March 28 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

Keeping a repeater on the air in New Zealand could become very expensive and Australia considers complete restructuring of its Amateur Radio service. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1337 coming your way right now

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RADIO REGULATIONS: NEW ZEALAND MAY START REPEATER LICENSE FEES

Ham radio operators could soon be paying a lot of money to keep a repeater on the air in New Zealand. This as government regulators down-under look at instituting a new license fees that could make keeping a system on-the-air prohibitive for many clubs that sponsor multiple machines. Amateur Radio Newsline's Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, is in Auckland New Zealand with the rest of this breaking story:

--
NZART stands for The New Zealand Association of Radio Transmitters and it is the official national ham radio society here in New Zealand. It also functions much the same as the ARRL in the United States and is a member of the International Amateur Radio Union.

NZART has received proposals from government telecommunications regulators that could cost hams in this nation a lot of money just to stay on the air. What the New Zealand regulators want to do is go to lifetime licensing with a one off license payment, That's the good idea. But there is more.

Regulators have also proposed fees for repeater and beacon licenses that are just plain unacceptable to NZART or the New Zealand ham radio community. Right now there is no repeater or beacon license fee. Under the proposed revision, there would a NZ$250 initial fee to put a one on the air and an on-going annual NZ $200 charge per system to keep it on the air. Currently the NZ to US Dollar exchange at just under 2 for 1.

The current no fee for beacons and repeaters was introduced some years ago for good reason. This proposal is a very significant policy change with what NZART says are serious and unacceptable implications. This is because, by definition and by international agreement, the Amateur Service is non-pecuniary and by international agreement cannot be used for money-making. Unlike other services

that can pass on costs to others, in the world of Amateur Radio, there are no "others". As a result, the NZART
intends to oppose this one, all the way.

Reporting from below the Southern Cross in Auckland New Zealand, I’m Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

An example of what Jim was talking about? Since each repeater would pay the $200 license fee, a club with 5 systems -- which is quite common -- would be paying $1000 New Zealand dollars every 12 months. (NZART)

**

RESTRUCTURING: WILL AUSTRALIA CHANGE ALL?

The debate in Australia about the need for a new Entry Level license has now been expanded into a call for the review of the entire amateur licensing system. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, in Brisbane is here with the details:

--

A research report entitled "Amateur radio and the challenge of change" has been co-authored by Jim Linton VK3PC and Roger Harrison VK2ZRH. Here is Jim Linton VK3PC giving a summary report of the Linton-Harrison Paper 2003.

--

(Note: This is an expanded version of what is found in the audio newscast)

VK3PC: “Amateur radio is at the crossroads, it can continue straight ahead down hill and virtually disappear, or set its own path by changing the amateur licensing system.

The time to act is now. When the UK Foundation License was introduced at the beginning of last year, there was not instant support for Australia to take a similar approach. However, some 15 months later there is majority support for a new license in Australia.

What the Linton-Harrison Paper 2003 does is to refocus the debate on the entire licensing system in Australia, the types of licenses, the syllabuses and examinations. We must not be tempted to simply copy the UK Foundation License. It does not meet Australian conditions and needs, and will not provide the necessary sustained growth for amateur radio here.

Australia's new Entry Level License should not be strictly an "operators' license" - a simple permit to use a type-approved transceiver. Entry Level Licensees should be able to enjoy the thrill and satisfaction of operating a radiocommunication system under as many circumstances and conditions and on a wide variety of bands across the RF spectrum as they wish to explore. This should be in keeping with long-standing amateur radio tradition and in line with the ITU definition, which says amateur radio exists for the purpose of self-training, intercommunication and technical investigations.

There will be changes to the licensing system as a direct result of the World Radiocommunications Conference in Geneva later this year where the mandatory Morse code testing requirement is to end.
The amateur radio community and the Wireless Institute of Australia must be ready to take action to revitalize the amateur radio licensing system at the earliest opportunity.

If the right action is not taken, the decline of amateur radio that the Linton-Harrison Paper identifies as being in now its 6th year, will lead to its ultimate demise.

Again, sustainable growth is absolutely essential. It is important to encourage people into the hobby who retain their license and their interest in amateur radio. A hobby that continues to interest, challenge or reward them.

Linton-Harrison advocates a two license system. An Entry Level with a syllabus set at a basic standard, along the lines of the original intention of the Australian Novice license. An Unrestricted License with a syllabus that is revised to comply with the ITU Recommendations for amateur licensing.

The Linton-Harrison Paper describes the current Novice and AOCP syllabuses as being "bloated" and beyond what is expected internationally. The WIA Federal Council agrees.

The current Novice license standard is recognized as being too high. It should not take 40 weeks study to get an amateur license. The Novice license is equivalent to the United States Technician License.

The current AOCP examination is also not relevant to the needs of today, and is at least two decades behind the times. The Linton-Harrison Paper calls for the whole licensing structure, the examination system and syllabuses to undergo a fundamental rethink. In its 8-pages the Paper covers much more than I can in this audio report.

--

Linton and Harrison wrote a similar paper in 1985 that is still being referred to today. (Q-News)

**

RESCUE RADIO: THE PARTNERSHIP FOR PUBLIC WARNINGS DRAFT IS NOW AVAILABLE

Here in the United States as well as around the world, letting the public know that an emergency situation is taking place can save lives. Because of this government agencies as well as the private sector are always trying to find betters methods of issuing alerts.

Now, comes word of a draft document for a new United States national emergency warning strategy from a group called the Partnership For Public Warning. A plan that some say holds the potential to truly modernize the way the public is informed.

For those not aware, the Partnership for Public Warning is a national organization formed in November of 2001. Its Board of Trustee’s include

representatives from every area of public warning communications including at least one radio amateur. The stated goal of the Partnership for Public Warning is to promote and enhance efficient, effective, and integrated dissemination of public warnings and related information so as to save lives, reduce disaster losses and speed recovery.

This document they have released is said to represent the first time anyone has proposed an overall emergency warning strategy for the United States. The concepts outlined help to look ahead to more advanced warning systems than the current E-A-S, weather service products, and other offerings. After reading it, the Partnership for Public Warning invites your participation and comments. You will find it in cyberspace at:
http://www.ppw.us/ppw/docs/nationalstrategy.pdf (GCC, PPW))

**

RESCUE RADIO: S.DAKOTA EMERGENCY COMMS LOOSE TOWER

The town of Mitchell South Dakota has last its 180 foot communications tower used for public safety and public radio. According to Jeff Pierce of the South Dakota Bureau of Information and Telecommunications, the tower fell Tuesday, March 18th after a ground anchor rotted and gave way.

Pierce said it knocked out State Radio communications used by law enforcement and other agencies, though nearby towers picked up that radio traffic. South Dakota Public Radio in the area was off the air until a portable tower was put up the next day but reception of weather alerts will not be possible until the fallen tower is replaced. Also, Mitchell police have not been able to use handheld radios and instead must rely on radios in their cars. A replacement tower should be installed and operational the week of April 1st. (CGC)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Montgomery Amateur Radio Club serving Rockville Maryland.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: NJ HAMS RESPOND FOLLOWING PROPANE BLAST

New Jersey radio amateurs were called up following a large propane explosion in the city of Newton the weekend of March 8th. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Ken Locke, N8PJN, has the rest of the story:

--

It was Robert Stepanek, N2TTT who put out the call for more assistance. Stepanek is the ARES District Emergency Coordinator of Susan County who requested assistance in the form of additional operators after a propane tank exploded in the town on Newton New Jersey on March 14th. Hams from several

other New Jersey counties responded.

Amateur radios' primary role was to provide back-up relief shelter communications. Many of the evacuated residents were sheltered by the Susan County Chapter of the American Red Cross.

Pat Day is the Executive Director of that Red Cross chapter. According to Day, about 1000 residents who were forced out of their homes. Those who did not have other places to stay went to nearby shelters operated by the relief agency where some stayed until March 16th. Hams from Somerset, Union, Morris and Hudson
counties volunteered during the emergency.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Ken Locke, N8PJN, reporting

--

Rich Krajewski, WB2CRD is the Public Information Coordinator for the ARRL's Northern New Jersey Section and provided most of the information for this story. (WB2CRD)

**

RESCUE RADIO: KILLER TORNADO HITS GEORGIA

Amateur Radio operators in southwestern Georgia have been helping in the wake of tornadoes that hit the region on March 20th. The storms left six people dead and over 200 injured. Georgia's Governor has declared a state of emergency in two of the hardest hit areas.

According to an ARRL Bulletin, ARES was activated in Mitchell, Worth, Lee and Dougherty counties. There, hams have been assisting various relief agencies including the American Red Cross, the Salvation Army and Georgia Baptist Disaster Relief.

ARES members of the Albany Amateur Radio Club also responded. Most of them are Red Cross volunteers. They took emergency response vehicles to the affected areas to feed victims and provide communications.

The ARRL Lee County Georgia Emergency Coordinator is Bob Smith, K4PHE. He says that several ARES members have been volunteering continuously since the tornadoes hit. (ARRL)

**

ENFORCEMENT: NY HAM WARNED ABOUT INTERFERENCE

A Patchogue New York ham has been told that he could face a fine of up to $7500 if he continues to violate the Amateur Service Rules. The FCC's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, tells us who and why:

--

Duckworth: "Anthony Satornino, N2QPY, was issued a Warning Notice concerning deliberate interference with other licensees' on the 2 meter Amateur band and

engaging in unlicensed operation in the 10 meter band.”

--

Satornino was also asked to clarify his actual address for FCC records and to do so within 20 days. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: THE FCC VS. K1MAN - AGAIN

The FCC has again written to Maine radio amateur Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, regarding he operates his Amateur Radio station. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Paul Courson, WA3VJB, is in Washington with the details:

--

In its latest letter to Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, the Commission says he has not corrected problems that prompted their letter in January, which was based on monitored information and numerous
complaints to the FCC.

The FCC claims that Baxter’s Amateur Radio station is apparently being used for broadcasting non-ham radio matter including programs, talk shows, and children’s shows. The agency also alleges transmissions from his station are being used for deliberate interference and for communications where Baxter apparently's trying to make money.

The FCC also notes that some of the transmissions start and stop erratically, and leave the air with no identification as required by Commission rules. An enforcement official who wrote the letter said such operation indicates the transmissions are not under the control of a licensed operator.

The FCC goes on to say that the transmissions from Baxter’s station are tape recordings, which themselves wouldn't be illegal, but that in some cases it sounds to the FCC as if the recordings may have been questionably taken from an answering machine and off the telephone and broadcast without full compliance with the law. Enforcement authorities also wrote some of the transmissions are repetitive, apparently for weeks, of the same telephone calls.

Baxter has raised controversy for years with what he portrays as a daily bulletin service on 14.272, 3.972 and 3.890 MHz, prompting interference complaints from sideband and AM communities alike.

Baxter has patterned his program to the style of commercial talk radio, right down to having a toll free telephone number for listeners to call in and chat. The FCC wants Baxter to respond to its latest letter to decide what if anything to do next.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Paul Courson, WA3VJB, near FCC headquarters in Washington.

--

This latest letter to Baxter came from Vincent F. Kajunski who is the FCC’s District Director in Boston Massachusetts. Kajunski also directed K1MAN to submit weekly reports detailing certain aspects of his stations on air operations. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: ALASKA BROADCASTER FACES FINES $137,000

A Christian broadcaster is facing up to $137,500 in fines for alleged wetlands damage on Alaska’s Kenai Peninsula. Fred Vobbe, W8HDU, of the National Radio Club’s D-X Audio Service has more:

--

The Anchorage Daily News reported on March 13th that Alexander Kozned of Ninilchik poured gravel and other fill into about three and a half acres of protected wetlands, as well as a stream and intertidal zone that drains into Cook Inlet.

The charges against Kozned come in a complaint filed this month by attorneys for the United States Environmental Protection Agency. The alleged violations are reported to have taken place during the summer of 2002 on Kozned's property a few miles north of Ninilchik. That’s a location where he reportedly wants to install a broadcast antenna array to broadcast religious programming to Russia and China.

An attorney for Kozned said the area affected is less than a tenth of an acre and that volunteers, not knowing about the wetlands, made an honest mistake. He also claims that the EPA's reaction amounts to overkill.

But officials at the federal agency said Kozned knew of the wetlands and filled them without a permit, despite a 1998 warning. The E-P-A and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers issued cease-and-desist orders at that time after discovering that Kozned used earth-moving and road building equipment on wetlands to build antenna pads. The E-P-A ordered Kozned to restore and revegetate the wetlands he harmed. Kozned complied and was not fined in that case.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Fred Vobbe, W8HDU.

--

The charge marks his second run-in with federal environmental regulators. (Anchorage Daily News)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: A NEW KIND OF POP UP SPAM

As if junk e-mail and pop-up ads weren't annoying enough on their own, now there's pop-up junk e-mail. This, as the result of a developer of bulk-mail software has figuring out how to blast
computers with pop-up spam over the Internet through a messaging function on many Windows operating systems. Amateur Radio Newslie’s Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, is here with more on how it works:

--
The software is called DirectAdvertiser. The company that developed it is reportedly based in Romania. In recent weeks, Internet users have reported receiving pop-up messages such as one touting university degrees without classes or books.

DirectAdvertiser does not hack into computers. Rather, it
uses a part of the Windows operating system called Messenger. It comes turned on by default with many Windows systems including 2000 and XP. Its meant for system administrators to broadcast service notices and should not to be confused with the various other instant messaging programs.

DirectAdvertiser was first reported by Wired.com, and appears to represent the latest attempt to bypass the increasingly sophisticated e-mail spam filters employed by leading Internet service providers and individual users. It also appears to circumvent federal and state laws designed to curb junk e-mail.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reporting

--

There is one major fault to DirectAdvertiser that makes it easy to beat. To receive the pop-ups Windows Messanger must be turned on. If you don’t want to get them -- just turn Messanger off. (OnLine Technology)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: AMSAT SPACE SYMPOSIUM SEEKS PAPERS

The 2003 AMSAT-NA Annual Symposium, scheduled for October 17 to the 19th in Toronto Canada has put out its first call for papers to be presented at the event. The subject matter should be of general interest to amateur radio operators involved in satellite communications.

Papers may be presented by the author during the Symposium or simply offered for inclusion in the Symposium Proceedings publication. A brief abstract of the proposed paper should be submitted as soon as possible. The final date for abstracts is June 15th with copy ready papers must be received no later than August 15th. Electronic submittal is preferred in Microsoft Word format. E-mail electronic submittals to Wayne Chandler at ve3whc@amsat.org (AMSAT)

**

INTERNATIONAL - AFGHANISTAN: NEW KANDAHAR RADIO STATION TO BE LAUNCHED

On the international scene, the Boston-based N-G-O Afghans for Civil Society has announced that former BBC producer Akhtar Kohestani will serve as station manager for Afghan Independent Radio or A-I-R. This is a new station which is to be launched this spring.

A-I-R will be the first independent radio station to be based in the former Taliban stronghold of Kandahar in southern Afghanistan. Plans are under development for program sharing with the BBC, Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, the Voice of America and Radio Afghanistan. (Stewart McKenzie)

**

INTERNATIONAL - POLAND: NEW BANDS FOR SP HAMS

Also, SP5HS reports that Poland’s new national frequency allocation table came into effect on February 27th and its pretty good news for that nations hams. The new rules allows S P amateurs to use the 136 kHz band, while the 50 MHz band is now allocated to amateurs in Poland on a secondary basis. 6 meters is still shared with government services. (GB2RS)

**

BEACONS: 2 METER K7XC/B ON THE AIR FROM NEVADA

A new 2 meter propagation beacon is on the air from the state of Nevada. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Don Wilbanks, AD5DW, tells us who put it on and where to find it:

--

Tim Mareck, K7XC reports that the 2 Meter beacon operating under is call sign is now installed at it's new mountain top home here in grid square DM-09. Tim says that its on 144.288 MHz and operating from 4900 feet atop Lahotan Peak. This is above the Lahotan Reservoir near Silver Springs Nevada. Currently, the beacon consists of a 10 watt C-W transmitter into a single K-Q Loop at the 30' level on the tower. If you hear it, you can be pretty sure that 2 meters is open to Nevada from where ever you are.

Tike adds that the next project is a 6 meter beacon from the same site. It will use a Yaesu FT-620B running at 10 watts into a old style KB6KQ loop. This antenna will be placed 2' above the 2 meter loop on the same mast. Tim's target date to complete this phase of the project? He says hopefully sometime in June.

--

Again, the frequency of the K7XC beacon is 144.288 MHz. If you hear it you can send Q-S-N reports to Tim by e-mail at timm@cccomm.net (VHF Reflector)

**

DX

In D-X, six German operators will be active as A-35-X-M from Tonga to the 4th of April. They will concentrate on working Europe. More information is at www.df3cb.com/a35xm (OPDX)

And Tim Totten, N4GN, reports that all Oh-J-one thru Oh-J-8 QSL cards for W-R-T-C 2002 have been printed and ready for release. If you want to obtain your QSL cards directly, send an S-A-S-E before April 15th to Toni Linden, OH2JTE, Ohratie 16E218, 01370 Vantaa, Finland. Tim also says that plaque and T-shirt and Early Bird submission winners can be viewed at the following site. Its out there in cyberspace -- at www.n4gn.com/wrtc. (N4GN)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: YHOTY 2003 NOMINATIONS SOUGHT

And finally this week, the nominating season for the 2003 Young Ham of the Year Award is now open. Our producer, Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, is here with the details:

--

Each year, we at the Amateur Radio Newsline join forces with Vertex-Standard and C-Q Magazine to honor the accomplishments of a young radio amateur who has contributed in some special way to the hobby or to society through the hobby.

The rules are still the same. A nominee must be age 18 or younger, hold any class of Amateur Radio license issued by the FCC and live in the contiguous 48 states. And this year, thanks to Kevin Boudreaux, N5XMH, its easier than ever to file a nomination.

Kevin was the 1993 Young Ham of the Year award winner. He has now created a new on-line home for the award that has all the information, rules and downloadable forms needed to submit a nomination. And Kevin has taken it a step further. He has also created our first-ever fill in the blank on-line nomination form. Just provide the information on-line, click at the bottom of the page and your nomination is on its way to us.

After you finish filing your nomination, please click on some of the other pages and take a look around. You will find it in cyberspace at www.yhoty.org/2003.htm . There is also a link to it from our website at www.arnewsline.org . Printed forms are available for an SASE to the Young Ham of the Year Award, 28197 Robin Avenue, Santa Clarita California 91350.

--

Our thanks to Kevin Boudreaux, N5XMH, of Dynamic Marketing for taking the time to create this new website. He is one Young Ham of the Year who is still an important part of the award. (ARNewsline™)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at

Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Norm Seeley, KI7UP, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

1485. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 17:29:48 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303280929.24cac87e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63720

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E83C83A.AC593364@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E836CC4.B5EBE8DD@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > I answered Brian's question.
> >
> > You don't know the answer.
>
> I provide not only one answer. I provided a number of answers. Any of
> them would be a suitable reply to your question.

State the minimum speed and accuracy level at which one can be
considered Morse Proficient.

> > You merely type words.
>
> That seems to have been what makes up your response.
>
> Dave K8MN

Back it up with anything from the FCC. Anything at all.

1486. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 17:38:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303280938.69bfa482@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63721

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E83C7B4.1CF1AC3C@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > Then state at what minimum word per minute rate and accuracy level, a
> > user of Morse Code can be considered proficient, and why.
>
> I've provided you with a definition of what it means to be proficient.
> I'll leave it for you to explain why it would be that when many are
> capable of 20, 25, 30, 35 and 40 wpm copy, anyone would consider an
> excruciatingly slow 5 wpm as proficient.

If the criterion is slowness, then you have a problem. Some consider
20wpm slow. Is 20wpm not proficient?

FISTS says accuracy transcends speed.

You said 20wpm was "more proficient" then 13wpm. But did not say
13wpm was proficient. You have not stated the lowest wpm rate at
which "proficiency" is achieved.

> > Back it up
> > with references to any FCC regulation or any US regulation prior to
> > the formation of the FCC.
>
> Did you believe that morse proficiency was codified by the U.S.
> government?

Not at this time.

The US government doesn't even have a definition of Morse Code in the
very regulations that use that term.

But if you can drag out a 1912 Dept of Navy or some other such agency,
then I'll accept it.

> > Best of luck (because I don't plan on hearing from you on this matter
> > again).
>
> The best laid plans...

are often modified. You have not stated the lowest wpm rate at which
"proficiency" is achieved.

> > Sayonara.
>
> boa noite.
>
> Dave K8MN

And your answer is???

1487. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 17:42:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303280942.68a43f64@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63722

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E83C87E.3D06A962@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E836D20.52616BE9@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > I'm thankful that I have no idea of whether or not you smell bad.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Hardly relevant on rrap.
>
> Then you'll want to address your comment to Leonard H. Anderson. He
> brought it up.

Het Len, hardly relevant on rrap.

> > Nor do you know what Morse Proficient is, or at least you cannot put it in words.
>
> I have put it into words. There is no answer which will satisfy you.
>
> Dave K8MN

No you haven't. You said that 'this speed is more proficient then that
speed.'

If 20wpm is "more proficient" than 13wpm, are you saying that 20wpm is
the lowest speed considered proficient?

1488. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 17:44:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303280944.152a8644@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63723

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030327221722.01698.00000008@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/27/2003 5:33 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303270333.324ba6c0@posting.google.com>

> >You changed the subject
>
> If you insist.
>
> Steve

I didn't insist that you change the subject. You did that on your
own. It's part of your little problem.

1489. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 17:47:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303280947.1272945d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63724

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030327225554.01698.00000013@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/27/2003 8:58 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303271858.7e6b73d2@posting.google.com>
>
> >Nor do you know what Morse Proficient is, or at least you cannot put it in
> >words.
>
> I can. "To be able to competently send by hand and receive by ear Amateur
> Radio signals using Morse Code without the use of interpretive encoding or
> decoding devices".
>
> I am Morse Proficient. I can "rag chew", pass traffic or operate in
> contests comfortably to 25 WPM, and in contests up to 40WPM...WITHOUT the use
> of a keyboard or any electronic or mechanical encoding or decoding device.
>
> Can YOU, Brain?
>
> Steve

Steve, first, can you spell my name correctly? Or must you obsess
over it and try to make my name an insult?

1490. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 17:57:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303280957.57d6cae9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63725

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030327151823.04776.00001240@mb-ct.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0303270918.1f9f604f@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >So I'll ask the hard question: What changes are Americans willing to
> >make in their lives to reduce/eliminate dependence on imported oil?
>
> Give up their SUVs and drive manual-transmission old autos.
>
> Adopting manual transmissions in vehicles is supposed to be
> the same as using morse code for fast, effective
> communications, right? :-)

Had Clinton renewed the EPA's Fleet MPG requirements...

Ah, yes, the "environmental" president.

1491. Re: XM-Radio compatible with 2M/450?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 20:03:13 UTC
From: k6lcs@clintbradford.com
Message-ID: <fc08b778.0303281203.6f4f8ec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63728
Cross-posted to: rec.outdoors.rv-travel,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.trucks.chevy

> I have a 5/25W 144Mhz ICOM transciever in our motorhome along with a Pioneer
> XM radio. When I key the mic the digital radio gets confused and stops
> playing Waiting a while or a power off/on cycle brings the XM radio back to
> life.

Hmmm...In my 2002 Ford Ranger, I am using a 2M/440 Larsen through-the-glass antenna on the rear window left side, and a 220mHz Larsen through-the-glass antenna on the right side of the rear window. The mag-mount Delphi satellite antenna cabling was routed through the third brake light hole above and to the middle - inbetween these two antennas.

Keying up to 45W on either 2M, 220, or 440 has no detrimental affect on the Delphi's reception.

Clint Bradford, K6LCS / KAF3359

1492. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 23:22:47 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <29034E0099872C24.C7299363D0D39CA4.0E9E98E25B286191@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 63733

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030327224014.19751.00004341@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article
<AFD0EE56BE6B4F8C.CC3FDF9A8774DCC9.EDB8B5345B2D887F@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >However, my original statement/response stands. It is for the reason of
> >intolerance from some of our own US citizens that we often lose sight of
the
> >fact that we are, as US citizens, allowed a diverse set of opinion and we
> >also have the right to express them--without fear.
>
> Kim:
>
> You have my complete assurance that any of my fellow Americans who freely
> express their opinions have nothing to fear from me. All they have to
fear is
> what I'll say about them if what they're saying is a bunch of foolishly
> unpatriotic
> liberal malarkey.
>
> >I refer back to your paragraph, above, Larry, and won't even engage you
on
> >the rest of your post, below. Do you really think you are not passing
> >judgement on someone's beliefs when you insinuate that dissent=support or
> >agreement with something others may disagree with? If so, do you
really
> >think you are being tolerant?
>
> Of course I'm passing judgment -- and as an intelligent, educated, and
> informed American, this is a judgment I'm qualified to make! Making
> judgments is a normal part of the human intellectual process, and one
thing
> I cannot understand about liberals is your stated aversion to being
> "judgmental" when you, in fact, make some of the most severe judgments
> about other people that have ever been entered into mankind's historical
> record.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry, if you sit very carefully on a nice, soft chair then squeeze the
cheeks of your ass just right and push real hard, you'll probably be
successful in releasing some of that hot air.

Kim W5TIT

1493. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 23:26:30 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <5554E5FDE074FA2E.B2670047AB436D52.476BC977E8906C5D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 63734

I think it was also Larry that stated that no peace has ever been achieved
without war. He needs to learn of the success of India's entrance into a
free nation....

Kim W5TIT

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030328122653.14527.00001115@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <BAA92F63.14A71%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewart@say.net>
> writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
> >From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
> >Date: Thu, 27 Mar 2003 22:44:51 -0500
> >
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >>
> >> An important thing for loyal Americans to do is
> >> to be well informed. Any reasonably attentive
> >> student of history will be able to draw the
> >> conclusion that appeasement of dictators
> >> through diplomacy does not put an end to
> >> vicious, totalitarian regimes. They must be
> >> confronted with sufficient force to put them
> >> out of power, (snip)
>
> That's one point of view.
>
> But consider the fact that the former Soviet Union was not defeated
militarily.
> And we're now big friends and trading partners with the People's Republic
of
> China.
>
> The bloodiest war the USA ever fought was from 1861 to 1865. Americans
against
> other Americans.
>
> > And there are well informed Americans who disagree with the use of
force
> >to solve problems. Does that make them less loyal?
> >
> Of course not.
>

> Pro-war or anti-war, nonviolent protests and demonstrations are a good
thing,
> because they demonstrate that free expression still exists in the USA. The
time
> to worry is when differences of political opinion cannot be freely
expressed.
>
> President Bush isn't afraid of dissenting opinions. Neither should any of
us
> be.
>
> Saddam Hussein is terrified of dissenting opinion, and brutally suppresses
> them.
>
> What does this tell us?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

1494. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 23:27:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030328182706.25403.00001282@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 63729

In article <b5s7vj$9uq$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>The one thing I've noticed with any person that actively engages
>in a hobby that the public doesn't consider "mainstream" is that
>the person is viewed as "weird" or different, etc. Unless you are
>a golfer or tennis player, the rest of the world thinks those
>of us interested in ham radio, model airplanes, antique cars,
>(the list goes on), are viewed as weird.

WELL SAID, Bill!

In fact, even "mainstream" activities are weird to some. For example, shirtless (male) football fans with their bodies painted in "their" team's colors - in subfreezing weather.

--

btw, ARRL now has a line of clothing with the ARRL logo and optional callsign and name embroidery. Gotta get me some, particularly a hat - hamfest season is coming up fast!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1495. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-28 23:43:36 UTC
From: lumushahs@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030328184336.04559.00000059@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 63730

At events people say I eat a lot. I disagree, but more than once someone has said this to me. In college my meal plan ran out because at lunch I may have ate too much. Actually, I ate a normal amount of food - they overcharged for food, so the meal card ran out. At relative's wedding or other family events that have food out and the possibility of eating throughout the day, I make many trips to the food table. I am snacking while writing this.

At a buffet in Las Vegas, I filled my plate. At a Hamfest where they had a buffet, I ate enough. At Thanksgiving, I was very thankful. Also, I have made many trips to <more than one> Chinese food buffet.

I met with one of the people that I went to Vegas trip with at another event. Not seeing what I had ate, he asked if I ate enough food. For some reason, he assumed I ate a lot. I was surprised and did not expect him to ask me that.

I am also a "food snob". I like fine dishes. I appreciate Quiche. Also, one of my hobbies is cooking.

If the food place chosen by the radio club is not good, I complain. The after club meeting dinner place was a restaurant. Most Hams got pizza. I ordered off the menu. The restaurant had lousy tasting food. I couldn't believe how bad the food at this restaurant was. Even the pizza tasted lousy. Nobody complained, although I said the food stinks. I guess the club members were happy the restaurant had enough seating, they did not complain the food was bad. Often Hams will settle for lower quality food.

Not surprisingly, the restaurant went out of business, and the radio club had to choose another place. By chance, the new food place was better. The pizza, which was now delivered to the club, was good.

Last year, before Field Day, the club met at another restaurant. It was better than the monthly club meeting restaurant, but nothing special. This year, at club meeting they asked if someone would handle the arrangements for the dinner place before Field Day. I volunteered. This way, I know the food place will be good. Who says I did not help out for Field Day?

At work, one outside sub shop place had a double-sized large sub (imagine 2 large subs). They delivered to my job. Most people ate half of it and saved the other half. I saw one of these. Next day, I bet my manager I could eat a whole <double-sized large> sub. I chose the Italian sub. The sub came, and it was fully stuffed, and double-sized large sub. I ate the entire sub.

In summer, on the way home, I often made a stop at Dunkin Donuts for a Coffee Coolatta. The reason was because it was so hot, I needed something cool to drink. Once a week, with a coworker (also a Ham), I visited Starbucks and had a "tall" size (their smallest size) coffee. Cream and sugar please. With the coffee, I often had cookies or some other sweet.

I often would stop at a fast food place and eat a "meal" in the car. Then, I would eat another meal at home. If I eliminated the 1st dinner meals and pricey coffee of those years I would have much money left. I could use it to buy another rig!

1496. Bad Ham Examples (was Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 00:01:54 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <v89ojkqv1ff9d6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 63731

"Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b626sh$125rv$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...

<SNIP>

> > I just had a horrible thought: I hope none of the Dixie Chicks are
> licensed
> > Amateur Radio operators!
> >
>
> Don't know if you have issues with women, but I can think of a much better
> "bad example....." How about Eminem?
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...

David Letterman (type) top ten list for today
Bad examples if they were Ham Radio Operators

10. Sodam Hussan
9. Osama Bin Laden
8. Leonard H. Anderson
7. Jane Fonda
6. Bozo the Clown
5. Jerry Springer
4. Al Sharpton
3. Bill Clinton
2. Jessie Jackson
.
.
.
.
.
.
and the number one answer to who would be
a bad example if they were a Ham Radio Operator
.
.
.
.

.
.
.
.
1. Michael Jackson

--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/
kb9tmp "at" juno.com

1497. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 00:32:54 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030328193254.25912.00000045@mb-ff.aol.com>
Source record: 63732

From K4YZ:
>The heavy emphasis on Morse code is
>>embarrassing.
>
> To whom?

To me. If I were to mention I belonged to a Ham radio club and the person asked me if they still used Morse code.

Its also bad for the hobby. It scares away the technical people, who might have benefitted the hobby. It looks bad for the hobby when the only "real" skill is Morse code.

>The Radio Police dragged themout in the street in the middle of the
>night and tortured them until they signed statements professing thier undying
>loyalty to Morse Code.

No, but from talking to club members, at least two (one is club Prez!) said they were resistant to learning Morse code, but claim to like it now. I guess social pressure works.

>Vipul, you recommend trashing the technical written tests and then say MY
>comments about that suggestion then failing to meet Part 97 is
>"illogical"...?!?!

It seems you don't understand my proposal. I did not reccommend trashing the technical written test.

I said keep written tests, but put Morse code out of pathway of written tests. No need to pass Morse code test to get General license or Extra license.

But, no HF for passing only written tests. If one passes code test (provided they pass tech written test) they can get on HF.

This compromise should satisfy Morse code lovers and no coders.

Do you understand this or do I have to draw a flowchart?

1498. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 00:52:19 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b62qss$3no$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63735

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030326204340.23598.00001091@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <b5s7k4$tm2$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >From: "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com>
> >Date: Wed, 26 Mar 2003 07:46:37 -0500
> >
> >
> >"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030325234011.10838.00000436@mb-cr.aol.com...
> >> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >>
> >> >But if someone or some group did want a non-technical ham license,
> >> <snip>
> >>
> >> You mean like the Technician license? Thats a non-technical license.
(No
> >> knowledge of material required to pass the test).
> >>
> >> > the same arguments against almost all of the written tests that have
> >been
> >> >used against the code tests.
> >>
> >> Morse code is irrelavant. The written material is not. There, that's
not
> >the
> >> same argument.
> >>
> >> If you don't understand a safety reg, a rig blows up.
> >
> >It can be far worse than just a smoking rig.
> >It can be death of the individual (wiring error leading to
electrocution),
>
> Sure. But the same thing can happen, and does, when homeowners do their
own
> electrical wiring or appliance repair. No test for doing that kind of work
to
> your own property.

In NY City you can NOT do your own electrical wiring.
In any location, any electrical work is (theoretically) subject

to inspection...although much home done work is never
inspected.

> >It can be a transmitted signal into public space that exceeds
> >permitted levels.
> >
> True - but all that's required to prevent that is a lower power limit and
a few
> RF exposure questions on the test.

RF exposure questions are technical questions.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1499. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 01:03:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b62rim$5jk$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63736

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030326204342.23598.00001092@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <b5s7dn$c8j$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >From: "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com>
> >Date: Wed, 26 Mar 2003 07:43:14 -0500
> >
> >
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030325222632.25154.00000954@mb-cb.aol.com...
> >> In article <b5oad6thd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20030322233747.29016.00000934@mb-fy.aol.com...
> >> >> In article <20030321210132.07005.00000197@mb-bk.aol.com>,
> >vshah101@aol.com
> >> >> (Vshah101) writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >From: "Bill Sohl"
> >> >> >>I belive it is only a personal choice. In today's world,
> >> >> >>the NEED for manual knowledge is strictly personal. Has anyone
> >> >> >>heard or read about anyone being in danger or worse because
> >> >> >>no one was available to drive a manual gearbox vehicle?
> >> >> >
> >> >> >You can understand the analogy.
> >> >>
> >> >> Actually, I got the analogy from Bill.
> >> >
> >> >And the anology is the fact that no test is required to be able
> >> >to learn, use and drive a manual gearbox vehicle.
> >>
> >> That's one interpretation, yes. Of course manual transmissions are not
> >> as common in passenger cars as Morse code is on the ham bands.
> >>
> >> The whole reason I brought it up was to provide a better analogy than
> >> the "ride a horse" analogy that was being discussed.
> >>
> >> >How come N2EY cannot understand the analogy
> >> >HE gave? He proposed this analogy.
> >>
> >> I understand it perfectly.

> >> >> >
> >> >> >Now he doesn't agree with the conclusion:
> >> >>
> >> >> I don't agree with YOUR conclusion.
> >> >>
> >> >> >There is no NEED for Morse code testing.
> >> >>
> >> >> I think there is.
> >> >
> >> >Then the anology as I put it forth is NOT consistent
> >> >with morse. Are you suggesting the anlogy as you propose
> >> >(i.e. N2EY) would be to require manual gearbox testing?
> >>
> >> If manual transmissions were as common in American cars as
> >> Morse transmissions are in the ham bands.....
> >
> >But even when that was the case, the states (many of them anyway)
> >did NOT require testing on a manual gearbox in order to be allowed to
> >drive a car with a manual trans.
>
> But at least some states DID require such a test.
> >
> >> >> The percentage of amateur radio HF communications using Morse
> >> >> is much higher
> >> >> than the percentage of cars with manual transmissions.
> >> >
> >> >The percent of manual gearboxes was once high and even then
> >> >many states did NOT require a manual gearbox certification.
> >> >EG: NY as far back as 1958.
> >>
> >> Sure. Other states were different.
> >
> >A handful at best.
> >
> It would be interesting to know how big that handful was, back in the days
when
> manual trans in cars were as common as Morse signals on amateur HF/MF.
>
> >> Today that's all gone - but manual transmissions survive.
> >
> >And such will be the case for Morse. There will be a group
> >of folks that use morse, advocate its use, and recruit new hams
> >to the use of morse....without any need for a test requirement.
>
> Exactly!
> >
> >> >> A manual transmission car does not use up less road than its
automatic
> >> >> transmission equivalent. A manual transmission car use slightly less
> >> >>fuel

> >> >> and
> >> >> pollutes slightly less than its automatic transmission equivalent. A
> >> >>Morse
> >> >> signal uses up much less spectrum than any analog voice signal.
> >> >>
> >> >> Does any of that mean Morse MUST be tested? Nope. Does that mean >>
>>
> Morse
> >> >> MUST NOT be tested? Nope. It all boils down to opinions, nothing
more.
> >> >
> >> >We all have them...opinions.
> >> >
> >> 'zactly. And the choice of what should and should not be a test
> >> requirement
> >> ultimately comes down to the FCC's opinion.
> >
> >Agreed. And the writing is on the wall in that court of opinion.
> >
> In fact, it's only because of the writing of S25.5 that we have Element 1.
>
> >> >> >It may be good to learn to communicate
> >> >> >to others that use Morse code, but it is NOT essential.
> >> >> >
> >> >> Nor is it essential to know anyhting about how a radio works in
order
> >> >> to
> >> >> use one.
> >> >
> >> >Are you proposing a non-technical license?
> >> >
> >> Heck no!
> >
> >Good.
> >
> Of course the definition of "technical" is largely a matter of opinion. An
EE's
> opinion of a "technical license test" may be quite different from, say, an
> accountant's.
>
> >> But if someone or some group did want a non-technical ham license, they
> >>could
> >> use the same arguments against almost all of the written tests that
have
> >> been
> >> used against the code tests.
> >> And how would we counter those arguments?
> >
> >The counter argument is clear. ALL hams are responsible for their
> >signal transmissions meeting FCC requirements.

>
> Sure. So are all users of radio transmitters.
>
> (Devil's Advocate Mode = ON)
>
> But there's no test for, say, a cell phone, or an FRS or GMRS radio. Or a
CB.

And the user of that equipment is never cited for
any signal problems (unless it can be shown that
the user illegally modified the CB, etc.)

Each of these specified services does NOT allow any modified
equipment to be used. All equipment is FCC spec'd.

> Does anyone really think that the current writtens test for all the info a
ham
> needs to insure that his/her transmitters meet all FCC requirements?

Probably not, but it does create the underlying responsibility
and avoids ay opportunity to say the FCC doesn't
create the setting that makes hams responsible for their
transmissiions.

> >To allow a non-technical
> >ham license the FCC would have to change/add many rules. For
> >example:
> >
> >1. A non-technical license would require operation with
> >commercial equipment only.
>
> What % of US hams today homebrew their rigs?

What difference does it make?

> What % of US hams today use rigs that require tuneup/adjustment to insure
> purity/quality of transmitted signal?

Repeat above

> I'd venture to say that the percentage of hams using Morse is much higher
than
> the percentage of hams doing either of the above.

Probably so.

> >2. Such commercially spec'd ham equipment would have
> >to have a heavy emphasis on such equipment not being modifiable.
>
> Why?

To minimize the opportunity to easily modify.

> >3. Someone setting up a station uder such a license would
> >require some type of "certification" by a technical license
> >holder as to their station being compliant with signal power
> >strength limits for themselves and for public space adjacent to
> >their property.
>
> Not really. If the power level of the non-technical license were kept low
> enough (say, 100 W on HF/MF and 25 W on VHF/UHF), and if there were a few
RF
> safety questions on the test, all would be fine.
>
> There's no test for a microwave oven.

Your point?

> >> Look at the UK's "Foundation" license, for an example of what
> >> could happen.
> >
> >Isn't that more like a "learner's permit" type of license which requires
> >a full license holder to be providing oversight and guidance?
>
> Nope. Basically it's a reduced-requirement license. Foundation hams take a
> "Morse assessment" test and a very simplified written. Foundation hams
must
> also attend an approved course. (The Brits are very big on having new hams
take
> formal courses in ham radio rather than do all self-study).
>
> They are allowed low power (100 W on HF, as I recall) and must use
"approved"
> rigs. The list of approved rigs is extensive, and includes kits as complex
as
> the Elecraft K2.

Interesting.

> The fact of the matter is that right now FCC allows Technician class hams
of
> any age, experience, or education to design/build/repair/modify/adjust and
> operate rigs of up to 1500 W output on all amateur bands and modes above
30
> MHz. Except for rules and propagation specific to HF/MF, why must Generals
and
> Extras learn more theory and take more written tests to get HF privs?

I've commented before on that disparity.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1500. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 01:35:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030328203547.25403.00001306@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 63737

In article <b626sj$125rv$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Okay... I'll bite on this one..... What about the millions of gallons
>flowing through our Alaska pipeline that is sold to other countries other
>than us?? (sold to Germany, France, Japan etc.)

The figures quoted on imported oil are net imports, which is calculated by subtracting exports from total imports. So if all oil produced in the USA were used here, we'd still need to import about half of our total use.

>What about the thousands of
>oil well rigs across the country pumping out oil etc. on a daily basis?

Not enough to meet the demand. Look at the webpage Dennis Ferguson pointed out - gives production figures by state and total consumption figures.

Think of all the things oil is used for - gasoline for autos and light trucks, diesel for trucks, heavy machinery, ships and railroad locomotives, jet fuel, aviation gasoline, kerosene, home heating oil, bunker oil, lube oils, paints and thinner, plastics, blacktop/asphalt, etc., etc.

>Oh... and this one I love, most of what is coming out of these wells as a
>by-product or waste product is being (at least here in Michigan) upped
>thirty percent when it is something that the basically get for free!

I'm not sure what you mean by "byproduct" or "waste product". Natural gas is in great demand.

> Hmmm
>propane and gas for heating is going up that much around here....

Supply and demand.

And it costs big money to drill the wells, extract the usable product, refine it and ship it to where it's needed. Some wells never produce enough to even pay for their drilling cost, so other wells must make up the loss.
>
>There's enough oil underneath us to last longer than even our grandkids
>would need to worry about....

How do you know?

One of the problems with domestic oil production is that much of the "easy" oil is gone, and what remains is difficult to extract and not easy to refine. Often the price of foreign oil (including shipping) is less than the cost of domestically produced oil.

How much more are you willing to pay for a gallon of gas, diesel or heating oil in order to buy 100% American?

>but our big oil corporations are working WITH
>OPEC in my own opinion, not against them.... Can't prove that but I bet I am
>not too far from the mark on that one...
>
Actually it's a complicated game of supply, demand, transportation cost, refining cost, product quality, etc. Add to this the fact that in some foreign countries the total extraction cost is as little as $5/barrel, so they can underprice almost anyone and still make huge profits. Back in 1990, when Iraqi and Kuwaiti production basically disappeared, the Saudis and others made up the loss AND kept the world price down.

I don't know what you're paying for gasoline in Michigan, but here in EPA a gallon of regular is under $1.70. Twenty years ago, the price was about $1.40. Petrol-based fuels are so cheap and plentiful in the USA that most people simply don't see the need to reduce their usage.

Here's just one example: For more than 25 years, VW and others have made practical diesel cars that get much better mileage than their gasoline counterparts. But unless you drive a lot of miles, the cost difference is hardly worth it. If a diesel car gets 40 mpg and the equivalent gas car gets 25 mpg, and the diesel car costs $1000 more to buy, and the price of gas and diesel are identical at $1.70/gallon, it will take more than 39,000 miles just to break even.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1501. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 03:26:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030328222652.29016.00001095@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 63738

In article <5554E5FDE074FA2E.B2670047AB436D52.476BC977E8906C5D@lp.airnews.net>, <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>I think it was also Larry that stated that no peace has ever been achieved >without war. He needs to learn of the success of India's entrance into a >free nation....

Not the best example, Kim.

It's true that India got its independence from the British Empire without a war. Ghandi & Co. used nonviolence to make the Brits realize that keeping India would require more repression than the Brits (being basically decent folks) could stand. Also, after almost six years of world war to preserve freedom, the British were not going to force countries to remain British subjects if they wanted independence.

But soon after the British left, India erupted into violent, bloody civil war and ultimately split into two (now three) countries, two of whom are still fighting over boundaries (Kashmir isn't a sweater). How many died in that war, and in the fighting that still goes on after more than 50 years?

South Africa got its independence from the Empire about the same time as India - and promptly enacted apartheid, which was much harsher and more repressive than anything the British ever did in South Africa.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1502. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 05:14:14 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <GY9ha.13944$se1.6859863@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 63739

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030328193254.25912.00000045@mb-ff.aol.com...
> From K4YZ:
> >The Radio Police dragged themout in the street in the middle of the
> >night and tortured them until they signed statements professing thier
undying
> >loyalty to Morse Code.
>
> No, but from talking to club members, at least two (one is club Prez!)
said
> they were resistant to learning Morse code, but claim to like it now. I
guess
> social pressure works.
>

Social pressure has nothing to do with it. There are numerous instances in all kinds of activities where a person did not want to do something but was forced to learn it and after they used it found they actually enjoyed it. People resist the unfamiliar even when it is beneficial. The more unfamiliar it is, the more they resist it.

In college, I absolutely hated computer programming but it was a required course. Later, I came to enjoy it and deliberately sought out positions where I could employ this skill. I would never had done so if not required to take programming as part of my degree studies.

I have many friends who were required by their parents to take piano lessons. So far every one of them has made one of the following statements depending on whether they quit the lessons or not.
"I'm glad my parents didn't let me quit." OR
"I wish my parents hadn't let me quit"
All of them, whether they quit as kids or not, valued it as adults.

One could make lists ad nauseum of cases where a person was required to learn something that they thought they would hate but were glad afterwards that they had studied it, even though it was against their will with social pressure having nothing to do with their change of opinion.

This is why I continue to believe that only those with a background in a subject are qualified to judge its worth and usefulness.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

1503. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 05:33:15 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87r88qu484.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 63740

"Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote:
>Okay... I'll bite on this one..... What about the millions of gallons
>flowing through our Alaska pipeline that is sold to other countries other
>than us?? (sold to Germany, France, Japan etc.) What about the thousands of

Flights of fantasy on your part amigo. There are exactly *zero*
gallons flowing through the trans-Alaska pipeline that end up
being sold to other countries than us. Zero. Zip. Zilch, Nada.
Not one gallon.

>oil well rigs across the country pumping out oil etc. on a daily basis?
>Oh... and this one I love, most of what is coming out of these wells as a
>by-product or waste product is being (at least here in Michigan) upped
>thirty percent when it is something that the basically get for free! Hmmm
>propane and gas for heating is going up that much around here....

I don't understand what you are trying to say there. Do you actually
think the gas from an oil well is "free"??? Why is it any more free
than the oil?

>There's enough oil underneath us to last longer than even our grandkids
>would need to worry about.... but our big oil corporations are working WITH

Well, if you know where all that oil is, you really should start up an
oil company. Nobody else knows where it's at, and you'll be about as
rich as Bill Gates in less than a decade. If you are telling the truth,
that is. Of course, you aren't, so it won't happen.

>OPEC in my own opinion, not against them.... Can't prove that but I bet I am
>not too far from the mark on that one...

Well, lets hope they are. How else would they buy oil from them?
Or did you mean something else?

>(snippage)
>>
>> No, I do NOT "tolerate" Americans who live in peace and prosperity, yet
>> feel the need to criticize the policies of our President when his objective is
>> to end the suffering of an imprisoned and enslaved nation. And I'll tell
>> you one more thing: If this war isn't about oil, I hope that George W. finds
>> a way to MAKE it about oil! We've just experienced an unusually cold
>> Winter here in this country, and if you don't think that the free flow of oil
>> at market prices is an important national goal of the United States, I
>> suggest that you volunteer for duty on an Antarctic expedition!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry is not making sense and being purely emotional, but adding
to the hysteria with more nonsense doesn't help.

Bush is *not* over there fighting for "the free flow of oil at
market prices"! What a ridiculous idea. He's fighting to make
sure the prices are *not* free market prices!

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

1504. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 08:17:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAAAC0D6.14D5A%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63741

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" wrote:

>> Dwight Stewart wrote...
>
>> Because they, and I, know Saddam Hussein had
>> nothing whatsoever to do with the attack on
>> the WTC. If Saddam wanted to attack this
>> country, he has had twelve years to do so.
>> He hasn't.
>
> You know this as a "fact" Dwight? You know
> beyond a shadow of a doubt that SH didn't help
> fund, support, promote or otherwise give confort
> or assistance to those murdering bastards?

Fact? What else would you call it, Steve? More than two years after the WTC attack, no evidence has been presented to even suggest anything other than what I said. Do you have that evidence? We're attacking a country and killing many thousands. More than rhetoric is required to justify that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1505. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 08:45:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAAAC76E.14D5C%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63742

"Bert Craig" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote...
>>
>> No single American is "We, the USA." If
>> he wants to voice his personal opinion, he
>> can do so in his own name (like everyone
>> else does).
>
> I very much disagree. While we're all individuals,
> we are also a part of the larger "united"
> collective, "We, the people." You need only read
> the replies to your response to Dan's post to gauge
> the popular feeling of "we, the people." That's
> part of democracy, Dwight.

I suspect the support for the use of "We, the USA" in his comments would
have been a little less enthusiastic if he had said something contrary to
current government or military policy.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1506. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 12:13:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329071333.03943.00002937@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63743

In article <b62qss$3no$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> >It can be death of the individual (wiring error leading to
>> >electrocution),
>>
>> Sure. But the same thing can happen, and does, when homeowners do their
>>own
>> electrical wiring or appliance repair. No test for doing that kind of work
>>to
>> your own property.
>
>In NY City you can NOT do your own electrical wiring.
>In any location, any electrical work is (theoretically) subject
>to inspection...although much home done work is never
>inspected.
>
All true. But the fact still remains that no license is required (except in
NYC) and in most cases no inspection will ever happen. In the case of appliance
repair, no license or inspection.

The point is that it is NOT government's job to protect people from their own
electrical stupidity, whether they be working on radio transmitters or toaster
ovens. The reason for things like the NEC and FCC are to protect innocent third
parties from such stupidity.

>> >It can be a transmitted signal into public space that exceeds
>> >permitted levels.
>> >
>> True - but all that's required to prevent that is a lower power limit and
>> a few RF exposure questions on the test.
>
>RF exposure questions are technical questions.
>
Of course - and earlier in my argument I specified that the test would have to
have just enough theory questions to show that the licensee understood the
rules.

As it is right now, a person can get all the RF exposure and electrical safetty
questions on all three ham tests wrong and still pass. FCC doesn't think
there's a problem with that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1507. Re: XM-Radio compatible with 2M/450?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 14:38:04 UTC
From: daver40us@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c71973b3.0303290638.19bc8d90@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63744
Cross-posted to: rec.outdoors.rv-travel,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.trucks.chevy

k6lcs@clintbradford.com (Clint Bradford) wrote in message
news:<fc08b778.0303281203.6f4f8ec@posting.google.com>...
> > I have a 5/25W 144Mhz ICOM transciever in our motorhome along with a Pioneer
> > XM radio. When I key the mic the digital radio gets confused and stops
> > playing Waiting a while or a power off/on cycle brings the XM radio back to
> > life.
>
> Hmmm...In my 2002 Ford Ranger, I am using a 2M/440 Larsen
> through-the-glass antenna on the rear window left side, and a 220mHz
> Larsen through-the-glass antenna on the right side of the rear window.
> The mag-mount Delphi satellite antenna cabling was routed through the
> third brake light hole above and to the middle - inbetween these two
> antennas.
>
> Keying up to 45W on either 2M, 220, or 440 has no detrimental affect
> on the Delphi's reception.
>
> Clint Bradford, K6LCS / KAF3359

I have an Icom 2100 using a Larsen 5/8 wave mag mount about 4 inches
from my Delphi SKYFI antenna in the center of the roof. The SKYFI is
mounted in the car about two inches from the Icom, and plugs into the
aux cigar plug. The Icom is direct wired to the battery. I've had
lengthy 2 meter QSO's at 25W with the SKYFI on and have noticed no ill
affect on either unit. I haven't upped the power to 50W yet to try it,
but I rarely use full power.

By the way, I drive a 2001 Isuzu Rodeo.

Dave KB2TTT

1508. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 14:44:07 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329094407.18686.00000097@mb-fn.aol.com>
Source record: 63745

From: "Dee D. Flint"
>Social pressure has nothing to do with it. There are numerous instances in
>all kinds of activities where a person did not want to do something but was
>forced to learn it and after they used it found they actually enjoyed it.

You already made this argument before.

Anyway, visceral realtime encoding/decoding is fun, I know. Potential fun is
not the only reason to consider.

Morse code is irrelavant to what I want to know, so I don't want to make the
effort. It also shows misplace priorities. More importantly, I don't like Morse
code. I could be doing much more interesting things in its place.

>This is why I continue to believe that only those with a background in a
>subject are qualified to judge its worth and usefulness.

Emotional ties to the mode is not a reason. Knowledge of the <Morse code>
encoding scheme is NOT required to evaluate its usefulness.

There are people with the background that are well qualified to judge its
usefulness, such as comm profs.

Other modes have been shown to be more BW effiecient. Morse has not been used
for emergency comm. by those that have emergency comm needs. Morse code does
not hold out in the worth and usefulness allocation. Its emphacis is very out
of proportion to its usefulness.

1509. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 17:00:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E85D10E.F491CEA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63746

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E83C83A.AC593364@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E836CC4.B5EBE8DD@earthlink.net>...
> > > >
> > > > I answered Brian's question.
> > >
> > > You don't know the answer.
> >
> > I provide not only one answer. I provided a number of answers. Any of
> > them would be a suitable reply to your question.
>
> State the minimum speed and accuracy level at which one can be
> considered Morse Proficient.

Jim already told you that he considers that point to be ten words per
minute. That answer didn't suit you. I placed the level somewhat
higher. That answer didn't suit you. We know that there are numerous
ops who are comfortable with 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 wpm. There are some who
can operate at much higher speeds. If you choose to delude yourself
that someone whose maximum speed is five words per minute is proficient
in morse, so be it. I've give you the definition of "proficient". I
don't consider the 5 wpm level to be "skilled" or "expert".

> > > You merely type words.
> >
> > That seems to have been what makes up your response.

> Back it up with anything from the FCC. Anything at all.

The FCC is not in the business of determing morse proficiency. In
recent years, the FCC is barely in the business of testing radio
amateurs. It is only within the past few years that the FCC has started
to once again address the enforcement of amateur regs.

Dave K8MN

1510. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 17:08:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E85D320.FC0B49CA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63747

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E83C7B4.1CF1AC3C@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > Then state at what minimum word per minute rate and accuracy level, a
> > > user of Morse Code can be considered proficient, and why.
> >
> > I've provided you with a definition of what it means to be proficient.
> > I'll leave it for you to explain why it would be that when many are
> > capable of 20, 25, 30, 35 and 40 wpm copy, anyone would consider an
> > excruciatingly slow 5 wpm as proficient.
>
> If the criterion is slowness, then you have a problem. Some consider
> 20wpm slow. Is 20wpm not proficient?

Sure, twenty wpm is proficient. Thirty wpm is more proficient than
twenty. Forty wpm is more proficient than thirty.

A batter who hits 385 is good. A batter who hits 405 is better. A
bowler whose average is 240 is good. A bowler whose average is 265 is
better. Are you having a problem with the concept?

> FISTS says accuracy transcends speed.

Does FISTS say anything about someone who can receive accurately at high
speed?

> > > Best of luck (because I don't plan on hearing from you on this matter
> > > again).
> >
> > The best laid plans...
>
> are often modified. You have not stated the lowest wpm rate at which
> "proficiency" is achieved.

I believe it to be higher than ten wpm. I've already stated that.

> And your answer is???

Silicone caulk. What was the question?

Dave K8MN

1511. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 17:11:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E85D3D6.ED8117B6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63748

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E83C87E.3D06A962@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E836D20.52616BE9@earthlink.net>...
> > > >
> > > > I'm thankful that I have no idea of whether or not you smell bad.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Hardly relevant on rrap.
> >
> > Then you'll want to address your comment to Leonard H. Anderson. He
> > brought it up.
>
> Het Len, hardly relevant on rrap.
>
> > > Nor do you know what Morse Proficient is, or at least you cannot put it in words.
> >
> > I have put it into words. There is no answer which will satisfy you.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> No you haven't. You said that 'this speed is more proficient then that
> speed.'

I wrote that I considered the speed of proficiency to be higher than ten
wpm.

> If 20wpm is "more proficient" than 13wpm, are you saying that 20wpm is
> the lowest speed considered proficient?

No. I'm saying that 20 wpm is more proficient than 13 wpm, 25 wpm is
more proficient than 20 wpm and 30 wpm is more proficient than 25 wpm.

Dave K8MN

1512. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 17:52:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E85DD73.1090707@adelphia.net>
Source record: 63749

Vshah101 wrote:
> From K4YZ:
>
>>The heavy emphasis on Morse code is
>>
>>>embarrassing.
>>
>> To whom?
>
>
> To me. If I were to mention I belonged to a Ham radio club and the person asked
> me if they still used Morse code.

Now you are embarrassed of us?

Maybe there should be an top ten Embarassment list based on the age and
percetion of how outmoded a mode is. In order of how embarrassed you
should be:

10. EME - Folks, this has been done once, so who cares any more?

09. Satellite comms - We've been doing this since when, the
60's?
08. Spread Spectrum - Hey, Hedy thought this up around 60 years
ago!
07. SSB - Yawn... Major old school. I 'll bet all those swl'ers
think that hams are trying to imitate Donald duck.

06. FM - Need we say more, you repeater rats?

05. PSK31 - Can't even imitate a half decent chat room.

04. SSTV - Hams have the nerve to call this TV? It's one
picture, for crying out loud. ANd now that you have a sound card
to do all the hard work, it doesn't take any skill anyway!

03. ATV - Silly amatuers, trying to compete with "Survivor and
American Idol!

02. Hellschreiber - Givr me a break! Its a mode where I'm
embarrassed to even say the name, and it was used by people of
ill repute a long long time ago. Why anyone would use it any
more is beyond me!

And now, for the most embarrassing communications mode ever
foisted upon the world, and the practice of which should make
all right thinking hams hang their heads in shame, and then

gallop off the nearest cliff like lemmings.............

01. Morse Code! This dog of a mode, when practiced more than once, has
been know to erase all your credit cards, cause your dog to become lame
and ill tempered, cause you to become cranky and ittitable. cause you to
gain weight and swing funny looking sticks around, and wear the same
clothes for weeks!

> Its also bad for the hobby. It scares away the technical people, who might have
> benefitted the hobby. It looks bad for the hobby when the only "real" skill is
> Morse code.

I am an extremely technical person. It didn't scare me away.

>>The Radio Police dragged themout in the street in the middle of the
>>night and tortured them until they signed statements professing thier undying
>>loyalty to Morse Code.
>
>
> No, but from talking to club members, at least two (one is club Prez!) said
> they were resistant to learning Morse code, but claim to like it now. I guess
> social pressure works.

Maybe they were, who knows? They are apparently big enough to admit
they were wrong about Morse.

>
>>Vipul, you recommend trashing the technical written tests and then say MY
>>comments about that suggestion then failing to meet Part 97 is
>>"illogical"...?!?!
>
>
> It seems you don't understand my proposal. I did not reccommend trashing the
> technical written test.
>
> I said keep written tests, but put Morse code out of pathway of written tests.
> No need to pass Morse code test to get General license or Extra license.
>
> But, no HF for passing only written tests. If one passes code test (provided
> they pass tech written test) they can get on HF.

What priveleges would a person get from passing just the writtens?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1513. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:35:11 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <jkoha.14325$se1.7132548@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 63750

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030329094407.18686.00000097@mb-fn.aol.com...
> Morse code is irrelavant to what I want to know, so I don't want to make
the
> effort. It also shows misplace priorities. More importantly, I don't like
Morse
> code. I could be doing much more interesting things in its place.
>

You aren't qualified to judge whether it is irrelevant or not. And how many more times are you going to keep making the same old spelling error on irrelevant?

> >This is why I continue to believe that only those with a background in a
> >subject are qualified to judge its worth and usefulness.
>
> Emotional ties to the mode is not a reason. Knowledge of the <Morse code>
> encoding scheme is NOT required to evaluate its usefulness.

I have no emotional tie to Morse code. Experience in its use is the only way to judge it's usefulness.

>
> There are people with the background that are well qualified to judge its
> usefulness, such as comm profs.

And some of them come down on the pro side of the debate.

>
> Other modes have been shown to be more BW effiecient. Morse has not been
used
> for emergency comm. by those that have emergency comm needs. Morse code
does
> not hold out in the worth and usefulness allocation. Its emphacis is very
out
> of proportion to its usefulness.

Every mode has it's advantages and disadvantages. For example, yes PSK is more bandwidth efficient but the signal is so narrow that unless you know exactly where the signal is, you can't find it. Not very useful in an emergency in that case. One could address each and every mode from voice through CW through every single digital mode and find that every one of them has both advantages and disadvantages. The point should be to keep them all in use as differing conditions will favor one mode over another.

There are only two modes that don't require a computer in the system: voice and CW. Therefore these form the basic communications modes of radio and

should be part of every ham's fundamental knowledge in the field of radio.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

1514. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:47:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329164727.13213.00000096@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63802

In article <f45722ac.0303280947.1272945d@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Steve
>
>Steve, first, can you spell my name correctly? Or must you obsess
>over it and try to make my name an insult?

Anything done by the Gang of Four is perfectly acceptible.
To them.

1515. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:47:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329164727.13213.00000095@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63805

In article <3E83CAE9.D066F9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Brian
>
>You're already confused. You're addressing me about what N2EY wrote.
>Good luck on that comprehension problem.

The Leader of the Gang of Four continues to use the Lieder
which N2EY wrote.

No originality. Good officer material.

1516. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:47:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329164727.13213.00000097@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63809

In article <3E836D20.52616BE9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Lieder of the Gang of Four.

1517. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:47:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329164728.13213.00000098@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63815

In article <BAAAC0D6.14D5A%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

> Fact? What else would you call it, Steve? More than two years after the
>WTC attack, no evidence has been presented to even suggest anything other
>than what I said. Do you have that evidence? We're attacking a country and
>killing many thousands. More than rhetoric is required to justify that.

The first World Trade Center attack happened in 1993. All but
one of the perpetrators have been tried and imprisoned. [one
was never caught]

Iraq has regularly disobeyed United Nations resolutions since
the cessation of the first Gulf War in 1991. Iraq has remained a
threat to Middle Eastern stability since the Iran-Iraq War of 1980
to 1988.

It should be noted that Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, not for any
peaceful expansion of its liebensraum. The USA-led coalition
did not pursue Iraqi forces at the cessation of hostilities in
1991. Events over the next dozen years seem to indicate that
the coalition should have continued all the way into Iraq then.

This second Gulf War is really a resumption of the first one
that wasn't fully completed.

1518. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:47:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329164729.13213.00000099@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63811

In article <20030328122653.14527.00001115@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>The bloodiest war the USA ever fought was from 1861 to 1865. Americans >against other Americans.

INCORRECT.

The total number of deaths (Union and Confederacy) in the American Civil War was 219,939 in battle. The total number of battle deaths during World War 2 was 292,131.

Battle deaths are considered "bloody."

Total number of casualties in the American Civil War were 646,392, including 281,881 wounds not mortal. Total number of casualties of all US military branches in World War 2 were 1,079,162 including 671,846 wounds not mortal.

All of that happened before N2EY's time. It is history. Please try to be factual when admonishing others.

1519. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:47:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329164731.13213.00000100@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63818

In article <GY9ha.13944$se1.6859863@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030328193254.25912.00000045@mb-ff.aol.com...
>> From K4YZ:
>> >The Radio Police dragged themout in the street in the middle of the
>> >night and tortured them until they signed statements professing thier
>undying
>> >loyalty to Morse Code.
>>
>> No, but from talking to club members, at least two (one is club Prez!) said
>> they were resistant to learning Morse code, but claim to like it now. I
guess
>> social pressure works.
>
>Social pressure has nothing to do with it. There are numerous instances in
>all kinds of activities where a person did not want to do something but was
>forced to learn it and after they used it found they actually enjoyed it.
>People resist the unfamiliar even when it is beneficial. The more
>unfamiliar it is, the more they resist it.

I differ. Amateur radio is basically a hobby, a recreation. It is
NOT a guild, craft, union, or other organization requiring working
to professional skills and responsibilities.

The "social pressure" is that exerted by long-timers who have
taken it upon themselves to self-righteously assert their rank
and status as knowing what is best for amateur radio entrance
requirements and the attendant privileges of licensing.

Morse code skill is required to be demonstrated by test to
obtain a US amateur radio license having below-30-MHz
privileges. That is a regulation which the US radio regulating
agency does not agree with for licensing but is required to
be kept due to honor the ITU membership.

>In college, I absolutely hated computer programming but it was a required
>course. Later, I came to enjoy it and deliberately sought out positions
>where I could employ this skill. I would never had done so if not required
>to take programming as part of my degree studies.

Irrelevant. In my degree studies, there was NO such thing as
computer programming in the electrical engineering curricula.
It was not available, therefore there was nothing to either "hate"
or love. Despite that, many of us engineers, myself included,

learned calculator and computer programming LATER to use
as a valuable tool in engineering. Today, computer programs
are part and parcel of engineering design in all disciplines of
engineering.

You bring up an old, trite "argument" about the "necessity" to
study something disliked because it is "valuable later."

The FCC publicly stated in 1990 and again in 1999 that morse
code testing is not worthwhile for their purpose of regulating
radio to determine if an amateur radio license applicant should
be granted a US amateur radio license.

Also, the FCC does not mandate morse code on-off keying
mode over and above all other allocated modes, any class
license. There is no logical reason, ONLY long-timer peer
pressure, to keep morse code testing for amateur radio.
The ONLY valid reason is simple peer pressure.

>I have many friends who were required by their parents to take piano
>lessons. So far every one of them has made one of the following statements
>depending on whether they quit the lessons or not.
>"I'm glad my parents didn't let me quit." OR
>"I wish my parents hadn't let me quit"
>All of them, whether they quit as kids or not, valued it as adults.

This is not a musical interest newsgroup nor are music
lessons of any kind applicable to amateur radio.

>One could make lists ad nauseum of cases where a person was required to
>learn something that they thought they would hate but were glad afterwards
>that they had studied it, even though it was against their will with social
>pressure having nothing to do with their change of opinion.

The converse is ALSO true...of "lists ad nauseum of cases" where
disliked studies were NOT useful later in life, outdated, had no
purpose whatsoever.

In US engineering schools, three semesters of The Calculus have
been required for years to fulfill a degree. Do they serve any REAL
purpose in engineering? There's considerable negative thought on
that among those who made a career in engineering. In my case
of having electronic design responsibility since 1962, I've used
elementary Calculus 1 just twice...Analytical Geometry techniques
two more times...and all of them after rising to more senior
postitions requiring report writing. None of the "advanced math"
was required for actual design engineering work, only for written
reports done after the design work itself was completed...to
satisfy corporate readers who were not even in the responsibility
loop for the projects in question.

In February 1953 I began my US Army assignment at Army radio
communications transmitter station ADA. ADA then had 36 high-

power transmitters (quantity raised to 43 by 1956) on HF and most trans-Pacific communications circuits ran 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Back 50 years ago NO morse code modes were used on HF for area headquarters communications which needed a throughput of 220 thousand messages a month. At the same time there were some military communications modes requiring morse code operating skill but those were waning skills that were all but defunct by a decade past.

>This is why I continue to believe that only those with a background in a
>subject are qualified to judge its worth and usefulness.

I have a background in communications that began 50 years ago. I've legally transmitted on frequencies from VLF to 24 GHz, including MF and HF portions. I also have a background that began with vacuum tubes and not-yet-ended with transistors and application-specific integrated circuits. Nowhere would I mandate that everyone should use only vacuum tube based radios or just HF for international radio communications. That old idea is ludicrous in light of the accomplisments in the wider other world of radio communications.

I don't presume to speak with authority on morse code skill. I CAN speak with some authority on radio communications from experience, knowledge, and various skills other than morse code. The rest of the radio world has either dropped morse code as a primary mode or never considered it when a radio service began.

I DO think it is equally ludicrous to demand that all amateurs must meet a skill test of any kind in manual morse code in order to be granted a license having below-30-MHz privileges.

The "code elimination question" is concerned only with the amateur radio license test viability. It isn't about "having to study something 'hated' which then magically transformed to something of great value or enjoyment later."

Peer pressure from old-timers in amateur radio is considered to be the ONLY valid reason to retain the morse code test for an amateur radio license. For that reason I've suggested that all the PCTAs strike for a change of the title of Part 97 to be the Ancient Radiotelegraphy Society.

1520. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:47:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329164732.13213.00000101@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63813

In article <f45722ac.0303271843.571d5821@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>>
>> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>> amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>> Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>> slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>Incapable of original thought? The mileage has run out on the Jim quote.

Lots more "mileage" on the Lieder of the Gang of Four.

It's become a standard "reply" to anything that detracts from
the Gang's accomplishments, status, rank, privilege and ego.

1521. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:47:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329164733.13213.00000103@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63814

In article <3E836CC4.B5EBE8DD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

More mantra.

Constant repetition of this is part of the Big Lie technique.

1522. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:47:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329164733.13213.00000102@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63816

In article <c2356669.0303271826.59fe8ac5@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>All right, here's a sample. Remember that these are not the exact
>questions on the old tests, and they are for the "entry level"
>license:
>
>1. Name the basic units of electrical resistance, inductance,
>capacitance, current, electromotive force or potential difference,
>power, energy, quantity, magneto-motive force, and frequency.

"Quantity?" :-)

>6. Why is it advisable to use a plate power supply for the oscillator
>of a transmitter separate from the final amplifier plate power supply?

What is this "plate" supply? :-)

>20. Describe the adjustment procedure for proper neutralization in a
>radio-frequency amplifier using an r.f. indicator coupled to the plate
>tank circuit.

There's that "plate" thing again...

>26. What is the purpose of a Faraday (electrostatic) shield between
>the output circuit of an r.f. power amplifier and antenna coupling
>system.

To keep from transmitting Faraday harmonics? :-)

Try as I might, never can recall a single transmitter seen since
1953 having any electrostatic shield in its output tank. :-)

>34. A low-drift crystal for the 3500-4000 kc. amateur band is
>guaranteed by the manufacturer to be calibrated to within 0.04% of its
>specified frequency. Desiring to operate as close to the lower band
>limit of 3500 kc. as possible, for what whole-number kilocycle
>frequency should you order your crystal, allowing 1 kc. additional for
>variation from temperature and circuit constants?

Oy, times have changed. 0.04% ? Gosh, I could order
0.005% crystals to order from a shop on La Brea Ave. in
L.A. back in 1958.

400 PPM tolerance was hardly "low-drift" even back in 1951.

>36. Draw a schematic diagram of a full-wave single-phase power supply
>using a center-tapped high-voltage secondary with a filter circuit for

>best regulation, showing a bleeder resistor providing two different
>output voltages and a method of suppressing "hash" interference from
>the mercury-vapor rectifier tubes. Give the names of the component
>parts and approximate values of of filter components suitable for
>either amateur radiotelephone or radiotelegraph operation

"Mercury-vapor rectifier tubes?!?" :-)

Were those used for a "plate" supply? :-)

>40. Draw a schematic diagram of two r.f. amplifier stages using triode
>tubes, showing neutralizing circuits, link coupling between stages and
>between output and antenna system, and a keying connection in the
>negative high-voltage lead including a key-click filter.

"Triodes?" :-)

>66. What operating characteristics distinguish the electron-coupled
>type oscillator with regard to frequency stability?

"Electron-coupled?" :-)

I guess nobody caught (onto) the Clapp oscillator back then? :-)

What does all that OLD stuff have to do with "honest code
elimination?" None of it is about morse code.

1523. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:47:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329164734.13213.00000106@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63801

In article <f45722ac.0303271902.54645e07@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Dave K8MN
>
>Apparently, Dave has no mind of his own.

Only his EGO which must be satisfied at all costs... :-)

1524. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:47:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329164734.13213.00000105@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63803

In article <20030327224845.01698.00000012@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> Hey...what ever works. You can't argue with the truth.

The truth is that Steamy has NO knowledge or experience of radio and electronics engineering. NONE.

1525. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:47:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329164734.13213.00000104@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63812

In article <3E836C4B.492B175F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Lieder of the Gang of Four sung again.

1526. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:47:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329164735.13213.00000108@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63806

In article <20030328182706.25403.00001282@mb-fm.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>btw, ARRL now has a line of clothing with the ARRL logo and optional callsign
>and name embroidery. Gotta get me some, particularly a hat - hamfest season
>is coming up fast!

Ordering by mail from Newington will result in paying extra for
shipping costs. Try for a local store carrying ARRL products.

Have you tried amazon.com yet?

1527. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:47:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329164735.13213.00000107@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63810

In article <3E836BF6.61AB913C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

The Lieder of the Gang of Four...

Usual mantra.

1528. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:47:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329164736.13213.00000109@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63807

In article <20030327223617.01698.00000010@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> Here's a new one:
>
>"Leonard H Anderson is a known and documented pathological liar with a
>penchant
>for character assassination and newsgroup antagonism."
>
> Not as civil as Jim's, but every bit as accurate.
>
>Steve

The stormtrooper of the Gang of Four tried kristallnacht in here
but only cut his finger, poor dear... :-)

1529. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:47:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329164737.13213.00000110@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63817

In article <20030327223326.01698.00000009@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 3/27/2003 2:18 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030327151829.04776.00001247@mb-ct.aol.com>
>
>>>That's NOT what you were asked, Vipul.
>>
>>You don't deserve an answer.
>
> Sure I so. YOUR rules. If you post something to a public forum, it
>becomes fair game.

You still don't deserve an answer when all you do is character assassination.

>> I asked you from what source you made your EXISTING opinion.
>>
>> You don't have a right to know.
>
> Sure I do. YOUR rules. If you post something to a public forum, it
>becomes fair game.

You still don't have any right to know.

The subject is ARS License Numbers, not Steamy Robeson's exhorting of his wounded ego and demands for answers.

>>This isn't a newsgroup for NASCAR or aircraft competition or about
>>equine interests
>
> I'm sorry. If forgot that only YOU may make an analogy or designate
>what is and is not proper for discussion.

This still isn't a newsgroup for NASCAR or aircraft or equine interests.

> Many pardons...NOT!

Neither is Steamy the warden or governor who can pardon anyone.

>>Except to the Gang of Four.
>
> Who? In what Amateur Radio publication will we find this "gang of four"
>you make reference to?

In this newsgroup the Gang of Four is K8MN, K4YZ, K3LT, and N2EY.

All four use antagonism, aggressive sarcasm, and very misplaced
misappropriated analogies to attempt battering everyone else
into submission and capitulation to their own viewpoints on any
subject.

>>US amateur radio is all about Working DX on HF with CW.
>
> I'll go ahead and put this in the "List of things Lennie the Liar Will
>Never Answer", but WHO said this (otehr than you) and WHERE is it published?

It is de facto, not de jure.

>>Not very engineer like, Vipul.
>>
>> Here we go again! Doctor Kildare II, having "worked in engineering,"
>> knows Everything about engineering!
>
> Nope. Just know enough to know what's expected of an engineer.

Nonsense. Robeson spent time filling out purchasing
requisitions, talking on the telephone, doing NO engineering
tasks, no design work, no drawing sign-offs, having NO
engineering responsibility.

>>Yes, a half-year as a PURCHASING AGENT...(SNIP)
>
> Once again, half cocked and ill-prepared, Lennie launches off on yet
>another windmill assault.

Steamy wants to bluff his way through by misdirection.

By his own admission he was a PURCHASING AGENT. NOT
a designer of anything, NOT involved in electronic design, NOT
anything but someone who did purchasing.

Steamy has NO experience or knowledge of engineering of
anything.

>>Not a long "career" in "professional radio," was it?
>
> If that was my only professioanl experience, you MIGHT be right. As
>usual, you only ahve half the story. But that's OK...you go right ahead.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...evidence of RAGE in typing again. :-)

The purchasing agent job was Steamy's ONLY experience even
close to engineering. Not IN engineering, just on the periphery.

That single job still didn't last long. Wonder why? :-)

>>The club you try to hit everyone with when they don't honor, respect, or
>> salute your mighty accomplishments.
>
> Which club would that be, Lennie?

The Ancient Radiotelegraphy Society.

1530. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:47:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329164738.13213.00000111@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63804

In article <f45722ac.0303271904.76adf606@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> So much for your character, Leonard.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>So much for your ability to create an original thought.

The Gang of Four's leader is trying the Big Lie technique.

It worked for a certain German political party and it should
do well for the Four. :-)

1531. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 21:47:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329164738.13213.00000112@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63808

In article <3E836BBA.2E45916E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

The Leider of the Gang of Four has been sung... :-)

1532. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 22:34:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329173447.02688.00000624@mb-fq.aol.com>
Source record: 63819

In article <jkoha.14325$se1.7132548@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Every mode has it's advantages and disadvantages. For example, yes PSK is
>more bandwidth efficient but the signal is so narrow that unless you know
>exactly where the signal is, you can't find it.

Not true. The signal can be as broad or narrow as selected by
the receiver in-use. It just doesn't sound like on-off keyed CW.
:-)

>Not very useful in an emergency in that case.

Is US amateur radio devoted to "emergency communications?"

I don't think so. [be careful with what you use for replies...]

>One could address each and every mode from voice
>through CW through every single digital mode and find that every one of them
>has both advantages and disadvantages. The point should be to keep them all
>in use as differing conditions will favor one mode over another.

On which bands? :-)

US amateur radio allocations haven't yet been made at bands
lower than 160 meters. Have you forgotten the old 500 KHz
International Distress Frequency? Quite a bit below 160m.

Of course, the maritime world has shifted to their GMDSS' much
higher frequencies. Did so a few years ago. The USCG doesn't
monitor 500 KHz anymore.

>There are only two modes that don't require a computer in the system: voice
>and CW.

Not quite. RTTY worked for decades without a single computer
being needed. So has ATV and SSTV.

>Therefore these form the basic communications modes of radio and
>should be part of every ham's fundamental knowledge in the field of radio.

There's no separate skill test for voice communications for a US
amateur radio license, any class. There's never been one of
those, not in 91 years of four US radio regulating agencies.

1533. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 23:25:28 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329182528.18686.00000108@mb-fn.aol.com>
Source record: 63820

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>You aren't qualified to judge whether it is irrelevant or not.
Knowledge of the encoding scheme is NOT needed to evaluate its usefulness. You don't know my background to say I'm not qualified to judge Morse code's usefulness.

>Experience in its use is the only
>way to judge it's usefulness.

Please realize that you can seperate the acutal memorization of the encoding scheme from its mathmatical analysis. Knowledge of the encoding scheme is NOT needed to evaluate its usefulness.

There are other ways to gain the experience needed to evaluate Morse code's usefulness.

Those that have the experience have not reached the conclusion that Morse is so useful, as many Hams claim.

>> There are people with the background that are well qualified to judge its
>> usefulness, such as comm profs.
>
>And some of them come down on the pro side of the debate.

Like which Prof? Name please. What reason did this Prof give for usefulness of Morse?

My Comm Theory Prof (also licensed amateur) apparantly does not agree. Many modes with performance tradeoffs given. Not ONE mention of the usefulness of Morse code. How about I ask my Comm Theory Prof?

Hospitals, firefighters, Coast Guard, Pilots, Military, other "emergency" functions do not use Morse code.

>There are only two modes that don't require a computer in the system: voice
>and CW. Therefore these form the basic communications modes of radio and
>should be part of every ham's fundamental knowledge in the field of radio.

Just because a mode does not require a computer, does not mean one should learn it.

1534. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 23:40:54 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329184054.18686.00000110@mb-fn.aol.com>
Source record: 63821

>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net

>Maybe there should be an top ten Embarassment list based on the age and
>percetion of how outmoded a mode is.

Interesting idea, but Hams should be skilled at all useful modes. That includes the modes you mention.

Morse code is known to be obsolete, not useful. Advertising Hams use Morse code to the non-Ham public would not make Ham radio look good.

>I am an extremely technical person. It didn't scare me away.

Good for you.

>What priveleges would a person get from passing just the writtens?

A Technician class license get almost the whole amateur bands, just like they do now.

More bands for General and Extra class is not possible, as the Tech class got all the bands up front. We can't take away bands from those who already have them to make things more "fair" for everyone.

The General and Extra classes get they extra "prestige" of getting those licenses. Before you say "What good is prestige?", remember that Extra class right now offers basically the same thing (with only a few extra freqs) - not much more than General class priveleges.

1535. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 23:45:53 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329184553.18686.00000111@mb-fn.aol.com>
Source record: 63822

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>I wrote that I considered the speed of proficiency to be higher than ten
>wpm.

Scientific proof of 10 wpm claim? Some say its 13wpm. At this speed, Morse code encoding/decoding is automatic, part of one's being, unforgettable. Only at this speed is one considered a "true" Ham.

1536. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-29 23:56:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329185632.23598.00001144@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63823

In article <20030329164733.13213.00000102@mb-ca.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0303271826.59fe8ac5@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>All right, here's a sample. Remember that these are not the exact
>>questions on the old tests, and they are for the "entry level"
>>license:
>>
>>1. Name the basic units of electrical resistance, inductance,
>>capacitance, current, electromotive force or potential difference,
>>power, energy, quantity, magneto-motive force, and frequency.
>
> "Quantity?" :-)

Yup. That's the exact wording of the question from the 1948 FCC study guide.

Guess you need to brush up on those basic terms.
>
>>6. Why is it advisable to use a plate power supply for the oscillator
>>of a transmitter separate from the final amplifier plate power supply?
>
> What is this "plate" supply? :-)
>
Look it up.

>>20. Describe the adjustment procedure for proper neutralization in a
>>radio-frequency amplifier using an r.f. indicator coupled to the plate
>>tank circuit.
>
> There's that "plate" thing again...
>
>>26. What is the purpose of a Faraday (electrostatic) shield between
>>the output circuit of an r.f. power amplifier and antenna coupling
>>system.
>
> To keep from transmitting Faraday harmonics? :-)
>
> Try as I might, never can recall a single transmitter seen since
> 1953 having any electrostatic shield in its output tank. :-)

Tell it to the FCC.
>
>>34. A low-drift crystal for the 3500-4000 kc. amateur band is
>>guaranteed by the manufacturer to be calibrated to within 0.04% of its

>>specified frequency. Desiring to operate as close to the lower band
>>limit of 3500 kc. as possible, for what whole-number kilocycle
>>frequency should you order your crystal, allowing 1 kc. additional for
>>variation from temperature and circuit constants?
>
> Oy, times have changed. 0.04% ? Gosh, I could order
> 0.005% crystals to order from a shop on La Brea Ave. in
> L.A. back in 1958.
>
> 400 PPM tolerance was hardly "low-drift" even back in 1951.

Tell it to the FCC. They wrote the question, not me.
>
>>36. Draw a schematic diagram of a full-wave single-phase power supply
>>using a center-tapped high-voltage secondary with a filter circuit for
>>best regulation, showing a bleeder resistor providing two different
>>output voltages and a method of suppressing "hash" interference from
>>the mercury-vapor rectifier tubes. Give the names of the component
>>parts and approximate values of of filter components suitable for
>>either amateur radiotelephone or radiotelegraph operation
>
> "Mercury-vapor rectifier tubes?!?" :-)
>
> Were those used for a "plate" supply? :-)
>
>>40. Draw a schematic diagram of two r.f. amplifier stages using triode
>>tubes, showing neutralizing circuits, link coupling between stages and
>>between output and antenna system, and a keying connection in the
>>negative high-voltage lead including a key-click filter.
>
> "Triodes?" :-)
>
>>66. What operating characteristics distinguish the electron-coupled
>>type oscillator with regard to frequency stability?
>
> "Electron-coupled?" :-)
>
> I guess nobody caught (onto) the Clapp oscillator back then? :-)

Not a single correct answer. Guess you're not ready for the entry-level exam.
>
> What does all that OLD stuff have to do with "honest code
> elimination?"

Read the post leading up to that one. I was asked to provide the information.
>
>

1537. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 01:26:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329202651.03943.00002989@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63824

In article <20030329184054.18686.00000110@mb-fn.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>
>>Maybe there should be an top ten Embarassment list based on the age and
>>percetion of how outmoded a mode is.
>
>Interesting idea, but Hams should be skilled at all useful modes. That
>includes
>the modes you mention.

He mentioned Morse code, so obviously hams should be skilled at Morse code.
>
>Morse code is known to be obsolete, not useful.

Of course it's useful. You just hate to admit that simple fact.

>Advertising Hams use Morse code
>to the non-Ham public would not make Ham radio look good.

We do and it does.
>
>>I am an extremely technical person. It didn't scare me away.
>
>Good for you.
>
Didn't scare me away, either.

>>What priveleges would a person get from passing just the writtens?
>
>A Technician class license get almost the whole amateur bands, just like they
>do now.

So no change to the Tech?
>
>More bands for General and Extra class is not possible, as the Tech class got
>all the bands up front. We can't take away bands from those who already have
>them to make things more "fair" for everyone.

Whoa, hold on.

I presume your talking about after the code test goes away.

So we have Techs getting all bands and all modes at full authorized power under your plan?
>

>The General and Extra classes get they extra "prestige" of getting those
>licenses.

Gee, thanks.

> Before you say "What good is prestige?", remember that Extra class
>right now offers basically the same thing (with only a few extra freqs) - not
>much more than General class priveleges.

You obviously don't know much about the HF amateur bands.

Did you know that AOL software includes a SPELLCHECKER?

So what you're proposing is that all hams have all all bands and modes at full power just for passing the 35 question Technician test.

Well, there it is.

1538. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 01:26:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329202653.03943.00002990@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63825

In article <20030329164729.13213.00000099@mb-ca.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030328122653.14527.00001115@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) >writes:
>
>>The bloodiest war the USA ever fought was from 1861 to 1865. Americans >>against other Americans.
>
> INCORRECT.

Americans weren't fighting other Americans in 1865?
>
> The total number of deaths (Union and Confederacy) in the
> American Civil War was 219,939 in battle. The total number
> of battle deaths during World War 2 was 292,131.

INCORRECT.

Civil War Dead:

185,594 combat
373,458 other
559,052 total

WW2 Dead:
292,131 combat
115,185 other
407,316 total

Source:

http://www.geobop.com/World/NA/Topics/History/Civil_War/reference/compare/

> Battle deaths are considered "bloody."

Dead is dead, whether it's on the battlefield, from disease, or in a prisoner of war camp. Us population during the Civil War was about 31 million. During WW2 it was about four times that.

You can dig through the pepper pot if you want but the fact remains that the Civil War cost more lives.

> All of that happened before N2EY's time.

And before Leonard Anderson's "time", unless he wants to take some sort of credit for being 12 years old on VJ Day.

> It is history.

That's why you should try to get it right.

> Please
> try to be factual when admonishing others.

Please practice what you preach, parson ;-)

1539. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 03:05:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E865F0E.3010702@adelphia.net>
Source record: 63826

N2EY wrote:
> In article <20030329164733.13213.00000102@mb-ca.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
>
>>In article <c2356669.0303271826.59fe8ac5@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>>(N2EY) writes:
>>
>>
>>>All right, here's a sample. Remember that these are not the exact
>>>questions on the old tests, and they are for the "entry level"
>>>license:
>>>
>>>1. Name the basic units of electrical resistance, inductance,
>>>capacitance, current, electromotive force or potential difference,
>>>power, energy, quantity, magneto-motive force, and frequency.
>>
>> "Quantity?" :-)
>
>
> Yup. That's the exact wording of the question from the 1948 FCC study guide.
>
> Guess you need to brush up on those basic terms.
>
>>>6. Why is it advisable to use a plate power supply for the oscillator
>>>of a transmitter separate from the final amplifier plate power supply?
>>
>> What is this "plate" supply? :-)
>>
>
> Look it up.
>
>
>>>20. Describe the adjustment procedure for proper neutralization in a
>>>radio-frequency amplifier using an r.f. indicator coupled to the plate
>>>tank circuit.
>>
>> There's that "plate" thing again...
>>
>>
>>>26. What is the purpose of a Faraday (electrostatic) shield between
>>>the output circuit of an r.f. power amplifier and antenna coupling
>>>system.
>>

>> To keep from transmitting Faraday harmonics? :-)
>>
>> Try as I might, never can recall a single transmitter seen since
>> 1953 having any electrostatic shield in its output tank. :-)
>
>
> Tell it to the FCC.
>
>>>34. A low-drift crystal for the 3500-4000 kc. amateur band is
>>>guaranteed by the manufacturer to be calibrated to within 0.04% of its
>>>specified frequency. Desiring to operate as close to the lower band
>>>limit of 3500 kc. as possible, for what whole-number kilocycle
>>>frequency should you order your crystal, allowing 1 kc. additional for
>>>variation from temperature and circuit constants?
>>
>> Oy, times have changed. 0.04% ? Gosh, I could order
>> 0.005% crystals to order from a shop on La Brea Ave. in
>> L.A. back in 1958.
>>
>> 400 PPM tolerance was hardly "low-drift" even back in 1951.
>
>
> Tell it to the FCC. They wrote the question, not me.
>
>>>36. Draw a schematic diagram of a full-wave single-phase power supply
>>>using a center-tapped high-voltage secondary with a filter circuit for
>>>best regulation, showing a bleeder resistor providing two different
>>>output voltages and a method of suppressing "hash" interference from
>>>the mercury-vapor rectifier tubes. Give the names of the component
>>>parts and approximate values of of filter components suitable for
>>>either amateur radiotelephone or radiotelegraph operation
>>
>> "Mercury-vapor rectifier tubes?!?" :-)
>>
>> Were those used for a "plate" supply? :-)
>>
>>
>>>40. Draw a schematic diagram of two r.f. amplifier stages using triode
>>>tubes, showing neutralizing circuits, link coupling between stages and
>>>between output and antenna system, and a keying connection in the
>>>negative high-voltage lead including a key-click filter.
>>
>> "Triodes?" :-)
>>
>>
>>>66. What operating characteristics distinguish the electron-coupled
>>>type oscillator with regard to frequency stability?
>>
>> "Electron-coupled?" :-)
>>

>> I guess nobody caught (onto) the Clapp oscillator back then? :-)
>
>
> Not a single correct answer. Guess you're not ready for the entry-level exam.
>
>> What does all that OLD stuff have to do with "honest code
>> elimination?"
>
>
> Read the post leading up to that one. I was asked to provide the information.

And thanks too, Jim. I really didn't think anyone would take you to
task for posting the questions. They seem entirely appropriate for 1948.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1540. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 03:10:05 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030329221005.25947.00000124@mb-ff.aol.com>
Source record: 63827

From (N2EY):
>He mentioned Morse code, so obviously hams should be skilled at Morse code.
Sure, just not everyone.

>>Morse code is known to be obsolete, not useful.
>Of course it's useful. You just hate to admit that simple fact.

The FCC says Morse is not more desirable or required for amateur radio operation.

Also, Morse code, useful or not, is a different kind of skill than the written test. By requiring Morse code for General Class, it blocks entry to that class. Real-time encoding skills should not block one's advancement in the written class.

>>Advertising Hams use Morse code
>>to the non-Ham public would not make Ham radio look good.
>
>We do and it does.

Advertising Ham radio as cool, useful rather than nerdy will gain more members.

>>>I am an extremely technical person. It didn't scare me away.
>>
>>Good for you.
>>
>Didn't scare me away, either.

Misplaced priorities. Real EEs (or anyone interested in technical skills) don't code. It shows you put effort into learning a visceral encoding scheme. This takes away from the theory, which one did not HAVE to learn to get the license.

You should be advocating troubleshooting of rigs, use of test equipment, antenna setups, tuning rigs, etc. Instead you advocate Morse code. I have to wonder about that.

>So no change to the Tech?

No, no change to the Tech. Remember, with the "license in a day" class, most can pass it very painlessly in one day - without having to actually study and learn the material. This should not be much sacrifice to get a license for someone that just wants to operate and no theory.

>So we have Techs getting all bands and all modes at full authorized power
>under
>your plan?

No, Tech class would get the same as right now. No change to the Tech class.

>>The General and Extra classes get they extra "prestige" of getting those
>>licenses.
>
>Gee, thanks.

That's basically what is offered right now for the Extra class. Still people
that passed the General test want to get that Extra class.

I have outlined the plan below.
-This should satisfy those that just want to operate, and not learn theory.
-It also removes the Morse barrier from General class, so a visceral skill
(Morse code) does not block the "recognition" of technical skill (written
test).
*The only group it may not satisfy is someone that wants to get on HF using
voice and not CW.

Here's the plan:

Tech Test -
required to get Tech class license an be a licensed amateur.
Same privileges with new plan as currently given.

General Test-
required for General Class.
Must pass Test test before you can take General Test.
No additional privileges (just the "prestige" of higher licence class).
However, More freqs can be given here if they become available.
(Correct me if I'm wrong- all privs were given in the current Tech class).

Extra Test-
required for Extra Class.
Must pass Tech test, then General test before taking Extra Test.
No additional privileges. However, More freqs can be given here if they become
available.

Morse code Test
required for access to HF bands.
Must pass Tech written test only.

1541. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 03:16:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E86619F.3020309@adelphia.net>
Source record: 63828

Vshah101 wrote:
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>
>
>>Maybe there should be an top ten Embarassment list based on the age and
>>percetion of how outmoded a mode is.
>
>
> Interesting idea, but Hams should be skilled at all useful modes. That includes
> the modes you mention.

There you have it! Morse is a very useful mode

> Morse code is known to be obsolete, not useful. Advertising Hams use Morse code
> to the non-Ham public would not make Ham radio look good.

It's one mode that takes some practice to get good at. Most of the other
modes do not. They take some electronic or procedural talent.

And no, Morse is not obsolete. It's just an old mode. We use plenty of
"old" modes, as pointed out in my post. By the time Digital voice gets
to ham radio, it will be fairly old. THe main reason it's not here more
now is bandwidth problems.

>
>>I am an extremely technical person. It didn't scare me away.
>
>
> Good for you.

Thanks, I am enjoying myself with my HF privileges

>>What priveleges would a person get from passing just the writtens?
>
> A Technician class license get almost the whole amateur bands, just like they
> do now.
>
> More bands for General and Extra class is not possible, as the Tech class got
> all the bands up front. We can't take away bands from those who already have
> them to make things more "fair" for everyone.
>
> The General and Extra classes get they extra "prestige" of getting those
> licenses. Before you say "What good is prestige?", remember that Extra class
> right now offers basically the same thing (with only a few extra freqs) - not
> much more than General class priveleges.

Better draw that diagram, because I read this as a contradiction of what you said before. I don't see anything about the difference between the General and Extra with written only, and the same with the Morse CW test.

1542. Re: Bad Ham Examples (was Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 03:17:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E866203.805@adelphia.net>
Source record: 63829

KB9TMP wrote:

> David Letterman (type) top ten list for today
> Bad examples if they were Ham Radio Operators
>
>
> 10. Sodam Hussan
> 9. Osama Bin Laden
> 8. Leonard H. Anderson
> 7. Jane Fonda
> 6. Bozo the Clown
> 5. Jerry Springer
> 4. Al Sharpton
> 3. Bill Clinton
> 2. Jessie Jackson
> .
> .
> .
> .
> .
> .
> and the number one answer to who would be
> a bad example if they were a Ham Radio Operator
> .
> .
> .
> .
> .
> .
> .
> .
> 1. Michael Jackson

HAR! You get the post of the day award!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1543. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 04:40:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E867576.7080809@adelphia.net>
Source record: 63830

Vshah101 wrote:
> From (N2EY):
>
>>He mentioned Morse code, so obviously hams should be skilled at Morse code.
>
> Sure, just not everyone.
>
>
>>>Morse code is known to be obsolete, not useful.
>>
>>Of course it's useful. You just hate to admit that simple fact.
>
>
> The FCC says Morse is not more desirable or required for amateur radio
> operation.
>
> Also, Morse code, useful or not, is a different kind of skill than the written
> test. By requiring Morse code for General Class, it blocks entry to that class.
> Real-time encoding skills should not block one's advancement in the written
> class.

Yes, it is a different skill entirely. That's why it's there. It is a
very unique area of am radio.

>>>Advertising Hams use Morse code
>>>to the non-Ham public would not make Ham radio look good.
>>
>>We do and it does.
>
>
> Advertising Ham radio as cool, useful rather than nerdy will gain more members.

Ham radio is simply NOT cool! If you want cool, get street smart. Buy
Brittany Spears CD's and posters (hurry tho', her 15 minutes is just
about up. Grab a skateboard. Learn how to talk cool people talk (and you
don't like the terms hams use). Become a part of the least common
denominator orientation and worship of the mediocre that pop culture has
become. Get some cool tats. Be cool.

If you want cool, you definitely DON'T want Ham radio.

That's just fine in my book. Hams don't have to be oddball overweight
recluses and social misfits as you apparently think they are, but you
have to face it, it is not ever going to be a hobby of people who are so
self conscious that they have to affect those behaviors that are
identified as cool.

>>>>I am an extremely technical person. It didn't scare me away.
>>>
>>>Good for you.
>>>
>>
>>Didn't scare me away, either.
>
>
> Misplaced priorities. Real EEs (or anyone interested in technical skills) don't
> code. It shows you put effort into learning a visceral encoding scheme. This
> takes away from the theory, which one did not HAVE to learn to get the license.

Oh, come on. Its Jim's time to do what he wants with. You seem to
insist that he spend his hobby time doing somethin that you want him to
do. Who ever said that a hobby had to have anything to do with a persons
vocation in the first place?

> You should be advocating troubleshooting of rigs, use of test equipment,
> antenna setups, tuning rigs, etc. Instead you advocate Morse code. I have to
> wonder about that.

From my tenure here, I gotta say that Jim is a lot more than just about
Morse code. You seem to be the one with an obsession with Morse.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1544. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 05:28:21 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <Vfvha.2408$rN3.226583@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 63831

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

:
: So I'll ask the hard question: What changes are Americans willing to
: make in their lives to reduce/eliminate dependence on imported oil?
:

That's not a hard question, it's an irrelevant question.

The hard question is how can the passengers on this planet figure out a way
to take mutual advantage of each others resources in a fashion which
benefits all of us, arbitrary borders drawn on a map notwithstanding.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1545. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 06:02:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAABF2A0.1516D%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63832

"Len Over 21" wrote:

> (snip) Iraq has regularly disobeyed United
> Nations resolutions since the cessation of the
> first Gulf War in 1991. Iraq has remained a
> threat to Middle Eastern stability since the
> Iran-Iraq War of 1980 to 1988.

True, but neither of those provide a clear reason why Iraq was singled out. Lets not forget that many countries have regularly disobeyed UN resolutions. I believe we've ignored a few ourselves. Likewise, numerous situations have caused, or are now causing, instability in the Middle East. The introduction of nuclear weapons to that region (by Israel) is one example.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1546. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 09:43:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E86BC53.DB197D89@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63833

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E83CAE9.D066F9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Brian
> > >
> > >You're already confused. You're addressing me about what N2EY wrote.
> > >Good luck on that comprehension problem.
>
> The Leader of the Gang of Four continues to use the Lieder
> which N2EY wrote.

Brian didn't seem to have any comment on the fact that he addressed me regarding what another wrote. It is lucky for him to have you around. The profile penned by N2EY is another matter. It does not describe Brian. It describes your behavior, the behavior which you seem unable to avoid.

> No originality. Good officer material.

Since you've obliged with yet another fulfillment of the profile, here it is:

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

1547. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 09:54:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E86BEC4.7BA5B0DB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63834

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E836CC4.B5EBE8DD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> More mantra.
>
> Constant repetition of this is part of the Big Lie technique.

Here's your big chance to demonstrate that the quote is the "Big Lie technique" which you say it is. Just explain the examples of your material I provided earlier in comparison to what Jim's profile says will be your actions. Maybe you can come up with a theory that your earlier material was accidentally posted or that you were under heavy medication when you wrote it. Perhaps you could convince readers that all of those things were forgeries.

To this point, you've offered no explanation at all. All you've done is moan about the "Big Lie technique" and "character assassination". Those things don't jibe with what anyone can plainly see is your typical behavior here.

Leonard doesn't play well with others.

Dave K8MN

1548. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 09:57:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E86BFB6.3B095824@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63835

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E836BF6.61AB913C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> The Lieder of the Gang of Four...

...sez the leader of the Gang of One.

> Usual mantra.

...and the usual N2EY profile justifying response.

Dave K8MN

1549. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 10:01:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E86C076.D6092677@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63836

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0303271904.76adf606@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> So much for your character, Leonard.
> >>
> >> Dave K8MN
> >
> >So much for your ability to create an original thought.
>
> The Gang of Four's leader is trying the Big Lie technique.
>
> It worked for a certain German political party and it should
> do well for the Four. :-)

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

I believe you'll find a number of the actions which the profile
describes, presented in your response. You just can't help yourself.

Dave K8MN

1550. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 10:05:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E86C15C.5D2E631E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63837

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >I wrote that I considered the speed of proficiency to be higher than ten
> >wpm.
>
> Scientific proof of 10 wpm claim? Some say its 13wpm. At this speed, Morse code
> encoding/decoding is automatic, part of one's being, unforgettable. Only at
> this speed is one considered a "true" Ham.

Vipul, meet Brian. Brian, meet Vipul. I'm sure you two will find that
you have a lot in common. I didn't make a ten wpm claim.

Dave K8MN

1551. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 11:26:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030330062648.29016.00001104@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 63838

In article <Vfvha.2408$rN3.226583@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
>:
>: So I'll ask the hard question: What changes are Americans willing to
>: make in their lives to reduce/eliminate dependence on imported oil?
>:
>
>That's not a hard question, it's an irrelevant question.

How is it irrelevant, Hans? Our economy and lifestyle are heavily dependent on imported petroleum. Where did Iraq get the money to build up its military and attack its neighbor in 1990?

>
>The hard question is how can the passengers on this planet figure out a way
>to take mutual advantage of each others resources in a fashion which
>benefits all of us, arbitrary borders drawn on a map notwithstanding.
>
OK, let me rephrase the question:

What changes are Americans willing to make in their lives so that the passengers on this planet can figure out and implement ways to take mutual advantage of each others resources in a fashion which benefits all of us, arbitrary borders drawn on a map notwithstanding?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1552. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 13:01:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303300501.b6db65c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63839

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E85D10E.F491CEA@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E83C83A.AC593364@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E836CC4.B5EBE8DD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > >
> > > > > I answered Brian's question.
> > > > >
> > > > You don't know the answer.
> > >
> > > I provide not only one answer. I provided a number of answers. Any of
> > > them would be a suitable reply to your question.
> >
> > State the minimum speed and accuracy level at which one can be
> > considered Morse Proficient.
>
> Jim already told you that he considers that point to be ten words per
> minute. That answer didn't suit you.

I didn't disagree with it. I asked where the authority was on that
figure. He said that some club issues certificates, but coundn't say
who.

I placed the level somewhat
> higher. That answer didn't suit you.

You had no number. You said this is more than that. Your answer did
not suit me.

We know that there are numerous
> ops who are comfortable with 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 wpm. There are some who
> can operate at much higher speeds. If you choose to delude yourself
> that someone whose maximum speed is five words per minute is proficient
> in morse, so be it. I've give you the definition of "proficient". I
> don't consider the 5 wpm level to be "skilled" or "expert".

I'd like to get to the bottom of this. If you have some information
on what the FCC says is proficient, past or present, I'd like to hear
of it. Even something from the 1912 Dept of the Navy would do.

> > > > You merely type words.
> > >

> > > That seems to have been what makes up your response.
>
> > Back it up with anything from the FCC. Anything at all.
>
> The FCC is not in the business of determing morse proficiency.

Yet, somehow, they require us to learn it.

1553. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 13:04:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303300504.cf5621@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63840

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E85D320.FC0B49CA@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E83C7B4.1CF1AC3C@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > Then state at what minimum word per minute rate and accuracy level, a
> > > > user of Morse Code can be considered proficient, and why.
> > >
> > > I've provided you with a definition of what it means to be proficient.
> > > I'll leave it for you to explain why it would be that when many are
> > > capable of 20, 25, 30, 35 and 40 wpm copy, anyone would consider an
> > > excruciatingly slow 5 wpm as proficient.
> >
> > If the criterion is slowness, then you have a problem. Some consider
> > 20wpm slow. Is 20wpm not proficient?
>
> Sure, twenty wpm is proficient. Thirty wpm is more proficient than
> twenty. Forty wpm is more proficient than thirty.
>
> A batter who hits 385 is good. A batter who hits 405 is better. A
> bowler whose average is 240 is good. A bowler whose average is 265 is
> better. Are you having a problem with the concept?
>
> > FISTS says accuracy transcends speed.
>
> Does FISTS say anything about someone who can receive accurately at high
> speed?
>
> > > > Best of luck (because I don't plan on hearing from you on this matter
> > > > again).
> > >
> > > The best laid plans...
> >
> > are often modified. You have not stated the lowest wpm rate at which
> > "proficiency" is achieved.
>
> I believe it to be higher than ten wpm. I've already stated that.
>
> > And your answer is???
>
> Silicone caulk. What was the question?
>

> Dave K8MN

How much higher than 10wpm?

1554. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 13:09:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303300509.4f25de4f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63841

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E85D3D6.ED8117B6@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E83C87E.3D06A962@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E836D20.52616BE9@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I'm thankful that I have no idea of whether or not you smell bad.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > > > Hardly relevant on rrap.
> > > >
> > > > Then you'll want to address your comment to Leonard H. Anderson. He
> > > > brought it up.
> > >
> > > Het Len, hardly relevant on rrap.
> > >
> > > > > Nor do you know what Morse Proficient is, or at least you cannot put it in words.
> > > >
> > > > I have put it into words. There is no answer which will satisfy you.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > No you haven't. You said that 'this speed is more proficient then that
> > > speed.'
> >
> > I wrote that I considered the speed of proficiency to be higher than ten
> > wpm.
> >
> > > If 20wpm is "more proficient" than 13wpm, are you saying that 20wpm is
> > > the lowest speed considered proficient?
> >
> > No. I'm saying that 20 wpm is more proficient than 13 wpm, 25 wpm is
> > more proficient than 20 wpm and 30 wpm is more proficient than 25 wpm.
> >
> > Dave K8MN

How much higher than 10wpm?

1555. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 13:13:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303300513.3bb58fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63842

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030327224845.01698.00000012@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/27/2003 9:02 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303271902.54645e07@posting.google.com>
>
> >> N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >>
> >> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >> government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >> amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >> Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >> slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
> >>
> >> Dave K8MN
> >
> >Apparently, Dave has no mind of his own.
>
> Hey...what ever works. You can't argue with the truth.
>
> Steve

How's your therapy coming?

1556. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 13:20:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303300520.1be0108@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63844

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E83D9FA.9BC1229A@att.net>...

> Good Grief, is The Magpie still chirping about Morse proficiency speed? Can't he read?
> FCC defined Morse proficiency very clearly long ago. He was told that and still he resists.
> He just can't understand the futility of it. Never could.

Excellent! DICK has a positive contribution to make.

State where the FCC defined Morse proficiency long ago.

I'm sure Jim will back you up; he has all the referenced going back to 1912.

1557. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 14:05:35 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <PQCha.8$lV1.3759@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 63843

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030329221005.25947.00000124@mb-ff.aol.com...
> Also, Morse code, useful or not, is a different kind of skill than the
written
> test. By requiring Morse code for General Class, it blocks entry to that
class.
> Real-time encoding skills should not block one's advancement in the
written
> class.

So what if it is a different kind of skill. I've known several hams with significant audio and/or learning handicaps. Those who wanted to pass the test did. "Real-time" encoding skills have NOT blocked anyone who really wanted to do it. Besides, didn't you know that talking is in itself a "real-time" encoding skill. Obviously not.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

1558. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 17:26:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030330122641.23598.00001158@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63845

In article <f45722ac.0303300501.b6db65c@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Jim already told you that he considers that point to be ten words per
>> minute. That answer didn't suit you.
>
>I didn't disagree with it. I asked where the authority was on that
>figure. He said that some club issues certificates, but coundn't say
>who.

I said you should go look it up.

There's no reason for me, Dave or anyone else to keep answering your questions
when you won't answer ours about you alleged /T5 amateur operation. Questions
like:

What callsign was used?
What rigs and antennas were used?
Who did the equipment belong to?
What amateur bands and modes were used?
What countries and continents were worked?
How were the QSLs delivered?

Try answering those first.

1559. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 17:26:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030330122641.23598.00001157@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63846

In article <3E86C076.D6092677@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>Date: Sun, 30 Mar 2003 10:01:12 GMT
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <f45722ac.0303271904.76adf606@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >> So much for your character, Leonard.
>> >>
>> >> Dave K8MN
>> >
>> >So much for your ability to create an original thought.
>>
>> The Gang of Four's leader is trying the Big Lie technique.

For a thing to be a lie, it must be untrue. Mr. Anderson's responses prove the
quote true over and over again.
>>
>> It worked for a certain German political party and it should
>> do well for the Four. :-)

In just those two sentences we have insult, ridicule, name-calling, factual
error, and an ethnic slur. Also possible, excessive emoticon and general
infantile behavior.
>
>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>>
Perhaps a slight rewrite is in order:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
ethnic/racial/religious

slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general infantile behavior."

>I believe you'll find a number of the actions which the profile
>describes, presented in your response.

There's at least 5 years' worth of examples in Google.

>You just can't help yourself.

Len has, on occasion, posted without the described behavior. Therefore, it is logical to conclude that he can control his behavior. The actions described are his choice.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>

1560. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 19:57:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hckksq2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 63847

On 30 Mar 2003 05:20:11 -0800, Brian wrote:

>State where the FCC defined Morse proficiency long ago.

The FCC Eules are plain about what proficiency is required:

Sect. 97.503(a)

A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that
the examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand and
to receive correctly by ear texts in the international Morse
code at not less than the prescribed speed, using all the
letters of the alphabet, numerals 0-9, period, comma,
question mark, slant mark, and prosigns AR, BT, and SK.

Seems to me that the proficincy required is to "send correctly
by hand and to receive correctly by ear texts in the international
Morse code at not less than the prescribed speed". The speed
itself is not the proficiency, the "correct sending and receiving"
is.

That wording has been in the Rules for decades.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1561. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 20:03:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E874D94.4D1BA6AC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63848

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E85D10E.F491CEA@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E83C83A.AC593364@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E836CC4.B5EBE8DD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I answered Brian's question.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You don't know the answer.
> > > > >
> > > > > I provide not only one answer. I provided a number of answers. Any of
> > > > > them would be a suitable reply to your question.
> > > >
> > > > State the minimum speed and accuracy level at which one can be
> > > > considered Morse Proficient.
> > >
> > > Jim already told you that he considers that point to be ten words per
> > > minute. That answer didn't suit you.
>
> I didn't disagree with it. I asked where the authority was on that
> figure. He said that some club issues certificates, but coundn't say
> who.

You didn't agree with it either. The answer didn't suit you.

> I placed the level somewhat
> > higher. That answer didn't suit you.
>
> You had no number. You said this is more than that. Your answer did
> not suit me.

As I've stated twice previously, there is no answer which will satisfy
you.

> > We know that there are numerous
> > ops who are comfortable with 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 wpm. There are some who
> > can operate at much higher speeds. If you choose to delude yourself
> > that someone whose maximum speed is five words per minute is proficient
> > in morse, so be it. I've give you the definition of "proficient". I

> > don't consider the 5 wpm level to be "skilled" or "expert".
>
> I'd like to get to the bottom of this. If you have some information
> on what the FCC says is proficient, past or present, I'd like to hear
> of it. Even something from the 1912 Dept of the Navy would do.

Look it up.

> > > > > You merely type words.
> > > >
> > > > That seems to have been what makes up your response.
> >
> > > Back it up with anything from the FCC. Anything at all.
> >
> > The FCC is not in the business of determing morse proficiency.
>
> Yet, somehow, they require us to learn it.

That's right. They don't claim that because you pass a five word per
minute exam, you've suddenly become proficient in the use of morse.
Passing a driving exam doesn't mean that you're certified as a good
driver. It just means that you passed the exam.

Dave K8MN

1562. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 20:05:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E874DFF.F7295714@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63849

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > >
> > > are often modified. You have not stated the lowest wpm rate at which
> > > "proficiency" is achieved.
> >
> > I believe it to be higher than ten wpm. I've already stated that.
> >
> > > And your answer is???
> >
> > Silicone caulk. What was the question?

>
> How much higher than 10wpm?

Not much.

Dave K8MN

1563. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 20:47:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303301247.5d3725bb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63850

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E86BC53.DB197D89@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3E83CAE9.D066F9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >> Brian
> > >
> > >You're already confused. You're addressing me about what N2EY wrote.
> > >Good luck on that comprehension problem.
> >
> > The Leader of the Gang of Four continues to use the Lieder
> > which N2EY wrote.
>
> Brian didn't seem to have any comment on the fact that he addressed me
> regarding what another wrote. It is lucky for him to have you around.

I am lucky.

1564. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 20:57:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303301257.685f1d7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63751

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E86C15C.5D2E631E@earthlink.net>...
> Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> > >I wrote that I considered the speed of proficiency to be higher than ten
> > >wpm.
> >
> > Scientific proof of 10 wpm claim? Some say its 13wpm. At this speed, Morse code
> > encoding/decoding is automatic, part of one's being, unforgettable. Only at
> > this speed is one considered a "true" Ham.
>
> Vipul, meet Brian. Brian, meet Vipul. I'm sure you two will find that
> you have a lot in common. I didn't make a ten wpm claim.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave doesn't seem to know.

1565. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 21:01:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303301301.42daf974@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63752

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030330062648.29016.00001104@mb-fy.aol.com>...

> OK, let me rephrase the question:
>
> What changes are Americans willing to make in their lives so that the
> passengers on this planet can figure out and implement ways to take mutual
> advantage of each others resources in a fashion which benefits all of us,
> arbitrary borders drawn on a map notwithstanding?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

"Passengers of this planet?"

That sounds a lot like Larry's, "Citizen of the World."

1566. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 23:03:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b67tab$6r9$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63753

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030329164728.13213.00000098@mb-ca.aol.com...
> In article <BAAAC0D6.14D5A%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewart@say.net>
> writes:
>
> > Fact? What else would you call it, Steve? More than two years after the
> >WTC attack, no evidence has been presented to even suggest anything other
> >than what I said. Do you have that evidence? We're attacking a country
and
> >killing many thousands. More than rhetoric is required to justify that.
>
> The first World Trade Center attack happened in 1993. All but
> one of the perpetrators have been tried and imprisoned. [one
> was never caught]
>
> Iraq has regularly disobeyed United Nations resolutions since
> the cessation of the first Gulf War in 1991. Iraq has remained a
> threat to Middle Eastern stability since the Iran-Iraq War of 1980
> to 1988.
>
> It should be noted that Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, not for any
> peaceful expansion of its liebensraum. The USA-led coalition
> did not pursue Iraqi forces at the cessation of hostilities in
> 1991. Events over the next dozen years seem to indicate that
> the coalition should have continued all the way into Iraq then.
>
> This second Gulf War is really a resumption of the first one
> that wasn't fully completed.

And the resumption is brought on by the sick Saddam regime's
own behavior, failure to abide by their agreements and just plain
gross injustice to the Iraqi people themselves.

And in this case, the resumption og Gulf War 1 ...it will be completed.

Support the coaliton troops.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1567. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-30 23:08:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b67thr$h9m$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63754

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hckksq2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 30 Mar 2003 05:20:11 -0800, Brian wrote:
> >State where the FCC defined Morse proficiency long ago.

Phil responded with...
> The FCC Rules are plain about what proficiency is required:
>
> Sect. 97.503(a)
> A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that
> the examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand and
> to receive correctly by ear texts in the international Morse
> code at not less than the prescribed speed, using all the
> letters of the alphabet, numerals 0-9, period, comma,
> question mark, slant mark, and prosigns AR, BT, and SK.
>
> Seems to me that the proficincy required is to "send correctly
> by hand and to receive correctly by ear texts in the international
> Morse code at not less than the prescribed speed". The speed
> itself is not the proficiency, the "correct sending and receiving"
> is.
>
> That wording has been in the Rules for decades.

Makes sense to me Phil...BUT the naysayers in this
group don't consider 5 wpm to be proficient...according
to their standards :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1568. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 01:37:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303301737.56d01905@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63755

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hckksq2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 30 Mar 2003 05:20:11 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >State where the FCC defined Morse proficiency long ago.
>
> The FCC [***{Caution: Tripping Hazard)***] Eules are plain about what proficiency is
required:
>
> Sect. 97.503(a)
>
> A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that
> the examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand and
> to receive correctly by ear texts in the international Morse
> code at not less than the prescribed speed, using all the
> letters of the alphabet, numerals 0-9, period, comma,
> question mark, slant mark, and prosigns AR, BT, and SK.
>
> Seems to me that the proficincy required is to "send correctly
> by hand and to receive correctly by ear texts in the international
> Morse code at not less than the prescribed speed". The speed
> itself is not the proficiency, the "correct sending and receiving"
> is.
>
> That wording has been in the Rules for decades.

Phil, yes, yes. But we've still got Dave saying that 5wpm cannot be
proficient. Jim says it's 10wpm. Dave says its higher but doesn't
know how much higher.

Apparently, Accuracy CANNOT Transcend Speed (sorry FISTS). Ever.

Even if it's to set a world record.

1569. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 01:42:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303301742.4201c4f1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63756

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030330122641.23598.00001158@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0303300501.b6db65c@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> Jim already told you that he considers that point to be ten words per
> >> minute. That answer didn't suit you.
> >
> >I didn't disagree with it. I asked where the authority was on that
> >figure. He said that some club issues certificates, but coundn't say
> >who.
>
> I said you should go look it up.

You must not remember which club it was. Not my problem.

> There's no reason for me, Dave or anyone else to keep answering your questions
> when you won't answer ours about you alleged /T5 amateur operation. Questions
> like:
>
> What callsign was used?
> What rigs and antennas were used?
> Who did the equipment belong to?
> What amateur bands and modes were used?
> What countries and continents were worked?
> How were the QSLs delivered?
>
> Try answering those first.

Sorry, but those questions are just too hard.

1570. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 02:53:45 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <973158DB723EF0DB.D34F8B23BE65C649.5FF020718DD7A5E2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 63758

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAAAC76E.14D5C%stewart@say.net...
> "Bert Craig" wrote:
> >
> > Dwight Stewart wrote...
> >>
> >> No single American is "We, the USA." If
> >> he wants to voice his personal opinion, he
> >> can do so in his own name (like everyone
> >> else does).
> >
> > I very much disagree. While we're all individuals,
> > we are also a part of the larger "united"
> > collective, "We, the people." You need only read
> > the replies to your response to Dan's post to gauge
> > the popular feeling of "we, the people." That's
> > part of democracy, Dwight.
>
>
> I suspect the support for the use of "We, the USA" in his comments would
> have been a little less enthusiastic if he had said something contrary to
> current government or military policy.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

You bring up an incredibly interesting and poignant observation, Dwight.
All the cries for "patriotism" (those of people who imply it is unpatriotic
not to support and stand behind a President of the US), are probably right
along party lines; i.e., would we find a Republican pleading for respect and
admiration of a Democrat President or vice versa? hmmmmm....

Kim W5TIT

1571. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 02:59:23 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <AEF4832828806B84.E8E16FBDEA8659C2.99154591CB422797@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 63757

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030328222652.29016.00001095@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article
<5554E5FDE074FA2E.B2670047AB436D52.476BC977E8906C5D@lp.airnews.net>,
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >I think it was also Larry that stated that no peace has ever been
achieved
> >without war. He needs to learn of the success of India's entrance into a
> >free nation....
>
> Not the best example, Kim.
>
> It's true that India got its independence from the British Empire without
a
> war. Ghandi & Co. used nonviolence to make the Brits realize that keeping
India
> would require more repression than the Brits (being basically decent
folks)
> could stand. Also, after almost six years of world war to preserve
freedom, the
> British were not going to force countries to remain British subjects if
they
> wanted independence.
>
> But soon after the British left, India erupted into violent, bloody civil
war
> and ultimately split into two (now three) countries, two of whom are still
> fighting over boundaries (Kashmir isn't a sweater). How many died in that
war,
> and in the fighting that still goes on after more than 50 years?
>

Yes, I understand. However, the fact that India initially won its
independence without a war is siginificant to the idea that peace and
freedom cannot be won from tyranny without a war. That India fell apart
after it won its independence may be partly due to the fact that those who
led the nonviolent front were less influential (due in part to some deaths).
Incidental to, that the people began to squabble among themselves what the
"best way" was.

>
> South Africa got its independence from the Empire about the same time as
India
> - and promptly enacted apartheid, which was much harsher and more

repressive
> than anything the British ever did in South Africa.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Ew yeah...go figure, huh?

Kim W5TIT

1572. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 03:37:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E87B80F.F2E8C335@att.net>
Source record: 63759

Dave Heil wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E85D10E.F491CEA@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E83C83A.AC593364@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E836CC4.B5EBE8DD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I answered Brian's question.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You don't know the answer.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I provide not only one answer. I provided a number of answers. Any of
> > > > > > them would be a suitable reply to your question.
> > > > >
> > > > > State the minimum speed and accuracy level at which one can be
> > > > > considered Morse Proficient.
> > > >
> > > > Jim already told you that he considers that point to be ten words per
> > > > minute. That answer didn't suit you.
> > >
> > > I didn't disagree with it. I asked where the authority was on that
> > > figure. He said that some club issues certificates, but coundn't say
> > > who.
> >
> > You didn't agree with it either. The answer didn't suit you.
> >
> > > I placed the level somewhat
> > > > higher. That answer didn't suit you.
> > >
> > > You had no number. You said this is more than that. Your answer did
> > > not suit me.
> >
> > As I've stated twice previously, there is no answer which will satisfy
> > you.
> >
> > > > We know that there are numerous

> > > ops who are comfortable with 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 wpm. There are some who
> > > can operate at much higher speeds. If you choose to delude yourself
> > > that someone whose maximum speed is five words per minute is proficient
> > > in morse, so be it. I've give you the definition of "proficient". I
> > > don't consider the 5 wpm level to be "skilled" or "expert".
> >
> > I'd like to get to the bottom of this. If you have some information
> > on what the FCC says is proficient, past or present, I'd like to hear
> > of it. Even something from the 1912 Dept of the Navy would do.
>
> Look it up.
>
> > > > > > You merely type words.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That seems to have been what makes up your response.
> > > >
> > > > > Back it up with anything from the FCC. Anything at all.
> > > >
> > > > The FCC is not in the business of determing morse proficiency.
> > >
> > Yet, somehow, they require us to learn it.
>
> That's right. They don't claim that because you pass a five word per
> minute exam, you've suddenly become proficient in the use of morse.
> Passing a driving exam doesn't mean that you're certified as a good
> driver. It just means that you passed the exam.
>
> Dave K8MN

Geez, Dave, I really need to introduce Brian to a good old fashoned Missouri mule. I've come to the
concrete conclusion that the mule could learn a lot from Slim about pure muleheaded stubborness.The
usual cure for the mule is a two by four upside the head. Brian seems to need a new head.

Lessee, now....ARRL has issued Morse code proficiency certificates for much longer than the 47 years
I've been licensed. If I recall correctly the lowest speed for which they will issue a certificate is
10 wpm. FCC, on the other hand, only issues Radiotelegraph Operators licenses for speeds of not
lower than 20wpm. Clearly that's their definition as they won't authorize one to operate at any lower
speed, whatever his technical qualifications.

Jim thinks it's at least 10p wpm, whileyou believe something higher.

So looks like the definition of Morse proficiency depends on who's making the call.
Of course you already knew that, and repeatedly attempted to clue in Clueless Slim, to no avail.
Just one more example of the vast array of information that floated right past him all

those years during which he was busily engaged in his lifetime passion of protesting the CW test requirement.

Could we say narrowminded, single-issue maven with blinders?

1573. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 03:41:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E87B8F1.519EEFBC@att.net>
Source record: 63760

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3E86C076.D6092677@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
> >From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >Date: Sun, 30 Mar 2003 10:01:12 GMT
> >
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <f45722ac.0303271904.76adf606@posting.google.com>,
> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >>
> >> >> So much for your character, Leonard.
> >> >>
> >> >> Dave K8MN
> >> >
> >> >So much for your ability to create an original thought.
> >>
> >> The Gang of Four's leader is trying the Big Lie technique.
>
> For a thing to be a lie, it must be untrue. Mr. Anderson's responses prove the
> quote true over and over again.
> >>
> >> It worked for a certain German political party and it should
> >> do well for the Four. :-)
>
> In just those two sentences we have insult, ridicule, name-calling, factual
> error, and an ethnic slur. Also possible, excessive emoticon and general
> infantile behavior.
> >
> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
> >>
> Perhaps a slight rewrite is in order:
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio

> amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
> ethnic/racial/religious
> slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general infantile behavior."
>
> >I believe you'll find a number of the actions which the profile
> >describes, presented in your response.
>
> There's at least 5 years' worth of examples in Google.
>
> >You just can't help yourself.
>
> Len has, on occasion, posted without the described behavior. Therefore, it is
> logical to conclude that he can control his behavior. The actions described are
> his choice.
>

Precisely.

1574. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 03:59:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E87BD36.57CCA1FB@att.net>
Source record: 63761

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hckksq2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > On 30 Mar 2003 05:20:11 -0800, Brian wrote:
> > >State where the FCC defined Morse proficiency long ago.
>
> Phil responded with...
> > The FCC Rules are plain about what proficiency is required:
> >
> > Sect. 97.503(a)
> > A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that
> > the examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand and
> > to receive correctly by ear texts in the international Morse
> > code at not less than the prescribed speed, using all the
> > letters of the alphabet, numerals 0-9, period, comma,
> > question mark, slant mark, and prosigns AR, BT, and SK.
> >
> > Seems to me that the proficincy required is to "send correctly
> > by hand and to receive correctly by ear texts in the international
> > Morse code at not less than the prescribed speed". The speed
> > itself is not the proficiency, the "correct sending and receiving"
> > is.
> >
> > That wording has been in the Rules for decades.
>
> Makes sense to me Phil...BUT the naysayers in this
> group don't consider 5 wpm to be proficient...according
> to their standards :-)

That would be because 5wpm is NOT proficient, and you know it just as well as Phil. Brian, on the other hand, is still just as clueless as ever..

1575. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 04:36:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E87C5D6.2E63CFD1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63762

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E86C15C.5D2E631E@earthlink.net>...
> > Vshah101 wrote:
> > >
> > > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> > > >I wrote that I considered the speed of proficiency to be higher than ten
> > > >wpm.
> > >
> > > Scientific proof of 10 wpm claim? Some say its 13wpm. At this speed, Morse code
> > > encoding/decoding is automatic, part of one's being, unforgettable. Only at
> > > this speed is one considered a "true" Ham.
> >
> > Vipul, meet Brian. Brian, meet Vipul. I'm sure you two will find that
> > you have a lot in common. I didn't make a ten wpm claim.
> >

> Dave doesn't seem to know.

Dave knows what he wrote. Vipul and Brian don't know. Vipul has an
excuse. English isn't his mother tongue.

Dave K8MN

1576. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 04:45:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E87C85A.225CA2F0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63763

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hckksq2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > On 30 Mar 2003 05:20:11 -0800, Brian wrote:
> > >State where the FCC defined Morse proficiency long ago.
>
> Phil responded with...
> > The FCC Rules are plain about what proficiency is required:
> >
> > Sect. 97.503(a)
> > A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that
> > the examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand and
> > to receive correctly by ear texts in the international Morse
> > code at not less than the prescribed speed, using all the
> > letters of the alphabet, numerals 0-9, period, comma,
> > question mark, slant mark, and prosigns AR, BT, and SK.
> >
> > Seems to me that the proficincy required is to "send correctly
> > by hand and to receive correctly by ear texts in the international
> > Morse code at not less than the prescribed speed". The speed
> > itself is not the proficiency, the "correct sending and receiving"
> > is.
> >
> > That wording has been in the Rules for decades.
>
> Makes sense to me Phil...BUT the naysayers in this
> group don't consider 5 wpm to be proficient...according
> to their standards :-)

Five word per minutes maximum code speed isn't proficiency in morse
under anyone's standards, Bill. It is a minimal speed.

Dave K8MN

1577. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 04:49:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E87C94F.18A23EA4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63764

Brian wrote:
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hckksq2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > On 30 Mar 2003 05:20:11 -0800, Brian wrote:
> >
> > >State where the FCC defined Morse proficiency long ago.
> >
> > The FCC [***{Caution: Tripping Hazard)***] Eules are plain about what proficiency is
required:
> >
> > Sect. 97.503(a)
> >
> > A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that
> > the examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand and
> > to receive correctly by ear texts in the international Morse
> > code at not less than the prescribed speed, using all the
> > letters of the alphabet, numerals 0-9, period, comma,
> > question mark, slant mark, and prosigns AR, BT, and SK.
> >
> > Seems to me that the proficincy required is to "send correctly
> > by hand and to receive correctly by ear texts in the international
> > Morse code at not less than the prescribed speed". The speed
> > itself is not the proficiency, the "correct sending and receiving"
> > is.
> >
> > That wording has been in the Rules for decades.
>
> Phil, yes, yes. But we've still got Dave saying that 5wpm cannot be
> proficient.

Dave says that five words per minute IS NOT proficiency in morse no
matter how much you'd like that to be the case.

> Jim says it's 10wpm. Dave says its higher but doesn't
> know how much higher.

Dave knows. You don't know.

> Apparently, Accuracy CANNOT Transcend Speed (sorry FISTS). Ever.

I'm not discussing speed over accuracy. I'm discussing speed WITH
accuracy.

> Even if it's to set a world record.

...only if they were attempting a "world's slowest morse" record.

Dave K8MN

1578. Re: Bad Ham Examples (was Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 06:32:18 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b69lm7$31pgl$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 63777

Definitely funny! I am sure that we could work on a list of up to or over
100 or better if we tried!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

(snippage)
> and the number one answer to who would be
> a bad example if they were a Ham Radio Operator
> .
> .
> 1. Michael Jackson
>
>
>
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP
> "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> -Groucho Marx
>
> http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/
> kb9tmp "at" juno.com
>
>
>
>

1579. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 06:37:34 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b69lm9$31pgl$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 63778

Making my vehicle a little more efficient and those recreational related trips will be cut down, but for the reasons of limiting how much I am gonna spend supporting our corrupt oil companies.

We don't have a dependancy on foreign oil.... that is an illusion created by the big oil companies.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> That's the loss of leverage - it would bother us a lot more than them.
>
> So I'll ask the hard question: What changes are Americans willing to
> make in their lives to reduce/eliminate dependence on imported oil?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1580. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-31-31 08:52:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0303310052.e73d403@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63765

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030329202653.03943.00002990@mb-fj.aol.com>...
> In article <20030329164729.13213.00000099@mb-ca.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >In article <20030328122653.14527.00001115@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >writes:
> >
> >>The bloodiest war the USA ever fought was from 1861 to 1865. Americans
> >>against other Americans.
> >
> > INCORRECT.
>
> Americans weren't fighting other Americans in 1865?
> >
> > The total number of deaths (Union and Confederacy) in the
> > American Civil War was 219,939 in battle. The total number
> > of battle deaths during World War 2 was 292,131.
>
> INCORRECT.
>
> Civil War Dead:
>
> 185,594 combat
> 373,458 other
> 559,052 total
>
> WW2 Dead:
> 292,131 combat
> 115,185 other
> 407,316 total
>
> Source:
>
> http://www.geobop.com/World/NA/Topics/History/Civil_War/reference/compare/
>
>
>
> > Battle deaths are considered "bloody."
>
> Dead is dead, whether it's on the battlefield, from disease, or in a prisoner
> of war camp. Us population during the Civil War was about 31 million. During
> WW2 it was about four times that.
>
> You can dig through the pepper pot if you want but the fact remains that the

> Civil War cost more lives.
>
>
> > All of that happened before N2EY's time.
>
> And before Leonard Anderson's "time", unless he wants to take some sort of
> credit for being 12 years old on VJ Day.
>
> > It is history.
>
> That's why you should try to get it right.
>
> > Please
> > try to be factual when admonishing others.
>
> Please practice what you preach, parson ;-)

Putz = Splat. Again. Getting boring.

w3rv

1581. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 12:31:32 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303310431.defc081@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63766

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E87C94F.18A23EA4@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hckksq2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > > On 30 Mar 2003 05:20:11 -0800, Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > >State where the FCC defined Morse proficiency long ago.
> > >
> > > The FCC [***{Caution: Tripping Hazard)***] Eules are plain about what proficiency is
required:
> > >
> > > Sect. 97.503(a)
> > >
> > > A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that
> > > the examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand and
> > > to receive correctly by ear texts in the international Morse
> > > code at not less than the prescribed speed, using all the
> > > letters of the alphabet, numerals 0-9, period, comma,
> > > question mark, slant mark, and prosigns AR, BT, and SK.
> > >
> > > Seems to me that the proficincy required is to "send correctly
> > > by hand and to receive correctly by ear texts in the international
> > > Morse code at not less than the prescribed speed". The speed
> > > itself is not the proficiency, the "correct sending and receiving"
> > > is.
> > >
> > > That wording has been in the Rules for decades.
> >
> > Phil, yes, yes. But we've still got Dave saying that 5wpm cannot be
> > proficient.
>
> Dave says that five words per minute IS NOT proficiency in morse no
> matter how much you'd like that to be the case.

Then you disagree with Phil, not Brian. Read more carefully next
time.

> > Jim says it's 10wpm. Dave says its higher but doesn't
> > know how much higher.
>
> Dave knows. You don't know.

If Dave knows, he's not saying. My interpretation is that Dave
doesn't know.

> > Apparently, Accuracy CANNOT Transcend Speed (sorry FISTS). Ever.
>
> I'm not discussing speed over accuracy. I'm discussing speed WITH
> accuracy.

And what is that lowest speed, and what is that lowest accuracy, which
when combined makes the lowest level of proficiency?

> > Even if it's to set a world record.
>
> ...only if they were attempting a "world's slowest morse" record.
>
> Dave K8MN

Wrong again. That wasn't what the record was for.

1582. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 12:34:32 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303310434.37fb06d5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63767

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E87BD36.57CCA1FB@att.net>...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > news:cuvyxnansvbet.hckksq2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > > On 30 Mar 2003 05:20:11 -0800, Brian wrote:
> > > >State where the FCC defined Morse proficiency long ago.
> >
> > Phil responded with...
> > > The FCC Rules are plain about what proficiency is required:
> > >
> > > Sect. 97.503(a)
> > > A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that
> > > the examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand and
> > > to receive correctly by ear texts in the international Morse
> > > code at not less than the prescribed speed, using all the
> > > letters of the alphabet, numerals 0-9, period, comma,
> > > question mark, slant mark, and prosigns AR, BT, and SK.
> > >
> > > Seems to me that the proficincy required is to "send correctly
> > > by hand and to receive correctly by ear texts in the international
> > > Morse code at not less than the prescribed speed". The speed
> > > itself is not the proficiency, the "correct sending and receiving"
> > > is.
> > >
> > > That wording has been in the Rules for decades.
> >
> > Makes sense to me Phil...BUT the naysayers in this
> > group don't consider 5 wpm to be proficient...according
> > to their standards :-)
>
> That would be because 5wpm is NOT proficient, and you know it just as well
> as Phil. Brian, on the other hand, is still just as clueless as ever..

We have Jim stating 10wpm, and Phil weighs in with Part 97 (5wpm).
Dave knows 5 cannot be proficient, and disagrees that 10wpm is it.
DICK just sit on the fence and slobbers.

1583. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 12:36:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303310436.1d33caf0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63768

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E87C5D6.2E63CFD1@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E86C15C.5D2E631E@earthlink.net>...
> > > Vshah101 wrote:
> > > >
> > > > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> > > > >I wrote that I considered the speed of proficiency to be higher than ten
> > > > >wpm.
> > > >
> > > > Scientific proof of 10 wpm claim? Some say its 13wpm. At this speed, Morse code
> > > > encoding/decoding is automatic, part of one's being, unforgettable. Only at
> > > > this speed is one considered a "true" Ham.
> > >
> > > Vipul, meet Brian. Brian, meet Vipul. I'm sure you two will find that
> > > you have a lot in common. I didn't make a ten wpm claim.
> > >
>
> > Dave doesn't seem to know.
>
> Dave knows what he wrote. Vipul and Brian don't know. Vipul has an
> excuse. English isn't his mother tongue.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave apparently doesn't know what he wrote, regardless of his mother tongue.

1584. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 12:41:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303310441.4c0b8d4e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63769

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E87B80F.F2E8C335@att.net>...
>
> Geez, Dave, I really need to introduce Brian to a good old fashoned Missouri mule.

I'm not into Tiajuana-style entertainment. Take your mule somewhere else.

1585. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 12:46:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303310446.4e22154f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63770

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E874D94.4D1BA6AC@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E85D10E.F491CEA@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E83C83A.AC593364@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E836CC4.B5EBE8DD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I answered Brian's question.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > You don't know the answer.
> > > > > >
> > > > > I provide not only one answer. I provided a number of answers. Any of
> > > > > them would be a suitable reply to your question.
> > > > >
> > > > State the minimum speed and accuracy level at which one can be
> > > > considered Morse Proficient.
> > > >
> > > Jim already told you that he considers that point to be ten words per
> > > minute. That answer didn't suit you.
> > >
> > I didn't disagree with it. I asked where the authority was on that
> > figure. He said that some club issues certificates, but coundn't say
> > who.
>
> You didn't agree with it either. The answer didn't suit you.

Welp, Slick, all the facts aren't in yet. I haven't rejected it.

> > I placed the level somewhat
> > > higher. That answer didn't suit you.
> > >
> > You had no number. You said this is more than that. Your answer did
> > not suit me.
>
> As I've stated twice previously, there is no answer which will satisfy
> you.

If you can come up with a number from an FCC publication or whatever
preceeded the FCC in history, I'll accept that.

Do you have that number?

> > > We know that there are numerous
> > > ops who are comfortable with 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 wpm. There are some who
> > > can operate at much higher speeds. If you choose to delude yourself
> > > that someone whose maximum speed is five words per minute is proficient
> > > in morse, so be it. I've give you the definition of "proficient". I
> > > don't consider the 5 wpm level to be "skilled" or "expert".
> >
> > I'd like to get to the bottom of this. If you have some information
> > on what the FCC says is proficient, past or present, I'd like to hear
> > of it. Even something from the 1912 Dept of the Navy would do.
>
> Look it up.

You guys are a living resource. Just give a straight answer for once.

> > > > > > You merely type words.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That seems to have been what makes up your response.
> >
> > > > > Back it up with anything from the FCC. Anything at all.
> > > >
> > > The FCC is not in the business of determing morse proficiency.
> > >
> > Yet, somehow, they require us to learn it.
> >
> That's right. They don't claim that because you pass a five word per
> minute exam, you've suddenly become proficient in the use of morse.
> Passing a driving exam doesn't mean that you're certified as a good
> driver. It just means that you passed the exam.
>
>
> Dave K8MN

Who certifies good drivers? What authority do they have to do so?
How is this related to Morse Code proficiency?

1586. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 12:47:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303310447.233f9aa4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63771

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E874DFF.F7295714@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > >
> > > > are often modified. You have not stated the lowest wpm rate at which
> > > > "proficiency" is achieved.
> > >
> > > I believe it to be higher than ten wpm. I've already stated that.
> > >
> > > > And your answer is???
> > >
> > > Silicone caulk. What was the question?
> >
> >
> > How much higher than 10wpm?
>
> Not much.
>
> Dave K8MN

How much?

1587. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 13:27:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030331082713.08714.00000375@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 63773

In article <f45722ac.0303280957.57d6cae9@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Subject: Re: OK everyone, here's the plan
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 28 Mar 2003 09:57:59 -0800
>
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030327151823.04776.00001240@mb-ct.aol.com>...
>> In article <c2356669.0303270918.1f9f604f@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>> (N2EY) writes:
>>
>> >So I'll ask the hard question: What changes are Americans willing to
>> >make in their lives to reduce/eliminate dependence on imported oil?
>>
>> Give up their SUVs and drive manual-transmission old autos.
>>
>> Adopting manual transmissions in vehicles is supposed to be
>> the same as using morse code for fast, effective
>> communications, right? :-)
>
>Had Clinton renewed the EPA's Fleet MPG requirements...

Would that have magically eliminated oil imports?
Would it have convinced people to buy Insights instead of Expeditions, or to
use transit?
Would it have magically changed the laws of physics?

No to all of those questions.
>
>Ah, yes, the "environmental" president.
>
That was one of the Bushes.

The question is abput what the American people are willing to do, not their
government. IOW, personal responsibility for the future rather than expecting
Big Government to do it all. Watta concept.

1588. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 13:27:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030331082714.08714.00000376@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 63774

In article <f45722ac.0303301301.42daf974@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>"Passengers of this planet?"
>
>That sounds a lot like Larry's, "Citizen of the World."
>

I got it from Hans, K0HB. Argue with him.

What's wrong with "Passengers of this planet?"

1589. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 13:27:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030331082714.08714.00000377@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 63775

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hckksq2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>Subject: Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?
>From: "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
>Date: Sun, 30 Mar 2003 19:57:30 GMT
>
>On 30 Mar 2003 05:20:11 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
>>State where the FCC defined Morse proficiency long ago.
>
> The FCC Eules are plain about what proficiency is required:
>
> Sect. 97.503(a)
>
> A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that
> the examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand and
> to receive correctly by ear texts in the international Morse
> code at not less than the prescribed speed, using all the
> letters of the alphabet, numerals 0-9, period, comma,
> question mark, slant mark, and prosigns AR, BT, and SK.

Nowhere in 97.503 does the word "proficiency" appear. Nor the word
"proficient".
All the above does is incorporate S25.5 into Part 97, and define what
characters are to be included in the test.
>
> Seems to me that the proficincy required is to "send correctly
> by hand and to receive correctly by ear texts in the international
> Morse code at not less than the prescribed speed". The speed
> itself is not the proficiency, the "correct sending and receiving"
> is.

It also says "at not less than the prescribed speed".
>
> That wording has been in the Rules for decades.
>
Sure.

It also says send by hand and receive by ear, but those terms are not taken
literally. In fact the sending test effectively disappeared ~20 years ago.

And here's another twist: 97.503 says "using ALL the letters of the alphabet,
numerals 0-9, period, comma, question mark, slant mark, and prosigns AR, BT,
and SK." (emphasis added). 26 letters of the alphabet, 10 numerals, seven
punctuations and prosigns totals 43 different characters. Yet Element 1 can be

passed by copying 25 consecutive characters correctly - 25/43 = 58.1%, and that's only if there are no repeats in the text sent. No matter how the text sent is designed, one minute of it cannot include more than 58.1% of the required 43 characters. So the best a solid minute of 5 wpm copy can do is demonstrate the ability to correctly receive 58.1% of the required characters.

At ten wpm, a solid minute is 50 characters.

Yes, those test methods have been in use for decades.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1590. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 16:12:29 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3E8868ED.F78A9EB4@crosslink.net>
Source record: 63772

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > State the minimum speed and accuracy level at which one can be
> > considered Morse Proficient.
>
> Jim already told you that he considers that point to be ten words per
> minute. That answer didn't suit you. I placed the level somewhat
> higher. That answer didn't suit you. We know that there are numerous
> ops who are comfortable with 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 wpm.

Jeeze guys, why do you care? There are computer sound card programs that do 80+ wpm, so "proficient" could mean an ability to click on an icon then read text.

In my limited experience these programs don't copy manually transmitted Morse with 100% accurcy because most code isn't sent accurately (ie, most fists are poor), but that's not the computer's fault. Garbage in = garbage out.

Yes, I already know that human EDAC ability exceeds most computers'.

Personally, I think Tap Code should replace Morse: it's easier to learn, requires only "dots" (no dashes) and hence is used in most emergency situations.

.... K3DWW

1591. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 16:17:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E8869FE.E5D06BA1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63779

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E87C5D6.2E63CFD1@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E86C15C.5D2E631E@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Vshah101 wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> > > > > >I wrote that I considered the speed of proficiency to be higher than ten
> > > > > >wpm.
> > > > >
> > > > > Scientific proof of 10 wpm claim? Some say its 13wpm. At this speed, Morse code
> > > > > encoding/decoding is automatic, part of one's being, unforgettable. Only at
> > > > > this speed is one considered a "true" Ham.
> > > >
> > > > Vipul, meet Brian. Brian, meet Vipul. I'm sure you two will find that
> > > > you have a lot in common. I didn't make a ten wpm claim.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Dave doesn't seem to know.
> >
> > Dave knows what he wrote. Vipul and Brian don't know. Vipul has an
> > excuse. English isn't his mother tongue.

> Dave apparently doesn't know what he wrote, regardless of his mother tongue.

Your lack of reading comprehension comes into play again, Brian. Again,
I know what I wrote and I did not make a statement calling ten wpm
"proficient". A few days ago you were so confused that you were
attempting to call me on things which Jim wrote. Get your stuff
grouped.

Dave K8MN

1592. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 16:20:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E886ACE.7D3BC001@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63780

Brian wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E87B80F.F2E8C335@att.net>...
> >
> > Geez, Dave, I really need to introduce Brian to a good old fashoned Missouri mule.
>
> I'm not into Tiajuana-style entertainment. Take your mule somewhere else.

I understand how you'd take that view since you'd evidently be teaming
up with the mule to provide the entertainment. Just what is
"Tiajuana-style entertainment" and how did you become familiar with it?

Dave K8MN

1593. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 16:29:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E886CD7.B55D9EA7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63781

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E874D94.4D1BA6AC@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E85D10E.F491CEA@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E83C83A.AC593364@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E836CC4.B5EBE8DD@earthlink.net>...

> > You didn't agree with it either. The answer didn't suit you.
>
> Welp, Slick, all the facts aren't in yet. I haven't rejected it.

Well, Pipsquawk, let me know when you're ready to provide your final
answer.

> > > I placed the level somewhat
> > > > higher. That answer didn't suit you.
> > >
> > > You had no number. You said this is more than that. Your answer did
> > > not suit me.
> >
> > As I've stated twice previously, there is no answer which will satisfy
> > you.
>
> If you can come up with a number from an FCC publication or whatever
> preceeded the FCC in history, I'll accept that.

Look through the archives and let us know what you come up with.

> Do you have that number?

There are all sorts of numbers in FCC publications. One of them is
"97". Another is "15". See what you can find.

> > > > We know that there are numerous
> > > > ops who are comfortable with 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 wpm. There are some who
> > > > can operate at much higher speeds. If you choose to delude yourself

> > > > that someone whose maximum speed is five words per minute is proficient
> > > > in morse, so be it. I've give you the definition of "proficient". I
> > > > don't consider the 5 wpm level to be "skilled" or "expert".
> > >
> > > I'd like to get to the bottom of this. If you have some information
> > > on what the FCC says is proficient, past or present, I'd like to hear
> > > of it. Even something from the 1912 Dept of the Navy would do.
> >
> > Look it up.
>
> You guys are a living resource. Just give a straight answer for once.

I did so.

> > > > > > > You merely type words.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > That seems to have been what makes up your response.
> >
> > > > > > Back it up with anything from the FCC. Anything at all.
> > > > >
> > > > > The FCC is not in the business of determing morse proficiency.
> > > >
> > > Yet, somehow, they require us to learn it.
> >
> > That's right. They don't claim that because you pass a five word per
> > minute exam, you've suddenly become proficient in the use of morse.
> > Passing a driving exam doesn't mean that you're certified as a good
> > driver. It just means that you passed the exam.

> Who certifies good drivers?

I don't know that anyone does yet I'm certain that you see good drivers
and bad drivers all the time. Do you have trouble telling them apart?

> What authority do they have to do so?

Why would anyone need authority to tell a good driver from a bad driver
or a good batter from a bad batter or a good rifle shot from a bad rifle
shot?

> How is this related to Morse Code proficiency?

That was already explained. Sorry you missed it.

Dave K8MN

1594. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 16:31:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E886D54.568EAD36@att.net>
Source record: 63782

Brian Kelly wrote:

> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030329202653.03943.00002990@mb-fj.aol.com>...
> > In article <20030329164729.13213.00000099@mb-ca.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> > (Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> > >In article <20030328122653.14527.00001115@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > >writes:
> > >
> > >>The bloodiest war the USA ever fought was from 1861 to 1865. Americans
> > >>against other Americans.
> > >
> > > INCORRECT.
> >
> > Americans weren't fighting other Americans in 1865?
> > >
> > > The total number of deaths (Union and Confederacy) in the
> > > American Civil War was 219,939 in battle. The total number
> > > of battle deaths during World War 2 was 292,131.
> >
> > INCORRECT.
> >
> > Civil War Dead:
> >
> > 185,594 combat
> > 373,458 other
> > 559,052 total
> >
> > WW2 Dead:
> > 292,131 combat
> > 115,185 other
> > 407,316 total
> >
> > Source:
> >
> > http://www.geobop.com/World/NA/Topics/History/Civil_War/reference/compare/
> >
> >
> >
> > > Battle deaths are considered "bloody."
> >
> > Dead is dead, whether it's on the battlefield, from disease, or in a prisoner
> > of war camp. Us population during the Civil War was about 31 million. During

> > WW2 it was about four times that.
> >
> > You can dig through the pepper pot if you want but the fact remains that the
> > Civil War cost more lives.
> >
> >
> > > All of that happened before N2EY's time.
> >
> > And before Leonard Anderson's "time", unless he wants to take some sort of
> > credit for being 12 years old on VJ Day.
> >
> > > It is history.
> >
> > That's why you should try to get it right.
> >
> > > Please
> > > try to be factual when admonishing others.
> >
> > Please practice what you preach, parson ;-)
>
> Putz = Splat. Again. Getting boring.

Naw. Been butt-ugly boring for years.

1595. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 16:31:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E886D7B.22FAA1B0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63783

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E874DFF.F7295714@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > >
> > > > > are often modified. You have not stated the lowest wpm rate at which
> > > > > "proficiency" is achieved.
> > > >
> > > > I believe it to be higher than ten wpm. I've already stated that.
> > > >
> > > > > And your answer is???
> > > >
> > > > Silicone caulk. What was the question?
> > >
> > >
> > > How much higher than 10wpm?
> > >
> > Not much.

> How much?

I'll think about providing an answer as soon as you come up with the
answers regarding your supposed operation from Somalia:

What callsign was used?
What rigs and antennas were used?
Who did the equipment belong to?
What amateur bands and modes were used?
What countries and continents were worked?
How were the QSLs delivered?

Dave K8MN

1596. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 16:33:01 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3E886DBD.F5FB2064@crosslink.net>
Source record: 63776

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> :
> : So I'll ask the hard question: What changes are Americans willing to
> : make in their lives to reduce/eliminate dependence on imported oil?
> :
None! There's no need given nuclear energy and the law of supply and
demand. Americans can simply use surplus cold-war weapons to both
increase their supply (ie, nuke the supplier and take the oil) and
reduce world demand (after all, stone-age peoples don't use oil).
>
>
> The hard question is how can the passengers on this planet figure out a way
> to take mutual advantage of each others resources in a fashion which
> benefits all of us, arbitrary borders drawn on a map notwithstanding.
>
Benefits us all?!? Simple. First we eliminate France, then .... (c:

Seriously, there is just as much air, water, et al, and almost as much
oil as there was 100 years ago. Trouble is there are what 4 or 5 times
as many people using and dirtying it as before. So, world population is
the real problem, not lack of (insert your favorite). It follows that
world population must and will shrink - one way or another. Remember
Easter Island?

73, K3DWW

1597. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 16:39:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E886F42.520EE38E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63784

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E87C94F.18A23EA4@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hckksq2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > > > On 30 Mar 2003 05:20:11 -0800, Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >State where the FCC defined Morse proficiency long ago.
> > > >
> > > > The FCC [***{Caution: Tripping Hazard)***] Eules are plain about what proficiency
is required:
> > > >
> > > > Sect. 97.503(a)
> > > >
> > > > A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that
> > > > the examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand and
> > > > to receive correctly by ear texts in the international Morse
> > > > code at not less than the prescribed speed, using all the
> > > > letters of the alphabet, numerals 0-9, period, comma,
> > > > question mark, slant mark, and prosigns AR, BT, and SK.
> > > >
> > > > Seems to me that the proficincy required is to "send correctly
> > > > by hand and to receive correctly by ear texts in the international
> > > > Morse code at not less than the prescribed speed". The speed
> > > > itself is not the proficiency, the "correct sending and receiving"
> > > > is.
> > > >
> > > > That wording has been in the Rules for decades.
> > >
> > > Phil, yes, yes. But we've still got Dave saying that 5wpm cannot be
> > > proficient.
> >
> > Dave says that five words per minute IS NOT proficiency in morse no
> > matter how much you'd like that to be the case.
>
> Then you disagree with Phil, not Brian. Read more carefully next
> time.

I don't have a disagreement with Phil. I even read the cautionary
"Tripping Hazard" part. What is "the prescribed speed", Brian? Did you
see anything in the FCC material about "proficiency"?

> > > Jim says it's 10wpm. Dave says its higher but doesn't
> > > know how much higher.
> >
> > Dave knows. You don't know.
>
> If Dave knows, he's not saying.

That's correct.

My interpretation is that Dave
> doesn't know.

That's incorrect.

> > > Apparently, Accuracy CANNOT Transcend Speed (sorry FISTS). Ever.
> >
> > I'm not discussing speed over accuracy. I'm discussing speed WITH
> > accuracy.
>
> And what is that lowest speed, and what is that lowest accuracy, which
> when combined makes the lowest level of proficiency?

In my view, that lowest speed is higher than ten wpm. I'm not
discussing lowest accuracy at all. I'm more interested in the highest
accuracy.

> > > Even if it's to set a world record.
> >
> > ...only if they were attempting a "world's slowest morse" record.

> Wrong again. That wasn't what the record was for.

My statement can't be "Wrong again" since I didn't make any claim at
all. I know that wasn't what the world record was for and that's the
reason for my statement. It's all about reading comprehension, Brian.

Dave K8MN

1598. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 16:41:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E886FBC.E9CEE25D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63785

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0303301301.42daf974@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >"Passengers of this planet?"
> >
> >That sounds a lot like Larry's, "Citizen of the World."
> >
>
> I got it from Hans, K0HB. Argue with him.
>
> What's wrong with "Passengers of this planet?"

Brian's just honked that he missed his stop.

Dave K8MN

1599. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 16:47:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E887110.F6E15C34@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63786

Vito wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > > State the minimum speed and accuracy level at which one can be
> > > considered Morse Proficient.
> >
> > Jim already told you that he considers that point to be ten words per
> > minute. That answer didn't suit you. I placed the level somewhat
> > higher. That answer didn't suit you. We know that there are numerous
> > ops who are comfortable with 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 wpm.
>
> Jeeze guys, why do you care? There are computer sound card programs that
> do 80+ wpm, so "proficient" could mean an ability to click on an icon
> then read text.

We'll then call such a computer proficient in morse. We're talking
about operators, not computers.

> In my limited experience these programs don't copy manually transmitted
> Morse with 100% accurcy because most code isn't sent accurately (ie,
> most fists are poor), but that's not the computer's fault. Garbage in =
> garbage out.

...and even if the morse is accurately sent, noise or interference fools
the programs much of the time. Maybe that computer isn't proficient
after all.

> Yes, I already know that human EDAC ability exceeds most computers'.
>
> Personally, I think Tap Code should replace Morse: it's easier to learn,
> requires only "dots" (no dashes) and hence is used in most emergency
> situations.

Do they have computer programs for the tap code?

Dave K8MN

1600. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 17:03:52 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0303310903.761bdcf6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63787

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E87B80F.F2E8C335@att.net>...
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E85D10E.F491CEA@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E83C83A.AC593364@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E836CC4.B5EBE8DD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I answered Brian's question.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > You don't know the answer.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I provide not only one answer. I provided a number of answers. Any of
> > > > > > > > them would be a suitable reply to your question.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > State the minimum speed and accuracy level at which one can be
> > > > > > > considered Morse Proficient.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Jim already told you that he considers that point to be ten words per
> > > > > > minute. That answer didn't suit you.
> > > > >
> > > > > I didn't disagree with it. I asked where the authority was on that
> > > > > figure. He said that some club issues certificates, but coundn't say
> > > > > who.
> > >
> > > You didn't agree with it either. The answer didn't suit you.
> > >
> > > > > I placed the level somewhat
> > > > > higher. That answer didn't suit you.
> > > >
> > > > You had no number. You said this is more than that. Your answer did
> > > > not suit me.
> > >
> > > As I've stated twice previously, there is no answer which will satisfy
> > > you.
> > >

> > > > We know that there are numerous
> > > > ops who are comfortable with 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 wpm. There are some who
> > > > can operate at much higher speeds. If you choose to delude yourself
> > > > that someone whose maximum speed is five words per minute is proficient
> > > > in morse, so be it. I've give you the definition of "proficient". I
> > > > don't consider the 5 wpm level to be "skilled" or "expert".
> > > >
> > > I'd like to get to the bottom of this. If you have some information
> > > on what the FCC says is proficient, past or present, I'd like to hear
> > > of it. Even something from the 1912 Dept of the Navy would do.
> > >
> > Look it up.
> >
> > > > > > > You merely type words.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > That seems to have been what makes up your response.
> >
> > > > > > Back it up with anything from the FCC. Anything at all.
> > > > > >
> > > > > The FCC is not in the business of determing morse proficiency.
> > > > >
> > > > Yet, somehow, they require us to learn it.
> > >
> > That's right. They don't claim that because you pass a five word per
> > minute exam, you've suddenly become proficient in the use of morse.
> > Passing a driving exam doesn't mean that you're certified as a good
> > driver. It just means that you passed the exam.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
> Geez, Dave, I really need to introduce Brian to a good old fashoned Missouri mule. I've
come to the
> concrete conclusion that the mule could learn a lot from Slim about pure muleheaded
stubborness.The
> usual cure for the mule is a two by four upside the head. Brian seems to need a new head.
>
> Lessee, now....ARRL has issued Morse code proficiency certificates for much longer than
the 47 years
> I've been licensed. If I recall correctly the lowest speed for which they will issue a
certificate is
> 10 wpm. FCC, on the other hand, only issues Radiotelegraph Operators licenses for speeds
of not
> lower than 20wpm. Clearly that's their definition as they won't authorize one to operate
at any lower
> speed, whatever his technical qualifications.
>
> Jim thinks it's at least 10p wpm, whileyou believe something higher.
>
> So looks like the definition of Morse proficiency depends on who's making the call.
> Of course you already knew that, and repeatedly attempted to clue in Clueless Slim, to no

avail.
> Just one more example of the vast array of information that floated right past him all
> those years during which he was busily engaged in his lifetime passion of
> protesting the CW test requirement.
>
> Could we say narrowminded, single-issue maven with blinders?

Couldn't we simply boil him down to "village idiot" and save some bandwidth?

w3rv

1601. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 17:08:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b69slsneh1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63788

At least for me it is not a political thing. If we had a democratic president with the same approach. I.E. first strike if necessary, then I would support him also.

What I never have, and I have 12 years in the military, not only in VN but in Germany literally defending the boundries of freedom during the 'cold war', supported the totally defensive stance of our country.

We won the cold war. Thats good. But we let our guard down. I blame that wholly on Clinton. Then 9/11 woke us up. If you dont see that we are under attack by now then I cant convince you. We have been at war for about 23 years, dating from the Aquilly Loura (sp) incident when that old man was tossed overboard in his wheelchair. The terrorists of this world hate us because of our power, or system and our support of Israel.

If we dont wake up and support this effort at preventing the inevitable then we can kiss off this American dream. Dont believe me? Think what this country would be like if we didnt help stop Hitler and Tojo.

Did you know that war cost this country 130percent of its GNP? And that most of the countries we helped have yet to repay us? But that after all was said and done we pulled out of it and created the best economy in the world. Our production exceeds the TOTAL OUTPUT of the entire area known as EUROPE.

Of course there jealous. Screw them.

Dan/W4NTI

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message news:973158DB723EF0DB.D34F8B23BE65C649.5FF020718DD7A5E2@lp.airnews.net...

>
> You bring up an incredibly interesting and poignant observation, Dwight.
> All the cries for "patriotism" (those of people who imply it is unpatriotic
> not to support and stand behind a President of the US), are probably right
> along party lines; i.e., would we find a Republican pleading for respect and
> admiration of a Democrat President or vice versa? hmmmmm....
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

1602. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 18:51:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAADF848.153F5%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63789

"W5TIT" wrote:
>
> You bring up an incredibly interesting and
> poignant observation, Dwight. All the cries
> for "patriotism" (those of people who imply
> it is unpatriotic not to support and stand
> behind a President of the US), are probably
> right along party lines; i.e., would we
> find a Republican pleading for respect and
> admiration of a Democrat President or vice
> versa? hmmmmm....

You're probably right, Kim. It is amazing how many people identify with a single political party. I supported Bush during the last election. I did so because of Republican party claims of support for smaller government (Bush has increased it dramatically), opposition to NAFDA (Bush has done nothing to end it), opposition to massive immigration (again, Bush has done nothing to even slow it down), and a return to fairness in civil rights (nothing).

Prior to that, I supported Clinton during his first campaign. I did so because of Democratic party claims of support for an increase in the minimum wage (very minimal), health care (nothing), world peace (war in Kosovo), and increased educational benefits (minimal).

Do I blame either political party? No, both are to blame. Both are so similar on major issues (like those above) it is hard to tell them apart. Both have done things to harm the American people, the American worker, and the American family. At this point, I feel we would be better off with a complete ban on political parties, or large spending on a single candidate, in this country. Sadly, with political parties in control, we are not likely to ever see that.

There is an interesting line towards the end of the movie "Hunt for Red October" that would probably apply here. I'll leave this rant with that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1603. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 19:26:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAAE00AD.153F7%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63790

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
> (snip) We won the cold war. Thats good. But we
> let our guard down. I blame that wholly on
> Clinton. (snip)

Why blame only Clinton, Dan? When it comes to the military (base closings, weapons cuts, military spending, etc), Clinton only continued the trends of the Regan and Bush administrations. The military base here was closed while Bush Sr. was in the White House.

> (snip) If you dont see that we are under attack by
> now then I cant convince you. (snip)

With our country presently blasting the heck out of the people of two countries (with threats to attack still other countries), it is a little hard to see the present situation as an attack on us.

> (snip) The terrorists of this world hate us because of
> our power, or system and our support of Israel. (snip)

Then perhaps we should rethink the support for Israel. Israel has never came to our aid in any recent conflict around the world. In fact, I can't think of a single substantial benefit from siding with Israel. Can you? This is an honest question that I'd really like an answer to (from anybody).

> (snip) Did you know that war cost this country 130
> percent of its GNP? And that most of the countries
> we helped have yet to repay us? (snip)

They repaid us exactly what we asked for - the lease of military bases in their countries for nearly a century, support in our political restructuring of the axis countries, and so on.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1604. make money legally, fast and easy!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 19:59:57 UTC
From: smsiemon@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030331145957.16172.00000200@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 63791

$MAKE YOURSELF SOME MONEY$$, NO SCAM! GUARANTEED MONEY! NO JOKE!$$

Dear Internet User,

Hi, I'm 23 years old and I make more money than my parents and so can you" Turn $6.00 into $60,000...read this to find out how!!! READING THIS COULD CHANGE YOUR LIFE!

I found this on a bulletin board like this one and decided to try it. A little while back, I was browsing through several newsgroups, just like you are now, and came across an article similar to this that said you could make thousands of dollars within weeks with only an initial investment of $6.00! So I thought, "Yeah right, this must be a scam", but like most of us, I was curious, so I kept reading. Anyway, it said that you need to send $1.00 to each of the 6 names and address stated in the article. You then place your own name and address in the bottom of the list at #6, and post the article in at least 200 newsgroups. (There are millions) No catch, that was it. So after thinking it over, and talking to a few people first, I thought about trying it. I figured: "what have I got to lose except 6 stamps and $6.00, right?" Then I invested the measly $6.00. Well GUESS WHAT!!... within 7 days, I started getting money in the mail! I was shocked! I figured it would end soon, but the money just kept coming in. In my first week, I made about $25.00. By the end of the second week I had made a total of over $1,000.00! In the third week I had over $10,000.00 and it's still growing. This is now my fourth week and I have made just over $42,000.00 and it's still coming in rapidly. It's certainly worth $6.00, and 6 stamps, I have spent more than that on the lottery!!

Let me tell you how this works and most importantly, why it works.... Also, make sure you print a copy of this article NOW, so you can get the information off of it as you need it. I promise you that if you follow the directions exactly, that you will start making more money than you thought possible by doing something so easy!

SUGGESTION: Read this entire message carefully! (print it out or download it.) Follow the simple directions and watch the money come in! It's easy. It's legal. And, your investment is only $6.00 (Plus postage).

IMPORTANT: This is not a rip-off; it is not indecent; it is not illegal; and it is virtually no risk - it really works!!!! If all of the following instructions are adhered to, you will receive extraordinary dividends.

PLEASE NOTE: Please follow these directions EXACTLY, and $50,000 or more can be yours in 20 to 60 days. This program remains successful because of the honesty and integrity of the participants. Please continue it’s success by carefully adhering to the instructions. You will now become part of the Mail Order business. In this business your product is not solid and tangible, it's a

service. You are in the business of developing Mailing Lists. Many large corporations are happy to pay big bucks for quality lists. However, the money made from the mailing lists is secondary to the income which is made from people like you and me asking to be included in that list.

~~~>HERE ARE 4 EASY STEPS TO GET STARTED<~~~

STEP 1: Get 6 separate pieces of paper and write the following on each piece of paper "PLEASE PUT ME ON YOUR MAILING LIST." Now get 6 US $1.00 bills and place ONE inside EACH of the 6 pieces of paper so the bill will not be seen through the envelope (Please make sure that the bill wouldn't be noticed in the envelope to prevent thievery). Send out US $ DOLLAR, so it would be more acceptable.

STEP 2: Next, place one paper in each of the 6 envelopes and seal them properly. You should now have 6 sealed envelopes, each with a piece of paper stating the phrase, "PLEASE PUT ME ON YOUR MAILING LIST.", your name and address, and a $1.00 bill.

What you are doing is creating a service. THIS IS ABSOLUTELY LEGAL! You are requesting for a legitimate service and you are paying for it! Like most of us, I was a little skeptical and a little worried about the legal aspects of it all. So I checked it out with the U.S. Post Office (1-800-725-2161) and they confirmed that it is indeed legal!

Mail the 6 envelopes to the following addresses below:

#1)B. Hooper ; 3 Warringah Gve.
Petrie, QLD, Australia 4502

#2)Matthew Speight ; 6 Charnwood Ave.
Belfast , N. Ireland : BT15 5DH

#3)Ahmad Mujeeb ; 307-14 15 st, NW,
Charlottesville, VA, USA, 22903

#4)Rostum Hernandez ; #2 Jericho St.,
Victoriaville Subd. ,Antipolo City,
Phillippine, 1870

#5)R.Pena ; 1962 46St. S.W.,
Naples , FL., USA, 34116

#6)sara siemon
9245 lower valley pike
new carlisle,oh 45344

STEP 3: Now take the #1 name off the list that you see above, move the other names up (6 becomes 5, 5 becomes 4, etc...) and add YOUR Name as number 6 on the list.

STEP 4: Copy this article. Change anything you need to, but try to keep this article as close to original as possible. Now, post your amended article to at least 200 newsgroups. (I think there are close to 2.4million groups) All you
~~~

need is 200, but remember, the more you post, the more money you make! This is perfectly legal! If you have any doubts, refer to Title 18, Section 1302 and 1341, US Postal and Lottery Laws or Title 18, Section 3005 in the US code, also in the code of Federal regulations, Volume 16, Sections 255 and 436, which states; "a product or service must be exchanged for money received." The simple note in the letter, "PLEASE PUT ME ON YOUR MAILING LIST", makes it legal because you are paying for exchange of a service, (adding the purchasers name to his mailing list) for a $1.00 fee.
: Keep a copy of these steps for yourself and, whenever you need money, you can use it again, and again. PLEASE REMEMBER that this program remains successful because of the honesty and integrity of the participants and by their carefully adhering to the directions. Look at it this way. If you are of integrity, the program will continue and the money that so many others have received will come your way.

NOTE: You may want to retain every name and address sent to you, either on a computer or hard copy and keep the notes people send you. This VERIFIES that you are truly providing a service. (Also, it might be a good idea to wrap the $1 bill in dark paper to reduce the risk of mail theft.) So, as each post is downloaded and the directions carefully followed, six members will be reimbursed for their participation as a List Developer with one dollar each. Your name will move up the list geometrically so that when your name reaches the #1 position you will be receiving thousands of dollars in CASH!!! What an opportunity for only $6.00 ($1.00 for each of the first six people listed above) Send it now, add your own name to the list and you're in business!

~~~>DIRECTIONS FOR HOW TO POST TO NEWSGROUPS<~~

Step 1) You do not need to re-type this entire letter to do your own posting. Simply put your mouse cursor at the beginning of this letter, click and drag your cursor to the bottom of this document, right click and select 'copy' from the edit menu. This will copy the entire letter into the computer's memory.

Step 2) Open a blank 'notepad' file and place your mouse cursor at the top of the blank page. Right click and from the 'edit' menu select 'paste'. This will paste a copy of the letter into notepad so that you can add your name and postal address to the list.

Step 3) Save your new notepad file as a .txt file. If you want to do your postings in different settings, you'll always have this file to go back to.

Step 4) Use Netscape or Internet explorer and try searching for various newsgroups (on-line forums, message boards, chat sites, discussions.)You can post anywhere!!! There are tons of free bulletin boards if you just look for them!!

Step 5) Visit these message boards and post this article as a new message by highlighting the text of this letter and selecting paste from the edit menu. Fill in the Subject, this will be the header that everyone sees as they scroll through the list of postings in a particular group, click the "post" message button. You're done with your first one!
NOTE: Please don't SPAM or send unsolicited emails. It's completely illegal.
~~~

Send emails to all the people you know or any ways that allows you to, instead of SPAMMING.(Just a reminder).

Congratulations...THAT'S IT! All you have to do is jump to different newsgroups and post away, after you get the hang of it, it will take about a minute for each newsgroup! **REMEMBER, THE MORE NEWSGROUPS YOU POST IN, THE MORE MONEY YOU WILL MAKE!! BUT YOU HAVE TO POST A MINIMUM OF 200** That's it! You will begin receiving money from around the world within days! You may eventually want to rent a P.O.Box due to the large amount of mail you will receive. If you wish to stay anonymous, you can invent a name to use, as long as the postman will deliver it. **JUST MAKE SURE ALL THE ADDRESSES ARE CORRECT.**

*Now the WHY part; Out of 200 postings, say I receive only 5 replies (a very low example). So then I made $5.00 with my name at #6 on the letter. Now, each of the 5 persons who just sent me $1.00 make the MINIMUM 200 postings, each with my name at #5 and only 5 persons respond to each of the original 5, that is another $25.00 for me, now those 25 each make 200 MINIMUM posts with my name at #4 and only 5 replies each, I will bring in an additional $125.00! Now, those 125 persons turn around and post the MINIMUM 200 with my name at #3 and only receive 5 replies each, I will make an additional $626.00! OK, now here is the fun part, each of those 625 persons post a MINIMUM 200 letters with my name at #2 and they each only receive 5 replies, that just made me $3,125.00!!! Those 3,125 persons will all deliver this message to 200 newsgroups with my name at #1 and if still ONLY 5 persons per 200 newsgroups react I will receive $15,625,00! With an original investment of only $6.00! AMAZING! When your name is no longer on the list, you just take the latest posting in the newsgroups, and send out another $6.00 to names on the list, putting your name at number 6 again. And start posting again. The thing to remember is: do you realize that thousands of people all over the world are joining the internet and reading these articles everyday?, JUST LIKE YOU are now!! So, can you afford $6.00 and see if it really works?? I think so... People have said, "what if the plan is played out and no one sends you the money? So what! What are the chances of that happening when there are tons of new honest users and new honest people who are joining the internet and newsgroups everyday and are willing to give it a try? Estimates are at 20,000 to 50,000 new users, every day, with thousands of those joining the actual internet!!! REMEMBER, PLAY FAIRLY AND HONESTLY AND THIS WILL WORK FOR YOU!!!

1605. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 23:22:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6aila$4e2$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63792

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAAE00AD.153F7%stewart@say.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) We won the cold war. Thats good. But we
> > let our guard down. I blame that wholly on
> > Clinton. (snip)
>
>
> Why blame only Clinton, Dan? When it comes to the military (base
closings,
> weapons cuts, military spending, etc), Clinton only continued the trends
of
> the Regan and Bush administrations. The military base here was closed
while
> Bush Sr. was in the White House.

I never mentioned base closings. Perhaps I should have been more clear. I blame Clinton for GUTTING OUR DEFENSE, the CIA and the FBI. I blame Clinton for getting BJs and sleeping around while the terrorists set things up. Plus other things, but I'll stop here.

>
>
> > (snip) If you dont see that we are under attack by
> > now then I cant convince you. (snip)
>
>
> With our country presently blasting the heck out of the people of two
> countries (with threats to attack still other countries), it is a little
> hard to see the present situation as an attack on us.

You dont think flying four planeloads loaded with Americans into two targets and a field in Pennsylvania a declaration of war? What would you call it then?

Have you forgotten the airliners blasted out of the sky? The Americans killed just for being Americans...etc. ??

>
>
> > (snip) The terrorists of this world hate us because of
> > our power, or system and our support of Israel. (snip)
>
>
> Then perhaps we should rethink the support for Israel. Israel has never

> came to our aid in any recent conflict around the world. In fact, I can't
> think of a single substantial benefit from siding with Israel. Can you?
This
> is an honest question that I'd really like an answer to (from anybody).
>
>
They are the bullet stoppers of the middle east. And when they have had
enough they will take care of business.

They provide the ONLY real ally this country will EVER have in the Middle
East.

They provide us with much useful intelligence of terrorist activities. Our
problem is we didnt pay any attention.

Im sure there are many more. But that will do for me.

> > (snip) Did you know that war cost this country 130
> > percent of its GNP? And that most of the countries
> > we helped have yet to repay us? (snip)
>
>
> They repaid us exactly what we asked for - the lease of military bases
in
> their countries for nearly a century, support in our political
restructuring
> of the axis countries, and so on.
>
>
If thats true then why did DeGualle throw us out? And still not repay a
damn cent?

Status of forces agreements vary from country to country. They needed us
there to blunt the Red Army from walking through Fulda gap and chewing up
the Rhine River.

They needed us a heck of a lot more than we needed them. For that matter
still do. Without American force of arms they would all be Russian now.
And the USSR would still be around. Period.

Dan/W4NTI

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>
> ----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

1606. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 23:40:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303311540.274be5d2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63793

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0303310903.761bdcf6@posting.google.com>...

> Couldn't we simply boil him down to "village idiot" and save some bandwidth?
>
> w3rv

or I could begin and end every post with "plonk," "boink," and "bend
over" and you could call me Brian Kelley.

1607. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 23:43:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303311543.2c47c6e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63794

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E886ACE.7D3BC001@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E87B80F.F2E8C335@att.net>...
> > >
> > > Geez, Dave, I really need to introduce Brian to a good old fashoned Missouri mule.
> >
> > I'm not into Tiajuana-style entertainment. Take your mule somewhere else.
>
> I understand how you'd take that view since you'd evidently be teaming
> up with the mule to provide the entertainment.

Excuse me?

Just what is
> "Tiajuana-style entertainment" and how did you become familiar with it?
>
> Dave K8MN

While I was on an illegal DXpedition without written permission?

1608. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 23:46:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303311546.3f2070b2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63795

```
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E886D7B.22FAA1B0@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E874DFF.F7295714@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > >
> > > > > > are often modified. You have not stated the lowest wpm rate at which
> > > > > > "proficiency" is achieved.
> > > > > >
> > > > > I believe it to be higher than ten wpm. I've already stated that.
> > > > >
> > > > > > And your answer is???
> > > > > >
> > > > Silicone caulk. What was the question?
>
> > > >
> > > How much higher than 10wpm?
> > >
> > Not much.
>
> How much?
>
> I'll think about providing an answer as soon as you come up with the
> answers regarding your supposed operation from Somalia:
>
> What callsign was used?
> What rigs and antennas were used?
> Who did the equipment belong to?
> What amateur bands and modes were used?
> What countries and continents were worked?
> How were the QSLs delivered?
>
> Dave K8MN

Why? Is there more libel to follow?
```

1609. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 23:54:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303311554.1b017e4b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63796

Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message news:<3E8868ED.F78A9EB4@crosslink.net>...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > > State the minimum speed and accuracy level at which one can be
> > > considered Morse Proficient.
> >
> > Jim already told you that he considers that point to be ten words per
> > minute. That answer didn't suit you. I placed the level somewhat
> > higher. That answer didn't suit you. We know that there are numerous
> > ops who are comfortable with 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 wpm.
>
> Jeeze guys, why do you care? There are computer sound card programs that
> do 80+ wpm, so "proficient" could mean an ability to click on an icon
> then read text.

Dave got a bug up his butt (no pun intended) and is badmouthing a
couple of world record setters going at 0.02wpm.

> In my limited experience these programs don't copy manually transmitted
> Morse with 100% accurcy because most code isn't sent accurately (ie,
> most fists are poor), but that's not the computer's fault. Garbage in =
> garbage out.

You could have just as easily have said DICK/W0EX In = Garbage Out.
He claims to send Morse Code so attrociously that there isn't a
No-Coder alive who could copy him with a computer program.

And he's proud of it.

> Yes, I already know that human EDAC ability exceeds most computers'.
>
> Personally, I think Tap Code should replace Morse: it's easier to learn,
> requires only "dots" (no dashes) and hence is used in most emergency
> situations.
>
> K3DWW

Oh Geez!!!

Don't go defaming the Mother Code.

You won't last long around here.

Prepare to have your character assassinated.

Nice knowing you.

73 and Sayanora

Brian

1610. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-03-31 23:58:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303311558.3ca23a4e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63797

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E886FBC.E9CEE25D@earthlink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > In article <f45722ac.0303301301.42daf974@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >"Passengers of this planet?"
> > >
> > >That sounds a lot like Larry's, "Citizen of the World."
> > >
> >
> > I got it from Hans, K0HB. Argue with him.
> >
> > What's wrong with "Passengers of this planet?"
>
> Brian's just honked that he missed his stop.
>
> Dave K8MN

And where do you get off at? Downtown Dar es Saturn?

1611. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 00:06:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303311606.5a848a87@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63798

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030331082713.08714.00000375@mb-fb.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0303280957.57d6cae9@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: OK everyone, here's the plan
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 28 Mar 2003 09:57:59 -0800
> >
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030327151823.04776.00001240@mb-ct.aol.com>...
> >> In article <c2356669.0303270918.1f9f604f@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> >> (N2EY) writes:
> >>
> >> >So I'll ask the hard question: What changes are Americans willing to
> >> >make in their lives to reduce/eliminate dependence on imported oil?
> >>
> >> Give up their SUVs and drive manual-transmission old autos.
> >>
> >> Adopting manual transmissions in vehicles is supposed to be
> >> the same as using morse code for fast, effective
> >> communications, right? :-)
> >
> >Had Clinton renewed the EPA's Fleet MPG requirements...
>
> Would that have magically eliminated oil imports?

No.

> Would it have convinced people to buy Insights instead of Expeditions, or to
> use transit?

It would have more Ford Escorts and Geo Metros on the road than SUVs.
You do the math.

> Would it have magically changed the laws of physics?

There's nothing wrong with physical laws. You just need to know how
to apply them. You're supposed to be an engineer, right?

> No to all of those questions.

Wrong.

> >Ah, yes, the "environmental" president.
> >
> That was one of the Bushes.

No, Clinton/Gore were supposed to be environmental president team, and
they fell flat.

> The question is abput what the American people are willing to do, not their
> government. IOW, personal responsibility for the future rather than expecting
> Big Government to do it all. Watta concept.

Whatta load of BS. Conspicuous consumption will occur anywhere the
government doesn't slow it down.

1612. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 00:17:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303311617.3c0a2c51@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63799

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E886F42.520EE38E@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E87C94F.18A23EA4@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hckksq2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > > > > On 30 Mar 2003 05:20:11 -0800, Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > >State where the FCC defined Morse proficiency long ago.
> > > > >
> > > > > The FCC [***{Caution: Tripping Hazard)***] Eules are plain about what proficiency
is required:
> > > > >
> > > > > Sect. 97.503(a)
> > > > >
> > > > > A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that
> > > > > the examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand and
> > > > > to receive correctly by ear texts in the international Morse
> > > > > code at not less than the prescribed speed, using all the
> > > > > letters of the alphabet, numerals 0-9, period, comma,
> > > > > question mark, slant mark, and prosigns AR, BT, and SK.
> > > > >
> > > > > Seems to me that the proficincy required is to "send correctly
> > > > > by hand and to receive correctly by ear texts in the international
> > > > > Morse code at not less than the prescribed speed". The speed
> > > > > itself is not the proficiency, the "correct sending and receiving"
> > > > > is.
> > > > >
> > > > > That wording has been in the Rules for decades.
> > > >
> > > > Phil, yes, yes. But we've still got Dave saying that 5wpm cannot be
> > > > proficient.
> > >
> > > Dave says that five words per minute IS NOT proficiency in morse no
> > > matter how much you'd like that to be the case.
> >
> > Then you disagree with Phil, not Brian. Read more carefully next
> > time.
>
> I don't have a disagreement with Phil.

But you do. There's that comprehension thing again. I wonder what's
next?

I even read the cautionary
> "Tripping Hazard" part. What is "the prescribed speed", Brian? Did you
> see anything in the FCC material about "proficiency"?

You are supposed to be the knowledgeable Code. I'm the mere 5wpm guy.

I'll defer to your "expertise."

What is the minimum speed and accuracy at which proficiency starts (or
begins)?

> > > > Jim says it's 10wpm. Dave says its higher but doesn't
> > > > know how much higher.
> > >
> > > Dave knows. You don't know.
> >
> > If Dave knows, he's not saying.
>
> That's correct.
>
> My interpretation is that Dave
> > doesn't know.
>
> That's incorrect.

My opinion is that you don't know.

> > > > Apparently, Accuracy CANNOT Transcend Speed (sorry FISTS). Ever.
> > >
> > > I'm not discussing speed over accuracy. I'm discussing speed WITH
> > > accuracy.
> >
> > And what is that lowest speed, and what is that lowest accuracy, which
> > when combined makes the lowest level of proficiency?
>
> In my view, that lowest speed is higher than ten wpm. I'm not
> discussing lowest accuracy at all. I'm more interested in the highest
> accuracy.

You need to state the standard at which proficiency starts. Accuracy
is an element of proficiency as you've previously stated.

So what is it?

> > > > Even if it's to set a world record.
> > >
> > > ...only if they were attempting a "world's slowest morse" record.
>
> > Wrong again. That wasn't what the record was for.
>
> My statement can't be "Wrong again" since I didn't make any claim at

> all.

Sure you did; "worlds slowest morse." That wasn't what the record was
for.

I know that wasn't what the world record was for and that's the
> reason for my statement. It's all about reading comprehension, Brian.

Yes it is, Dave. Try it sometime.

Brian

1613. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 00:22:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303311622.19bcc315@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63800

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E87C85A.225CA2F0@earthlink.net>...
> Bill Sohl wrote:

> > Makes sense to me Phil...BUT the naysayers in this
> > group don't consider 5 wpm to be proficient...according
> > to their standards :-)
>
> Five word per minutes maximum code speed isn't proficiency in morse
> under anyone's standards, Bill.

Apparently it is for Phil and Bill. That makes's two "anyone's."

> It is a minimal speed.
>
> Dave K8MN

Minimal speed for what?

1614. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 00:28:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0303311628.3a552eef@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63651

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E8869FE.E5D06BA1@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E87C5D6.2E63CFD1@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E86C15C.5D2E631E@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Vshah101 wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> > > > > > >I wrote that I considered the speed of proficiency to be higher than ten
> > > > > > >wpm.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Scientific proof of 10 wpm claim? Some say its 13wpm. At this speed, Morse code
> > > > > > encoding/decoding is automatic, part of one's being, unforgettable. Only at
> > > > > > this speed is one considered a "true" Ham.
> > > > >
> > > > > Vipul, meet Brian. Brian, meet Vipul. I'm sure you two will find that
> > > > > you have a lot in common. I didn't make a ten wpm claim.
> > > > >
> >
> > > > Dave doesn't seem to know.
> > >
> > > Dave knows what he wrote. Vipul and Brian don't know. Vipul has an
> > > excuse. English isn't his mother tongue.
> >
> > Dave apparently doesn't know what he wrote, regardless of his mother tongue.
> >
> Your lack of reading comprehension comes into play again, Brian.

Wow. You get two direct replies, one from Phil Kane, the other from
Bill Sohl, and then you state "5wpm ... in anyone's book."

Talk about a comprehension problem.

Again,
> I know what I wrote and I did not make a statement calling ten wpm
> "proficient".

Talk about a comprehension problem. I never said that you said 10wpm
was proficient. You said 20wpm is more proficient than 13wpm. You
-never- stated what the you consider the lowest proficiency level or
why.

A few days ago you were so confused that you were
> attempting to call me on things which Jim wrote. Get your stuff
> grouped.

Dave, it would appear that you are confused. Take a moment before
responding again. Maybe the right words will come to you.

1615. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 01:08:14 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0303311708.34e122e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63652

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E886FBC.E9CEE25D@earthlink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > In article <f45722ac.0303301301.42daf974@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >"Passengers of this planet?"
> > >
> > >That sounds a lot like Larry's, "Citizen of the World."
> > >
> >
> > I got it from Hans, K0HB. Argue with him.
> >
> > What's wrong with "Passengers of this planet?"
>
> Brian's just honked that he missed his stop.

Hell he got on the wrong track and is still on it with no way off.

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1616. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 01:27:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030331202713.25257.00000013@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63653

In article <f45722ac.0303310446.4e22154f@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

> Just give a straight answer for once.
>
First, give some straight answers to these questions regarding your alleged /T5
amateur radio operation:

What callsign was used?
What rigs and antennas were used?
Who did the equipment belong to?
What amateur bands and modes were used?
What countries and continents were worked?
How were the QSLs delivered?

You have said these questions were "too hard", but it's clear the answers are
easy.

1617. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 01:59:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E88F259.C61498FA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63654

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E886D7B.22FAA1B0@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E874DFF.F7295714@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > > > > > are often modified. You have not stated the lowest wpm rate at which
> > > > > > > > > > > > "proficiency" is achieved.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > I believe it to be higher than ten wpm. I've already stated that.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > And your answer is???
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Silicone caulk. What was the question?
> > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > How much higher than 10wpm?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Not much.
> > >
> > > How much?
> > >
> > I'll think about providing an answer as soon as you come up with the
> > answers regarding your supposed operation from Somalia:
> >
> > What callsign was used?
> > What rigs and antennas were used?
> > Who did the equipment belong to?
> > What amateur bands and modes were used?
> > What countries and continents were worked?
> > How were the QSLs delivered?

> Why? Is there more libel to follow?

You really have taken after your West Coast mentor. For there to be
more libel, there'd have to be some libel.

Dave K8MN

1618. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 02:02:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030331210210.04054.00000027@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63655

In article <BAAAC0D6.14D5A%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
>Date: Sat, 29 Mar 2003 03:17:42 -0500
>
>"Steve Robeson K4YZ" wrote:
>
>>> Dwight Stewart wrote...
>>
>>> Because they, and I, know Saddam Hussein had
>>> nothing whatsoever to do with the attack on
>>> the WTC. If Saddam wanted to attack this
>>> country, he has had twelve years to do so.
>>> He hasn't.
>>
>> You know this as a "fact" Dwight? You know
>> beyond a shadow of a doubt that SH didn't help
>> fund, support, promote or othrwise give confort
>> or assistance to those murdering bastards?
>
>
> Fact? What else would you call it, Steve? More than two years after the
>WTC attack, no evidence has been presented to even suggest anything other
>than what I said. Do you have that evidence?

I was surprised to read this, but upon looking I found there has been no direct
evidence that Iraq had anything to do with the Sept 11 attacks. Indeed, it
would go against character for Saddam to help out people (terrorists) over whom
he does not have total control.

>We're attacking a country and
>killing many thousands. More than rhetoric is required to justify that.
>
I think the main concerns of the Bush administration are:

- the continued efforts by Iraq to obtain WMDs
- the continued defiance of the requirements of the 1991 cease-fire agreements
such as harassment and access denial of UN weapons inspectors, targeting of UN
aircraft in the no-fly zones, etc.

Do these concerns justify the actions taken by the coalition forces? Will those
actions help our national security? Or will they act as recruitment aids for
OBL & Co.?

--

Here's an odd thought for you:

One of the things that OBL demands is removal of foreign infidel troops from the holy land of Arabia. Yet the main reason those troops are there is because of invasion of Kuwait and the continued threat of more of the same. If regime change and stabilization does occur, there will no longer be a reason for those troops to be in the region.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1619. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 02:02:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030331210211.04054.00000028@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63656

In article <AEF4832828806B84.E8E16FBDEA8659C2.99154591CB422797@lp.airnews.net>,
"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030328222652.29016.00001095@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> In article
><5554E5FDE074FA2E.B2670047AB436D52.476BC977E8906C5D@lp.airnews.net>,
>> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>>
>> >I think it was also Larry that stated that no peace has ever been
>> >achieved
>> >without war. He needs to learn of the success of India's entrance into a
>> >free nation....
>>
>> Not the best example, Kim.
>>
>> It's true that India got its independence from the British Empire without
>>a
>> war. Ghandi & Co. used nonviolence to make the Brits realize that keeping
>>India
>> would require more repression than the Brits (being basically decent
>>folks)
>> could stand. Also, after almost six years of world war to preserve
>>freedom, the
>> British were not going to force countries to remain British subjects if
>>they
>> wanted independence.
>>
>> But soon after the British left, India erupted into violent, bloody civil
>>war
>> and ultimately split into two (now three) countries, two of whom are still
>> fighting over boundaries (Kashmir isn't a sweater). How many died in that
>>war,
>> and in the fighting that still goes on after more than 50 years?
>>
>
>Yes, I understand. However, the fact that India initially won its
>independence without a war is siginificant to the idea that peace and
>freedom cannot be won from tyranny without a war.

Was British rule of India really "tyranny"?

In any event, dead in a war is still dead, whether it's a war of independence
or a civil war.

The British left India in part because they were too decent to brutally crush the nonviolent resistance movement, in part because they were worn out from WW2, and in part because they realized it was contradictory to force their rule upon India when they'd just spent years stopping Germany and Japan from ruling everything. Do you think Hitler or Stalin would have responded the way the British did?

Besides, one of the main reasons the Brits gave for their colonialist/Kiplingesque "burden" behavior went something like this: "If we just up and leave, these blighters will be at each others throats as soon as we're gone". Which sounded oversimplified until the Brits actually left, whereupon they were proven correct.

How many people died in the war that split India into 2-3 countries? How many did the British kill in all the preceding years of colonial rule?

I'm not trying to justify denying people their independence, just pointing out that Indian independence involved a very bloody war.

>That India fell apart
>after it won its independence may be partly due to the fact that those who
>led the nonviolent front were less influential (due in part to some deaths).
>Incidental to, that the people began to squabble among themselves what the
>"best way" was.
>
I'd say it's mostly due to the fact that without the common enemy of the British, the various factions started fighting.

Note also that India was trying to gain its independence from a distant foreign empire rule that saw itself as benevolent. Overthrowing a homegrown dictatorship that has dominated every aspect of a country for decades is a different thing.

What's a real unknown is how people will behave when a foreign superpower invades with the goal of overthrowing the current homegrown dictator. Some are bound to react with "We hate him, but we hate these invaders even more" and "Yes, he's a murdering SOB, but he's OUR murdering SOB!!".
>>
>> South Africa got its independence from the Empire about the same time as
>> India
>> - and promptly enacted apartheid, which was much harsher and more
>> repressive
>> than anything the British ever did in South Africa.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Ew yeah...go figure, huh?

Or consider what happened in the Balkans.
>
Then think about how Germany was reunited and the Soviet Union fell apart.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1620. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 03:34:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E8908D2.72D0EF7E@att.net>
Source record: 63657

Dave Heil wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E87B80F.F2E8C335@att.net>...
> > >
> > > Geez, Dave, I really need to introduce Brian to a good old fashoned Missouri mule.
> >
> > I'm not into Tiajuana-style entertainment. Take your mule somewhere else.
>
> I understand how you'd take that view since you'd evidently be teaming
> up with the mule to provide the entertainment. Just what is
> "Tiajuana-style entertainment" and how did you become familiar with it?

Wellllll!...."Tijuana style entertainmant" Indeed! One wonders just
how much of that
sort of thing Slim has participated within, or if maybe he's just
regurgitating what he has heard, as so many have, from those who've been
there and reported on it -sort of like
Slim's ham radio exposure.

But he removed all doubt on one point - Surprise! A mule is smarter
than he is. It knows the difference between a mule and a donkey.

1621. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 03:50:00 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <646E27DA8CC4C03C.1D8EFAFA502384C1.E41D8A8EBE928353@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64065

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAADF848.153F5%stewart@say.net...
> "W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > You bring up an incredibly interesting and
> > poignant observation, Dwight. All the cries
> > for "patriotism" (those of people who imply
> > it is unpatriotic not to support and stand
> > behind a President of the US), are probably
> > right along party lines; i.e., would we
> > find a Republican pleading for respect and
> > admiration of a Democrat President or vice
> > versa? hmmmmm....
>
>
> You're probably right, Kim. It is amazing how many people identify with
a
> single political party. I supported Bush during the last election. I did
so
> because of Republican party claims of support for smaller government (Bush
> has increased it dramatically), opposition to NAFDA (Bush has done nothing
> to end it), opposition to massive immigration (again, Bush has done
nothing
> to even slow it down), and a return to fairness in civil rights (nothing).
>
> Prior to that, I supported Clinton during his first campaign. I did so
> because of Democratic party claims of support for an increase in the
minimum
> wage (very minimal), health care (nothing), world peace (war in Kosovo),
and
> increased educational benefits (minimal).
>
> Do I blame either political party? No, both are to blame. Both are so
> similar on major issues (like those above) it is hard to tell them apart.
>

Yep, you got that right for sure. There is nearly no difference--the people
get to go to the voting booths...and I do...but why? Politicians turn
around and tell us we are too stupid to tell them what we desire. And it
doesn't matter *what* political party it is, both/all do whatever the hell
they want while they are in office...with our push of a button and at our
expense.

>
> Both have done things to harm the American people, the American worker,

and
> the American family. At this point, I feel we would be better off with a
> complete ban on political parties, or large spending on a single
candidate,
> in this country. Sadly, with political parties in control, we are not
likely
> to ever see that.
>
> There is an interesting line towards the end of the movie "Hunt for Red
> October" that would probably apply here. I'll leave this rant with that.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Oh well...

Kim W5TIT

1622. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 03:52:27 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0303311952.6c7802a1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63658

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message

>
> Let's test your ideas. Do you consider five word per minute code to be
> fast code?

It is "fast" to someone who copies at 4 WPM.

> Do you think that anyone whose highest speed is 5 wpm is
> proficient at morse?

If they copy 100% at 5 WPM, then they are proficient at that speed.
If they continue to practice like I did, then some day they may be
proficient at 45WPM.

73, de Hans, K0HB

PS: Jackie --- can I plagarize that "Captain Obvious" line? .... and
BTW, welcome to the Minnesota Wireless Association.

1623. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 04:29:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E891614.EBB46076@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63659

Brian wrote:
>
> Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message news:<3E8868ED.F78A9EB4@crosslink.net>...

> Dave got a bug up his butt (no pun intended) and is badmouthing a
> couple of world record setters going at 0.02wpm.

You're certainly dancing around the truth more than a bit, Brian. At no time did I write anything derogatory about either op involved in the effort on 136 KHz.

Dave K8MN

1624. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 04:39:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E891875.FAF5FD42@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63660

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E886F42.520EE38E@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E87C94F.18A23EA4@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hckksq2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > > > > > On 30 Mar 2003 05:20:11 -0800, Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >State where the FCC defined Morse proficiency long ago.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > The FCC [***{Caution: Tripping Hazard)***] Eules are plain about what
proficiency is required:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Sect. 97.503(a)
> > > > > >
> > > > > > A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that
> > > > > > the examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand and
> > > > > > to receive correctly by ear texts in the international Morse
> > > > > > code at not less than the prescribed speed, using all the
> > > > > > letters of the alphabet, numerals 0-9, period, comma,
> > > > > > question mark, slant mark, and prosigns AR, BT, and SK.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Seems to me that the proficincy required is to "send correctly
> > > > > > by hand and to receive correctly by ear texts in the international
> > > > > > Morse code at not less than the prescribed speed". The speed
> > > > > > itself is not the proficiency, the "correct sending and receiving"
> > > > > > is.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That wording has been in the Rules for decades.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Phil, yes, yes. But we've still got Dave saying that 5wpm cannot be
> > > > > proficient.
> > > > >
> > > > Dave says that five words per minute IS NOT proficiency in morse no
> > > > matter how much you'd like that to be the case.
> > > >
> > > Then you disagree with Phil, not Brian. Read more carefully next
> > > time.
```

> >
> > I don't have a disagreement with Phil.
>
> But you do. There's that comprehension thing again. I wonder what's
> next?

I said that I don't and I meant that I don't.

> I even read the cautionary
> > "Tripping Hazard" part. What is "the prescribed speed", Brian? Did you
> > see anything in the FCC material about "proficiency"?
>
> You are supposed to be the knowledgeable Code. I'm the mere 5wpm guy.

I'm not a code.

> I'll defer to your "expertise."

Then this will be a first.

> What is the minimum speed and accuracy at which proficiency starts (or
> begins)?

Higher than ten words per minute.

> > > > > Jim says it's 10wpm. Dave says its higher but doesn't
> > > > > know how much higher.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave knows. You don't know.
> > > >
> > > > If Dave knows, he's not saying.
> > >
> > > That's correct.
> > >
> > > My interpretation is that Dave
> > > > doesn't know.
> > >
> > > That's incorrect.
> >
> > My opinion is that you don't know.

Okay. Your opinion is wrong.

> > > > > Apparently, Accuracy CANNOT Transcend Speed (sorry FISTS). Ever.
> > > > >
> > > > > I'm not discussing speed over accuracy. I'm discussing speed WITH
> > > > > accuracy.
> > > >
> > > > And what is that lowest speed, and what is that lowest accuracy, which
> > > > when combined makes the lowest level of proficiency?
> > >
> > > In my view, that lowest speed is higher than ten wpm. I'm not
> > > discussing lowest accuracy at all. I'm more interested in the highest

> > accuracy.
>
> You need to state the standard at which proficiency starts. Accuracy
> is an element of proficiency as you've previously stated.
>
> So what is it?

...above ten words per minute.

> > > > > Even if it's to set a world record.
> > > > >
> > > > > ...only if they were attempting a "world's slowest morse" record.
> > >
> > > Wrong again. That wasn't what the record was for.
> >
> > My statement can't be "Wrong again" since I didn't make any claim at
> > all.
>
> Sure you did; "worlds slowest morse." That wasn't what the record was
> for.

Sure(ly) I did not. At no time did I state that the two were going for
the world's slowest morse record.

> I know that wasn't what the world record was for and that's the
> > reason for my statement. It's all about reading comprehension,
> Yes it is, Dave. Try it sometime.

Why would I take advice from a guy who reads one short line and gets it
wrong?

Dave K8MN

1625. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 04:44:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E891996.ED8C8CF1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63661

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E87C85A.225CA2F0@earthlink.net>...
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > > Makes sense to me Phil...BUT the naysayers in this
> > > group don't consider 5 wpm to be proficient...according
> > > to their standards :-)
> >
> > Five word per minutes maximum code speed isn't proficiency in morse
> > under anyone's standards, Bill.
>
> Apparently it is for Phil and Bill. That makes's two "anyone's."

Neither of them said that they believe five word per minute morse is the
mark of an op who is proficient in morse.

> > It is a minimal speed.

> Minimal speed for what?

...an agitator type automatic washer.

Dave K8MN

1626. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 04:56:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E891C72.2ABDF1CB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63662

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8869FE.E5D06BA1@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E87C5D6.2E63CFD1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E86C15C.5D2E631E@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Vshah101 wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> > > > > > > >I wrote that I considered the speed of proficiency to be higher than ten
> > > > > > > >wpm.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Scientific proof of 10 wpm claim? Some say its 13wpm. At this speed, Morse
code
> > > > > > > encoding/decoding is automatic, part of one's being, unforgettable. Only at
> > > > > > > this speed is one considered a "true" Ham.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Vipul, meet Brian. Brian, meet Vipul. I'm sure you two will find that
> > > > > > you have a lot in common. I didn't make a ten wpm claim.
> > > > > >
> > >
> > > Dave doesn't seem to know.
> > >
> > > Dave knows what he wrote. Vipul and Brian don't know. Vipul has an
> > > excuse. English isn't his mother tongue.
> >
> > Dave apparently doesn't know what he wrote, regardless of his mother tongue.
> >
> > Your lack of reading comprehension comes into play again, Brian.
>
> Wow. You get two direct replies, one from Phil Kane, the other from
> Bill Sohl, and then you state "5wpm ... in anyone's book."

Neither has thusfar made a statement to the effect that they believe
five word per minute morse marks the point at which one is skilled or
expert in the use of morse code.

> Talk about a comprehension problem.

I believe I already have talked about it.

> Again,
> > I know what I wrote and I did not make a statement calling ten wpm
> > "proficient".
>
> Talk about a comprehension problem.

Yes, I did.

> I never said that you said 10wpm
> was proficient.

Vipul did. Try and keep up.

> You said 20wpm is more proficient than 13wpm.

Yes, I did.

> You
> -never- stated what the you consider the lowest proficiency level or
> why.

I stated that I believe it to be higher than ten words per minute and I
don't owe you a "why".

> > A few days ago you were so confused that you were
> > attempting to call me on things which Jim wrote. Get your stuff
> > grouped.
>
> Dave, it would appear that you are confused.

I wasn't the one replying to the wrong individual.

> Take a moment before
> responding again. Maybe the right words will come to you.

...and if they do and if I type them here, who will explain them to you?

Dave K8MN

1627. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 06:34:49 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0303312234.3ca35e4b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63663

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0303311606.5a848a87@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030331082713.08714.00000375@mb-fb.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0303280957.57d6cae9@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >Subject: Re: OK everyone, here's the plan
> > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >Date: 28 Mar 2003 09:57:59 -0800
> > >
> > >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> > >news:<20030327151823.04776.00001240@mb-ct.aol.com>...
> > >> In article <c2356669.0303270918.1f9f604f@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> > >> (N2EY) writes:
> > >>
> > >> >So I'll ask the hard question: What changes are Americans willing to
> > >> >make in their lives to reduce/eliminate dependence on imported oil?
> > >>
> > >> Give up their SUVs and drive manual-transmission old autos.
> > >>
> > >> Adopting manual transmissions in vehicles is supposed to be
> > >> the same as using morse code for fast, effective
> > >> communications, right? :-)
> > >
> > >Had Clinton renewed the EPA's Fleet MPG requirements...
> >
> > Would that have magically eliminated oil imports?
>
> No.
>
> > Would it have convinced people to buy Insights instead of Expeditions, or to
> > use transit?
>
> It would have more Ford Escorts and Geo Metros on the road than SUVs.
> You do the math.
>
> > Would it have magically changed the laws of physics?
>
> There's nothing wrong with physical laws. You just need to know how
> to apply them. You're supposed to be an engineer, right?
>
> > No to all of those questions.
>

> Wrong.
>
> > >Ah, yes, the "environmental" president.
> > >
> > That was one of the Bushes.
>
> No, Clinton/Gore were supposed to be environmental president team, and
> they fell flat.
>
> > The question is abput what the American people are willing to do, not their
> > government. IOW, personal responsibility for the future rather than expecting
> > Big Government to do it all. Watta concept.
>
> Whatta load of BS. Conspicuous consumption will occur anywhere the
> government doesn't slow it down.

BS. The gummint didn't have squat to do with the lack of "conspicuous consumption" in '72. Not the gummint in Washington that is. $5/gal. in a real free capitalist market will fix the "problem" real quick and that maneuver is long overdue. Now that we're in the process of making even more OPEC "friends" watch it happen. Fuggit, I have my Metro.

w3rv

1628. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 12:38:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304010438.34a148c3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63664

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0303312234.3ca35e4b@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0303311606.5a848a87@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030331082713.08714.00000375@mb-fb.aol.com>...
> > > In article <f45722ac.0303280957.57d6cae9@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >Subject: Re: OK everyone, here's the plan
> > > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > > >Date: 28 Mar 2003 09:57:59 -0800
> > > >
> > > >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> > > >news:<20030327151823.04776.00001240@mb-ct.aol.com>...
> > > >> In article <c2356669.0303270918.1f9f604f@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> > > >> (N2EY) writes:
> > > >>
> > > >> >So I'll ask the hard question: What changes are Americans willing to
> > > >> >make in their lives to reduce/eliminate dependence on imported oil?
> > > >>
> > > >> Give up their SUVs and drive manual-transmission old autos.
> > > >>
> > > >> Adopting manual transmissions in vehicles is supposed to be
> > > >> the same as using morse code for fast, effective
> > > >> communications, right? :-)
> > > >
> > > >Had Clinton renewed the EPA's Fleet MPG requirements...
> > >
> > > Would that have magically eliminated oil imports?
> >
> > No.
> >
> > > Would it have convinced people to buy Insights instead of Expeditions, or to
> > > use transit?
> >
> > It would have more Ford Escorts and Geo Metros on the road than SUVs.
> > You do the math.
> >
> > > Would it have magically changed the laws of physics?
> >
> > There's nothing wrong with physical laws. You just need to know how
> > to apply them. You're supposed to be an engineer, right?
> >

> > > No to all of those questions.
> >
> > Wrong.
> >
> > > >Ah, yes, the "environmental" president.
> > > >
> > > That was one of the Bushes.
> >
> > No, Clinton/Gore were supposed to be environmental president team, and
> > they fell flat.
> >
> > > The question is abput what the American people are willing to do, not their
> > > government. IOW, personal responsibility for the future rather than expecting
> > > Big Government to do it all. Watta concept.
> >
> > Whatta load of BS. Conspicuous consumption will occur anywhere the
> > government doesn't slow it down.
>
> BS. The gummint didn't have squat to do with the lack of "conspicuous
> consumption" in '72. Not the gummint in Washington that is.

I'm not sure how to argue this one. At first look it appears that
you're agreeing with me. The government did nothing to slow/stop
consumption.

But when we throw Henry Kissinger (government employee) into the
picture a few months later, it becomes cloudy. He convinced the Arab
nations to hold us hostage, and use the ransom money to purchase US
manufactured arms.

$5/gal. in
> a real free capitalist market will fix the "problem" real quick and
> that maneuver is long overdue. Now that we're in the process of making
> even more OPEC "friends" watch it happen. Fuggit, I have my Metro.
>
> w3rv

$5/gallon is NOT free market. The only people paying $5/gal are the
one's who's government interfered and put a tariff/tax on fuel to slow
the trade imbalance.

I've still got my 91 metro with 149.5k miles on it, and drive it
daily,

and I love it when Rush plays "In a Yugo."

1629. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 12:43:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304010443.57a8f896@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63665

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E891C72.2ABDF1CB@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8869FE.E5D06BA1@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E87C5D6.2E63CFD1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E86C15C.5D2E631E@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Vshah101 wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> > > > > > > > >I wrote that I considered the speed of proficiency to be higher than ten
> > > > > > > > >wpm.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Scientific proof of 10 wpm claim? Some say its 13wpm. At this speed, Morse
code
> > > > > > > > encoding/decoding is automatic, part of one's being, unforgettable. Only at
> > > > > > > > this speed is one considered a "true" Ham.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Vipul, meet Brian. Brian, meet Vipul. I'm sure you two will find that
> > > > > > > you have a lot in common. I didn't make a ten wpm claim.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave doesn't seem to know.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave knows what he wrote. Vipul and Brian don't know. Vipul has an
> > > > > excuse. English isn't his mother tongue.
> > > >
> > > > Dave apparently doesn't know what he wrote, regardless of his mother tongue.
> > >
> > > Your lack of reading comprehension comes into play again, Brian.
> >
> > Wow. You get two direct replies, one from Phil Kane, the other from
> > Bill Sohl, and then you state "5wpm ... in anyone's book."
>
> Neither has thusfar made a statement to the effect that they believe
> five word per minute morse marks the point at which one is skilled or
> expert in the use of morse code.

Talk about a comprehension problem.

> > Talk about a comprehension problem.

> I believe I already have talked about it.

Talk is cheap. Now do something about it.

> > Again,
> > > I know what I wrote and I did not make a statement calling ten wpm
> > > "proficient".
> >
> > Talk about a comprehension problem.
>
> Yes, I did.

At least you get that part of it.

> > I never said that you said 10wpm
> > was proficient.
>
> Vipul did. Try and keep up.
>
> > You said 20wpm is more proficient than 13wpm.
>
>
> Yes, I did.
>
> > You
> > -never- stated what the you consider the lowest proficiency level or
> > why.
>
> I stated that I believe it to be higher than ten words per minute and I
> don't owe you a "why".

How much higher? Why?

> > > A few days ago you were so confused that you were
> > > attempting to call me on things which Jim wrote. Get your stuff
> > > grouped.
> >
> > Dave, it would appear that you are confused.
>
> I wasn't the one replying to the wrong individual.

It happens.

> > Take a moment before
> > responding again. Maybe the right words will come to you.
>
> ...and if they do and if I type them here, who will explain them to you?
>
Bill and Phil both responded here, and then you say that no one could possibly ...

I think I've got a handle on it.

1630. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 12:46:09 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304010446.ab00894@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63666

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E891996.ED8C8CF1@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E87C85A.225CA2F0@earthlink.net>...
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > > > Makes sense to me Phil...BUT the naysayers in this
> > > > group don't consider 5 wpm to be proficient...according
> > > > to their standards :-)
> > >
> > > Five word per minutes maximum code speed isn't proficiency in morse
> > > under anyone's standards, Bill.
> >
> > Apparently it is for Phil and Bill. That makes's two "anyone's."
>
> Neither of them said that they believe five word per minute morse is the
> mark of an op who is proficient in morse.

We're not talking about the mark of ops. We're talking about morse proficiency.

What is the lowest speed that you consider proficient, and why?

> > > It is a minimal speed.
>
> > Minimal speed for what?
>
> ...an agitator type automatic washer.
>
Dave, do try to stay on topic. Here's a hint: Morse Proficiency.

1631. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 13:20:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304010520.62283454@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63667

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E886CD7.B55D9EA7@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E874D94.4D1BA6AC@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E85D10E.F491CEA@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E83C83A.AC593364@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E836CC4.B5EBE8DD@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > You didn't agree with it either. The answer didn't suit you.
> > >
> > Welp, Slick, all the facts aren't in yet. I haven't rejected it.
>
> Well, Pipsquawk, let me know when you're ready to provide your final
> answer.

I'm still gathering information. Unfortunately, the information
forthcoming from those who have always claimed to know the most about
amateur radio (The Extras) just aren't amounting to much.

One say's its 10wpm, two others say 5, and one says its above 10wpm,
but doesn't know how much higher.

> > > > I placed the level somewhat
> > > > > higher. That answer didn't suit you.
> > > > >
> > > > You had no number. You said this is more than that. Your answer did
> > > > not suit me.
> > > >
> > > As I've stated twice previously, there is no answer which will satisfy
> > > you.
> > >
> > If you can come up with a number from an FCC publication or whatever
> > preceeded the FCC in history, I'll accept that.
>
> Look through the archives and let us know what you come up with.

Your word will do. If its verifiable.

> > Do you have that number?
>
> There are all sorts of numbers in FCC publications. One of them is
> "97". Another is "15". See what you can find.

97wpm? Wowee! 15wpm? That is higher than 10wpm. Is 15wpm your
final answer?

> > > > > We know that there are numerous
> > > > > ops who are comfortable with 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 wpm. There are some who
> > > > > can operate at much higher speeds. If you choose to delude yourself
> > > > > that someone whose maximum speed is five words per minute is proficient
> > > > > in morse, so be it. I've give you the definition of "proficient". I
> > > > > don't consider the 5 wpm level to be "skilled" or "expert".
> > > >
> > > > I'd like to get to the bottom of this. If you have some information
> > > > on what the FCC says is proficient, past or present, I'd like to hear
> > > > of it. Even something from the 1912 Dept of the Navy would do.
> > >
> > > Look it up.
> >
> > You guys are a living resource. Just give a straight answer for once.
>
> I did so.

You did not.

> > > > > > > > You merely type words.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > That seems to have been what makes up your response.
>
> > > > > > > Back it up with anything from the FCC. Anything at all.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > The FCC is not in the business of determing morse proficiency.
> > > > >
> > > > > Yet, somehow, they require us to learn it.
> > >
> > > That's right. They don't claim that because you pass a five word per
> > > minute exam, you've suddenly become proficient in the use of morse.
> > > Passing a driving exam doesn't mean that you're certified as a good
> > > driver. It just means that you passed the exam.
>
> > Who certifies good drivers?
>
> I don't know that anyone does yet I'm certain that you see good drivers
> and bad drivers all the time. Do you have trouble telling them apart?

So no one certifies good drivers yet you bring up good driver
certification. Why do you do this? Why can't you stay on subject?
Are you confused?

> > What authority do they have to do so?
>
> Why would anyone need authority to tell a good driver from a bad driver
> or a good batter from a bad batter or a good rifle shot from a bad rifle
> shot?

You were talking about good driver certification, now you've floated
off to marksmanship. Do you have Adult Attention Defecit Disorder?

> > How is this related to Morse Code proficiency?
>
> That was already explained. Sorry you missed it.

Just stick to Morse code proficiency. We just might get through this
some day.

1632. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 13:23:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304010523.2c83e731@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63668

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E8908D2.72D0EF7E@att.net>...
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E87B80F.F2E8C335@att.net>...
> > > >
> > > > Geez, Dave, I really need to introduce Brian to a good old fashoned Missouri mule.
> > >
> > > I'm not into Tiajuana-style entertainment. Take your mule somewhere else.
> >
> > I understand how you'd take that view since you'd evidently be teaming
> > up with the mule to provide the entertainment. Just what is
> > "Tiajuana-style entertainment" and how did you become familiar with it?
>
> Wellllll!...."Tijuana style entertainmant" Indeed! One wonders just
> how much of that
> sort of thing Slim has participated within, or if maybe he's just
> regurgitating what he has heard, as so many have, from those who've been
> there and reported on it -sort of like
> Slim's ham radio exposure.
>
> But he removed all doubt on one point - Surprise! A mule is smarter
> than he is. It knows the difference between a mule and a donkey.

I know the difference between a donkey and an ass.

1633. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 14:22:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E89A0A7.E601C9C2@att.net>
Source record: 63670

Brian wrote:

>
> I know the difference between a donkey and an ass.

Obviously not, since they're one and the same.

1634. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 14:24:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E89A0F4.5B934923@att.net>
Source record: 63671

One WILL note the date of this missive...

Vito wrote:

> From EHam
>
> Eham.net has learned that the FCC will soon announce that all licensing
> and regulation of the Amateur Service will cease, effective upon
> publication of the applicable Order in the Federal Register. Eham was
> told that the FCC is taking this step for two reasons. First, this
> action will reduce the FCC's budgetary needs in this era of federal
> deficits. Second, the FCC noted that so-called "freeband" unlicensed HF
> operation has matured to the point where it no longer has significant
> negative impact. Therefore, the FCC reached the conclusion that the
> current Amateur Service testing, licensing, and regulatory structure
> serves little or no real purpose.
>
> Eham's source emphasized that HF operation will continue to be permitted
> by any U.S. resident in the current amateur allocations below 30 MHz.
> These frequencies, along with the 26-28 MHz band, will become officially
> available for any non-commercial, non-broadcasting communication
> purpose. All other Amateur allocations (above 30 MHz) will be withdrawn,
> and will be reallocated to commercial interests. .....

1635. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 14:46:47 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <rDhia.34700$HR6.30379@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 63672

At first, I figured it was just some kid that snuck onto daddy's computer.
:-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3E89A0F4.5B934923@att.net...
> One WILL note the date of this missive...
>
> Vito wrote:
>
> > From EHam
> >
> > Eham.net has learned that the FCC will soon announce that all licensing
> > and regulation of the Amateur Service will cease, effective upon
> > publication of the applicable Order in the Federal Register. Eham was
> > told that the FCC is taking this step for two reasons. First, this
> > action will reduce the FCC's budgetary needs in this era of federal
> > deficits. Second, the FCC noted that so-called "freeband" unlicensed HF
> > operation has matured to the point where it no longer has significant
> > negative impact. Therefore, the FCC reached the conclusion that the
> > current Amateur Service testing, licensing, and regulatory structure
> > serves little or no real purpose.
> >
> > Eham's source emphasized that HF operation will continue to be permitted
> > by any U.S. resident in the current amateur allocations below 30 MHz.
> > These frequencies, along with the 26-28 MHz band, will become officially
> > available for any non-commercial, non-broadcasting communication
> > purpose. All other Amateur allocations (above 30 MHz) will be withdrawn,
> > and will be reallocated to commercial interests. .....
>

1636. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 16:35:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAAF29E4.15441%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63673

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart writes:
>
>> Fact? What else would you call it, Steve? More
>> than two years after the WTC attack, no evidence
>> has been presented to even suggest anything other
>> than what I said. Do you have that evidence?
>
> I was surprised to read this, but upon looking I
> found there has been no direct evidence that Iraq
> had anything to do with the Sept 11 attacks. Indeed,
> it would go against character for Saddam to help
> out people (terrorists) over whom he does not have
> total control.

I'm no different than anyone else, Jim. If I thought Saddam had anything to do with 9/11, I'd be spitting mad. But, like you, I don't see any evidence of that. Yet this very incident is consistently thrown out as one justification for the current invasion of Iraq. The contradiction of those two realities makes me uncomfortable, and causes suspicion about the other justifications thrown around.

> I think the main concerns of the Bush administration
> are:
>
> - the continued efforts by Iraq to obtain WMDs

And when looking at this issue, we cannot ignore Israel. Many Arabs feel they have a bone to pick with that country. Israel, in an effort to defend itself, obtained nuclear weapons (a weapon of mass destruction). Fine and dandy. But, by doing so, it caused other nations in the area to want nuclear weapons also. We said and did very little, if anything, about Israel's attempts to obtain nuclear weapons, but are bombing the heck out of Iraq because they seek to obtain nuclear weapons. This contradiction in our policies towards countries is looked at with suspicion by many in the Arab world, and by a growing number of people all over the world. One could argue this contradiction is just politics but, when we start invading countries and killing people over it, support for our actions is certain to weaken.

> - the continued defiance of the requirements of the
> 1991 cease-fire agreements such as harassment and
> access denial of UN weapons inspectors, targeting
> of UN aircraft in the no-fly zones, etc.

This is a legitimate point (perhaps the only one with a real justification for the invasion of Iraq), but it brings to mind the events following WWI, leading up to WWII. If you remember your history books, heavy burdens were placed on Germany following the first World War (weapons restrictions, troop limitations, reparations, and so on). This had a detrimental effect on the German economy, its efforts to rebuild following the war, caused Germans to feel venerable in the volatile Europe of the time, and was an affront to the honor of that country. Right or wrong, Germany began to defy the surrender agreements within a decade of that war's end, with the people open to any leader who offered a solution to their problems. Hitler was the eventual answer, with another World War as the result.

Taking the lessons we learned there, one could argue that an invasion is necessary to head off a potential conflict down the road as Iraq goes through similar detrimental effects from its last war. One could also point to a similar empowerment of rogue leaders. Clearly, the only way to avoid an endless cycle of detrimental effects and empowerment of rogue leaders, is to spend hundreds of millions or perhaps billions to reduce the detrimental effects by rebuilding the country (not missed by some when discussing a post-Saddam Iraq).

However, the question remains whether this will ultimately work with the same conditions in the region - Israel will still have nuclear weapons and our contradiction in policies will still remain (we will still attempt to block the acquisition of nuclear weapons by other nations in the region). Even if we're successful with Iraq, there are a dozen other countries in the region with similar views about acquiring weapons of mass destruction. Do we invade them all? Or do we change our policy towards Israel?

> One of the things that OBL demands is removal of foreign
> infidel troops from the holy land of Arabia. Yet the
> main reason those troops are there is because of invasion
> of Kuwait and the continued threat of more of the same.
> If regime change and stabilization does occur, there
> will no longer be a reason for those troops to be in the
> region.

No regime change is going to cause the removal of our troops. Like Europe and Asia, our troops will be in that region for the next hundred years or so. The "defense" industry is jumping for joy today - suffering from the end of the cold war in Europe, they can now look forward to decades of conflicts and arms sales. And this country is going to need new national cemeteries to bury our war dead - Arlington is nearly full.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1637. No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 16:54:20 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3E89C43C.B4EDF9AD@crosslink.net>
Source record: 63669

From EHam

Eham.net has learned that the FCC will soon announce that all licensing and regulation of the Amateur Service will cease, effective upon publication of the applicable Order in the Federal Register. Eham was told that the FCC is taking this step for two reasons. First, this action will reduce the FCC's budgetary needs in this era of federal deficits. Second, the FCC noted that so-called "freeband" unlicensed HF operation has matured to the point where it no longer has significant negative impact. Therefore, the FCC reached the conclusion that the current Amateur Service testing, licensing, and regulatory structure serves little or no real purpose.

Eham's source emphasized that HF operation will continue to be permitted by any U.S. resident in the current amateur allocations below 30 MHz. These frequencies, along with the 26-28 MHz band, will become officially available for any non-commercial, non-broadcasting communication purpose. All other Amateur allocations (above 30 MHz) will be withdrawn, and will be reallocated to commercial interests. .....

1638. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 17:00:55 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304010900.5ade4b0f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63674

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of March 31, 2003:

Novice - 35,024 (decrease of 14,305)
Tech - 251,221 (increase of 46,715)
Tech Plus - 70,249 (decrease of 58,611)
General - 140,487 (increase of 27,810)
Advanced - 83,833 (decrease of 15,949)
Extra - 103,709 (increase of 24,959)
Total - 685,471 (increase of 10,679)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1639. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 17:26:53 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304010926.12312e86@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63675

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0303311606.5a848a87@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030331082713.08714.00000375@mb-fb.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0303280957.57d6cae9@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >Subject: Re: OK everyone, here's the plan
> > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >Date: 28 Mar 2003 09:57:59 -0800
> > >
> > >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> > >news:<20030327151823.04776.00001240@mb-ct.aol.com>...
> > >> In article <c2356669.0303270918.1f9f604f@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> > >> (N2EY) writes:
> > >>
> > >> >So I'll ask the hard question: What changes are Americans willing to
> > >> >make in their lives to reduce/eliminate dependence on imported oil?
> > >>
> > >> Give up their SUVs and drive manual-transmission old autos.
> > >>
> > >> Adopting manual transmissions in vehicles is supposed to be
> > >> the same as using morse code for fast, effective
> > >> communications, right? :-)
> > >
> > >Had Clinton renewed the EPA's Fleet MPG requirements...
> >
> > Would that have magically eliminated oil imports?
>
> No.
>
> > Would it have convinced people to buy Insights instead of Expeditions, or to
> > use transit?
>
> It would have more Ford Escorts and Geo Metros on the road than SUVs.

How?

People buying cars seek out the cars they want. When fuel was
relatively expensive and the supply perceived to be in jeopardy, fuel
efficient cars were highly sought after. Years of plentiful, cheap gas
have made fuel economy very low on the list of buyer priorities - new
or used.

Just look at the cost figures: If someone drives 12,000 miles/yr and
fuel is $1.50/gallon, the fuel cost for a 12 MPG SUV is $1500/yr vs.
$500/yr for a 36 MPG econobox. Compared to what a new car costs to buy
and insure, that's just not a lot of money. To many Americans, $1000
shelled out over the course of a year is not worth giving up the
comfort, convenience and image of driving an SUV, pickup, etc. And
because fuel cost is paid out $20-30 at a time, it does not show up on
many people's economic radar.

> You do the math.

Just did. What do YOU drive, and how many miles/yr?
>
> > Would it have magically changed the laws of physics?
>
> There's nothing wrong with physical laws. You just need to know how
> to apply them.

So tell us how to improve fuel economy to the point that the USA
doesn't have to import half its oil.

> You're supposed to be an engineer, right?

Not "supposed to be". I am. Among the required coursed in electrical
engineering were basic mechanics and thermodynamics. An Otto-cycle
gasoline engine with 10:1 compression ratio isn't going to do much
better than 30-35% efficiency under ideal conditions, for a start.
>
> > No to all of those questions.
>
> Wrong.

How is it "wrong"?
>
> > >Ah, yes, the "environmental" president.
> > >
> > That was one of the Bushes.
>
> No, Clinton/Gore were supposed to be environmental president team, and
> they fell flat.

So The Congress bears no responsibility?

Note that the American people elected a former oil man as President.
>
> > The question is abput what the American people are willing to do, not their
> > government. IOW, personal responsibility for the future rather than
> > expecting
> > Big Government to do it all. Watta concept.
>
> Whatta load of BS.

The concept of personal responsibility is BS?

> Conspicuous consumption will occur anywhere the
> government doesn't slow it down.

Ah, I see. You want Big Government to force people to "do the right thing", rather than educating them so that they take responsibility for their own actions.

It has been shown that the fuel efficiency of cars and trucks drops dramatically above about 50 MPH, so by your logic the 55 MPH speed limit should be reimposed.

Since it's fuel we're trying to save, your logic would follow the European model of taxing gasoline at a very high rate to bring the consumption down. (The basic production cost of gasoline in Europe isn't much higher than in the USA, but the taxes are so high that their price per liter is close to our price per gallon). So perhaps gasoline should be taxed so it costs $4-$5 gallon, or even more.

All these things follow from your argument that "Conspicuous consumption will occur anywhere the government doesn't slow it down."

And why stop at gasoline? Perhaps junk food and McD's should be more heavily regulated, because so many Americans carry around extra pounds due to "conspicuous consumption". Would make Vipul happy, anyway.

I wonder how other folks think about your ideas.

1640. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 18:17:52 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030401131752.16855.00000266@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 63676

>From EHam
>
>Eham.net has learned that the FCC will soon announce that all licensing
>and regulation of the Amateur Service will cease, effective upon
>publication of the applicable Order in the Federal Register. Eham was
>told that the FCC is taking this step for two reasons. First, this
>action will reduce the FCC's budgetary needs in this era of federal
>deficits. Second, the FCC noted that so-called "freeband" unlicensed HF
>operation has matured to the point where it no longer has significant
>negative impact. Therefore, the FCC reached the conclusion that the
>current Amateur Service testing, licensing, and regulatory structure
>serves little or no real purpose.
>
>Eham's source emphasized that HF operation will continue to be permitted
>by any U.S. resident in the current amateur allocations below 30 MHz.
>These frequencies, along with the 26-28 MHz band, will become officially
>available for any non-commercial, non-broadcasting communication
>purpose. All other Amateur allocations (above 30 MHz) will be withdrawn,
>and will be reallocated to commercial interests. .....
>
>
>
>
>

Its about time.

1641. WARC-03 and 40 Meter Realignment

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 20:29:18 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304011229.4c8c0c4f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63677

See:

http://www.arrl.org/news/features/2003/04/01/1/?nc=1

73 de Jim, N2EY

1642. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 21:15:03 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304011315.76ebc4d8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63678

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030331210211.04054.00000028@mb-fj.aol.com>...
>
> Besides, one of the main reasons the Brits gave for their
> colonialist/Kiplingesque "burden" behavior went something like this: "If we
> just up and leave, these blighters will be at each others throats as soon as
> we're gone". Which sounded oversimplified until the Brits actually left,
> whereupon they were proven correct.

They also bailed away from Palestine after WW2 and lookit the mess WE
inherited from them. I've always figgered that move was the payback
for Yorktown. They won.

> How many people died in the war that split India into 2-3 countries? How many
> did the British kill in all the preceding years of colonial rule?

Beyond that the Indians wouldn't yet have the most of the
infrastructure and institutions it has today if the Brits hadn't built
them.

>
> What's a real unknown is how people will behave when a foreign superpower
> invades with the goal of overthrowing the current homegrown dictator. Some are
> bound to react with "We hate him, but we hate these invaders even more" and
> "Yes, he's a murdering SOB, but he's OUR murdering SOB!!".

That's what the Serbs said a few years ago and the "authorities" are
stil diddling with Milosevic in the Hauge.

> >
> Then think about how Germany was reunited and the Soviet Union fell apart.

Does not apply to the current conflict in Iraq. Anybody who had half a
brain knew that the Communist socioeconomic system defied basic human
nature and was doomed from the gitgo in 1917. Ref: Pat Moynihan and
others circa 1960s who preached patience instead of "liberation".
Unfortunately it took 75 years for the Russians to wise up and unplug
the Soviet Union and start over.

A huge number of Arabs & many other Muslims are a whole different
ballgame by virtue of their religious beliefs which are at odds in
very basic ways with fundamental western beliefs including those of
the Russians. Any time any western power goes up against an enemy
which postulates that dying for the cause is glorious based on
religious beliefs we have a problem of monumental proportions. And we
sure as hell do. Q.E.D.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1643. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 22:58:44 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304012255090.81@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 63679

For those of us in Southern California, since when has there been any
regulations or enforcement since 1990? :-)

[That is NOT an April Fool's joke. The FCC has practically abandoned "socal,"
and Riley's poor, failed effort to deal with things such as the W6NUT repeater
(when under it's pre-Sept 2002 ownership) is prima-facie evidence of such!]

On Tue, 1 Apr 2003, Vito wrote:
> From EHam
>
> Eham.net has learned that the FCC will soon announce that all licensing
> and regulation of the Amateur Service will cease, effective upon
> publication of the applicable Order in the Federal Register. Eham was
> told that the FCC is taking this step for two reasons. First, this
> action will reduce the FCC's budgetary needs in this era of federal
> deficits. Second, the FCC noted that so-called "freeband" unlicensed HF
> operation has matured to the point where it no longer has significant
> negative impact. Therefore, the FCC reached the conclusion that the
> current Amateur Service testing, licensing, and regulatory structure
> serves little or no real purpose.
>
> Eham's source emphasized that HF operation will continue to be permitted
> by any U.S. resident in the current amateur allocations below 30 MHz.
> These frequencies, along with the 26-28 MHz band, will become officially
> available for any non-commercial, non-broadcasting communication
> purpose. All other Amateur allocations (above 30 MHz) will be withdrawn,
> and will be reallocated to commercial interests. .....
>

1644. Re: Anybody here have any new thoughts?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-01 23:00:15 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304012259190.81@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 63680

On Tue, 1 Apr 2003, Lloyd wrote:
> So far, I've seen no evidence of it.

I've seen little evidence of any old and/or intelligent thought here.

1645. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 00:05:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030401190533.25511.00000032@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 63682

In article <BAAF29E4.15441%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
>Date: Tue, 01 Apr 2003 11:35:01 -0500
>
>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> Dwight Stewart writes:
>>
>>> Fact? What else would you call it, Steve? More
>>> than two years after the WTC attack, no evidence
>>> has been presented to even suggest anything other
>>> than what I said. Do you have that evidence?
>>
>> I was surprised to read this, but upon looking I
>> found there has been no direct evidence that Iraq
>> had anything to do with the Sept 11 attacks. Indeed,
>> it would go against character for Saddam to help
>> out people (terrorists) over whom he does not have
>> total control.
>
> I'm no different than anyone else, Jim. If I thought Saddam had anything
>to do with 9/11, I'd be spitting mad. But, like you, I don't see any
>evidence of that.

I'm not talking about the evidence I see, I'm atalking about the evidence
presented. There isn't any. That may change as documents and other evidence are
captured.

>Yet this very incident is consistently thrown out as one
>justification for the current invasion of Iraq.

Not by those who closely follow what the administration is saying.

>The contradiction of those
>two realities makes me uncomfortable, and causes suspicion about the other
>justifications thrown around.

>> I think the main concerns of the Bush administration
>> are:
>>
>> - the continued efforts by Iraq to obtain WMDs
>
> And when looking at this issue, we cannot ignore Israel.

OK, let's talk frankly about Israel.

>Many Arabs feel
>they have a bone to pick with that country. Israel, in an effort to defend
>itself, obtained nuclear weapons (a weapon of mass destruction).

Many of Israel's neighbors have said they want to destroy Israel completely.
"Push them all into the sea", etc. To my knowledge, only Egypt has acknowledged
that Israel even has a right to exist. And Egypt's president paid for the Camp
David agreement with his life.

> Fine and
>dandy. But, by doing so, it caused other nations in the area to want nuclear
>weapons also.

Does Saudi Arabia want nukes? Yemen, Bahrain, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon - do any of
them want nuclear weapons? I don't think so.

>We said and did very little, if anything, about Israel's
>attempts to obtain nuclear weapons, but are bombing the heck out of Iraq
>because they seek to obtain nuclear weapons.

Israel isn't a dictatorship that has used chemical weapons on civilians.

Israel isn't a country with the second largest oil reserves in the world, and
the potential to be a rich paradise of a country, whose people exist in
poverty, want and desperation due to the repressive policies of its govt.

>This contradiction in our
>policies towards countries is looked at with suspicion by many in the Arab
>world, and by a growing number of people all over the world.

I think it really boils down to not wanting to set a precedent of invading a
country and overthrowing a govt. because a country half the world away feels
threatened.
>
>One could argue
>this contradiction is just politics but, when we start invading countries
>and killing people over it, support for our actions is certain to weaken.

This part I agree with.
>
>> - the continued defiance of the requirements of the
>> 1991 cease-fire agreements such as harassment and
>> access denial of UN weapons inspectors, targeting
>> of UN aircraft in the no-fly zones, etc.
>
> This is a legitimate point (perhaps the only one with a real justification
>for the invasion of Iraq), but it brings to mind the events following WWI,
>leading up to WWII. If you remember your history books, heavy burdens were
>placed on Germany following the first World War (weapons restrictions, troop
>limitations, reparations, and so on). This had a detrimental effect on the
>German economy, its efforts to rebuild following the war, caused Germans to
>feel venerable in the volatile Europe of the time, and was an affront to the

>honor of that country.

Different thing entirely. Iraq wasn't required to make huge payments or damage its economy. All that was really required was disarmament, and verification of same. But SH wouldn't allow it.

> Right or wrong, Germany began to defy the surrender
>agreements within a decade of that war's end, with the people open to any
>leader who offered a solution to their problems.

And the rest of the world did not stand up to Germany and stop them when it would have been easy to do so. And the USA refused to join the LEague of Nations, leading to that organization's failure.

Let's play alternative history for a bit:

What if the first German violation of the treaty had been stopped rather than appeased?

What if the first Iraqi violation of the cease fire had not been tolerated, rather than appeased?

>Hitler was the eventual
>answer, with another World War as the result.

Also something now known as the Holocaust.
>
> Taking the lessons we learned there, one could argue that an invasion is
>necessary to head off a potential conflict down the road as Iraq goes
>through similar detrimental effects from its last war.

Which was started by whom?

>One could also point
>to a similar empowerment of rogue leaders. Clearly, the only way to avoid an
>endless cycle of detrimental effects and empowerment of rogue leaders, is to
>spend hundreds of millions or perhaps billions to reduce the detrimental
>effects by rebuilding the country (not missed by some when discussing a
>post-Saddam Iraq).

Or maybe the West should not be so friendly with dictators. Didja see the pictures of Rumsfeld and Saddam shaking hands and smiling for the camera in 1983?
>
> However, the question remains whether this will ultimately work with the
>same conditions in the region - Israel will still have nuclear weapons and
>our contradiction in policies will still remain (we will still attempt to
>block the acquisition of nuclear weapons by other nations in the region).

>Even if we're successful with Iraq, there are a dozen other countries in the
>region with similar views about acquiring weapons of mass destruction. Do we
>invade them all?

THAT is the big question. Is the USA to be the world's policeman?

>Or do we change our policy towards Israel?

Exactly how should we change it?

What will happen to Israel if the USA cuts off support?

>> One of the things that OBL demands is removal of foreign
>> infidel troops from the holy land of Arabia. Yet the
>> main reason those troops are there is because of invasion
>> of Kuwait and the continued threat of more of the same.
>> If regime change and stabilization does occur, there
>> will no longer be a reason for those troops to be in the
>> region.

Another thing OBL demands is an end of Western support of Israel, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and other govts. which are not sufficiently radical for OBL.
>
> No regime change is going to cause the removal of our troops.

I hope you're not right about that.

> Like Europe
>and Asia, our troops will be in that region for the next hundred years or
>so.

Not if there's enough protest and resistance. Our troops were in Europe as part of NATO, to counter the Soviet bloc threat. All gone now. Except for North Korea, what Far Eastern country is any sort of threat? "Red" China is now a major trading partner. Yesterday I saw a kid's G.I.Joe lunchbox and a George Bush jack-in-the-box that plays "Hail To The Chief" when you turn the handle. Both made in - China.

>The "defense" industry is jumping for joy today - suffering from the end
>of the cold war in Europe, they can now look forward to decades of conflicts
>and arms sales.

Rather than having to do things like modern mass transit, fuel efficient cars and alternative energy sources......

>And this country is going to need new national cemeteries to
>bury our war dead - Arlington is nearly full.
>
All too true.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1646. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 00:05:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030401190534.25511.00000033@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 63681

In article <f45722ac.0304010438.34a148c3@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> > > The question is abput what the American people are willing to do, not
>> > >their
>> > > government. IOW, personal responsibility for the future rather than
>> > >expecting
>> > > Big Government to do it all. Watta concept.
>> >
>> > Whatta load of BS. Conspicuous consumption will occur anywhere the
>> > government doesn't slow it down.
>>
>> BS. The gummint didn't have squat to do with the lack of "conspicuous
>> consumption" in '72. Not the gummint in Washington that is.
>
>I'm not sure how to argue this one. At first look it appears that
>you're agreeing with me. The government did nothing to slow/stop
>consumption.

Govt. didn't have to. Overnight doubling of gasoline price and shortages did it
for them.

And don't forget odd-even days and the 55 mph speed limit.
>
>But when we throw Henry Kissinger (government employee) into the
>picture a few months later, it becomes cloudy. He convinced the Arab
>nations to hold us hostage, and use the ransom money to purchase US
>manufactured arms.

Nonsense! The US buys oil from amy countries. If we're "held hostage", it's by
choice.
>
> $5/gal. in
>> a real free capitalist market will fix the "problem" real quick and
>> that maneuver is long overdue. Now that we're in the process of making
>> even more OPEC "friends" watch it happen. Fuggit, I have my Metro.
>>
>> w3rv
>
>$5/gallon is NOT free market.

Neither are the CAFE standards you seem to like so much.

>The only people paying $5/gal are the
>one's who's government interfered and put a tariff/tax on fuel to slow
>the trade imbalance.

>
Most of the rest of the oil-importing world pays about $5 gallon.

The point is that in order to get a certain behavior, that behavior must be rewarded. Reimposing CAFE standards in a country with cheap plentiful gas will not cause people to buy more efficient cars. Initially, it will cause a rush to buy big cars before the requirements are enacted, and afterwards will keep existing big cars on the road longer. It also unfairly penalizes those who need a large vehicle, no matter how little or how efficiently they use it. Example: which is better - one 16 mpg minivan with 6-7 commuters carpooling, or those same 6-7 people driving their own 32 mpg econoboxes?

If it's reduced fuel consumption that's the goal, then it's the price of fuel that needs to change in order to make reduced consumption the goal. That's W3RV's pint, and he's right on target.

Know why other countries have great transit and passenger rail systems? They partially fund 'em with fuel taxes.

1647. Re: Anybody here have any new thoughts?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 01:34:55 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6dent$3b$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63683

Lloyd wrote:
> So far, I've seen no evidence of it.

The Tazo Chai at Starbucks is surpisingly good.

73 Corry K4DOH

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/

"Here I am, the CEO of a multibillion-dollar company, and I'm having to answer about what some weirdo has said on a message board." - Richard Scrushy, 1999

1648. Re: Anybody here have any new thoughts?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 03:12:02 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030401221202.26062.00000411@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 63684

From: Unclaimed Mysteries k4doh@mindspring.com

>The Tazo Chai at Starbucks is surpisingly good.

True, so is the Starbucks ice cream from a grocery store.*

*While going grocery shopping yesterday, a "stranger" came up to me and asked "What's your call sign?". I was very surprised. How could he possibly know to ask me that? Then, he said "I saw you at the club meeting". That explained it. You never know who you will run into.

1649. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 04:31:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E8A679C.D41B116F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63685

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E891C72.2ABDF1CB@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8869FE.E5D06BA1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E87C5D6.2E63CFD1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:

> > > > > > Dave apparently doesn't know what he wrote, regardless of his mother tongue.
> > > > >
> > > > > Your lack of reading comprehension comes into play again, Brian.
> > > >
> > > Wow. You get two direct replies, one from Phil Kane, the other from
> > > Bill Sohl, and then you state "5wpm ... in anyone's book."

> > Neither has thusfar made a statement to the effect that they believe
> > five word per minute morse marks the point at which one is skilled or
> > expert in the use of morse code.
>
> Talk about a comprehension problem.

I don't think either Phil or Bill has a comprehension problem.

> > > Talk about a comprehension problem.
>
> > I believe I already have talked about it.
>
> Talk is cheap. Now do something about it.

You wrote "Talk about..." so I pointed out that I have talked about.

> > > Again,
> > > > I know what I wrote and I did not make a statement calling ten wpm
> > > > "proficient".
> > >
> > > Talk about a comprehension problem.
> >
> > Yes, I did.
>
> At least you get that part of it.

That's the only part you brought up.

> > > I never said that you said 10wpm
> > > was proficient.
> > >
> > > Vipul did. Try and keep up.
> > >
> > > > You said 20wpm is more proficient than 13wpm.
> > >
> > >
> > > Yes, I did.
> > >
> > > > You
> > > > -never- stated what the you consider the lowest proficiency level or
> > > > why.
> > >
> > > I stated that I believe it to be higher than ten words per minute and I
> > > don't owe you a "why".
> >
> > How much higher? Why?

Dealing with you is like trying to hold a conversation with a myna bird.

> > > > A few days ago you were so confused that you were
> > > > attempting to call me on things which Jim wrote. Get your stuff
> > > > grouped.
> > > >
> > > > Dave, it would appear that you are confused.
> > >
> > > I wasn't the one replying to the wrong individual.
> >
> > It happens.

It hasn't happened to me.

> > > Take a moment before
> > > responding again. Maybe the right words will come to you.

> > ...and if they do and if I type them here, who will explain them to you?

> Bill and Phil both responded here, and then you say that no one could possibly ...

You must have read something into each of their posts which was not
stated by either of them. It either of them decides to build upon their
respective statements, I can deal with that. So far, it hasn't
happened.

> I think I've got a handle on it.

No, I don't believe you do.

Dave K8MN

1650. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 04:39:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E8A696F.56D1BA24@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63686

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E891996.ED8C8CF1@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E87C85A.225CA2F0@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > > > > Makes sense to me Phil...BUT the naysayers in this
> > > > > > group don't consider 5 wpm to be proficient...according
> > > > > > to their standards :-)
> > > > >
> > > > > Five word per minutes maximum code speed isn't proficiency in morse
> > > > > under anyone's standards, Bill.
> > > >
> > > > Apparently it is for Phil and Bill. That makes's two "anyone's."
> > >
> > > Neither of them said that they believe five word per minute morse is the
> > > mark of an op who is proficient in morse.
> >
> > We're not talking about the mark of ops. We're talking about morse proficiency.

Neither of those gents has said what you seem to think they've said.

> What is the lowest speed that you consider proficient, and why?

I've already answered and have pointed out that there is no answer which
will satisfy you.

> > > > It is a minimal speed.
> > >
> > > > Minimal speed for what?
> > >
> > > ...an agitator type automatic washer.
> > >
> > Dave, do try to stay on topic. Here's a hint: Morse Proficiency.

Okay. Five wpm is a minimal speed for morse code. It is slow enough
for a receiving op to be able to count dits and dahs, glance at a chart
containing morse characters and write down the character received, while
eating a sandwich.

Dave K8MN

1651. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 04:53:37 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E8A6CD0.80F3354A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 63687

WA8ULX wrote:

> >From EHam
> >
> >Eham.net has learned that the FCC will soon announce that all licensing
> >and regulation of the Amateur Service will cease, effective upon
> >publication of the applicable Order in the Federal Register.

> All other Amateur allocations (above 30 MHz) will be withdrawn,
> >and will be reallocated to commercial interests. .....
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
> Its about time.

Double April Fools'......

1652. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 04:58:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E8A6DCD.7305D32D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 63688

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E886CD7.B55D9EA7@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E874D94.4D1BA6AC@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E85D10E.F491CEA@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E83C83A.AC593364@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E836CC4.B5EBE8DD@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > You didn't agree with it either. The answer didn't suit you.
> > > >
> > > > Welp, Slick, all the facts aren't in yet. I haven't rejected it.
> > >
> > Well, Pipsquawk, let me know when you're ready to provide your final
> > answer.
>
> I'm still gathering information. Unfortunately, the information
> forthcoming from those who have always claimed to know the most about
> amateur radio (The Extras) just aren't amounting to much.

Broaden the scope of your research.

> One say's its 10wpm, two others say 5, and one says its above 10wpm,
> but doesn't know how much higher.
>
> > > > > I placed the level somewhat
> > > > > higher. That answer didn't suit you.
> > > > >
> > > > > You had no number. You said this is more than that. Your answer did
> > > > > not suit me.
> > > > >
> > > > As I've stated twice previously, there is no answer which will satisfy
> > > > you.

> > >
> > > If you can come up with a number from an FCC publication or whatever
> > > preceeded the FCC in history, I'll accept that.
> > >
> > Look through the archives and let us know what you come up with.
> >
> Your word will do. If its verifiable.

Then my word won't satisfy you. If you want verification, you'll have
to do the work yourself.

> > > Do you have that number?
> > >
> > There are all sorts of numbers in FCC publications. One of them is
> > "97". Another is "15". See what you can find.
> >
> 97wpm? Wowee! 15wpm? That is higher than 10wpm. Is 15wpm your
> final answer?

You babbled about numbers in FCC publications. I pointed out that there
are a number of numbers in FCC publications. See what you can find.

> > > > > > We know that there are numerous
> > > > > > ops who are comfortable with 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 wpm. There are some who
> > > > > > can operate at much higher speeds. If you choose to delude yourself
> > > > > > that someone whose maximum speed is five words per minute is proficient
> > > > > > in morse, so be it. I've give you the definition of "proficient". I
> > > > > > don't consider the 5 wpm level to be "skilled" or "expert".
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I'd like to get to the bottom of this. If you have some information
> > > > > > on what the FCC says is proficient, past or present, I'd like to hear
> > > > > > of it. Even something from the 1912 Dept of the Navy would do.
> > > > >
> > > > > Look it up.
> > > >
> > > > You guys are a living resource. Just give a straight answer for once.
> > >
> > > I did so.
> >
> > You did not.

"Look it up" is a straight answer.

> You were talking about good driver certification, now you've floated
> off to marksmanship. Do you have Adult Attention Defecit Disorder?

A "defecit" sounds like it could be very unpleasant. A batter whose
average is .125 isn't a proficient hitter. A driver who weaves across
the center line and who doesn't use turn signals isn't a proficient
driver. A shooter who hits the target ten times out of a hundred shots
isn't a proficient marksman. One whose maximum morse speed is five words
per minute when most others receive at speeds which are three to eight

times faster is not proficient in the use of morse code.

> > > How is this related to Morse Code proficiency?
> >
> > That was already explained. Sorry you missed it.
>
> Just stick to Morse code proficiency. We just might get through this
> some day.

I don't believe we will. You want someone to tell you that someone whose maximum morse speed is five words per minute is proficient in the use of morse. I'm not going to be the person to tell you that because I don't believe it to be true.

Dave K8MN

1653. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 08:44:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB00D0F.15628%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63689

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
> I never mentioned base closings. Perhaps I should
> have been more clear. I blame Clinton for GUTTING
> OUR DEFENSE, the CIA and the FBI.

Other than the issues I raised (base closings, weapons cuts, military spending, etc), how did Clinton gut defense in a manner inconsistent with the two previous administrations?

The cold war was over, leading to an obvious opportunity to reduce military spending. But, I don't agree our defense capability was seriously weakened by that reduction. We lowered manpower by about 500,000, leaving a military with a million and half active duty personnel - perhaps the largest active duty military in the world. We continue to have more planes, more tanks, more ships, and better technology than any other country in the world. Overall, our planes, tanks, ships, and other hardware, are newer than that of any other country in the world. Our military is the best trained and best equipped in the world. And finally, our spending on military research and development remains the highest in the world. I wouldn't trade our military today, or at the end of the Clinton administration, for any other military in the world.

> You dont think flying four planeloads loaded with
> Americans into two targets and a field in
> Pennsylvania a declaration of war? What would you
> call it then?
>
> Have you forgotten the airliners blasted out of
> the sky? The Americans killed just for being
> Americans...etc. ??

I haven't forgotten anything, but I thought we were talking about Iraq. It doesn't appear Iraq was involved in any of what you just mentioned.

> If thats true then why did DeGualle throw us out?
> And still not repay a damn cent?

We left France because of later disagreements. Our government hasn't asked for "cent" beyond that. If you don't feel that is right, perhaps you should talk to your representatives in that government. Of course, they'll probably tell you there is a reason why nothing was asked for - such as our desire not to drive a further wedge between us and an ally.

> They needed us a heck of a lot more than we needed
> them. (snip)

Don't fool yourself. I don't think either (the Europeans or ourselves) needed one over the other - Europe offered as many benefits to us as we did to them.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1654. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 10:13:40 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304020213.7bcc5388@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63690

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E886D54.568EAD36@att.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:

that the
> > > > Please
> > > > try to be factual when admonishing others.
> > >
> > > Please practice what you preach, parson ;-)
> >
> > Putz = Splat. Again. Getting boring.
>
> Naw. Been butt-ugly boring for years.

Yeah, but the boredom takes time to build up to the point where ya say
to self "fuggit, who needs RRAP?". I'm there, I'm well on my way back
to the airwaves for serious this time.

w3rv

1655. Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 10:32:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030402053240.25257.00000019@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63691

Long-time rrappers may remember that back on April 2, 1998, "Cutie Boy" (screen persona of one Masataka Noda, now JP2CKG, then VA2QRU/VE7JPN) wrote the following post. It is reproduced in its entirety, thanks to Google.

At the time, there were approximately 674,000 US hams. Today, exactly five years later, there are over 685,000.

BEGIN GOOGLE QUOTE

From: Cutie Boy (cute@radiotelephone.net.ham)
Subject: I will crap my hands

View this article only
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc, rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 1998/04/02

I will crap my hands if the number of hams of 5 years later are more than the number of hams of today.

Joli Garï¿½on (ï¿½galement connu comme M@S@)
Indicatif d'appel de radioamateur: VA2QRU & VE7JPN
ï¿½tudient @ Informatique et Mathï¿½matiques d'Universitï¿½ McGill
Montrï¿½al, Quï¿½bec, Canada
Cï¿½: cute@radiotelephone.net.ham
URL : http://www.radiotelephone.net (Universel)
http://www.radiotelephone.net/amateur/ (Radio)
http://www.geocities.com/~masataka/mcgill.htm (Universitï¿½ McGill)

Visit this excellent site
why code has no importance to the amateur radio today:
http://www.nocode.org
License Suggestion: http://www.radiotelephone.net/no-code/

Enlevez l' " .ham " pour rï¿½pondre.
Please remove "ham" to reply.

ATTENTION: Je n'achï¿½terai pas ou rï¿½ponse aucun produit des Cï¿½S non sollicitï¿½s!!

END GOOGLE QUOTE

Time to make good, Masa!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1656. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 10:35:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB02711.1562B%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63692

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Many of Israel's neighbors have said they want
> to destroy Israel completely. "Push them all
> into the sea", etc. To my knowledge, only Egypt
> has acknowledged that Israel even has a right
> to exist. And Egypt's president paid for the
> Camp David agreement with his life.

If you note the "fine and dandy" following the sentence you replied to, I didn't dispute Israel's need to defend itself. However, as I understand it, Israel pushed out almost all Arabs once living within its borders, creating massive refugee camps in neighboring countries and in occupied territories once belonging to those neighboring countries. Am I wrong about that? If not, that could certainly explain ill feelings towards Israel on the part of some Arabs.

The land of Israel is also not valueless. It contains some of the most valuable agricultural land in that immediate region, is the seat of several major religions, and was the only access to the Mediterranean Sea (a major trade route) for two of Israel's neighbors. In other words, the loss of those lands was a significant blow to the Arabs, again which may help explain the ill feelings.

Regardless, Israel is there and is not going to be destroyed. I think even most Arabs realize that at this point, in spite of the rhetoric.

> Does Saudi Arabia want nukes? Yemen, Bahrain, Egypt,
> Syria, Lebanon - do any of them want nuclear weapons?
> I don't think so.

Since most countries seek nuclear weapons in secret, it is difficult to tell which specific countries want nuclear weapons. However, it is known that neighboring countries often seek nuclear weapons once those weapons are introduced into a region - which suggests Iraq is not the only one interested in acquiring them in response to their presence in Israel.

> I think it really boils down to not wanting to set
> a precedent of invading a country and overthrowing
> a govt. because a country half the world away feels
> threatened.

The suspicion over our policies existed long before the current invasion - the current situation only adds fuel to it.

> And the rest of the world did not stand up to Germany
> and stop them when it would have been easy to do so.

> And the USA refused to join the LEague of Nations,
> leading to that organization's failure.

Already addressed in the next paragraph after the one you replied to with this comment.

> Or maybe the West should not be so friendly with
> dictators. Didja see the pictures of Rumsfeld and
> Saddam shaking hands and smiling for the camera
> in 1983?

Sadly, we have a long history of that, Jim. After our defense of Kuwait, we placed a "king" right back on the throne in that country. As a result, the people there are only a matter of degree more free than they were during Saddam's occupation. And, of course, you're aware of many other examples. We do need to be more selective over our choice of friends.

> THAT is the big question. Is the USA to be the
> world's policeman?

We are at the moment. But, what do you think about the future in that regard? I'm just darn tired of endless conflicts. At fifty, there has not been a single decade in my life that we have not been at war with someone (occasionally several in one decade). And, as legitimate as those conflicts sounded at the time, I would have a hard time justifying many of those conflicts today. In the end, I would like just one decade when our soldiers stayed their butts home and we stayed out of conflicts. Sadly, it may be an impossible dream.

> What will happen to Israel if the USA cuts off
> support?

I don't think we have to cut off support to have a change in policy. We can simply more directly address the middle east issues without weighting our position so heavily towards Israel alone - a serious move towards the creation of a Palestinian state, an end to Israel's current military actions in Palestine and the occupied areas, and the eventual return of refugees to Israel are good examples.

Well, perhaps enough about Israel and certainly enough for this message. Responding adequately to comments about such complex issues really eats up time and I'm simply running short of that these days.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1657. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 11:08:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304020308.23da1d87@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63693

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E8A6DCD.7305D32D@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > Just stick to Morse code proficiency. We just might get through this
> > some day.
>
> I don't believe we will. You want someone to tell you that someone
> whose maximum morse speed is five words per minute is proficient in the
> use of morse. I'm not going to be the person to tell you that because I
> don't believe it to be true.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, you let your "feelings" get in the way of objective, rational
thought. You continually try to redirect the the conversation to
driving or shooting or make it something personal with me.

And you couldn't be more wrong about what "answer" will satisfy me.
Too bad for you.

Brian

1658. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 11:10:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304020310.14964091@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63694

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E891614.EBB46076@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message news:<3E8868ED.F78A9EB4@crosslink.net>...
>
> > > Dave got a bug up his butt (no pun intended) and is badmouthing a
> > > couple of world record setters going at 0.02wpm.
>
> You're certainly dancing around the truth more than a bit, Brian. At no
> time did I write anything derogatory about either op involved in the
> effort on 136 KHz.
>
> Dave K8MN

You said that 0.02wpm couldn't possibly be their top end morse code speed.

What if it is?

1659. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 11:12:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304020312.5d303147@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63695

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E89A0A7.E601C9C2@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> >
> > > I know the difference between a donkey and an ass.
>
> Obviously not, since they're one and the same.

You're an ass. Are you also a donkey?

1660. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 11:34:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304020334.2622d4a8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63696

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E891875.FAF5FD42@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E886F42.520EE38E@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E87C94F.18A23EA4@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hckksq2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > > > > > > On 30 Mar 2003 05:20:11 -0800, Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >State where the FCC defined Morse proficiency long ago.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > The FCC [***{Caution: Tripping Hazard)***] Eules are plain about what
proficiency is required:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Sect. 97.503(a)
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that
> > > > > > > the examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand and
> > > > > > > to receive correctly by ear texts in the international Morse
> > > > > > > code at not less than the prescribed speed, using all the
> > > > > > > letters of the alphabet, numerals 0-9, period, comma,
> > > > > > > question mark, slant mark, and prosigns AR, BT, and SK.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Seems to me that the proficincy required is to "send correctly
> > > > > > > by hand and to receive correctly by ear texts in the international
> > > > > > > Morse code at not less than the prescribed speed". The speed
> > > > > > > itself is not the proficiency, the "correct sending and receiving"
> > > > > > > is.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > That wording has been in the Rules for decades.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Phil, yes, yes. But we've still got Dave saying that 5wpm cannot be
> > > > > > proficient.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Dave says that five words per minute IS NOT proficiency in morse no
> > > > > matter how much you'd like that to be the case.
> > > > >
> > > > Then you disagree with Phil, not Brian. Read more carefully next

> > > > time.
> > >
> > > I don't have a disagreement with Phil.
> >
> > But you do. There's that comprehension thing again. I wonder what's
> > next?
>
> I said that I don't and I meant that I don't.

I don't see either one of you withdrawing his comments. They are
incompatible. There is a disagreement in there whether you recognize
or admit it.

> > I even read the cautionary
> > > "Tripping Hazard" part. What is "the prescribed speed", Brian? Did you
> > > see anything in the FCC material about "proficiency"?
> >
> > You are supposed to be the knowledgeable Code. I'm the mere 5wpm guy.
>
> I'm not a code.

Skin your knee?

> > I'll defer to your "expertise."
>
> Then this will be a first.

It was your chance to shine.

> > What is the minimum speed and accuracy at which proficiency starts (or
> > begins)?
>
> Higher than ten words per minute.

10.5?

> > > > > > Jim says it's 10wpm. Dave says its higher but doesn't
> > > > > > know how much higher.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave knows. You don't know.
> > > > >
> > > > > If Dave knows, he's not saying.
> > > >
> > > > That's correct.
> > > >
> > > > My interpretation is that Dave
> > > > > doesn't know.
> > > >
> > > > That's incorrect.
> > >
> > > My opinion is that you don't know.
> >
> > Okay. Your opinion is wrong.

Can't be.

> > > > > > Apparently, Accuracy CANNOT Transcend Speed (sorry FISTS). Ever.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I'm not discussing speed over accuracy. I'm discussing speed WITH
> > > > > > accuracy.
> > > > >
> > > > > And what is that lowest speed, and what is that lowest accuracy, which
> > > > > when combined makes the lowest level of proficiency?
> > > >
> > > > In my view, that lowest speed is higher than ten wpm. I'm not
> > > > discussing lowest accuracy at all. I'm more interested in the highest
> > > > accuracy.
> > >
> > You need to state the standard at which proficiency starts. Accuracy
> > is an element of proficiency as you've previously stated.
> >
> > So what is it?
>
> ...above ten words per minute.
>
> > > > > > Even if it's to set a world record.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > ...only if they were attempting a "world's slowest morse" record.
>
> > > > Wrong again. That wasn't what the record was for.
> > > >
> > > > My statement can't be "Wrong again" since I didn't make any claim at
> > > > all.
> > >
> > Sure you did; "worlds slowest morse." That wasn't what the record was
> > for.
>
> Sure(ly) I did not. At no time did I state that the two were going for
> the world's slowest morse record.

Then why did you state it?

1661. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 13:23:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304020523.1d053666@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63697

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E8A679C.D41B116F@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E891C72.2ABDF1CB@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8869FE.E5D06BA1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E87C5D6.2E63CFD1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > > Dave apparently doesn't know what he wrote, regardless of his mother tongue.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Your lack of reading comprehension comes into play again, Brian.
> > > > >
> > > > > Wow. You get two direct replies, one from Phil Kane, the other from
> > > > > Bill Sohl, and then you state "5wpm ... in anyone's book."
>
> > > Neither has thusfar made a statement to the effect that they believe
> > > five word per minute morse marks the point at which one is skilled or
> > > expert in the use of morse code.
> >
> > Talk about a comprehension problem.
>
> I don't think either Phil or Bill has a comprehension problem.

Nor do I.

> > > > Talk about a comprehension problem.
>
> > > I believe I already have talked about it.
> >
> > Talk is cheap. Now do something about it.
>
> You wrote "Talk about..." so I pointed out that I have talked about.

Now you're talking about it again.

> > > > Again,
> > > > > I know what I wrote and I did not make a statement calling ten wpm
> > > > > "proficient".

> > > >
> > > > Talk about a comprehension problem.
> > >
> > > Yes, I did.
> >
> > At least you get that part of it.
>
> That's the only part you brought up.

Was there more?

> > > > I never said that you said 10wpm
> > > > was proficient.
> > >
> > > Vipul did. Try and keep up.
> > >
> > > > You said 20wpm is more proficient than 13wpm.
> > >
> > >
> > > Yes, I did.
> > >
> > > > You
> > > > -never- stated what the you consider the lowest proficiency level or
> > > > why.
> > >
> > > I stated that I believe it to be higher than ten words per minute and I
> > > don't owe you a "why".
> >
> > How much higher? Why?
>
> Dealing with you is like trying to hold a conversation with a myna bird.

I know the feeling.

> > > > > A few days ago you were so confused that you were
> > > > > attempting to call me on things which Jim wrote. Get your stuff
> > > > > grouped.
> > > >
> > > > Dave, it would appear that you are confused.
> > >
> > > I wasn't the one replying to the wrong individual.
> >
> > It happens.
>
> It hasn't happened to me.

It happened to me.

> > > > Take a moment before
> > > > responding again. Maybe the right words will come to you.
>
> > > ...and if they do and if I type them here, who will explain them to you?

>
> > Bill and Phil both responded here, and then you say that no one could possibly ...
>
> You must have read something into each of their posts which was not
> stated by either of them. It either of them decides to build upon their
> respective statements, I can deal with that. So far, it hasn't
> happened.
>
> > I think I've got a handle on it.
>
> No, I don't believe you do.

They haven't recanted their statements. I have a handle on it. You don't.

1662. Re: Anybody here have any new thoughts?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 13:24:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304020524.3818d777@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63698

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:<Pine.LNX.4.53.0304012259190.81@kd6lvw.ampr.org>...
> On Tue, 1 Apr 2003, Lloyd wrote:
> > So far, I've seen no evidence of it.
>
> I've seen little evidence of any old and/or intelligent thought here.

Mynah birds talking to mynah birds.

1663. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 13:46:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304020546.4be45a8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63699

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030401190534.25511.00000033@mb-fm.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0304010438.34a148c3@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> > > The question is abput what the American people are willing to do, not
> >> > >their
> >> > > government. IOW, personal responsibility for the future rather than
> >> > >expecting
> >> > > Big Government to do it all. Watta concept.
> >> >
> >> > Whatta load of BS. Conspicuous consumption will occur anywhere the
> >> > government doesn't slow it down.
> >>
> >> BS. The gummint didn't have squat to do with the lack of "conspicuous
> >> consumption" in '72. Not the gummint in Washington that is.
> >
> >I'm not sure how to argue this one. At first look it appears that
> >you're agreeing with me. The government did nothing to slow/stop
> >consumption.
>
> Govt. didn't have to. Overnight doubling of gasoline price and shortages did it
> for them.

Don't forget the trade imbalance it caused and what the government
tried to do about it. Muscle cars out, Pintos and Vegas in.

> And don't forget odd-even days and the 55 mph speed limit.

I thought it was even-odd?

> >But when we throw Henry Kissinger (government employee) into the
> >picture a few months later, it becomes cloudy. He convinced the Arab
> >nations to hold us hostage, and use the ransom money to purchase US
> >manufactured arms.
>
> Nonsense! The US buys oil from amy countries. If we're "held hostage", it's by
> choice.

Like I said, our own government engineered it. We wanted to sell
Arms. Vietnam was shutting down.

> > $5/gal. in
> >> a real free capitalist market will fix the "problem" real quick and
> >> that maneuver is long overdue. Now that we're in the process of making
> >> even more OPEC "friends" watch it happen. Fuggit, I have my Metro.
> >>

> >> w3rv
> >
> >$5/gallon is NOT free market.
>
> Neither are the CAFE standards you seem to like so much.

You'll have to help me with "CAFE."

> >The only people paying $5/gal are the
> >one's who's government interfered and put a tariff/tax on fuel to slow
> >the trade imbalance.
> >
> Most of the rest of the oil-importing world pays about $5 gallon.

Do they pay more per barrel? Or do they pay more for inefficient
refining, tariffs, and taxes?

> The point is that in order to get a certain behavior, that behavior must be
> rewarded.

Easy. You restrict the kind of cars available for sale, and then
allow the consumer to choose anyting they want from the available
inventory.

Reimposing CAFE standards in a country with cheap plentiful gas will
> not cause people to buy more efficient cars. Initially, it will cause a rush to
> buy big cars before the requirements are enacted, and afterwards will keep
> existing big cars on the road longer. It also unfairly penalizes those who need
> a large vehicle, no matter how little or how efficiently they use it. Example:
> which is better - one 16 mpg minivan with 6-7 commuters carpooling, or those
> same 6-7 people driving their own 32 mpg econoboxes?

So you do know numbers. Sort of. Carpooling and minivans are a
result of those standards you don't like and say cannot be
reimplemented.

> If it's reduced fuel consumption that's the goal, then it's the price of fuel
> that needs to change in order to make reduced consumption the goal. That's
> W3RV's pint, and he's right on target.

Pint? It could be his whole quart and still be missing the target.

He said "$5/gal" and "real free capitalist market" in the same
sentence.

> Know why other countries have great transit and passenger rail systems? They
> partially fund 'em with fuel taxes.

Jim, I understand central place theory, transportation networks, and
urban planning. The places where mass transit occurs are place with
compact population centers, not places with urban sprawl. For mass
transportation to work in most places in the USA, you'd need to
reconstruct American society. Don't worry, the Socialists are already
trying.

All I suggested is the we limit the number of large, petrol using vehicles on the roads. Just like we successfully did in the 70's through 90's, till Clinton. And that's as socialist as I would ever want to get.

Today, trucks, vans and sport utility vehicles outnumber passenger car sales. And most trucks, vans, and sport utility vehicles carry only one person, the driver, and no cargo.

Do the math.

1664. Re: WARC-03 and 40 Meter Realignment

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 13:53:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304020553.6a837f9a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63700

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0304011229.4c8c0c4f@posting.google.com>...
> See:
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/features/2003/04/01/1/?nc=1
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Good stuff for amateur radio. Thank you Jim.

Brian

1665. Re: Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 14:31:11 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <PuCia.301$fE.82@nwrdny02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 64051

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030402053240.25257.00000019@mb-cb.aol.com...
> Long-time rrappers may remember that back on April 2, 1998, "Cutie Boy"
(screen
> persona of one Masataka Noda, now JP2CKG, then VA2QRU/VE7JPN) wrote the
> following post. It is reproduced in its entirety, thanks to Google.
>
> At the time, there were approximately 674,000 US hams. Today, exactly five
> years later, there are over 685,000.
>
>
> BEGIN GOOGLE QUOTE
>
> From: Cutie Boy (cute@radiotelephone.net.ham)
> Subject: I will crap my hands
>
> View this article only
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc, rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: 1998/04/02
>
> I will crap my hands if the number of hams of 5 years later are more
> than the number of hams of today.
>
> _____
> Joli Gar�on (�galement connu comme M@S@)
> Indicatif d'appel de radioamateur: VA2QRU & VE7JPN
> �tudient @ Informatique et Math�matiques d'Universit� McGill
> Montr�al, Qu�bec, Canada
> C�: cute@radiotelephone.net.ham
> URL : http://www.radiotelephone.net (Universel)
> http://www.radiotelephone.net/amateur/ (Radio)
> http://www.geocities.com/~masataka/mcgill.htm (Universit�
McGill)
>
> Visit this excellent site
> why code has no importance to the amateur radio today:
> http://www.nocode.org
> License Suggestion: http://www.radiotelephone.net/no-code/
> _____
> ***Enlevez l' " .ham " pour r�pondre.***
> ***Please remove "ham" to reply.***
>
> ATTENTION: Je n'ach�terai pas ou r�ponse aucun produit des C�S non

sollicit&#65533;s!!
>
> END GOOGLE QUOTE
>
>
> Time to make good, Masa!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

LMAO! BTW, remind me to NEVER make a long term wager with you. You've got a memory like an elephant. Besides, I believe I already owe Ed, W1RFI a lobster dinner (...or lunch?) re. increase 11m enforcement over the past two to three years. I will very happily pay this one off when I visit W1AW this summer. :-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1666. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 14:34:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E8AF56A.B876C62@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64052

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8A6DCD.7305D32D@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > Just stick to Morse code proficiency. We just might get through this
> > > some day.
> >
> > I don't believe we will. You want someone to tell you that someone
> > whose maximum morse speed is five words per minute is proficient in the
> > use of morse. I'm not going to be the person to tell you that because I
> > don't believe it to be true.

> Dave, you let your "feelings" get in the way of objective, rational
> thought. You continually try to redirect the the conversation to
> driving or shooting or make it something personal with me.

It is rational and objective thought which brings me to the conclusion
that a person whose maximum morse speed is five words per minute is not
proficient in the use or morse code. The driving, baseball hitting and
shooting analogies are good comparisons. My views are not at all based
upon feelings but upon experience and observation.

> And you couldn't be more wrong about what "answer" will satisfy me.

Prove me wrong.

> Too bad for you.

What are the possible "bad" consequences for me? There'll be no army of
5 wpm operators protesting in front of my home. My morse speed won't be
effected. Those drivers, batters, shooters and morse users who are not
skilled or expert will still not be skilled or expert.

Dave K8MN

1667. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 14:36:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E8AF5C9.EA40AC17@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64053

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E891614.EBB46076@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message news:<3E8868ED.F78A9EB4@crosslink.net>...
> >
> > > Dave got a bug up his butt (no pun intended) and is badmouthing a
> > > couple of world record setters going at 0.02wpm.
> >
> > You're certainly dancing around the truth more than a bit, Brian. At no
> > time did I write anything derogatory about either op involved in the
> > effort on 136 KHz.
> >

> You said that 0.02wpm couldn't possibly be their top end morse code speed.
>
> What if it is?

Your lack of reading comprehension comes into play yet again. I've
never written what you attempt to attribute to me.

Dave K8MN

1668. Re: Matching Words With Action...Are You Up To It, Vipul?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 14:40:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E8AF6B0.A84B4F13@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64054

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E891875.FAF5FD42@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E886F42.520EE38E@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E87C94F.18A23EA4@earthlink.net>...

> > > > > > > Even if it's to set a world record.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > ...only if they were attempting a "world's slowest morse" record.
> > >
> > > > > > Wrong again. That wasn't what the record was for.
> > > > >
> > > > > My statement can't be "Wrong again" since I didn't make any claim at
> > > > > all.
> > > >
> > > > Sure you did; "worlds slowest morse." That wasn't what the record was
> > > > for.
> > >
> > Sure(ly) I did not. At no time did I state that the two were going for
> > the world's slowest morse record.
>
> Then why did you state it?

This is the kind of material which resulted in an Ed Hare exit. If your
goal is to look stupid, you've succeeded.

Dave K8MN

1669. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 18:02:57 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3E8B25D1.67159D5F@crosslink.net>
Source record: 64055

"D. Stussy" wrote:
>
> For those of us in Southern California, since when has there been any
> regulations or enforcement since 1990? :-)
>
> [That is NOT an April Fool's joke. The FCC has practically abandoned "socal,"
> and Riley's poor, failed effort to deal with things such as the W6NUT repeater
> (when under it's pre-Sept 2002 ownership) is prima-facie evidence of such!]
>

FCC only has authority in America (ie the U.S.A.).

1670. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 19:54:02 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304021154.8f2d6b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64056

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304020615.79e4d2f0@posting.google.com>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0304010900.5ade4b0f@posting.google.com>...
> > These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> > licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
> >
> > As of May 14, 2000:
> >
> > Novice - 49,329
> > Tech - 205,394
> > Tech Plus - 128,860
> > General - 112,677
> > Advanced - 99,782
> > Extra - 78,750
> > Total - 674,792
> >
> > As of March 31, 2003:
> >
> > Novice - 35,024 (decrease of 14,305)
> > Tech - 251,221 (increase of 46,715)
> > Tech Plus - 70,249 (decrease of 58,611)
> > General - 140,487 (increase of 27,810)
> > Advanced - 83,833 (decrease of 15,949)
> > Extra - 103,709 (increase of 24,959)
> > Total - 685,471 (increase of 10,679)
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> In May 2000, there were 469,398 Morse Coded amateurs. In March 2003,
> there were 35,148 fewer coded hams.

How did you arrive at those numbers?

1671. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 21:07:41 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304022107160.317@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 64057

On Wed, 2 Apr 2003, Vito wrote:
> "D. Stussy" wrote:
> > For those of us in Southern California, since when has there been any
> > regulations or enforcement since 1990? :-)
> >
> > [That is NOT an April Fool's joke. The FCC has practically abandoned "socal,"
> > and Riley's poor, failed effort to deal with things such as the W6NUT repeater
> > (when under it's pre-Sept 2002 ownership) is prima-facie evidence of such!]
>
> FCC only has authority in America (ie the U.S.A.).

Are you saying that California is not part of the U.S.A.?

1672. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 21:10:02 UTC
From: snarflemike@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <20619edc.0304021310.e0041a2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64058

Excellent! When do we start up the spark transmitter net?

Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message news:<3E89C43C.B4EDF9AD@crosslink.net>...
> From EHam
>
> Eham.net has learned that the FCC will soon announce that all licensing
> and regulation of the Amateur Service will cease, effective upon
> publication of the applicable Order in the Federal Register. Eham was
> told that the FCC is taking this step for two reasons. First, this
> action will reduce the FCC's budgetary needs in this era of federal
> deficits. Second, the FCC noted that so-called "freeband" unlicensed HF
> operation has matured to the point where it no longer has significant
> negative impact. Therefore, the FCC reached the conclusion that the
> current Amateur Service testing, licensing, and regulatory structure
> serves little or no real purpose.
>
> Eham's source emphasized that HF operation will continue to be permitted
> by any U.S. resident in the current amateur allocations below 30 MHz.
> These frequencies, along with the 26-28 MHz band, will become officially
> available for any non-commercial, non-broadcasting communication
> purpose. All other Amateur allocations (above 30 MHz) will be withdrawn,
> and will be reallocated to commercial interests. .....

1673. Re: Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 21:15:21 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304021315.2e50c406@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64059

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<PuCia.301$fE.82@nwrdny02.gnilink.net>...
> >
> > Time to make good, Masa!
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> LMAO!

You shoulda been here when that was first posted, Bert. Seemed too
good to be true. Right in the tradition of Hashafisti Scratchi.

> BTW, remind me to NEVER make a long term wager with you.

(Cousteau narration voice ON)

.....ze barracuda iz nozing iv not paytient.....

(Cousteau narration voice OFF)

> You've got a
> memory like an elephant.

Who could forget a post like that? Thought it was an AF joke at first,
but the date was April 2.

> Besides, I believe I already owe Ed, W1RFI a
> lobster dinner (...or lunch?) re. increase 11m enforcement over the past two
> to three years.

Yeah, me too, the guy has never shown up to collect. He must be busy
with other matters. WRC-03 is coming up fast.

> I will very happily pay this one off when I visit W1AW this
> summer. :-)

I gotta get back there. Been ten years. Bring your license so you can
operate the station. Allow plenty of time, too - lots to see.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1674. Re: OK everyone, here's the plan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-02 22:13:42 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304021413.4fe8dec0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64060

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304020546.4be45a8@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030401190534.25511.00000033@mb-fm.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0304010438.34a148c3@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >> > > The question is abput what the American people are willing to do, not
> > >> > >their
> > >> > > government. IOW, personal responsibility for the future rather than
> > >> > >expecting
> > >> > > Big Government to do it all. Watta concept.
> > >> >
> > >> > Whatta load of BS. Conspicuous consumption will occur anywhere the
> > >> > government doesn't slow it down.
> > >>
> > >> BS. The gummint didn't have squat to do with the lack of "conspicuous
> > >> consumption" in '72. Not the gummint in Washington that is.
> > >
> > >I'm not sure how to argue this one. At first look it appears that
> > >you're agreeing with me. The government did nothing to slow/stop
> > >consumption.
> >
> > Govt. didn't have to. Overnight doubling of gasoline price and shortages did it
> > for them.
>
> Don't forget the trade imbalance it caused and what the government
> tried to do about it.

In 1975.

> Muscle cars out, Pintos and Vegas in.

Determined by market forces mostly.
>
> > And don't forget odd-even days and the 55 mph speed limit.
>
> I thought it was even-odd?

Shall we go back to 55 mph?
>
> > >But when we throw Henry Kissinger (government employee) into the
> > >picture a few months later, it becomes cloudy. He convinced the Arab
> > >nations to hold us hostage, and use the ransom money to purchase US
> > >manufactured arms.

> >
> > Nonsense! The US buys oil from amy countries. If we're "held hostage",
> >it's by choice.
>
> Like I said, our own government engineered it.

And you would have them do it again?

> We wanted to sell
> Arms.

I didn't.

>Vietnam was shutting down.
>
> > > $5/gal. in
> > >> a real free capitalist market will fix the "problem" real quick and
> > >> that maneuver is long overdue. Now that we're in the process of making
> > >> even more OPEC "friends" watch it happen. Fuggit, I have my Metro.
> > >>
> > >> w3rv
> > >
> > >$5/gallon is NOT free market.
> >
> > Neither are the CAFE standards you seem to like so much.
>
> You'll have to help me with "CAFE."

You're arguing about mileage standards and you don't know what "CAFE"
means. Nor will you even bother to look it up.

Try reading this:

http://www.policyalmanac.org/environment/archive/crs_cafe_standards.shtml

Note that mileage standards still exist, and the Clinton
Administration wanted them higher but couldn't get the bill through
Congress.
>
> > >The only people paying $5/gal are the
> > >one's who's government interfered and put a tariff/tax on fuel to slow
> > >the trade imbalance.
> > >
> > Most of the rest of the oil-importing world pays about $5 gallon.
>
> Do they pay more per barrel?

Partly.

> Or do they pay more for inefficient
> refining, tariffs, and taxes?

Most of the price difference is taxes.
>

> > The point is that in order to get a certain behavior, that behavior must be
> > rewarded.
>
> Easy. You restrict the kind of cars available for sale, and then
> allow the consumer to choose anyting they want from the available
> inventory.

And that's "free market"??

> > Reimposing CAFE standards in a country with cheap plentiful gas will
> > not cause people to buy more efficient cars. Initially, it will cause a rush to
> > buy big cars before the requirements are enacted, and afterwards will keep
> > existing big cars on the road longer. It also unfairly penalizes those who need
> > a large vehicle, no matter how little or how efficiently they use it. Example:
> > which is better - one 16 mpg minivan with 6-7 commuters carpooling, or those
> > same 6-7 people driving their own 32 mpg econoboxes?
>
> So you do know numbers. Sort of.

A lot more than "sort of". Restricting the availability of minivans
will hinder carpooling Not a good thing at all. Carpools not only save
fuel, they pollute less, ease the parking problem and reduce traffic
congestion.

> Carpooling and minivans are a
> result of those standards you don't like and say cannot be
> reimplemented.

You're wrong about that. Carpooling is a result of higher fuel costs,
not mileage standards. Minivans were a Chrysler/Iaccoca idea, invented
because the market wanted something bigger than an Escort or Citation
station wagon.
>
> > If it's reduced fuel consumption that's the goal, then it's the price of fuel
> > that needs to change in order to make reduced consumption the goal. That's
> > W3RV's pint, and he's right on target.
>
> Pint?

Point.

>It could be his whole quart and still be missing the target.
>
> He said "$5/gal" and "real free capitalist market" in the same
> sentence.
>
So? How many wars has the US fought, and at what cost, to keep cheap
oil flowing?

> > Know why other countries have great transit and passenger rail systems? They
> > partially fund 'em with fuel taxes.
>
> Jim, I understand central place theory, transportation networks, and

> urban planning.

Your posts don't indicate that at all, Brian. You sound like an auto
industry exectutive from the '50s and '60s.

> The places where mass transit occurs are place with
> compact population centers, not places with urban sprawl.

Transit doesn't just "occur". It needs to be championed and supported
by policy. Just like the interstate highway system and cheap gasoline
have been championed and supported since the end of WW2.

> For mass
> transportation to work in most places in the USA, you'd need to
> reconstruct American society.

Sounds like a good thing.

> Don't worry, the Socialists are already
> trying.

Who are "the Socialists"? Those who want to limit our choices of
vehicles for sale?
>
> All I suggested is the we limit the number of large, petrol using
> vehicles on the roads.

How? Outright ban, production quota, surtax?

> Just like we successfully did in the 70's
> through 90's, till Clinton.

You're blaming the wrong person. Clinton supported higher standards.
CAFE standards are still in effect. The problem with making them much
higher is that The Congress won't stand for it. Nor will Mr. Bush - he
won't even support the Kyoto accords.

> And that's as socialist as I would ever
> want to get.

Uh-huh. The govt. uses tax dollars to build roads, bridges and
airports - isn't that "socialist"?
>
> Today, trucks, vans and sport utility vehicles outnumber passenger car
> sales.

Because they are what most people want to drive. Think about WHY
people want to drive them. Hint: It's not because they like paying
more for fuel.

> And most trucks, vans, and sport utility vehicles carry only
> one person, the driver, and no cargo.

Tell the people who buy them. Ask them why they want such a vehicle
for on-road use.

Tell us how such a requirement is going to get through a Republican Congress and White House. You'd have more of a chance with Ralph Nader in the Oval Office.

And do please read up on CAFE standards. They're in effect right now, and the industry is meeting them. To eliminate or even seriously reduce oil imports without other changes, the standards must go much higher. And the effect is a very gradual one, because the on-road fleet turns over very slowly.

1675. Re:Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 00:08:58 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030402190858.10669.00000083@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 64061

From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>How much higher than 10wpm?

The question is: "What is the minimum code speed for code proficiency?" The link below answers the question.

http://mvmpc200.ciw.uni-karlsruhe.de/~mvmpc9/public/NOS/HAM/HAMFAQ

I will quote the relevant part:
"That's the key to code proficiency. Copying code must be a thought-free process. When you hear a character, you should know, without thinking, what it is. It should be a REFLEX. In fact, copying above about 10 wpm can only be done by reflex.

10 wpm is the minimum speed where code can be copied by reflex and therefore is the minimum speed for code proficiency.

Individual variation of reflex perception may occur. However, lets assume the variance is small and 10wpm is the minimum speed for everyone.

Note that the reflex definition is based on the operator encoding/decoding perception, not on desirable communication rate. Slow as it may seem for some people (Normal voice conversation

1676. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 00:17:30 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304021617.6401e84c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64062

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BAB02711.1562B%stewart@say.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > Many of Israel's neighbors have said they want
> > to destroy Israel completely. "Push them all
> > into the sea", etc. To my knowledge, only Egypt
> > has acknowledged that Israel even has a right
> > to exist. And Egypt's president paid for the
> > Camp David agreement with his life.
>
>
> If you note the "fine and dandy" following the sentence you replied to, I
> didn't dispute Israel's need to defend itself.

I misunderstood. Now it's clear - thanks.

> However, as I understand it,
> Israel pushed out almost all Arabs once living within its borders, creating
> massive refugee camps in neighboring countries and in occupied territories
> once belonging to those neighboring countries. Am I wrong about that?

I think so. As I recall, most of those who left the new state of
Israel did so voluntarily, not wanting to live in a "Jewish" state.

> If
> not, that could certainly explain ill feelings towards Israel on the part of
> some Arabs.

As I recall it, old British Palestine was divided into various
sections according to religion and ethnicity. A town would have a
"Jewish quarter", an "Arab quarter", a "European quarter", etc. Not a
new system - goes back to antiquity. And the Brits kept the peace
more-or-less. But once they left, civil war broke out, and the Israeli
nationalists won.
>
> The land of Israel is also not valueless. It contains some of the most
> valuable agricultural land in that immediate region,

Sure. But until the Israelis started caring for it again, it was not
in good shape.

> is the seat of several
> major religions, and was the only access to the Mediterranean Sea (a major
> trade route) for two of Israel's neighbors. In other words, the loss of
> those lands was a significant blow to the Arabs, again which may help
> explain the ill feelings.

I think it's much simpler than that. The new state of Israel was seen
by many of those who had been there for generations as simply a new
form of European intrusion into an area they had controlled for
hundreds of years. Recall that one of the factors in the Holocaust was
the unwillingness of many countries (including the USA) to admit large
numbers of Jewish refugees. Look up the ship "St. Louis" for one
tragic example. Israel was founded in large part to be a place where
any Jew would be accepted, no questions asked.

But it wasn't Arabs who built and ran Dachau or turned away refugees.
>
> Regardless, Israel is there and is not going to be destroyed. I think even
> most Arabs realize that at this point, in spite of the rhetoric.

I'm not sure Israel would survive if the rest of the world stopped
supporting it. Look at what happened to Kuwait in 1990.
>
> > Does Saudi Arabia want nukes? Yemen, Bahrain, Egypt,
> > Syria, Lebanon - do any of them want nuclear weapons?
> > I don't think so.
>
> Since most countries seek nuclear weapons in secret, it is difficult to
> tell which specific countries want nuclear weapons. However, it is known
> that neighboring countries often seek nuclear weapons once those weapons are
> introduced into a region - which suggests Iraq is not the only one
> interested in acquiring them in response to their presence in Israel.

But SH has a long bloody history of aggression against neighbor
states, including the use of chemical weapons against civilian
populations. And a long bloody history of human rights violations and
atrocities. Iran, Kuwait, and ethnic Kurds, as well as Israel, have
all been targeted by SH.

If Israel hadn't gone after that reactor in Iraq back in 1981, SH
probably would have had nukes by the time of the first Gulf War.
>
> > I think it really boils down to not wanting to set
> > a precedent of invading a country and overthrowing
> > a govt. because a country half the world away feels
> > threatened.
>
> The suspicion over our policies existed long before the current invasion -
> the current situation only adds fuel to it.

Exactly.
>
> > And the rest of the world did not stand up to Germany
> > and stop them when it would have been easy to do so.
> > And the USA refused to join the LEague of Nations,
> > leading to that organization's failure.
>
> Already addressed in the next paragraph after the one you replied to with
> this comment.

>
> > Or maybe the West should not be so friendly with
> > dictators. Didja see the pictures of Rumsfeld and
> > Saddam shaking hands and smiling for the camera
> > in 1983?
>
> Sadly, we have a long history of that, Jim.

Sure - lookit the Shah of Iran, Noriega, Marcos, etc., etc.

> After our defense of Kuwait,
> we placed a "king" right back on the throne in that country.

A friendly king. The coalition restored the government of Kuwait.

> As a result,
> the people there are only a matter of degree more free than they were during
> Saddam's occupation.

I have friends who fled Kuwait in 1990 just ahead of SH's tanks. They
tell a very different story.

> And, of course, you're aware of many other examples. We
> do need to be more selective over our choice of friends.
>
Much of this is left over from the Cold War, when the USA would be
friends with all sorts of folks in order to prevent them from being
friends with the USSR. Now the USSR is gone.
>
> > THAT is the big question. Is the USA to be the
> > world's policeman?
>
> We are at the moment. But, what do you think about the future in that
> regard?

I say we run the risk of turning into New Rome - if that hasn't
happened already. It does no good to make more and more enemies.

> I'm just darn tired of endless conflicts. At fifty, there has not
> been a single decade in my life that we have not been at war with someone
> (occasionally several in one decade).

I thought you were younger! I'm 48, and I have the same memories.

> And, as legitimate as those conflicts
> sounded at the time, I would have a hard time justifying many of those
> conflicts today. In the end, I would like just one decade when our soldiers
> stayed their butts home and we stayed out of conflicts. Sadly, it may be an
> impossible dream.

Not at all. The solution starts with thinking long-term about foreign
policy, rather than short-term fixes that never fix anything.
>
> > What will happen to Israel if the USA cuts off

> > support?
>
> I don't think we have to cut off support to have a change in policy. We
> can simply more directly address the middle east issues without weighting
> our position so heavily towards Israel alone - a serious move towards the
> creation of a Palestinian state, an end to Israel's current military actions
> in Palestine and the occupied areas, and the eventual return of refugees to
> Israel are good examples.

Maybe. But the other side has to give something, too.
>
> Well, perhaps enough about Israel and certainly enough for this message.
> Responding adequately to comments about such complex issues really eats up
> time and I'm simply running short of that these days.

Me too! But the real solution to these problems will come from
ordinary citizens voting for politicians who will look long-term
rather than crisis-to-crisis.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1677. Re: Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 01:12:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E8B8A7D.F848F6FB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64063

Bert Craig wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030402053240.25257.00000019@mb-cb.aol.com...
> > Long-time rrappers may remember that back on April 2, 1998, "Cutie Boy"
> (screen
> > persona of one Masataka Noda, now JP2CKG, then VA2QRU/VE7JPN) wrote the
> > following post. It is reproduced in its entirety, thanks to Google.
> >
> > At the time, there were approximately 674,000 US hams. Today, exactly five
> > years later, there are over 685,000.
> >
> >
> > BEGIN GOOGLE QUOTE
> >
> > From: Cutie Boy (cute@radiotelephone.net.ham)
> > Subject: I will crap my hands
> >
> > View this article only
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc, rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Date: 1998/04/02
> >
> > I will crap my hands if the number of hams of 5 years later are more
> > than the number of hams of today.
> >
> > ____
> > Joli Garï¿½on (ï¿½galement connu comme M@S@)
> > Indicatif d'appel de radioamateur: VA2QRU & VE7JPN
> > ï¿½tudient @ Informatique et Mathï¿½matiques d'Universitï¿½ McGill
> > Montrï¿½al, Quï¿½bec, Canada
> > Cï¿½: cute@radiotelephone.net.ham
> > URL : http://www.radiotelephone.net (Universel)
> > http://www.radiotelephone.net/amateur/ (Radio)
> > http://www.geocities.com/~masataka/mcgill.htm (Universitï¿½
> McGill)
> >
> > Visit this excellent site
> > why code has no importance to the amateur radio today:
> > http://www.nocode.org
> > License Suggestion: http://www.radiotelephone.net/no-code/
> > ____
> > ***Enlevez l' " .ham " pour rï¿½pondre.***
> > ***Please remove "ham" to reply.***
> >

> > ATTENTION: Je n'achï¿½terai pas ou rï¿½ponse aucun produit des Cï¿½S non
> sollicitï¿½s!!
> >
> > END GOOGLE QUOTE
> >
> >
> > Time to make good, Masa!
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> LMAO! BTW, remind me to NEVER make a long term wager with you. You've got a
> memory like an elephant. Besides, I believe I already owe Ed, W1RFI a
> lobster dinner (...or lunch?) re. increase 11m enforcement over the past two
> to three years. I will very happily pay this one off when I visit W1AW this
> summer. :-)

Bert,

You have to admit that this one would be difficult to forget.
Masa's likely forgetten the whole thing by now and is likely sitting
quietly at home--probabry sipping some Ripton Tea.

Dave K8MN

1678. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 01:35:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304021735.56e4cdc1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64064

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030401190533.25511.00000032@mb-fm.aol.com>...
> In article <BAAF29E4.15441%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
> writes:
>

>
> >Or do we change our policy towards Israel?
>
> Exactly how should we change it?
>
> What will happen to Israel if the USA cuts off support?

Glad you brought this up because it is my opinion that the Israeli mauling of the Palestinians for the past 56 years is the root cause of the mess we have today in the mideast. I think it's been obvious that at some point in history the soverign nations of Palestine and Israel *will* coexist on that patch. I have reservations about the legitimacy of the Israeli claims to it's piece of the patch but never mind that.

The assorted regimes in the White House & Congress have never used our leverage to force an end to that conflict. While we've been "patiently" waiting for the old warriors (Arafat, Sharon. etc.) to quit shooting at each other for the half century the Arab world has finally had it with our blind, unswerving support of Israel at the expense of the Palestinians and is lashing out. And in a sense I don't blame them.

I daresay that if we'd jumped into the conflict 25-30 years ago and banged their heads together until they signed the treaty the World Trade Ceter would still be standing and we wouldn't be in Afghanistan and Iraq.

You bet we have the leverage to make it happen. The last numbers I saw stated that Israel is kept economically afloat by annual four billion dollar handouts from us. Wherein lies the answer to your question.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1679. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 02:05:36 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <1192107152640DD2.9B8E88945EBD07DC.EDDF21E8EC0879E0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64066

Just an observation--I have not checked for accuracy, etc. In its comments to the UN Security Council, the Syrian representative stated that [paraphrased] the Council was being asked by the United States for serious measures against Iraq to be supported, due its (Iraq's) violations of UN Sanctions while no one is saying a thing about Israel's violations against UN Sanctions toward it (Israel). I either have forgotten or never knew that Israel has UN Sanctions...

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:BAAF29E4.15441%stewart@say.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > Dwight Stewart writes:
> >
> >> Fact? What else would you call it, Steve? More
> >> than two years after the WTC attack, no evidence
> >> has been presented to even suggest anything other
> >> than what I said. Do you have that evidence?
> >
> > I was surprised to read this, but upon looking I
> > found there has been no direct evidence that Iraq
> > had anything to do with the Sept 11 attacks. Indeed,
> > it would go against character for Saddam to help
> > out people (terrorists) over whom he does not have
> > total control.
>
>
> I'm no different than anyone else, Jim. If I thought Saddam had anything
> to do with 9/11, I'd be spitting mad. But, like you, I don't see any
> evidence of that. Yet this very incident is consistently thrown out as one
> justification for the current invasion of Iraq. The contradiction of those
> two realities makes me uncomfortable, and causes suspicion about the other
> justifications thrown around.
>
>
> > I think the main concerns of the Bush administration
> > are:
> >
> > - the continued efforts by Iraq to obtain WMDs
>
>
> And when looking at this issue, we cannot ignore Israel. Many Arabs feel
> they have a bone to pick with that country. Israel, in an effort to defend

> itself, obtained nuclear weapons (a weapon of mass destruction). Fine and
> dandy. But, by doing so, it caused other nations in the area to want
nuclear
> weapons also. We said and did very little, if anything, about Israel's
> attempts to obtain nuclear weapons, but are bombing the heck out of Iraq
> because they seek to obtain nuclear weapons. This contradiction in our
> policies towards countries is looked at with suspicion by many in the Arab
> world, and by a growing number of people all over the world. One could
argue
> this contradiction is just politics but, when we start invading countries
> and killing people over it, support for our actions is certain to weaken.
>
>
> > - the continued defiance of the requirements of the
> > 1991 cease-fire agreements such as harassment and
> > access denial of UN weapons inspectors, targeting
> > of UN aircraft in the no-fly zones, etc.
>
>
> This is a legitimate point (perhaps the only one with a real
justification
> for the invasion of Iraq), but it brings to mind the events following WWI,
> leading up to WWII. If you remember your history books, heavy burdens were
> placed on Germany following the first World War (weapons restrictions,
troop
> limitations, reparations, and so on). This had a detrimental effect on the
> German economy, its efforts to rebuild following the war, caused Germans
to
> feel venerable in the volatile Europe of the time, and was an affront to
the
> honor of that country. Right or wrong, Germany began to defy the surrender
> agreements within a decade of that war's end, with the people open to any
> leader who offered a solution to their problems. Hitler was the eventual
> answer, with another World War as the result.
>
> Taking the lessons we learned there, one could argue that an invasion is
> necessary to head off a potential conflict down the road as Iraq goes
> through similar detrimental effects from its last war. One could also
point
> to a similar empowerment of rogue leaders. Clearly, the only way to avoid
an
> endless cycle of detrimental effects and empowerment of rogue leaders, is
to
> spend hundreds of millions or perhaps billions to reduce the detrimental
> effects by rebuilding the country (not missed by some when discussing a
> post-Saddam Iraq).
>
> However, the question remains whether this will ultimately work with the
> same conditions in the region - Israel will still have nuclear weapons and
> our contradiction in policies will still remain (we will still attempt to

> block the acquisition of nuclear weapons by other nations in the region).
> Even if we're successful with Iraq, there are a dozen other countries in
the
> region with similar views about acquiring weapons of mass destruction. Do
we
> invade them all? Or do we change our policy towards Israel?
>
>
> > One of the things that OBL demands is removal of foreign
> > infidel troops from the holy land of Arabia. Yet the
> > main reason those troops are there is because of invasion
> > of Kuwait and the continued threat of more of the same.
> > If regime change and stabilization does occur, there
> > will no longer be a reason for those troops to be in the
> > region.
>
>
> No regime change is going to cause the removal of our troops. Like
Europe
> and Asia, our troops will be in that region for the next hundred years or
> so. The "defense" industry is jumping for joy today - suffering from the
end
> of the cold war in Europe, they can now look forward to decades of
conflicts
> and arms sales. And this country is going to need new national cemeteries
to
> bury our war dead - Arlington is nearly full.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>
> ----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

1680. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 03:26:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB11408.15713%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64067

"W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Just an observation--I have not checked for accuracy,
> etc. In its comments to the UN Security Council, the
> Syrian representative stated that [paraphrased] the
> Council was being asked by the United States for serious
> measures against Iraq to be supported, due its (Iraq's)
> violations of UN Sanctions while no one is saying a
> thing about Israel's violations against UN Sanctions
> toward it (Israel). I either have forgotten or never
> knew that Israel has UN Sanctions...

In reality, half the countries in that region have sanctions or resolutions against them - Turkey and Greece (their fight over Cyprus), Syria, Iraq, Iran, Israel, and others. We tend to ignore or focus on those sanctions and resolutions as it fits our agenda - ignoring those against our friends and focusing on those against less favored nations. Some feel a little consistency on our part might move things along better in the Middle East.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1681. Address Change

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 04:19:52 UTC
From: tcarlisle01@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c1fc7883.0304022019.2d4f82fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64068

I need to update the home address on my Ham License. I have the Quick Form 605 application, but I'm not sure where to send it. At the bottom is says not to return it to the FCC, but it doesn't say where it should go.

Thanks

TC

1682. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 04:31:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB1235E.15715%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64069

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> I'm not sure Israel would survive if the rest
> of the world stopped supporting it. Look at
> what happened to Kuwait in 1990.

Again, I would not want support for Israel to end, by us or anyone else. But that doesn't mean we can't take a more balanced approach to resolving issues in that region. Many of the problems today are a result of years of conflicts. We have to take that into consideration when addressing issues today. In other words, we can't go in there pointing a finger at one group without understanding why that group is doing what it is doing. Once we understand, we may better understand what is needed to address that issue and end the conflict. The next part is even harder - getting to two to stop fighting long enough to actually do something positive.

> (snip) And a long bloody history of human rights
> violations and atrocities. Iran, Kuwait, and
> ethnic Kurds, as well as Israel, have all been
> targeted by SH.

The Kurds are a interesting story. They have been a thorn in the sides of Iraq, Iran, and Turkey for perhaps centuries. I lived in Turkey in the mid 60's and remember raids by Kurds into Turkish towns along the Iraq border. They would attack towns, steal what they could, and rush back across the border before Turkish troops could respond. Kurds living in Southern Turkey did the same to towns across the border in Iraq. As I understand it, this has been going on for centuries, even back to the Ottoman Empire (Kurds would raid towns and hide in the mountains to avoid detection). Of course, none of this justifies the use of chemical weapons, but it does perhaps explain why Iraq might want to do so and why Turkey is so interested in getting into the Kurdish regions of Northern Iraq today.

> I thought you were younger! I'm 48, and I have the
> same memories.

Heck, we're almost into the senior citizen category now. Magically, when you turn 50, you start getting advertising for senior benefit insurance plans and so on in the mail. I get stuff like this several times a week now. However, I have not signed up for any of it yet - a stubborn refusal to admit I'm getting old.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1683. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 04:59:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB129D1.15717%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64070

"W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Yep, you got that right for sure. There is nearly
> no difference--the people get to go to the voting
> booths...and I do...but why? Politicians turn
> around and tell us we are too stupid to tell them
> what we desire. And it doesn't matter *what*
> political party it is, both/all do whatever the
> hell they want while they are in office...with
> our push of a button and at our expense.

And, if you complain, they insist they have access to information you don't have - which does somewhat defeat the concept of a democratic government ran by the people, doesn't it? In reality, they get their information from the same sources we do (news agencies) and then slap a secret stamp on any information so we can't judge their actions.

> Oh well...

I'm sorry, Kim. The rant about political parties was a little off topic (even for the thread), so I didn't dwell on it. However, if you want to continue the discussion, I'm more than willing.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1684. Re: Address Change

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 05:47:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403004717.29421.00000050@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 64071

In article <c1fc7883.0304022019.2d4f82fc@posting.google.com>,
tcarlisle01@yahoo.com (Tony Carlisle) writes:

>I need to update the home address on my Ham License. I have the Quick
>Form 605 application, but I'm not sure where to send it. At the bottom
>is says not to return it to the FCC, but it doesn't say where it
>should go.

Once upon a time this newsgroup was the correct place
for such questions (and answers). No longer.

This newsgroup has become a CHAT ROOM for geopolitics
and solving Middle East issues by the PCTA. :-)

1685. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 06:51:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403015100.05732.00000177@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64072

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/29/2003 3:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030329164729.13213.00000099@mb-ca.aol.com>

>>The bloodiest war the USA ever fought was from 1861 to 1865. Americans
>>against other Americans.
>
> INCORRECT.

As is usually the case, Lennie tries to go against conventional and
well-archived knowledge in order to make a "newsgroup battle point".

And as usual, he's wrong. Collier's and Brittanica refer.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

1686. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 06:53:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403015326.05732.00000178@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64073

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/29/2003 5:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030329184553.18686.00000111@mb-fn.aol.com>

>Only at
>this speed is one considered a "true" Ham.

You will, of course, provide us a reference to this milrestone?

Steve

1687. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 06:59:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403015945.05732.00000179@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64074

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/28/2003 11:44 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303280944.152a8644@posting.google.com>

>I didn't insist that you change the subject. You did that on your
>own. It's part of your little problem.

Hmmmm...Let's see....

YOU insist that I am "obsessive compulsive", yet you continue to go tit-for-tat in these little exchanges despite having been given ample opportunity to tactfully withdraw.

You insist that your T5 operation was "authorized" yet you cannot (or will not) provide us with the name of the person who allegedly gave that permission.

You further refuse to even make available any log excepts so that we can make some efforts to validate that you indeed DID operate from Somalia while deployed there.

Youn further insist that I (and others on occassion) make assersions that we never did, then never provide the quote proving where we made the statement you insist upon.

Seems YOU are the one with the problems, Brain. Truthfulness and a lack of facts being two of them.

Hmmmmmmmmmmmm........

Steve

1688. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 07:04:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403020437.05732.00000180@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64075

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/28/2003 11:47 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303280947.1272945d@posting.google.com>

>> >Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >Date: 3/27/2003 8:58 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303271858.7e6b73d2@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >Nor do you know what Morse Proficient is, or at least you cannot put it in
>> >words.
>>
>> I can. "To be able to competently send by hand and receive by ear
>Amateur
>> Radio signals using Morse Code without the use of interpretive encoding or
>> decoding devices".

I see you have no argument with my definition. Therefore you must attack
something else...

>> I am Morse Proficient. I can "rag chew", pass traffic or operate in
>> contests comfortably to 25 WPM, and in contests up to 40WPM...WITHOUT the
>use
>> of a keyboard or any electronic or mechanical encoding or decoding device.
>>
>> Can YOU, Brain?
>>
>> Steve
>
>Steve, first, can you spell my name correctly? Or must you obsess
>over it and try to make my name an insult?

Still unable to argue facts, you find my calling your "Brain" as opposed
to "Brian" as insulting.

You are INSULTED being called a brain? Whewie!

Steve

1689. Plop-Plop Fizz Fizz Oh What A Relief It Is...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 07:07:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403020722.05732.00000181@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64076

Plopped Lennie the Liar into the kill file for a while. He usually is able to insert at least SOMETHING into one of his tirades of some use or interest, but even those have long since withered on the vine.

Brain is getting close.

Steve

1690. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 07:11:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403021149.05732.00000182@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64077

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/28/2003 11:49 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303280949.75588e1f@posting.google.com>

>> >You could start with spelling my name correctly. The road to recovery
>> >starts with the first small step.
>>
>> I didn't? You're no Brain...???
>
>You just have to keep making a fool of yourself, don't you?

I am not the one making the silly assertions unsupported by facts, Brain.
You are.

And you didn't answer the question...Are you not a brain?

>That is obsessive/compulsive behavior.

And we're still waiting on you to list your qualifications in psychology
or psychiatry that allow you to make that diagnosis, Dr. Brain.

Steve

1691. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 07:15:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403021530.05732.00000183@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64078

>Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 3/30/2003 7:13 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303300513.3bb58fc@posting.google.com>

>How's your therapy coming?

For...?!?!

So far I am not the one who's NOT a documented pathological liar.

Neither are you (yet), but it sure seems "stupid" sure runs in your bloodline.

Steve

Steven J Robeson, LPN

1692. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 07:18:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403021817.05732.00000184@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64079

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: lumushahs@aol.com (Lumushahs)
>Date: 3/28/2003 5:43 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030328184336.04559.00000059@mb-fr.aol.com>

>At events people say I eat a lot. I disagree, but more than once someone has
>said this to me.

Perhaps, Vipul, this is why people don't like you at their meetings.

Steve

1693. Re: Anybody here have any new thoughts?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 07:24:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403022457.05732.00000185@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64080

>Subject: Re: Anybody here have any new thoughts?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/1/2003 9:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030401221202.26062.00000411@mb-fd.aol.com>

>*While going grocery shopping yesterday, a "stranger" came up to me and asked
>"What's your call sign?". I was very surprised. How could he possibly know to
>ask me that? Then, he said "I saw you at the club meeting". That explained
>it.
>You never know who you will run into.

Gee...and I bet you weren't even wearing your "callsign hat", had an HT on
your belt, nor were chanting the Wouff Hong, were you?

And I also bet it didn't hurt a bit, socializing with mere mortal Amateurs
in a public palce of assembly, did it...?!?!

Steve

1694. Re: Address Change

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 07:36:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403023642.05732.00000186@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64081

>Subject: Address Change
>From: tcarlisle01@yahoo.com (Tony Carlisle)
>Date: 4/2/2003 10:19 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c1fc7883.0304022019.2d4f82fc@posting.google.com>

>I need to update the home address on my Ham License. I have the Quick
>Form 605 application, but I'm not sure where to send it. At the bottom
>is says not to return it to the FCC, but it doesn't say where it
>should go.
>

Send it to the FCC at 1270 Fairfield Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325.

If you are going to try and send it via a postal or commercial carrier,
they now haev an off-site delievery at 35 York Road, Gettysburg. But if all
you are sending is a non-feeable renewal or modification, the 1270 address is
the place to send it.

Good luck!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1695. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 07:54:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403025419.05732.00000187@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64082

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/28/2003 6:32 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030328193254.25912.00000045@mb-ff.aol.com>

>>The heavy emphasis on Morse code is
>>>embarrassing.
>>
>> To whom?
>
>To me.

Then I guess we just need to get hot re-writing all federal regulations to save you some embarrasment, Vippy!

>If I were to mention I belonged to a Ham radio club and the person asked
>me if they still used Morse code.

What absoute silliness. You can do better than this,Vippy.

>Its also bad for the hobby. It scares away the technical people, who might
>have
>benefitted the hobby. It looks bad for the hobby when the only "real" skill
>is
>Morse code.

If a "technical (person) is "scared away"from the Amateur Radio service over the idea of taking a five word per minute Code test, and then ONLY if they want access to HF, then I say WHO NEEDS THEM...?!?!?!

Any "experimenting" of any consequence is being done at or above the VHF portion of the spectrum, Vippy, and that requires NO Code test.

Your "argument" is a tissue of lies.

>>The Radio Police dragged themout in the street in the middle of the
>>night and tortured them until they signed statements professing thier
>undying
>>loyalty to Morse Code.
>
>No, but from talking to club members, at least two (one is club Prez!) said
>they were resistant to learning Morse code, but claim to like it now. I guess
>social pressure works.

There was a lot I didn't want to have to do in Nursing School, yet had to get through it in order to get where I am now. None of which, byt the way, has been manifested in my years in the ER.

>>Vipul, you recommend trashing the technical written tests and then say MY
>>comments about that suggestion then failing to meet Part 97 is
>>"illogical"...?!?!
>
>It seems you don't understand my proposal. I did not reccommend trashing the
>technical written test.

Then the problem is with YOUR use of the English language, because that's
exactly what you said!

>I said keep written tests, but put Morse code out of pathway of written
>tests.
>No need to pass Morse code test to get General license or Extra license.

Sure there is. It's right there in Part 97. And that requirement is
there because of the United States' compliance with treaties that it is
signatory to.

Do you condone breaking the law?

>But, no HF for passing only written tests. If one passes code test (provided
>they pass tech written test) they can get on HF.

That's the way it is NOW, Mr Wizard.

>This compromise should satisfy Morse code lovers and no coders.

You continue to make yourself sound really stupid, Vipul.

You said: "But, no HF for passing only written tests"

That IS the way it is now...In the United States, anyway.

You said: "If one passes code test (provided they pass tech written test)
they can get on HF."

Again, that is exactly how it is today.

>Do you understand this or do I have to draw a flowchart?

You can draw me a lewd picture of Spongebob and Catdog if you want, but
you STILL won't prove anything. We're close enough to a completely code test
free license that now matter how YOU color it, it's irrelevent.

Steve

1696. A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 08:02:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403030258.05732.00000188@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64083

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/29/2003 8:44 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030329094407.18686.00000097@mb-fn.aol.com>

>Morse code is irrelavant to what I want to know, so I don't want to make the
>effort. It also shows misplace priorities. More importantly, I don't like
>Morse
>code. I could be doing much more interesting things in its place.

Without having tried it, how can you know?

Every year I know of people who make the same claim UNTIL THEY TRY IT.

If you're the rocket scientist you claim to be, Vippy, learning it is a couple days worth of effort at most...Certainly the time you waste on RRAP and RRCB posts alone would get you up to five words per minute.

Tell ya what, Vippy...I have a 0-to-5 WPM tape here a the house that I'd be glad to send yuo at MY expense...the only thing I'd "need" from you is a promise to listen to it and then pass the test.

Personally, I have $20.00 says you can't study and pass that 5WPM by April 30th. You just don't have it in you. "Proof" will be your upgrade to General in the FCC database. (YOU said the writtens can be done in a day...let's see if your word is as good as you say...)

Shall I send this to your QRZ address?

Steve

1697. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 08:16:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403031657.05732.00000189@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64084

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/29/2003 5:25 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030329182528.18686.00000108@mb-fn.aol.com>

>You
>don't know my background to say I'm not qualified to judge Morse code's
>usefulness.

Sure she is...ANYone is, Vippy.

YOU have stated you don't know code and that you refuse to learn it.

THAT makes YOU unqualified to make ANY judgements on how effective or
useful it is.

>>Experience in its use is the only
>>way to judge it's usefulness.
>
>Please realize that you can seperate the acutal memorization of the encoding
>scheme from its mathmatical analysis. Knowledge of the encoding scheme is NOT
>needed to evaluate its usefulness.

Wrong.

>There are other ways to gain the experience needed to evaluate Morse code's
>usefulness.

And without being an active practitioner of the art, how would YOU do
that, Vippy?

>those that have the experience have not reached the conclusion that Morse is
>so
>useful, as many Hams claim.

And WHO are "they", Vipul?

>Hospitals, firefighters, Coast Guard, Pilots, Military, other "emergency"
>functions do not use Morse code.

Pilots, the Coast Guard and the Military DO use Morse Code, Vipul.

No nearly as prolificly as years ago, but they DO use it. I suggest that
you take any receiver capable of tuning below 500 kHz and tune slowly. Morse
Code signals abound. Also tune from 108.0 to 118.0 MHz. Even more Morse code
signals. Those are VOR's and VORTAC's use by civil and military pilots to
navigate by.

>Just because a mode does not require a computer, does not mean one should
>learn
>it.

Why not?

Morse Code is the ONLY "encoding scheme" that I can think of that could potentially allow a person to "communicate" directly with a computer. The spoken word is still subject to speech impediments and dialect inflections.

Steve

1698. Re: Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 08:24:59 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304030024.1102b1aa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64085

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E8B8A7D.F848F6FB@earthlink.net>...
> Bert Craig wrote:
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030402053240.25257.00000019@mb-cb.aol.com...
> > > Long-time rrappers may remember that back on April 2, 1998, "Cutie Boy"
> (screen
> > > persona of one Masataka Noda, now JP2CKG, then VA2QRU/VE7JPN) wrote the
> > > following post. It is reproduced in its entirety, thanks to Google.
> > >
> > > At the time, there were approximately 674,000 US hams. Today, exactly five
> > > years later, there are over 685,000.
> > >
> > >
> > > BEGIN GOOGLE QUOTE
> > >
> > > From: Cutie Boy (cute@radiotelephone.net.ham)
> > > Subject: I will crap my hands
> > >
> > > View this article only
> > > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc, rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > Date: 1998/04/02
> > >
> > > I will crap my hands if the number of hams of 5 years later are more
> > > than the number of hams of today.
> > >
> > > ____
> > > Joli Garï¿½on (ï¿½galement connu comme M@S@)
> > > Indicatif d'appel de radioamateur: VA2QRU & VE7JPN
> > > ï¿½tudient @ Informatique et Mathï¿½matiques d'Universitï¿½ McGill
> > > Montrï¿½al, Quï¿½bec, Canada
> > > Cï¿½: cute@radiotelephone.net.ham
> > > URL : http://www.radiotelephone.net (Universel)
> > > http://www.radiotelephone.net/amateur/ (Radio)
> > > http://www.geocities.com/~masataka/mcgill.htm (Universitï¿½
> McGill)
> > >
> > > Visit this excellent site
> > > why code has no importance to the amateur radio today:
> > > http://www.nocode.org
> > > License Suggestion: http://www.radiotelephone.net/no-code/
> > > ____
> > > ***Enlevez l' " .ham " pour rï¿½pondre.***
> > > ***Please remove "ham" to reply.***

> > >
> > > ATTENTION: Je n'achï¿½terai pas ou rï¿½ponse aucun produit des Cï¿½S non
> sollicitï¿½s!!
> > >
> > > END GOOGLE QUOTE
> > >
> > >
> > > Time to make good, Masa!
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > LMAO! BTW, remind me to NEVER make a long term wager with you. You've got a
> > memory like an elephant. Besides, I believe I already owe Ed, W1RFI a
> > lobster dinner (...or lunch?) re. increase 11m enforcement over the past two
> > to three years. I will very happily pay this one off when I visit W1AW this
> > summer. :-)
>
>
> Bert,
>
> You have to admit that this one would be difficult to forget.
> Masa's likely forgetten the whole thing by now and is likely sitting
> quietly at home--probabry sipping some Ripton Tea.

Whatta jerk he was . . I popped him with a bunch of binaries he
couldn't handle which really ticked him off and called him "cootie
boy" to boot. Those were "unrestricted warfare days" in this village.
The Putz went ape when I got into the subject of the neighborhood CBer
who had a 35kW rig in his Chebby Suburban. Another memorable thread.

Last I heard abt Cootie was that he'd sold all his ham gear and
evaporated.

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1699. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 09:01:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403040136.05732.00000190@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64086

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 3/29/2003 5:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030329184054.18686.00000110@mb-fn.aol.com>

>Morse code is known to be obsolete, not useful. Advertising Hams use Morse
>code
>to the non-Ham public would not make Ham radio look good.

Uh huh...In a country that consumes tons of illegal drugs, eats junk food
by the MILLIONS of tons, and iconolizies "Spongebob" and "Catdog", we are
worried about how Morse Code might make us not "look good"...

Yeah....riiiiiiiiiiiight.

>>What priveleges would a person get from passing just the writtens?
>
>A Technician class license get almost the whole amateur bands, just like they
>do now.

Glad you agree.

>More bands for General and Extra class is not possible, as the Tech class got
>all the bands up front.

Then WHAT bands are being assigned to Generals and Extras now, Vippy?

>The General and Extra classes get they extra "prestige" of getting those
>licenses. Before you say "What good is prestige?", remember that Extra class
>right now offers basically the same thing (with only a few extra freqs) - not
>much more than General class priveleges.

I'd be interested in knowing where you came up with this from, Vippy.

Let's consider the HF bands in general where Amateur privileges are
divided by classes:

On the 80 meter band, Amateur Extras have access to the full 500kHz of the
band. Amateur Generals only have access to 275kHz. Discounting the bands
shared with the now stagnant/declining Amateur Advanced class license, this
bestows an additional 225 kHz of spectrum to the Extra over the General, or
about 45%.

On the 40 meter band, Amateur Extras have access to the full 300kHz of the
band. Amateur Generals only have access to 200kHz. A nice "round" 33 1/3
percent more spectrum than the Generals to be had here.

On the 20 meter band, Amateur Extras have access to the full 350kHz of the band. Amateur Generals only have access to 200kHz. This is an extra (pardon the pun) 150kHz of spectrum.

And on the 15 meter band, the last band where by-class sub bands are manifested, Amateur Extras have access to the full 450kHz, while Amateur Generals have access to 325kHz.

All-in-all, this is 600 kHz of 1600kHz...NOT a small percentage. About 37% increase according to my table top napkin computations.

By the way...the added privileges are by virtue of a written "technical" test...NOT a Morse Code test as would have been required a few years ago.

In case you didn't notice...

Steve

1700. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 15:38:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E8C556E.43421AFD@att.net>
Source record: 64088

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 3/29/2003 5:40 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030329184054.18686.00000110@mb-fn.aol.com>
>
> >Morse code is known to be obsolete, not useful. Advertising Hams use Morse
> >code
> >to the non-Ham public would not make Ham radio look good.
>
> Uh huh...In a country that consumes tons of illegal drugs, eats junk food
> by the MILLIONS of tons, and iconolizies "Spongebob" and "Catdog", we are
> worried about how Morse Code might make us not "look good"...
>
> Yeah....riiiiiiiiiiiight.
>
> >>What priveleges would a person get from passing just the writtens?
> >
> >A Technician class license get almost the whole amateur bands, just like they
> >do now.
>
> Glad you agree.
>
> >More bands for General and Extra class is not possible, as the Tech class got
> >all the bands up front.
>
> Then WHAT bands are being assigned to Generals and Extras now, Vippy?
>
> >The General and Extra classes get they extra "prestige" of getting those
> >licenses. Before you say "What good is prestige?", remember that Extra class
> >right now offers basically the same thing (with only a few extra freqs) - not
> >much more than General class priveleges.
>
> I'd be interested in knowing where you came up with this from, Vippy.
>
> Let's consider the HF bands in general where Amateur privileges are
> divided by classes:
>
> On the 80 meter band, Amateur Extras have access to the full 500kHz of the
> band. Amateur Generals only have access to 275kHz. Discounting the bands
> shared with the now stagnant/declining Amateur Advanced class license, this
> bestows an additional 225 kHz of spectrum to the Extra over the General, or
> about 45%.

>
> On the 40 meter band, Amateur Extras have access to the full 300kHz of the
> band. Amateur Generals only have access to 200kHz. A nice "round" 33 1/3
> percent more spectrum than the Generals to be had here.
>
> On the 20 meter band, Amateur Extras have access to the full 350kHz of the
> band. Amateur Generals only have access to 200kHz. This is an extra (pardon
> the pun) 150kHz of spectrum.
>
> And on the 15 meter band, the last band where by-class sub bands are
> manifested, Amateur Extras have access to the full 450kHz, while Amateur
> Generals have access to 325kHz.
>
> All-in-all, this is 600 kHz of 1600kHz...NOT a small percentage. About
> 37% increase according to my table top napkin computations.
>
> By the way...the added privileges are by virtue of a written "technical"
> test...NOT a Morse Code test as would have been required a few years ago.
>
> In case you didn't notice...

Steve, don't confuse the poor lad. He hasn't heard of HF yet.

1701. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 16:47:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E8C65B2.8010208@psu.edu>
Source record: 64089

Brian wrote:
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0304010900.5ade4b0f@posting.google.com>...
>
>>These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
>>licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>>
>>As of May 14, 2000:
>>
>>Novice - 49,329
>>Tech - 205,394
>>Tech Plus - 128,860
>>General - 112,677
>>Advanced - 99,782
>>Extra - 78,750
>>Total - 674,792
>>
>>As of March 31, 2003:
>>
>>Novice - 35,024 (decrease of 14,305)
>>Tech - 251,221 (increase of 46,715)
>>Tech Plus - 70,249 (decrease of 58,611)
>>General - 140,487 (increase of 27,810)
>>Advanced - 83,833 (decrease of 15,949)
>>Extra - 103,709 (increase of 24,959)
>>Total - 685,471 (increase of 10,679)
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
> In May 2000, there were 469,398 Morse Coded amateurs. In March 2003,
> there were 35,148 fewer coded hams.
>
> Assuming 13wpm as the exam level at which Morse proficiency is
> demonstrated, in May 2000, there were 291,209 Morse Code proficient
> amateurs (no accounting for waivered hams). In March 2003, I estimate
> there were 2,258 fewer Morse Code proficient hams. The estimation is
> based upon a generous 90% of the 2000 General class licensees (13wpm)
> renewing their licenses. The remaining 2003 General licensees
> (39078) are 5wpm examined, i.e., not proficient.
>
> There are fewer coded people in the USA today than there were 3 years
> ago. I just don't see Morse Code as a growth industry.

Wow, Brian, that was some statistical work! Your mistake is that mo one is tested at 13 wpm any more. This means that no new hams can be qualified as proficient. In addition, there is not a statistic on how many of the new extras are upgrades from earlier (higher CW speed tested) Generals or Advanced Hams. In their case we just don't know.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1702. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 17:22:26 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3E8C6DD2.1CFFD473@crosslink.net>
Source record: 64087

"D. Stussy" wrote:
>
> Are you saying that California is not part of the U.S.A.?

Yes. One must submit to Ca customs when coming in from the USA, its governments (state and local) ignore the U.S. Constitution and courts, law enforcement techniques are more like those in Iraq than in the U.S.A., etc., so ....

1703. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 17:22:54 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304030922.7165b709@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64090

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BAB1235E.15715%stewart@say.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > I'm not sure Israel would survive if the rest
> > of the world stopped supporting it. Look at
> > what happened to Kuwait in 1990.
>
>
> Again, I would not want support for Israel to end, by us or anyone else.
> But that doesn't mean we can't take a more balanced approach to resolving
> issues in that region. Many of the problems today are a result of years of
> conflicts. We have to take that into consideration when addressing issues
> today. In other words, we can't go in there pointing a finger at one group
> without understanding why that group is doing what it is doing. Once we
> understand, we may better understand what is needed to address that issue
> and end the conflict.

All true.

But there is also the issue of "rewarding the unwanted behavior". If
repeated suicide bombings and terrorism get results, those methods
will become more prevalent.

> The next part is even harder - getting to two to stop
> fighting long enough to actually do something positive.

More than 20 years ago, President Jimmy Carter actually got the
leaders of Israel and Egypt to sit down and come to an agreement.
Israel gave back almost all the land it had conquered in the Six Day
War. And throughout all that has happened in the intervening years,
Israel and Egypt have lived by those Camp David accords. So it CAN be
done.

Unconfirmed legend has it that Carter simply wore them down with good
manners, Southern hospitality and old Georgia peanut farmer stories
until they would sign ANYTHING just to get out of there.
> >
> > (snip) And a long bloody history of human rights
> > violations and atrocities. Iran, Kuwait, and
> > ethnic Kurds, as well as Israel, have all been
> > targeted by SH.
>
>
> The Kurds are a interesting story. They have been a thorn in the sides of
> Iraq, Iran, and Turkey for perhaps centuries. I lived in Turkey in the mid
> 60's and remember raids by Kurds into Turkish towns along the Iraq border.

> They would attack towns, steal what they could, and rush back across the
> border before Turkish troops could respond. Kurds living in Southern Turkey
> did the same to towns across the border in Iraq. As I understand it, this
> has been going on for centuries, even back to the Ottoman Empire (Kurds
> would raid towns and hide in the mountains to avoid detection). Of course,
> none of this justifies the use of chemical weapons, but it does perhaps
> explain why Iraq might want to do so and why Turkey is so interested in
> getting into the Kurdish regions of Northern Iraq today.

Indeed.

Another element that has escaped much notice until now is the fact
that much of northern "Iraq" is actually controlled by Kurds, not SH,
and has been for years.

The concept of nation-states with central governments, rule-of-law and
fixed, respected borders is actually much more of a Western Civ idea
than many Americans realize.

Here's a "what if" for ya....

One of the main reasons for the war is to eliminate SH's WMDs. But no
WMDs have been found by coalition forces yet - just lots of protective
suits. Protective suits aren't proof that anyone has or will use WMDs
- coalition troops have those suits, too.

What if Bagdad falls and the regime changes, but no WMDs or evidence
of same are ever found? Coalition will look like the aggressor and SH
as a martyr who told the truth. Which may be his plan all along. Talk
about a recruitment tool for OBL....
>
> > I thought you were younger! I'm 48, and I have the
> > same memories.
>
> Heck, we're almost into the senior citizen category now.

Naw, we're just middle aged. You gotta be a lot older to be old
nowadays.

> Magically, when
> you turn 50, you start getting advertising for senior benefit insurance
> plans and so on in the mail. I get stuff like this several times a week now.

My billion-dollar idea is to invent a furnace that can burn paper
cleanly and efficiently. Could heat our houses on junkmail alone.

> However, I have not signed up for any of it yet - a stubborn refusal to
> admit I'm getting old.

Not old - older. Beats the alternative, anyway.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1704. Re: Plop-Plop Fizz Fizz Oh What A Relief It Is...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 17:42:53 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <v8oskqtjpa55e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 64091

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030403020722.05732.00000181@mb-fz.aol.com...
> Plopped Lennie the Liar into the kill file for a while. He usually
is
> able to insert at least SOMETHING into one of his tirades of some use or
> interest, but even those have long since withered on the vine.
>
> Brain is getting close.
>
> Steve

I've been thinking of doing that for the whole of RRAP.
It's getting almost as bad as rec.radio.amateur.misc.
Maybe we need a new subgroup called
rec.radio.amateur.policy.mudslinging ;^)
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/
kb9tmp "at" juno.com

1705. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 17:54:46 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <v8otb0cigtjo9f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 64094

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAA944E1.14A77%stewart@say.net...
> "KB9TMP" wrote:
> >
> > Stand Up for America Rally Speech By: Beth Chapman
> >
> > (snip) After the tragic events of Sept. 11th, my
> > then eleven -year-old son said terrorism is a war
> > between them and us, and if you're not one of us,
> > then you're one of them. (snip)
>
>
> And it is hoped most Americans have more sense than an eleven-year-old
> boy. Sadly, Beth Chapman (the writer) obviously doesn't.
>
> She mentioned that she is not here "because Sheryl Crowe, Rosie
O'Donnell,
> Martin Sheen, George Clooney, Jane Fonda or Phil Donahue, sacrificed their
> lives for me." Perhaps she (Beth Chapman) needs to be reminded that we are
> also not here because she gave her life for us. Beth Chapman neither
treaded
> "the blazing waters of Pearl Harbor" or stood as a human shield "against
the
> debris and falling bodies descending from the World Trade Center." Nor has
> she ever offered to lay down her life so "we all may live in freedom." Nor
> is she included in "the men and women of honesty and integrity that
> epitomizes courage and embody the spirit of freedom by wearing the proud
> uniforms of the United States Military." By attacking others with such
> rhetoric, she only attacks herself (she is "guilty" of same).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

And you, her, the people she mentioned and myself included do
not have nail imprints in the palms of our hands & feet. But I will
try to remember to mention all of the above people the next time
I speak to the One who does have them.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/
kb9tmp "at" juno.com

>
>
>
> ----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

1706. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 17:57:26 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304030957.1057e8f0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64092

"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<973158DB723EF0DB.D34F8B23BE65C649.5FF020718DD7A5E2@lp.airnews.net>...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> news:BAAAC76E.14D5C%stewart@say.net...
> > "Bert Craig" wrote:
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart wrote...
> > >>
> > >> No single American is "We, the USA." If
> > >> he wants to voice his personal opinion, he
> > >> can do so in his own name (like everyone
> > >> else does).
> > >
> > > I very much disagree. While we're all individuals,
> > > we are also a part of the larger "united"
> > > collective, "We, the people." You need only read
> > > the replies to your response to Dan's post to gauge
> > > the popular feeling of "we, the people." That's
> > > part of democracy, Dwight.
> >
> >
> > I suspect the support for the use of "We, the USA" in his comments would
> > have been a little less enthusiastic if he had said something contrary to
> > current government or military policy.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
> You bring up an incredibly interesting and poignant observation, Dwight.
> All the cries for "patriotism" (those of people who imply it is unpatriotic
> not to support and stand behind a President of the US), are probably right
> along party lines; i.e., would we find a Republican pleading for respect and
> admiration of a Democrat President or vice versa? hmmmmm....
>
I dunno about that one way or the other, Kim.

But I cannot recall another instance of senior State Department
officials resigning because they cannot support American foreign
policies.

Take a look at:

http://www.snopes.com/politics/soapbox/wright.php

to see the resignation letter of Mary Wright. Note her extensive government service and reasons for quitting. Hardly a wild-eyed radical.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1707. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 18:29:29 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <v8ovc43imppq08@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 64093

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b5vqbfjbv1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> Excellent....the only problem is I doubt most of the present day
> 'peace-nicks' would be able to comprehend it.
>

I'd say it's more in the order of "My mind is already
made up, don't confuse me with the facts!"
They could understand IF THEY WANTED TO!

Look how many years we have been searching for
the "MISSING LINK". Have they ever found it?
Nope! That don't change their minds though. It's
there, somewhere, we just haven't found it yet.
They just keep saying it's true until it happens.

My mother told me once to wish in one hand and
crap in the other, then see which fills the quickest!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/
kb9tmp "at" juno.com

> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "KB9TMP" <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com> wrote in message
> news:v84obohjr0rsb0@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > I was sent this in an email and thought it fit in really well here at
this
> > time.
> >
> > --
> > '73' From KB9TMP
> > ---
> >
> > The Shelby County Alabama Legislative Delegation hosted a "Stand Up for
> > America Rally. " More than 1,200 people attended including featured
> speakers
> > Chief Justice Roy Moore, Adjutant General Mark Bowen and Alabama State
> > Auditor Beth Chapman. Attached is a copy of Mrs. Chapman's speech, which
> > resulted in five standing ovations, tremendous applause and an encore.

> It's
> > a short read and well worth it. I hope you enjoy it as we continue to
> "Stand
> > up for America!"
> >
> > Stand Up for America Rally Speech By: Beth Chapman
> >
> > I'm here tonight because men and women of the United States military
have
> > given their lives for my freedom. I am NOT here tonight because Sheryl
> > Crowe, Rosie O'Donnell, Martin Sheen, George Clooney, Jane Fonda or Phil
> > Donahue, sacrificed their lives for me.
> >
> > If my memory serves me correctly, it was not movie stars or musicians,
but
> > the United States Military who fought on the shores of Iwo Jima, the
> jungles
> > of Vietnam, and the beaches of Normandy. Tonight, I say we should
support
> > the President of the United States and the U. S. Military and tell the
> > liberal, tree-hugging, Birkenstock-wearing, hippy, tie-dyed liberals to
go
> > make their movies and music and whine somewhere else.
> >
> > After all, if they lived in Iraq, they wouldn't be allowed the freedom
of
> > speech they're being given here today. Ironically, they would be put to
> > death at the hands of Sadam Hussein or Osama Bin Laden. I want to know
how
> > the very people who are against war because of the loss of life, can
> > possibly be the same people who are for abortion?
> >
> > They are the same people who are for animal rights but against the
rights
> of
> > the unborn. The movie stars say they want to go to Iraq and serve as
> "human
> > shields" for the Iraqis. I say let them buy a one-way ticket and go.
> >
> > No one likes war. I hate war! But the one thing I hate more is the fact
> that
> > this country has been forced into war - - innocent people have lost
their
> > lives - - and there but for the grace of God, it could have been my
> brother,
> > my husband, or even worse my own son.
> >
> > On December 7, 1941, there are no records of movie stars treading the
> > blazing waters of Pearl Harbor.
> >

> > On September 11, 2001; there are no photos of movie stars standing as
> "human
> > shields" against the debris and falling bodies descending from the World
> > Trade Center. There were only policemen and firemen - -underpaid civil
> > servants who gave their all with nothing expected in return.
> >
> > When the USS Cole was bombed, there were no movie stars guarding the
> ship -
> > - where were the human shields then?
> >
> > If America's movie stars want to be human shields, let them shield the
> > gang-ridden streets of Los Angeles, or New York City, let them shield
the
> > lives of the children of North Birmingham whose mothers lay them down to
> > sleep on the floor each night to shelter them from stray bullets.
> >
> > If they want to be human shields, I say let them shield the men and
women
> of
> > honesty and integrity that epitomizes courage and embody the spirit of
> > freedom by wearing the proud uniforms of the United States Military.
Those
> > are the people who have earned and deserve shielding!
> >
> > Throughout the course of history, this country has remained free, not
> > because of movie stars and liberal activists, but because of brave men
and
> > women who hated war too. However, they lay down their lives so that we
all
> > may live in freedom. After all - "What greater love hath no man, that he
> lay
> > down his life for his friend," or in this case a country.
> >
> > We should give our military honor, and acknowledgement, and not let
their
> > lives be in vain. If you want to see true human shields, walk through
> > Arlington Cemetery. There lie human shields, heroes, and the BRAVE
> Americans
> > who didn't get on television and talk about being a human shield
> > - they were human shields.
> >
> > 1 thank God tonight for freedom - - those who bought and paid for it
with
> > their lives in the past - - those who will protect it in the present and
> > defend it in the future.
> >
> > America has remained silent too long! God-fearing people have remained
> > silent too long!
> >
> > We must lift our voices united in a humble prayer to God for guidance

and
> > the strength and courage to sustain us throughout whatever the future
may
> > hold.
> >
> > After the tragic events of Sept. 11th, my then eleven -year-old son said
> > terrorism is a war between them and us, and if you're not one of us,
then
> > you're one of them.
> >
> > So in closing tonight, let us be of one accord, let us stand proud, and
> let
> > us be the human shields of prayer, encouragement and support for the
> > President, our troops and their families and our country.
> >
> > May God bless America, the land of the free, the home of the brave and
the
> > greatest country on the face of this earth
> >
> >
> >
>
>

1708. Re: Plop-Plop Fizz Fizz Oh What A Relief It Is...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 19:26:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403142642.24104.00000117@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 64096

>Subject: Re: Plop-Plop Fizz Fizz Oh What A Relief It Is...
>From: "KB9TMP" NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com
>Date: 4/3/2003 11:42 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <v8oskqtjpa55e@corp.supernews.com>

>I've been thinking of doing that for the whole of RRAP.
>It's getting almost as bad as rec.radio.amateur.misc.
>Maybe we need a new subgroup called
>rec.radio.amateur.policy.mudslinging

You may be right. It's getting to be pretty much the same old thing. And now we have Lennie2 (Vippy)...yet another "engineer" who can't reason his way out of a tub of hot water, and Brain, who STILL can't get his definitions right.

Hohum.....

73

Steve, K4YZ

1709. Re: Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 19:27:10 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <iW%ia.56$Jr2.53@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 64095

Interesting. I believe that there were 250,000 amateurs when I was first licensed in 1962. Seems the numbers just keep going higher. I'll keep watching this thread and see if "Cutie Boy" wants to make good on this one ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030402053240.25257.00000019@mb-cb.aol.com...
> Long-time rrappers may remember that back on April 2, 1998, "Cutie Boy" (screen
> persona of one Masataka Noda, now JP2CKG, then VA2QRU/VE7JPN) wrote the
> following post. It is reproduced in its entirety, thanks to Google.
>
> At the time, there were approximately 674,000 US hams. Today, exactly five
> years later, there are over 685,000.
>
>
> BEGIN GOOGLE QUOTE
>
> From: Cutie Boy (cute@radiotelephone.net.ham)
> Subject: I will crap my hands
>
> View this article only
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc, rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: 1998/04/02
>
> I will crap my hands if the number of hams of 5 years later are more
> than the number of hams of today.
>
> _____
> Joli Gar�on (�galement connu comme M@S@)
> Indicatif d'appel de radioamateur: VA2QRU & VE7JPN
> �tudient @ Informatique et Math�matiques d'Universit� McGill
> Montr�al, Qu�bec, Canada
> C�: cute@radiotelephone.net.ham
> URL : http://www.radiotelephone.net (Universel)
> http://www.radiotelephone.net/amateur/ (Radio)
> http://www.geocities.com/~masataka/mcgill.htm (Universit� McGill)
>
> Visit this excellent site
> why code has no importance to the amateur radio today:

> http://www.nocode.org
> License Suggestion: http://www.radiotelephone.net/no-code/
> _____
> ***Enlevez l' " .ham " pour r&#65533;pondre.***
> ***Please remove "ham" to reply.***
>
> ATTENTION: Je n'ach&#65533;terai pas ou r&#65533;ponse aucun produit des C&#65533;S non sollicit&#65533;s!!
>
> END GOOGLE QUOTE
>
>
> Time to make good, Masa!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.467 / Virus Database: 266 - Release Date: 4/1/03

1710. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 19:32:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403143204.24104.00000118@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 64097

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>Date: 4/3/2003 9:38 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E8C556E.43421AFD@att.net>

>Steve, don't confuse the poor lad. He hasn't heard of HF yet.

Yeah, Dick...It's really embarrassing to see these "engineer" types get confused with facts.

Jim Miccolis is an engineer...How do you think he turned out to be an alright guy, but these other "engineers" (ie Vipppy and Lennie) can't reason thier way out of a paper bag?

Funny, isn't it...?!?! (Or is it more pitiful? I haven't decided which yet...

73

Steve, K4YZ

1711. Re: Plop-Plop Fizz Fizz Oh What A Relief It Is...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 19:54:11 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E8C9163.9040203@psu.edu>
Source record: 64098

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Plop-Plop Fizz Fizz Oh What A Relief It Is...
>>From: "KB9TMP" NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com
>>Date: 4/3/2003 11:42 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <v8oskqtjpa55e@corp.supernews.com>
>
>
>>I've been thinking of doing that for the whole of RRAP.
>>It's getting almost as bad as rec.radio.amateur.misc.
>>Maybe we need a new subgroup called
>>rec.radio.amateur.policy.mudslinging
>
>
> You may be right. It's getting to be pretty much the same old thing. And
> now we have Lennie2 (Vippy)...yet another "engineer" who can't reason his way
> out of a tub of hot water, and Brain, who STILL can't get his definitions
> right.

Good Man! If enough people ignore the trollers, they will find another
place to fish. They don't have anything to add, and their expressed
views are outrageous enough that there's no worry about them finding
many converts.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1712. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 22:32:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403173213.11311.00000003@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 64099

In article <20030403031657.05732.00000189@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve the Air Ace) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 3/29/2003 5:25 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030329182528.18686.00000108@mb-fn.aol.com>
>
>>You
>>don't know my background to say I'm not qualified to judge Morse code's
>>usefulness.
>
> Sure she is...ANYone is, Vippy.
>
> YOU have stated you don't know code and that you refuse to learn it.
>
> THAT makes YOU unqualified to make ANY judgements on how effective or
>useful it is.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Circular logic and self-congratulatory, too.

If one has demonstrated skill in morse code, it is then "effective and useful?" For ALL? No, only for the one individual. Federal radio regulations apply to ALL not just one individual.

Once upon a dim prehistoric time, before the life existance of Steve the Air Ace, morse code skill MAY have been useful in radio. No more.

Morse code mode communications is NOT effective or useful EXCEPT to use as self-congratulatory bragging points to use against others.

In the last half century a number of NEW radio services have come into being. ALL of those new radio services didn't bother to consider morse code modes. Older radio services either didn't bother with morse code skills as a requirement or dropped such skills. Only amateur radio requires such "qualifications" for an amateur radio license having below-30-MHz privileges.

Old morsemen refuse to give up their bragging points citing a bunch of mthology and half-truths that is older than they. If morsemanship is no longer required for licensing, those old morsemen will lose all their bragging qualifications. They will "lose face" and no longer be able to lord it over other amateurs.

>>There are other ways to gain the experience needed to evaluate Morse code's
>>usefulness.
>
> And without being an active practitioner of the art, how would YOU do
>that, Vippy?

More circular logic. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Steve the Air Ace has a hammer and thinks everything else is a
nail. :-)

>>those that have the experience have not reached the conclusion that Morse is
>>so useful, as many Hams claim.
>
> And WHO are "they", Vipul?
>
>>Hospitals, firefighters, Coast Guard, Pilots, Military, other "emergency"
>>functions do not use Morse code.
>
> Pilots, the Coast Guard and the Military DO use Morse Code, Vipul.

Private and Commercial aircraft pilots are NOT tested for
morsemanship by the FAA or any other agency.

The US Military does NOT USE morse code for any sort of
radio communications. US Military Intelligence does teach
morse code cognition for interception of enemy communications
as part of electronic intelligence gathering activities but it does
NOT USE morse code skills for communications.

> No nearly as prolificly as years ago, but they DO use it.

The US Military DOES NOT USE MORSE CODE for
radio communications.

>I suggest that
>you take any receiver capable of tuning below 500 kHz and tune slowly. Morse
>Code signals abound.

"Abound?!?" So does QRN and QRM.

There are NO US amateur bands allocated below MF. None.

>Also tune from 108.0 to 118.0 MHz. Even more Morse code
>signals.

Oh, wow, the automatic ID keyer requirement means "morse
is USED in air navigation?!?!?" No, no, no. That automatic
keyer is there as a left-over requirement from 50+ years ago.

>Those are VOR's and VORTAC's use by civil and military pilots to
>navigate by.

Not quite. VORs (Very high frequency Omnidirectional Ranges)
and Localizer beams share that, interleaved on 0.1 MHz
increments. Localizers are rather narrow azimuth beams for

aircraft positioning to set up approach for landing. VOR was developed from the US Military TACAN (TACtical Area Navigation) and shares much of the technical basis of operation with TACAN. TACAN operates in low L-band microwave frequencies, not VHF. Decades ago the US Military and FAA cooperated on installing both TACAN and VOR on many ground stations and the combined equipment service was dubbed "VORTAC" (an acronym of acronyms).

Only a fanatic morseman would think that "pilots use morse to navigate by." In actual practice there's absolutely NO need to use any sort of morse code if a pilot knows approximately where he/she is within several hundred miles. FAA has set up VORs such that there isn't any possibility of one VOR interfering with another by high-altitude aircraft. VOR receivers are crystal-controlled. Reception is line-of-sight. Relatively low-power VOR ground stations are either there or not there to aircraft. It is quite easy to determine which VOR is which without any need for "reading" the slow-speed morse automatic ID keyer. Since that keying is audio tone and carried on the "voice" mid-band of VORs, any ground station has the opportunity to use the voice part as supplementary control information...the keying would not be heard under such conditions.

VORs use 30 Hz AM at 30% modulation for the "rotating beam" (literally rotating the RF beam) and a 30 Hz reference phase carried as FM on a 9.96 KHz sub-carrier. A phase comparison subsystem in the VOR receiver allows determination of the aircraft's azimuthal positioning to a VOR ground station by comparing the two 30 Hz phases. There is plenty of room between 30 Hz and 9.96 KHz to send audio information from ground to aircraft. VORs, Localizers, Glideslopes (UHF) are all coordinated in carrier frequency relative to VORs so that one radionavigation receiver tuning control will select all three if that feature is built into aircraft equipment.

VOR's inception dates to 1955 for the International Civil Aviation Organization, slightly earlier for the USA which developed the elegant (for vacuum tube based receivers) system. There was more morse used 48 years ago than today and it was common practice to have ground stations use automatic keying IDs in several services...by regulation. There has been no movement to eliminate the automatic keyers since their reliability keeps them auto-keying away on audio (not the carrier) and the audio voice portion exists since it is an AM system for both azimuth phases. Any use of the audio portion for ground-to-air communications will override the keying.

Frequencies and general characteristics of US civil aviation radio service is found in Part 87, Title 47 CFR. Any local aviation publication store will have "sectional" charts from the

US government showing all details on ground station
frequencies, their ID, even the dot-dash coding for the slow-
speed automatic ID keying shown in dot and dash symbols.

Civil aviation pilot license tests do NOT require morse code
cognition "by ear" tests in the USA.

>>Just because a mode does not require a computer, does not mean one should
>>learn it.
>
> Why not?
>
> Morse Code is the ONLY "encoding scheme" that I can think of that could
>potentially allow a person to "communicate" directly with a computer. The
>spoken word is still subject to speech impediments and dialect inflections.

Utter nonsense by the Air Ace. Speech recognition programs
have been around for years. Some of them are commercial. As a
case in point "Dragon Naturally Speaking" was available in 1998
(in my case bundled with the WordPerfect 8 upgrade, complete
with a little headband mounted microphone, no extra cost). It is
still on the software market. Like all recognition programs it needs
a learning practice for the individual user. It works but then I've
been a touch typist since middle school and am faster and more
comfortable with keyboard entry.

Children younger than 4 learn speech recognition, complete with
various speakers' dialects, impediments, and so forth. Computers
are machines, not human beings, cannot "learn" anything without
appropriate hardware and software.

A number of years ago a programmer friend developed a "morse
code recognition" program as an intellectual exercise in making a
self-adaptive program, adjusting itself for word rate (actually
character speed), dot versus dash ratios, and some ability to
distinguish signal from noise without going into DSP techniques.
It worked quite well by test with a receiver input (my Icom R-70)
using a simple hardware interface between receiver output and
parallel port on the PC. According to some monitoring morsemen
it worked very well although two of them got in a running argument
between themselves as to which was "more skilled." :-)

1713. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 22:32:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403173217.11311.00000004@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 64100

In article <20030403025419.05732.00000187@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Spongebob Roundpants) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 3/28/2003 6:32 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030328193254.25912.00000045@mb-ff.aol.com>
>
>>>The heavy emphasis on Morse code is
>>>>embarrassing.
>>>
>>> To whom?
>>
>>To me.
>
> Then I guess we just need to get hot re-writing all federal regulations
to
>save you some embarrasment, Vippy!

Of course. The LAW is the LAW and shall NEVER BE CHANGED!

>>If I were to mention I belonged to a Ham radio club and the person asked
>>me if they still used Morse code.
>
> What absoute silliness. You can do better than this,Vippy.

So can salivating Spongebob Roundpants, flow chart or not.

>>Its also bad for the hobby. It scares away the technical people, who might
have
>>benefitted the hobby. It looks bad for the hobby when the only "real" skill
is
>>Morse code.
>
> If a "technical (person) is "scared away"from the Amateur Radio service
>over the idea of taking a five word per minute Code test, and then ONLY if
they
>want access to HF, then I say WHO NEEDS THEM...?!?!?!

Tsk, tsk, tsk. ELITISM!

Real Hams work DX on HF with CW.

> Any "experimenting" of any consequence is being done at or above the VHF
>portion of the spectrum, Vippy, and that requires NO Code test.

Unbelievers get to the back of the amateur bus and cannot
drink from the same fountains as Real Hams (who can do
morse).

> Your "argument" is a tissue of lies.

Steamy is straining his schizophrenia while salivating again...

> There was a lot I didn't want to have to do in Nursing School, yet had to
>get through it in order to get where I am now. None of which, byt the way,
>has been manifested in my years in the ER.

Poor baby. Steamy screams curriculum vitae in a radio newsgroup
and then goes on about non-radio nursing and non-radio licenses?

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

> Then the problem is with YOUR use of the English language, because
>that's exactly what you said!

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Normally the doctor practices English without a
license (after years in ER) and almost makes it through a whole
posting without typo or bad sentence structure. It's gotta be
some sneaked-out Prozac.

>>I said keep written tests, but put Morse code out of pathway of written
tests.
>>No need to pass Morse code test to get General license or Extra license.
>
> Sure there is. It's right there in Part 97. And that requirement is
>there because of the United States' compliance with treaties that it is
>signatory to.

Doctor Killgore, after years in ER, is about to state "something
up with which he will not put" ---

> Do you condone breaking the law?

THOU SHALT NOT BREAK THE HAM LAW!!!

THOU SHALT NOT EVEN THINK OF CHANGING HAM LAW!!!

Why does the ham fantasy forbid CHANGING LAW?

All this "breaking the law" nonsense sounds like output from the
Hamish Ministry of Information psycho-babble and denial.

>>But, no HF for passing only written tests. If one passes code test (provided
>>they pass tech written test) they can get on HF.
>
> That's the way it is NOW, Mr Wizard.

...and so must it be forever more for the mighty macho morsemen.

>>This compromise should satisfy Morse code lovers and no coders.
>
> You continue to make yourself sound really stupid, Vipul.

Yup, output right out of Bagdad daily propaganda releases,
A few words changed to make it apply to morsemen and
their mighty macho accomplishments.

Anyone against Dr. Kilgore's opinions is automatically "stupid,"
a "liar," or, Maxim forbid, a "pathological liar!" :-)

>>Do you understand this or do I have to draw a flowchart?
>
> You can draw me a lewd picture of Spongebob and Catdog if you want, but
>you STILL won't prove anything. We're close enough to a completely code test
>free license that now matter how YOU color it, it's irrelevent.

Why does Dr. Kilgore need "lewd pictures" to comprehend a
hobby radio regulation or a change in federal law? Bizarre
behavior in a sexless technical avocation...

Get mental help, Steve.

1714. Re: Plop-Plop Fizz Fizz Oh What A Relief It Is...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 22:32:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403173218.11311.00000006@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 63954

In article <v8oskqtjpa55e@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP"
<NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com> writes:

>I've been thinking of doing that for the whole of RRAP.
>It's getting almost as bad as rec.radio.amateur.misc.
>Maybe we need a new subgroup called
>rec.radio.amateur.policy.mudslinging ;^)

What you need is a "rec.radio.amateur.religion" newsgroup,
moderated to allow only the purest of propaganda approved
by the Hamish Ministry of Information in Newington.

That way there would be no argument about morse code
because none would be allowed. [morse code is the
ultimate amateur radio skill according to its Believers]

Remember, Real Hams work DX on HF with CW.

1715. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 22:32:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403173218.11311.00000005@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 63955

In article <20030403021530.05732.00000183@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Dr. A. Freud) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
>>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>Date: 3/30/2003 7:13 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303300513.3bb58fc@posting.google.com>
>
>>How's your therapy coming?
>
> For...?!?!
>
> So far I am not the one who's NOT a documented pathological liar.

"Documented pathological liar?"

Where is this "documentation?"

Who wrote the "documentation?" Some nursie in a "southern" state? Does she wear scrubs while newsgrouping? :-)

> Neither are you (yet), but it sure seems "stupid" sure runs in your
>bloodline.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. The Hamish Ministry of Information is working overtime. There Shall Be No Dissent Against Olde-Tyme Hamish Practices! Any Dissent Shall Be Met With Personal Denigration and Personal Pejoratives! There Shall Be No Dissent Against The One True Amateur Religion!

Polish.

1716. Re: Plop-Plop Fizz Fizz Oh What A Relief It Is...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 22:32:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403173219.11311.00000007@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 63953

In article <20030403020722.05732.00000181@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Pathologically a Morseman) writes:

> Plopped Lennie the Liar into the kill file for a while. He usually is
>able to insert at least SOMETHING into one of his tirades of some use or
>interest, but even those have long since withered on the vine.
>
> Brain is getting close.

No "vine," Steamy. Poor baby, can't hold his own in here without all those charges of "lying," "pathology," or references to middle European Yiddish pejoratives.

I wonder if Steamy Robeson has defected and gone to work for the Iraq Ministry of Information? His staunch defense of a near religious Belief of olde-tyme Hamism sounds just like the denial statements from Bagdad. :-)

Polish.

1717. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 22:32:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403173222.11311.00000009@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 63952

In article <20030403015326.05732.00000178@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve the Real Ham) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 3/29/2003 5:45 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030329184553.18686.00000111@mb-fn.aol.com>
>
>>Only at
>>this speed is one considered a "true" Ham.
>
> You will, of course, provide us a reference to this milrestone?

What is a "milrestone?" :-)

Is it a new Italian pasta dish or a resting rock for medically-discharged veterans?

True hams work DX on HF with CW.

Polish.

1718. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 22:32:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403173222.11311.00000008@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 63956

In article <20030403015945.05732.00000179@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Raddio Kop) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>Date: 3/28/2003 11:44 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <f45722ac.0303280944.152a8644@posting.google.com>
>
>>I didn't insist that you change the subject. You did that on your
>>own. It's part of your little problem.
>
> Hmmmm...Let's see....
>
> YOU insist that I am "obsessive compulsive", yet you continue to go
>tit-for-tat in these little exchanges despite having been given ample
>opportunity to tactfully withdraw.

"Withdraw?"

Big Raddio Kop is now a moderator of this newsgroup?

> You insist that your T5 operation was "authorized" yet you cannot (or
will
>not) provide us with the name of the person who allegedly gave that
>permission.

You don't have a need to know. :-)

Raddio Kop has never identified those "seven hostile actions." :-)

> You further refuse to even make available any log excepts so that we can
>make some efforts to validate that you indeed DID operate from Somalia while
>deployed there.

Raddio Kop is now working for the Somalian government?!?

> Youn further insist that I (and others on occassion) make assersions that
>we never did, then never provide the quote proving where we made the
>statement you insist upon.

Who is this "Youn?"

Tsk, tsk, tsk, not only medically discharged but also making
with bad English sentence structure.

> Seems YOU are the one with the problems, Brain. Truthfulness and a lack
>of facts being two of them.

Ah, Kop has the "answer"...anything against his opinion is a
"lie" and probably "pathological" as well. :-)

Get help, Steamy, before everyone decides your medical discharge
was due to mental, not physical problems.

1719. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 22:32:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403173223.11311.00000010@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 63957

In article <20030403015100.05732.00000177@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
Seven Hostile Engagements Robeson) writes:

>>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 3/29/2003 3:47 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030329164729.13213.00000099@mb-ca.aol.com>
>
>>>The bloodiest war the USA ever fought was from 1861 to 1865. Americans
>>>against other Americans.
>>
>> INCORRECT.
>
> As is usually the case, Lennie tries to go against conventional and
>well-archived knowledge in order to make a "newsgroup battle point".
>
> And as usual, he's wrong. Collier's and Brittanica refer.
>
> Putz.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. My source was numbers from the United States
Department of Defense. They should know since they are the
source of "Collier's and Brittanica" casualty data. :-)

On the other hand, Robeson may have a dispute with the DoD
since they are the responsible department from which his
medical discharge originated. Tsk, tsk, spite in action again.

Polish.

1720. Re: Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 22:32:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403173224.11311.00000011@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 63951

In article <d22b54c3.0304030024.1102b1aa@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> You have to admit that this one would be difficult to forget.
>> Masa's likely forgetten the whole thing by now and is likely sitting
>> quietly at home--probabry sipping some Ripton Tea.
>
>Whatta jerk he was . . I popped him with a bunch of binaries he
>couldn't handle which really ticked him off and called him "cootie
>boy" to boot. Those were "unrestricted warfare days" in this village.

You've managed to "destroy the village in order to save it?" :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk, some ethnic-racial improprieties used by Kellie's compatriot and worshipper of the PCTA Religion (SS chapter).

>The Putz went ape when I got into the subject of the neighborhood CBer
>who had a 35kW rig in his Chebby Suburban. Another memorable thread.
>
>Last I heard abt Cootie was that he'd sold all his ham gear and
>evaporated.

Evaporate yourself, olde-tymer. :-)

1721. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 23:08:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403180824.22957.00000004@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 63958

In article <20030403143204.24104.00000118@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve the Polish Salesman) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>>Date: 4/3/2003 9:38 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <3E8C556E.43421AFD@att.net>
>
>>Steve, don't confuse the poor lad. He hasn't heard of HF yet.
>
> Yeah, Dick...It's really embarrassing to see these "engineer" types get
>confused with facts.

It's only embarrassing to see the amateurs spout off about things
they don't know. Poor them.

> Jim Miccolis is an engineer...How do you think he turned out to be an
>alright guy, but these other "engineers" (ie Vipppy and Lennie) can't reason
>thier way out of a paper bag?

Some amateurs can't type their way into a newsgroup... :-)

Miccolis is of the True Faith, a Believer in the Way of Morse.

Miccolis is too ashamed to admit who he works at "engineering"
for, only that he got a degree many years ago. Chances are,
Miccolis doesn't really do any "engineering" at all. He doesn't
read RF Design magazine, a trade periodical. He should have
caught the March 2003 issue. :-)

Believers in the Way of Morse are fanatics, some akin to the
fedayin of Iraq, while some use the same propaganda style as
practiced by the Iraqi Ministry of Information ("we are repelling
the aggressor invaders even now on the encircled outskirts of
Bagdad").

> Funny, isn't it...?!?! (Or is it more pitiful? I haven't decided which
yet...

Poor baby, no decision-making capabilities even while in middle
age. No wonder just a nurse and not a real medical doctor. Tsk.

1722. Re: Plop-Plop Fizz Fizz Oh What A Relief It Is...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 23:08:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403180825.22957.00000005@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 63959

In article <3E8C9163.9040203@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>>>Subject: Re: Plop-Plop Fizz Fizz Oh What A Relief It Is...
>>>From: "KB9TMP" NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com
>>>Date: 4/3/2003 11:42 AM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <v8oskqtjpa55e@corp.supernews.com
>>
>>>I've been thinking of doing that for the whole of RRAP.
>>>It's getting almost as bad as rec.radio.amateur.misc.
>>>Maybe we need a new subgroup called
>>>rec.radio.amateur.policy.mudslinging
>>
>> You may be right. It's getting to be pretty much the same old thing.
And
>> now we have Lennie2 (Vippy)...yet another "engineer" who can't reason his
way
>> out of a tub of hot water, and Brain, who STILL can't get his definitions
>> right.
>
> Good Man! If enough people ignore the trollers, they will find another
>place to fish. They don't have anything to add, and their expressed
>views are outrageous enough that there's no worry about them finding
>many converts.

Aha, another vote for a moderated religious newsgroup! :-)

Dissent with olde-tyme hamish radio cannot be tolerated!

All those not of the True Faith shall be excommunicated?

> - Mike KB3EIA -

Go for it, Mikey. :-)

1723. Re: Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 23:51:31 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403185131.24070.00000211@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 63960

From N2EY:
>> From: Cutie Boy (cute@radiotelephone.net.ham)
>> Subject: I will crap my hands
>>
>> View this article only
>> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc, rec.radio.amateur.policy
>> Date: 1998/04/02
>>
>> I will crap my hands if the number of hams of 5 years later are more
>> than the number of hams of today.

Poor "Cutie Boy".

1724. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-03 23:52:45 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403185245.24070.00000212@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 63961

From K4YZ:
>Tell ya what, Vippy...I have a 0-to-5 WPM tape here a the house that I'd
>be glad to send yuo at MY expense...the only thing I'd "need" from you is a
>promise to listen to it and then pass the test.
>
> Personally, I have $20.00 says you can't study and pass that 5WPM by
>April
>30th. You just don't have it in you. "Proof" will be your upgrade to
>General
>in the FCC database. (YOU said the writtens can be done in a day...let's see
>if your word is as good as you say...)
> Shall I send this to your QRZ address?
Seems like it would be addressed to someone named "Vippy".

No thanks. I got a free code CD from my local club. I know I can do it, but
perhaps cannot do it in just under a month.

More importantly, I do not want to learn Morse code.

1725. Re: Anybody here have any new thoughts?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 00:01:16 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403190116.24070.00000213@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 63962

From K4YZ:
> Gee...and I bet you weren't even wearing your "callsign hat", had an HT
>on
>your belt, nor were chanting the Wouff Hong, were you?

No, neither was he. He did not seem weird.

>>At events people say I eat a lot. I disagree, but more than once someone has
>>said this to me.
> Perhaps, Vipul, this is why people don't like you at their meetings.
>
>Steve

If you paid more attention, you would see I got re-invited.

One can imply from your quote that certain Hams that eat a lot would not get
re-invited. Hey, you said it.

1726. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 00:05:45 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403190545.24070.00000214@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 63963

From K4YZ:
>>Only at
>>this speed is one considered a "true" Ham.
>
> You will, of course, provide us a reference to this milrestone?

Only those that are proficient at code are considered a "true" Ham, although some Hams forgive this and allow no-coders that are true to the other traditions.

Actually, the proficiency speed is 10 wpm, not 13wpm. I did provide a reference link in another post in this thread.

1727. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 00:39:26 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403193926.24070.00000216@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 63964

From K4YZ:
>>No need to pass Morse code test to get General license or Extra license.
>
> Sure there is. It's right there in Part 97. And that requirement is
>there because of the United States' compliance with treaties that it is
>signatory to.
>
> Do you condone breaking the law?

It doesn't break the law. I'm surprised you did not see that.

No law that says Morse test must be passed for General class. Law says Morse code test must be for HF. My compromise proposal keeps that in place.

>YOU have stated you don't know code and that you refuse to learn it.
>
> THAT makes YOU unqualified to make ANY judgements on how effective or
>useful it is.

I can make use of expert's opinion of those that do know about it. Comm. Prof (also Ham radio op.) ,does not make claim about Morse in class. Class covered many encoding schemes, gives tradeoffs. As it uses OOK (on-off keying), Morse is the least complex modulation scheme. Didn't see Morse having better BandWidth or Bit Error Rate. Shall I ask this specific question to Prof.?

*By the way in class, Prof asked if anyone is a Ham radio operator. Prof said more people should have Ham license. Not one person in the Comm Theory class raised their hand. From seeing the class email list, one can see that some people in the class are in companies in the Comm field. You would assume a Ham license would be beneficial to them.

>Knowledge of the encoding scheme is NOT
>>needed to evaluate its usefulness.
>
> Wrong.

The encoding scheme (Morse) is different from its mode of transmission (OOK). One can use any (or all) possible "character(s)" for the calculations its evaluation. Knowledge of the encoding scheme is not needed to evaluate its usefulness. You do not know enough about encoding schemes to say this is wrong.

> Pilots, the Coast Guard and the Military DO use Morse Code, Vipul.
>
> No nearly as prolificly as years ago, but they DO use it. I suggest
>that
>you take any receiver capable of tuning below 500 kHz and tune slowly. Morse
>Code signals abound. Also tune from 108.0 to 118.0 MHz. Even more Morse

>code
>signals. Those are VOR's and VORTAC's use by civil and military pilots to
>navigate by.

Morse may be used somewhere, but Morse does not deserve the high emphasis that it gets in Ham radio. It is not THAT important. Placing that high emphasis on Morse takes away from the more important aspects. Even emergency comm. would get a boost.

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>Steve, don't confuse the poor lad. He hasn't heard of HF yet.
I've heard of it and CQed on it. Just don't want to Morse on it.

From K4YZ:
>>Steve, don't confuse the poor lad. He hasn't heard of HF yet.
>
> Yeah, Dick...It's really embarrassing to see these "engineer" types get
>confused with facts.

These HF spectrum allocation "facts" do not affect my suggestion.

Don't you have to get the General class license to get those General class privileges? The General class test currently requires passing the Morse code test. You have to take a Morse code test to get those HF parts.

If you compare the current plan with my suggestion, you will see that no freqs need be taken away to accomplish my suggested change.

> Jim Miccolis is an engineer...How do you think he turned out to be an
>alright guy
…

He endorses Morse code and the "Ham" traditions.

1728. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 01:09:13 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403200913.24070.00000217@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 63965

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> It's only embarrassing to see the amateurs spout off about things
> they don't know. Poor them.

Some Hams don't want to learn the truth.

>Chances are,
> Miccolis doesn't really do any "engineering" at all.

There's no shame in that. Thats probably true of most EEs. One big problem is many low level tasks are called Engineering. Some times a <real> technician job can be better that one of these Engineer titled job. One example is "Component Engineer".

>He doesn't
> read RF Design magazine, a trade periodical.

Real EEs don't Morse code.

> Believers in the Way of Morse are fanatics

True, it is advocated and code classes taught in a local club. Guest speaker from military came. Someone asked if they used Morse. Answer was no, Morse was not used.

Its self congradulation for learning an essentially worthless skill. This skill (Morse code) is elevated in importance above anything else. Its easier to learn this skill than a multiple of <worthwhile> skills.

>some use the same propaganda style

In another club, club Pres announces everyone should learn Morse. HF rig was bought for club and it was claimed that this shows the club supports "advancement of the radio art".

Same club members hates homebrewing, but poses for homebrewing photo. Noone in the photo likes homebrewing, but homebrewing photo is still on club website.

1729. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 01:38:02 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <_l5ja.18141$B8.4575198@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 63966

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030403185245.24070.00000212@mb-ck.aol.com...
> From K4YZ:
> >Tell ya what, Vippy...I have a 0-to-5 WPM tape here a the house that I'd
> >be glad to send yuo at MY expense...the only thing I'd "need" from you is
a
> >promise to listen to it and then pass the test.
> >
> > Personally, I have $20.00 says you can't study and pass that 5WPM by
> >April
> >30th. You just don't have it in you. "Proof" will be your upgrade to
> >General
> >in the FCC database. (YOU said the writtens can be done in a day...let's
see
> >if your word is as good as you say...)
> > Shall I send this to your QRZ address?
> Seems like it would be addressed to someone named "Vippy".
>
> No thanks. I got a free code CD from my local club. I know I can do it,
but
> perhaps cannot do it in just under a month.

Sure you can. Take the bet, Vipul. It's easy money.

> More importantly, I do not want to learn Morse code.

At least give it a shot. That way you can honestly say that you dont enjoy
the code with the benefit of truly knowing exactly what you're talking
about. (Meant in a nice way, I assure you.)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1730. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 02:12:16 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304031812.36b87d1e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63967

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0304030957.1057e8f0@posting.google.com>...
> "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<973158DB723EF0DB.D34F8B23BE65C649.5FF020718DD7A5E2@lp.airnews.net>...

> >
> > You bring up an incredibly interesting and poignant observation, Dwight.
> > All the cries for "patriotism" (those of people who imply it is unpatriotic
> > not to support and stand behind a President of the US), are probably right
> > along party lines; i.e., would we find a Republican pleading for respect and
> > admiration of a Democrat President or vice versa? hmmmmm....
> >
> I dunno about that one way or the other, Kim.

Slick Willy declared a couple months ago that he fully supports Bush's
approach to Saddam. I forget his exact phrasing but it was something
like "Saddam has gotta go, period" essentially in support of a
unilateral military attack on the Iraqi regime if that's was what it
took.

> But I cannot recall another instance of senior State Department
> officials resigning because they cannot support American foreign
> policies.
>
> Take a look at:
>
> http://www.snopes.com/politics/soapbox/wright.php
>
> to see the resignation letter of Mary Wright. Note her extensive
> government service and reasons for quitting. Hardly a wild-eyed
> radical.

She's one of hundreds if not thousands of Foreign Service types at her
level. If she's such a hotshot what the (bleep) was she doing in a
non-entity like JT?? Not to mention that she has her thirty in the
bank and is bullet-proof. More media hype.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1731. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 03:26:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403222610.08544.00000007@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63968

In article <20030403200913.24070.00000217@mb-ck.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 04 Apr 2003 01:09:13 GMT
>
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> It's only embarrassing to see the amateurs spout off about things
>> they don't know. Poor them.
>
>Some Hams don't want to learn the truth.
>
>>Chances are,
>> Miccolis doesn't really do any "engineering" at all.

Just the opposite. Almost all of what I do for a living is electrical engineering. Been that way since I got out of college in 1976.
>
>There's no shame in that. Thats probably true of most EEs.

Maybe. But it doesn't apply in my case.

>One big problem is
>many low level tasks are called Engineering. Some times a <real> technician
>job
>can be better that one of these Engineer titled job. One example is
>"Component Engineer".

I'm not a component engineer.
>
>>He doesn't
>> read RF Design magazine, a trade periodical.

I don't do much RF design at work.
>
>Real EEs don't Morse code.

This one does. So do many others.

1732. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 03:26:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403222611.08544.00000008@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63969

In article <3E8C65B2.8010208@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
>Date: Thu, 03 Apr 2003 11:47:46 -0500
>
>
>
>Brian wrote:
>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0304010900.5ade4b0f@posting.google.com>...
>>
>>>These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
>>>licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>>>
>>>As of May 14, 2000:
>>>
>>>Novice - 49,329
>>>Tech - 205,394
>>>Tech Plus - 128,860
>>>General - 112,677
>>>Advanced - 99,782
>>>Extra - 78,750
>>>Total - 674,792
>>>
>>>As of March 31, 2003:
>>>
>>>Novice - 35,024 (decrease of 14,305)
>>>Tech - 251,221 (increase of 46,715)
>>>Tech Plus - 70,249 (decrease of 58,611)
>>>General - 140,487 (increase of 27,810)
>>>Advanced - 83,833 (decrease of 15,949)
>>>Extra - 103,709 (increase of 24,959)
>>>Total - 685,471 (increase of 10,679)
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>
>> In May 2000, there were 469,398 Morse Coded amateurs. In March 2003,
>> there were 35,148 fewer coded hams.
>>
>> Assuming 13wpm as the exam level at which Morse proficiency is
>> demonstrated, in May 2000, there were 291,209 Morse Code proficient
>> amateurs (no accounting for waivered hams). In March 2003, I estimate

>> there were 2,258 fewer Morse Code proficient hams. The estimation is
>> based upon a generous 90% of the 2000 General class licensees (13wpm)
>> renewing their licenses. The remaining 2003 General licensees
>> (39078) are 5wpm examined, i.e., not proficient.
>>
>> There are fewer coded people in the USA today than there were 3 years
>> ago. I just don't see Morse Code as a growth industry.
>
> Wow, Brian, that was some statistical work!

Too bad it's so full of mistakes.

>Your mistake is that mo one
>is tested at 13 wpm any more. This means that no new hams can be
>qualified as proficient.

That's one mistake.

>In addition, there is not a statistic on how
>many of the new extras are upgrades from earlier (higher CW speed
>tested) Generals or Advanced Hams. In their case we just don't know.

That's another mistake.

Here's the biggie:

Brian writes:

"In May 2000, there were 469,398 Morse Coded amateurs."

How does he get this number?

Total hams: 674,792
- Technicians: 205,394

Difference: 469,398

"In March 2003, there were 35,148 fewer coded hams."

Total hams: 685,471
- Technicians: 251,221

Difference: 434,250

469,398 - 434,250 = 35,148

The problem is that Brian assumes all Technicians are not "coded". This is not a valid assumption, because FCC has been renewing all Technician and Tech Plus licenses as Techs since April 15, 2000. In addition, any Tech who passes Element 1 but doesn't pass any more written tests stays a Tech in the database even though they have Tech HF privs.

Len Anderson made this same mistake a year or two ago and refused to acknowledge it despite repeated explanations. He even proclaimed that no Techs have HF privileges, with or without CSCEs for Element 1.

Three mistakes so far.

He concludes with:

"There are fewer coded people in the USA today than there were 3 years ago. I just don't see Morse Code as a growth industry."

which completely ignores the fact that what really matters is code USE, not code TESTS.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1733. Re: Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 03:26:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403222611.08544.00000009@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 63970

In article <iW%ia.56$Jr2.53@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Interesting. I believe that there were 250,000 amateurs when I was first
>licensed in 1962.

That's about right.

>Seems the numbers just keep going higher.

But not in a linear fashion. Growth has speeded up and slowed down throughout
the history of ham radio.

For example, there were about 60,000 US hams in 1946. That number grew to
250,000 by 1963 - then growth stopped completely for the rest of the '60s.
Started up again in the 1970s, and now we're at an all-time high.

> I'll keep
>watching this thread and see if "Cutie Boy" wants to make good on this one
>;)

Maybe that's why he went back home....;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1734. Re: Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 03:27:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030403222732.00177.00000029@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 63973

In article <20030402053240.25257.00000019@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>
>Long-time rrappers may remember that back on April 2, 1998, "Cutie Boy"
>(screen
>persona of one Masataka Noda, now JP2CKG, then VA2QRU/VE7JPN) wrote the
>following post. It is reproduced in its entirety, thanks to Google.
>
>At the time, there were approximately 674,000 US hams. Today, exactly five
>years later, there are over 685,000.
>
>
>BEGIN GOOGLE QUOTE
>
>From: Cutie Boy (cute@radiotelephone.net.ham)
>Subject: I will crap my hands
>
>View this article only
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc, rec.radio.amateur.policy
>Date: 1998/04/02
>
>I will crap my hands if the number of hams of 5 years later are more
>than the number of hams of today.
>

Jim:

Let's just hope that Masa-San doesn't try to applaud after he
"craps his hands."

73 de Larry, K3LT

1735. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 03:27:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030403222733.00177.00000030@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 63972

In article <BAA92F63.14A71%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> An important thing for loyal Americans to do is
>> to be well informed. Any reasonably attentive
>> student of history will be able to draw the
>> conclusion that appeasement of dictators
>> through diplomacy does not put an end to
>> vicious, totalitarian regimes. They must be
>> confronted with sufficient force to put them
>> out of power, (snip)
>
>
> And there are well informed Americans who disagree with the use of force
>to solve problems. Does that make them less loyal?
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Dwight:

I'll have to say yes, it does. If any American, who enjoys the blessings
of freedom and democracy which have been secured for him or her
through the sacrifices made by those who willingly fought, suffered, and
died to preserve them is not also willing to do so himself or herself, then
they most definitely are NOT a "loyal Americans." They are merely cowards
living under the protection of their moral superiors.

Diplomacy will always be the preferred method for settling political
differences between nations. However, when diplomacy fails, as it
historically will when dealing with maniacal, totalitarian dictators such
as Saddam Hussein, then military might is the correct response.
Nobody likes war -- it is a last resort. However, it is a resort which must
be taken to eliminate the evil in this world. If you disagree, consider
yourself lucky to be living in America -- where millions of your fellow
countrymen have sacrificed to give you the right to your disagreement.

73 de Larry, K3LT
MSgt, USAF (Retired)
Loyal American who supports our President, our Troops, and the
War in Iraq

1736. How to read Jap ham gear manuals "101"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 03:28:53 UTC
From: bignose ham <"bign oseh3"@juno.com>
Message-ID: <3e8cfbdf@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 63971
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap

The source: http://www.engrish.com

ROTFLMAO: http://www.engrish.com/recent/

1737. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 03:59:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403225910.08710.00000388@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63974

>Subject: Re: A Bet With Vippy
>From: "Bert Craig" wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM
>Date: 4/3/2003 7:38 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <_l5ja.18141$B8.4575198@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>

>> No thanks. I got a free code CD from my local club. I know I can do it,
>but
>> perhaps cannot do it in just under a month.
>
>Sure you can. Take the bet, Vipul. It's easy money.

I think what's "easy" Bert, is understanding the SBS, or Spoiled Brat
Syndrome.

>> More importantly, I do not want to learn Morse code.
>
>At least give it a shot. That way you can honestly say that you dont enjoy
>the code with the benefit of truly knowing exactly what you're talking
>about. (Meant in a nice way, I assure you.)

Naaaah. We'll let it go, Bert. He's shown us what he's made of, and it's
time to fumigate.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1738. Re: Anybody here have any new thoughts?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 04:00:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403230031.08710.00000389@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63975

>Subject: Re: Anybody here have any new thoughts?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/3/2003 6:01 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030403190116.24070.00000213@mb-ck.aol.com>

>One can imply from your quote that certain Hams that eat a lot would not get
>re-invited. Hey, you said it.

I didn't "say" anything, Vippy.

Steve

1739. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 04:02:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403230214.08710.00000390@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63976

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/3/2003 6:05 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030403190545.24070.00000214@mb-ck.aol.com>

>Only those that are proficient at code are considered a "true" Ham, although
>some Hams forgive this and allow no-coders that are true to the other
>traditions.

Says who?

>Actually, the proficiency speed is 10 wpm, not 13wpm. I did provide a
>reference
>link in another post in this thread.

Oh...??? I am still awating to see what authoratative source made this
milestone.

Steve

1740. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 04:11:12 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403231112.24173.00000318@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 63977

From Bert, WA2SI:
>Sure you can. Take the bet, Vipul. It's easy money.

No, I can't. I shouldn't mention this, but I have two other things which are due Apr 30. These items are very important to accomplish by this date.

>> More importantly, I do not want to learn Morse code.
>
>At least give it a shot.

That way you can honestly say that you dont enjoy
>the code with the benefit of truly knowing exactly what you're talking
>about. (Meant in a nice way, I assure you.)

I know (don't ask how) real-time encoding/decoding can be fun.

Enjoyment is not the only criteria. Usefulness, relavance are important criteria.

Also, it is not a "two-way street" as you suggest. Once you learn code by reflex, you CANNOT forget it, according to some studies. So, I would not be able to say "I don't like it, I won't use it anymore". It will stay with me.

1741. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 04:17:55 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403231755.24173.00000319@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 63978

From K4YZ:
>I think what's "easy" Bert, is understanding the SBS, or Spoiled Brat
>Syndrome.

How did you get this from not wanting to learn code?

1742. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 04:18:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030403231825.08710.00000391@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63979

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/3/2003 6:39 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030403193926.24070.00000216@mb-ck.aol.com>

>>>No need to pass Morse code test to get General license or Extra license.
>>
>> Sure there is. It's right there in Part 97. And that requirement is
>>there because of the United States' compliance with treaties that it is
>>signatory to.
>>
>> Do you condone breaking the law?
>
>It doesn't break the law. I'm surprised you did not see that.

Vippy, YOU said "No need to pass Morse code test to get General license or
Extra license".

Yes, thee IS a need. It's very specifically delineated in PArt 97.

I am surprised YOU did not see that.

>No law that says Morse test must be passed for General class. Law says Morse
>code test must be for HF. My compromise proposal keeps that in place.

No law except Part 97.

>I can make use of expert's opinion of those that do know about it. Comm. Prof
>(also Ham radio op.) ,does not make claim about Morse in class.

Without a name or callsign, your "comm prof" (sic) is just a figment of
your imagination as far as I am concerned.

>Shall I ask this specific question to Prof.?

Ask him who killed Hoffa for all I care. I am sure you will make up a
suitable answer either way.

>Morse may be used somewhere, but Morse does not deserve the high emphasis
>that
>it gets in Ham radio. It is not THAT important.

It's not that important to YOU. That is an opinion, NOT a matter of fact.

>Placing that high emphasis on
>Morse takes away from the more important aspects. Even emergency comm. would
>get a boost.

Some of the most proficient CW ops I know are also knee-deep in Emergency Services, homebrewing, EME, Public Service, etc.

Morse Code knowledge and/or proficiency does NOT in any way, shape or form prevent or detract a person from doing any other thing in Amateur Radio he or she chooses to do.

To assert so is to blatantly lie. Are YOU a liar too, Vippy?

>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net

>>Steve, don't confuse the poor lad. He hasn't heard of HF yet.

>I've heard of it and CQed on it. Just don't want to Morse on it.

How did you "CQ" on it, Vippy, without a General Class license?

>These HF spectrum allocation "facts" do not affect my suggestion.

Sure it does...So far you haven't offered a single viable alternative to the way things are now. WRC-03 will, eventually, see the end of Morse Code testing as a prerequisite to an Amateur authorization on HF.

Your "suggestions" are crude, ill-prepared and do no answer the letter of the law.

>Don't you have to get the General class license to get those General class
>privileges? The General class test currently requires passing the Morse code
>test. You have to take a Morse code test to get those HF parts.

Yes, and YOU said no Morse Code test was required to get there. That was in error.

>If you compare the current plan with my suggestion, you will see that no
>freqs
>need be taken away to accomplish my suggested change.

That's easy enough because the FCC is not going to implement any new rules vis-a-vis Morse Code testing. Until ITU S25.5 is modified or deleted, you're stuck with it.

>> Jim Miccolis is an engineer...How do you think he turned out to be an
>>alright guy
>…
>
>He endorses Morse code and the "Ham" traditions.

So now a person who endorses Morse code and "Ham" traditions is an OK guy, when only two days ago you were slandering anyone who supported Morse Code...?!?!

Are you on drugs, Shah?

Steve, K4YZ

1743. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 05:00:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E8D1163.7A8CA8EE@att.net>
Source record: 63980

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
> >Date: 4/3/2003 9:38 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3E8C556E.43421AFD@att.net>
>
> >Steve, don't confuse the poor lad. He hasn't heard of HF yet.
>
> Yeah, Dick...It's really embarrassing to see these "engineer" types get
> confused with facts.
>
> Jim Miccolis is an engineer...How do you think he turned out to be an
> alright guy, but these other "engineers" (ie Vipppy and Lennie) can't reason
> thier way out of a paper bag?
>
> Funny, isn't it...?!?! (Or is it more pitiful? I haven't decided which
> yet...

You know how it is, Steve. There are Engineers and then there are, ahem,
"Injuneers".

Like "Yesterday I couldn't spell it, now I are one".

1744. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 05:14:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E8D14A3.65B9169A@att.net>
Source record: 63981

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <BAA92F63.14A71%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
> writes:
>
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >>
> >> An important thing for loyal Americans to do is
> >> to be well informed. Any reasonably attentive
> >> student of history will be able to draw the
> >> conclusion that appeasement of dictators
> >> through diplomacy does not put an end to
> >> vicious, totalitarian regimes. They must be
> >> confronted with sufficient force to put them
> >> out of power, (snip)
> >>
> >>
> > And there are well informed Americans who disagree with the use of force
> >to solve problems. Does that make them less loyal?
> >>
> >>
> >Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> Dwight:
>
> I'll have to say yes, it does. If any American, who enjoys the blessings
> of freedom and democracy which have been secured for him or her
> through the sacrifices made by those who willingly fought, suffered, and
> died to preserve them is not also willing to do so himself or herself, then
> they most definitely are NOT a "loyal Americans." They are merely cowards
> living under the protection of their moral superiors.
>
> Diplomacy will always be the preferred method for settling political
> differences between nations. However, when diplomacy fails, as it
> historically will when dealing with maniacal, totalitarian dictators such
> as Saddam Hussein, then military might is the correct response.
> Nobody likes war -- it is a last resort. However, it is a resort which must
> be taken to eliminate the evil in this world. If you disagree, consider
> yourself lucky to be living in America -- where millions of your fellow
> countrymen have sacrificed to give you the right to your disagreement.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> MSgt, USAF (Retired)
> Loyal American who supports our President, our Troops, and the

> War in Iraq

Well said, Larry! You cut right to the heart of the matter. All the pacifists seen oblovious
to history and to them "It's all about me and what *I* think".

1745. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 05:56:25 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hcssvt6.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 63982

On Wed, 02 Apr 2003 23:31:42 -0500, Dwight Stewart wrote:

> Again, I would not want support for Israel to end, by us or anyone else.
>But that doesn't mean we can't take a more balanced approach to resolving
>issues in that region. Many of the problems today are a result of years of
>conflicts. We have to take that into consideration when addressing issues
>today. In other words, we can't go in there pointing a finger at one group
>without understanding why that group is doing what it is doing. Once we
>understand, we may better understand what is needed to address that issue
>and end the conflict. The next part is even harder - getting to two to stop
>fighting long enough to actually do something positive.

The solution is simple = kick the Arabs in the a** enough so
they will welcome the relief of sitting down and sorking out
the solution. They may be weird but they are not stupid.

We Israelis have been ready for such a sit down for over 50
years.

Most of us consider ourselves weird as well.

> Heck, we're almost into the senior citizen category now. Magically, when
>you turn 50, you start getting advertising for senior benefit insurance
>plans and so on in the mail. I get stuff like this several times a week now.
>However, I have not signed up for any of it yet - a stubborn refusal to
>admit I'm getting old.

Wait 'till you're 65 and the Guv'mint sends you the "U S
Government Certified Old Man" card, good for getting on the
bus for a quarter..... <ggg> Mine came a while back.

--
Peretz Moshe Kanafi (ex- 4X4UQ)
a.k.a. Phil Kane - K2ASP

Retired and Loving Every Minute of It
Work was getting in the way of my hobbies

1746. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 05:56:25 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hcssa75.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 63983

On Thu, 03 Apr 2003 09:22:26 -0800, Vito wrote:

>"D. Stussy" wrote:
>>
>> Are you saying that California is not part of the U.S.A.?
>
>Yes. One must submit to Ca customs when coming in from the USA, its
>governments (state and local) ignore the U.S. Constitution and courts,
>law enforcement techniques are more like those in Iraq than in the
>U.S.A., etc., so ....

TROLL ALERT

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1747. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 05:56:26 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hcst477.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 63984

On 3 Apr 2003 09:22:54 -0800, N2EY wrote:

>What if Bagdad falls and the regime changes, but no WMDs or evidence
>of same are ever found? Coalition will look like the aggressor and SH
>as a martyr who told the truth. Which may be his plan all along. Talk
>about a recruitment tool for OBL....

And meanwhile the nasty stuff will remain in storage in Syria
where it is now. We'd better do something about that, too....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1748. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 09:13:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB2B6FF.1588A%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63985

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> I'll have to say yes, it does. If any American, who
> enjoys the blessings of freedom and democracy which
> have been secured for him or her through the sacrifices
> made by those who willingly fought, suffered, and died
> to preserve them is not also willing to do so himself
> or herself, then they most definitely are NOT a
> "loyal Americans." They are merely cowards living under
> the protection of their moral superiors. (snip)

That is absolute bull crap, Larry. First of all, a willingness to kill has never been, and should never be, the judge of someone's loyalty to this country. Second, unless we now live in a military state, military service does not make one "superior" to other Americans. And finally, most who served in the military, including myself, will always strongly prefer a peaceful resolution over the failure of war.

> (snip) If you disagree, consider yourself lucky to be
> living in America -- where millions of your fellow
> countrymen have sacrificed to give you the right to
> your disagreement.

Larry, as a Vietnam era vet, I served in the military just like you did, and certainly came as close to war as you ever did (actual combat is not exactly a big concern for the typical Air Force Sergeant), so don't sit there on your pompous butt talking about being "superior" or more loyal.

The millions of fellow countrymen you described above didn't sacrifice so you could describe yourself as superior and other Americans as inferior or yourself as more loyal with others less so. In reality, to proclaim yourself more loyal or superior to other Americans is nothing more than a cruel slap in the face of what they actually sacrificed for.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1749. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 10:02:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB2C24F.1588C%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63986

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> But there is also the issue of "rewarding the
> unwanted behavior". If repeated suicide bombings
> and terrorism get results, those methods will
> become more prevalent.

At this point, both groups are caught up in an endless cycle of unwanted behavior and retaliation - and it is getting more difficult to decide which to assign to which group. I keep hoping for a great statesmen to come forward to truly move things along - to say we're going to do this in spite is the unwanted behavior of the other group. Since the Palestinians cannot do anything about their situation while Israel controls their fate, the burden of that ultimately falls on Israel. Perhaps in my lifetime.

> Unconfirmed legend has it that Carter simply wore
> them down with good manners, Southern hospitality
> and old Georgia peanut farmer stories until they
> would sign ANYTHING just to get out of there.

Probably true. Carter is a difficult person to get a grip on. I cannot decide whether I like or dislike him. He was a boring president, but certainly no worse a president than some we've had. But it would be hard to describe him as a good president. He did some good things, like the Camp David accords, and certainly deserves respect for that. I don't know.

> One of the main reasons for the war is to eliminate
> SH's WMDs. But no WMDs have been found by coalition
> forces yet - just lots of protective suits. Protective
> suits aren't proof that anyone has or will use WMDs
> - coalition troops have those suits, too.
>
> What if Bagdad falls and the regime changes, but no
> WMDs or evidence of same are ever found? Coalition
> will look like the aggressor and SH as a martyr who
> told the truth. Which may be his plan all along. Talk
> about a recruitment tool for OBL....

I wrote an offhand comment (meant to be humorous) about that in another newsgroup... "Weapons of Mass Destruction will be found - even if we have to build them here and fly them over."

> Naw, we're just middle aged. You gotta be a lot
> older to be old nowadays.

Yep, the age associated with old age definitely goes up as I get older.

> My billion-dollar idea is to invent a furnace
> that can burn paper cleanly and efficiently.
> Could heat our houses on junkmail alone.

Actually, I think someone has already tried that (heating a house with junk mail). By the way, did you ever see that house out West built entirely from junk mail? I saw it on television one night - thought about forwarding my junk mail to help with future room additions.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1750. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 10:23:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB2C744.1588E%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63987

"Phil Kane" wrote:
>
> On Thu, 03 Apr 2003 09:22:26 -0800, Vito wrote:
>
>> "D. Stussy" wrote:
>>>
>>> Are you saying that California is not part of the U.S.A.?
>>
>> Yes. One must submit to Ca customs when coming in from the
>> USA, its governments (state and local) ignore the U.S.
>> Constitution and courts, law enforcement techniques are
>> more like those in Iraq than in the U.S.A., etc., so ....
>
> TROLL ALERT

He's got a point about the borders, Phil. California is the only state where, when traveling from another state, I've had to stop at border inspection stations manned by state employees, often backed by armed state troopers sitting in nearby vehicles, to answer questions about the contents of my vehicle. The only other place I've seen this here is on our national borders.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1751. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 10:33:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB2C9B6.15890%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63988

"Vshah101" wrote:

> Also, it is not a "two-way street" as you suggest.
> Once you learn code by reflex, you CANNOT forget
> it, according to some studies. So, I would not be
> able to say "I don't like it, I won't use it anymore".
> It will stay with me.

I wish that was the case. I learned code years ago (a kid in the Boy Scouts) and spent many months exchanging messages with neighborhood friends and fellow Boy Scouts using a flashlight. Sadly, I don't remember any code now - and listening to tapes for a short time certainly didn't bring it back.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1752. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 10:56:49 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0304040256.531b15c7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63989

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030403231112.24173.00000318@mb-ck.aol.com>...
> From Bert, WA2SI:
> >Sure you can. Take the bet, Vipul. It's easy money.
>
> No, I can't. I shouldn't mention this, but I have two other things which are
> due Apr 30. These items are very important to accomplish by this date.

Then forget the time constraint and just do it at your leisure. I had
to shoe-horn my code practice into a pretty busy schedule, so I really
do understand. But don't EVER say "no, I can't!" You can, even if you
don't know it yet.

> >> More importantly, I do not want to learn Morse code.
> >
> >At least give it a shot.
>
> That way you can honestly say that you dont enjoy
> >the code with the benefit of truly knowing exactly what you're talking
> >about. (Meant in a nice way, I assure you.)
>
> I know (don't ask how) real-time encoding/decoding can be fun.

Ok, no questions asked.

> Enjoyment is not the only criteria. Usefulness, relavance are important
> criteria.

With all do respect, your as wrong as two left feet here. CW's
usefulness and relevance to amateur radio are two very important
criteria IN FAVOR of learning the most basic (read entry-level) Morse
code skills. Many find enjoyment AFTER learning the basic 5-wpm and
find they wish to progress further.

> Also, it is not a "two-way street" as you suggest. Once you learn code by
> reflex, you CANNOT forget it, according to some studies. So, I would not be
> able to say "I don't like it, I won't use it anymore". It will stay with me.

It's not a disease, Vipul. I don't ride a bike anymore either
retaining the knowledge of how to poses no burden in my day-to-day
life. You're reachin' dude! It's far less effort to just do it than it
is to come up with the various excuses why it's unfair to have to
learn it for increased privileges. (Ah, the oft forgotten
word...privies, not rights.)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1753. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 11:21:32 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0304040321.a74f388@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63990

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030402190858.10669.00000083@mb-cq.aol.com>...
> From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >How much higher than 10wpm?
>
> The question is: "What is the minimum code speed for code proficiency?" The
> link below answers the question.
>
> http://mvmpc200.ciw.uni-karlsruhe.de/~mvmpc9/public/NOS/HAM/HAMFAQ
>
> I will quote the relevant part:
> "That's the key to code proficiency. Copying code must be a thought-free
> process. When you hear a character, you should know, without thinking, what it
> is. It should be a REFLEX. In fact, copying above about 10 wpm can only be done
> by reflex.
>
> 10 wpm is the minimum speed where code can be copied by reflex and therefore is
> the minimum speed for code proficiency.
>
> Individual variation of reflex perception may occur. However, lets assume the
> variance is small and 10wpm is the minimum speed for everyone.
>
> Note that the reflex definition is based on the operator encoding/decoding
> perception, not on desirable communication rate. Slow as it may seem for some
> people (Normal voice conversation

So based on this info, Element 1 is just an entry level exam and true
Morse "proficiency" is not required for HF privileges.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1754. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 11:50:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404065040.04484.00000187@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 63991

>Subject: Re: A Bet With Vippy
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/3/2003 10:17 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030403231755.24173.00000319@mb-ck.aol.com>
>
>From K4YZ:
>>I think what's "easy" Bert, is understanding the SBS, or Spoiled Brat
>>Syndrome.
>
>How did you get this from not wanting to learn code?

You don't want to study or apply yourself...You just want it given to
you...Spoiled Brat Syndrome.

Steve

1755. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 11:55:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404065504.04484.00000188@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 63992

>Subject: Re: A Bet With Vippy
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/3/2003 10:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030403231112.24173.00000318@mb-ck.aol.com>

>From Bert, WA2SI:
>>Sure you can. Take the bet, Vipul. It's easy money.
>
>No, I can't. I shouldn't mention this, but I have two other things which are
>due Apr 30. These items are very important to accomplish by this date.

But obviously NOT so important that you can afford to take time to argue
and whine in here. Time that COULD have been applied to a study program.

>Enjoyment is not the only criteria. Usefulness, relavance are important
>criteria.

Having no practical experience from which to judge this, you are simply
spitting in the wind.

>Also, it is not a "two-way street" as you suggest. Once you learn code by
>reflex, you CANNOT forget it, according to some studies. So, I would not be
>able to say "I don't like it, I won't use it anymore". It will stay with me.

I guess you must have come with one of those "just so much" brains, huh,
Vipul...?!?!? Because it will only hold "just so much" and you're afraid you
might exceed your capacity?

Steve

1756. Buying radio gear ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 14:12:31 UTC
From: Tom Molyneaux <ke3gk@cablespeed.com>
Message-ID: <v8r4mao9vp8875@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 63993

The Hamster Shack

http://www.hamstershack.com

Before you buy, sell or trade radio equipment and accessories over the internet. Everyday another Ham gets his/her money or equipment stolen.

Please submit your reviews and experiences with the dealings with other Hams here too ! Good reviews always welcome. help us make the internet a safer place to buy, sell or trade.

This site is run by Hams - for Hams.

1757. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 15:09:29 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304040709.28562587@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63994

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030402190858.10669.00000083@mb-cq.aol.com>...
> From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >How much higher than 10wpm?
>
> The question is: "What is the minimum code speed for code proficiency?" The
> link below answers the question.
>
> http://mvmpc200.ciw.uni-karlsruhe.de/~mvmpc9/public/NOS/HAM/HAMFAQ
>
> I will quote the relevant part:
> "That's the key to code proficiency. Copying code must be a thought-free
> process. When you hear a character, you should know, without thinking, what it
> is. It should be a REFLEX. In fact, copying above about 10 wpm can only be done
> by reflex.
>
> 10 wpm is the minimum speed where code can be copied by reflex and therefore is
> the minimum speed for code proficiency.
>
> Individual variation of reflex perception may occur. However, lets assume the
> variance is small and 10wpm is the minimum speed for everyone.
>
> Note that the reflex definition is based on the operator encoding/decoding
> perception, not on desirable communication rate. Slow as it may seem for some
> people (Normal voice conversation

Experienced ham CW ops don't "copy" individual characters as such,
they "copy" words and phrases if the speed is above a threshold which
varies from op to op. This threshold is usually in the 15-25 wpm
range. At lower speeds the op has to copy character by character which
is royal pain in the butt when conducting "conversational CW" Qs. At
10 wpm taking it up the band and getting the drudgery over with on
phone is a much better idea. My definition of "CW proficiency"
therefore is some speed at or above the 15-25 wpm threshold depending
on the individuals, 10 wpm is *not* a "proficient speed". Not
counting weak signal and contest operations which are seldom
conversational in nature.

There is another aspect to consider: It takes time to build the
reflexes you mention. Cramming for and passing a 20 wpm code test for
instance does not build the reflexes or demnonstrate proficiency, all
it does is get the op past the test and nothing more. Unless the op
actually uses the stuff on the air for some considerable amount of
time his/her ability to copy 20 wpm usually drops like a rock shortly
after the test. Thus it is that there is a second threshold which is

defined by the number of hours it takes to create the reflexes which embed CW proficiency for life. The time required in the low ends of the bands running CW to get past this threshold is measured in the hundreds of hours.

Simply passing a 10 wpm or any other "wpm test" don't mean squat when it comes to a useful working level of CW proficiency.

w3rv

1758. How's This For Courage?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 15:44:09 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304040744.52d0de4e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63995

http://www.msnbc.com/news/895233.asp?vts=040420030730

1759. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 16:57:57 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6kdif$3mt$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63996

Here Here Well said Sarge.

Dan/W4NTI

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030403222733.00177.00000030@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <BAA92F63.14A71%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewart@say.net>
> writes:
>
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >>
> >> An important thing for loyal Americans to do is
> >> to be well informed. Any reasonably attentive
> >> student of history will be able to draw the
> >> conclusion that appeasement of dictators
> >> through diplomacy does not put an end to
> >> vicious, totalitarian regimes. They must be
> >> confronted with sufficient force to put them
> >> out of power, (snip)
> >>
> >>
> > And there are well informed Americans who disagree with the use of
force
> >to solve problems. Does that make them less loyal?
> >>
> >>
> >Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> Dwight:
>
> I'll have to say yes, it does. If any American, who enjoys the blessings
> of freedom and democracy which have been secured for him or her
> through the sacrifices made by those who willingly fought, suffered, and
> died to preserve them is not also willing to do so himself or herself,
then
> they most definitely are NOT a "loyal Americans." They are merely cowards
> living under the protection of their moral superiors.
>
> Diplomacy will always be the preferred method for settling political
> differences between nations. However, when diplomacy fails, as it
> historically will when dealing with maniacal, totalitarian dictators such
> as Saddam Hussein, then military might is the correct response.
> Nobody likes war -- it is a last resort. However, it is a resort which
must

> be taken to eliminate the evil in this world. If you disagree, consider
> yourself lucky to be living in America -- where millions of your fellow
> countrymen have sacrificed to give you the right to your disagreement.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> MSgt, USAF (Retired)
> Loyal American who supports our President, our Troops, and the
> War in Iraq
>

1760. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 17:03:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6kdt4$n1k$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63997

I have no idea what Larry did in the AF. But I can assure you that just because one is wearing AF Blue does NOT mean he wasn't in the 'crap'.

Who do you think dropped down from the AF rescue choppers? Who do you think was on the ground with the Army/Marines putting in Combat Air Strikes? Who was walking around the perimeter of Ton Son Nhut, DaNang, Cam Rahn Bay, Bien Hoa, etc?

Dan/W4NTI

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:BAB2B6FF.1588A%stewart@say.net...

> Larry, as a Vietnam era vet, I served in the military just like you did,
> and certainly came as close to war as you ever did (actual combat is not
> exactly a big concern for the typical Air Force Sergeant), so don't sit
> there on your pompous butt talking about being "superior" or more loyal.
>

1761. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 17:10:19 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304040910.36a0cc8d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63998

wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote in message
news:<b7d1465c.0304040321.a74f388@posting.google.com>...
> vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030402190858.10669.00000083@mb-cq.aol.com>...
> > From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >How much higher than 10wpm?
> >
> > The question is: "What is the minimum code speed for code proficiency?" The
> > link below answers the question.
> >
> > http://mvmpc200.ciw.uni-karlsruhe.de/~mvmpc9/public/NOS/HAM/HAMFAQ
> >
> > I will quote the relevant part:
> > "That's the key to code proficiency. Copying code must be a thought-free
> > process. When you hear a character, you should know, without thinking, what it
> > is. It should be a REFLEX. In fact, copying above about 10 wpm can only be done
> > by reflex.
> >
> > 10 wpm is the minimum speed where code can be copied by reflex and therefore is
> > the minimum speed for code proficiency.

Thanks, Vipul, for independently confirming my statements.
> >
> > Individual variation of reflex perception may occur. However, lets assume the
> > variance is small and 10wpm is the minimum speed for everyone.
> >
> > Note that the reflex definition is based on the operator encoding/decoding
> > perception, not on desirable communication rate. Slow as it may seem for some
> > people (Normal voice conversation

Accuracy transcends speed.
>
> So based on this info, Element 1 is just an entry level exam and true
> Morse "proficiency" is not required for HF privileges.

Which is exactly what I've been saying since the question was first
asked. If someone says their goal is to eliminate the Morse
proficiency test for an amateur license, then their goal has been
accomplished in the USA, because Element 1 is not a Morse proficiency
test. It's a basic skills test. QED

73 de Jim, N2EY

1762. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 18:06:53 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304041006.4138bdfa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63999

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BAB2C24F.1588C%stewart@say.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > But there is also the issue of "rewarding the
> > unwanted behavior". If repeated suicide bombings
> > and terrorism get results, those methods will
> > become more prevalent.
>
>
> At this point, both groups are caught up in an endless cycle of unwanted
> behavior and retaliation - and it is getting more difficult to decide which
> to assign to which group.

There are certain basic questions that have to be answered, though:

Does Israel have the right to exist as a sovereign nation?

Does "Palestine" have the right to exist as a sovereign nation?

> I keep hoping for a great statesmen to come
> forward to truly move things along - to say we're going to do this in spite
> is the unwanted behavior of the other group.

I think you meant to right "in spite *of* the unwanted behavior". And
you are right. Which is how Jimmy Carter got the job done.

> Since the Palestinians cannot
> do anything about their situation while Israel controls their fate, the
> burden of that ultimately falls on Israel. Perhaps in my lifetime.

WHOA! "Can't do anything about their situation"??? Sounds like
"learned helplessness" to me.

Have they tried nonviolent resistance? Not sporadically, mind you, but
as a widespread grassroots movement?

How about legal challenges through the justice system?

How about simply emigrating and starting a new life somewhere else?

Anybody can be a destroyer and simply blow things up - including
themselves. Becoming a productive person and society is much more
difficult. It took much more intelligence, work and skill to build the
WTC and the airplanes than it did to destroy them.

Remember the movies "Seven Samurai" and its Hollywood imitations,
"Magnificent Seven" and "A Bug's Life"? Simple lesson: The bandit
needs the farmer, but the farmer does not need the bandit.

I've never been to Israel, so perhaps the following questions seem
naive. But I'll ask them anyway:

- Can anyone who applies become an Israeli citizen, and get full
voting rights?

- What was Palestine like before 1948 in terms of agriculture,
industry, education, civil rights?

- Why have all of the proposals for a Palestinian state been rejected?
What was missing in those proposals?

> > Unconfirmed legend has it that Carter simply wore
> > them down with good manners, Southern hospitality
> > and old Georgia peanut farmer stories until they
> > would sign ANYTHING just to get out of there.
>
> Probably true. Carter is a difficult person to get a grip on. I cannot
> decide whether I like or dislike him. He was a boring president, but
> certainly no worse a president than some we've had. But it would be hard to
> describe him as a good president. He did some good things, like the Camp
> David accords, and certainly deserves respect for that. I don't know.

My image of him, based on a lot of different sources, is that he was
honest and straightforward to a fault. Think "exact opposite of LBJ",
who was his party's predecessor in the Oval Office. LBJ was am
intimidator and wheeler-dealer with a bucket of political IOUs who
knew where all the skeletons were buried. Jimmy Carter thought
politicians should do the right thing and not expect gimmees for doing
so. Guess who got his way more of the time?

Carter inherited all sorts of problems from his predecessors, most
notably a sort of nationwide identity crisis (remember the phrase
"crisis of confidence"?). He was also hampered by not having lots of
Washington IOUs, since he came straight from the governorship of
Georgia.

Perhaps his worst fault was taking bad advice from the likes of Henry
Kissinger, who advised him to admit the Shah of Iran to the USA.
>
> > One of the main reasons for the war is to eliminate
> > SH's WMDs. But no WMDs have been found by coalition
> > forces yet - just lots of protective suits. Protective
> > suits aren't proof that anyone has or will use WMDs
> > - coalition troops have those suits, too.
> >
> > What if Bagdad falls and the regime changes, but no
> > WMDs or evidence of same are ever found? Coalition
> > will look like the aggressor and SH as a martyr who
> > told the truth. Which may be his plan all along. Talk
> > about a recruitment tool for OBL....
>
> I wrote an offhand comment (meant to be humorous) about that in another

> newsgroup... "Weapons of Mass Destruction will be found - even if we have to
> build them here and fly them over."

Latest news says traces of ricin and botulinum toxins have been found
in northern Iraq - but not the part under SH's control.
>
> > Naw, we're just middle aged. You gotta be a lot
> > older to be old nowadays.
>
> Yep, the age associated with old age definitely goes up as I get older.

Works for me.

> > My billion-dollar idea is to invent a furnace
> > that can burn paper cleanly and efficiently.
> > Could heat our houses on junkmail alone.
>
> Actually, I think someone has already tried that (heating a house with
> junk mail). By the way, did you ever see that house out West built entirely
> from junk mail?

NO!!! I must look for it!

Which brings up the newest version of the old philosophical question:
"MaryAnn or Ginger?"/"Bailey Quarters or Jennifer Marlowe?":

"Robin Hartl or JoAnne Liebeler?"

>I saw it on television one night - thought about forwarding
> my junk mail to help with future room additions.

Each piece attached to a brick....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1763. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 19:58:20 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304041950280.1188@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 64000

On Fri, 4 Apr 2003, Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Phil Kane" wrote:
> > On Thu, 03 Apr 2003 09:22:26 -0800, Vito wrote:
> >> "D. Stussy" wrote:
> >>> Are you saying that California is not part of the U.S.A.?
> >>
> >> Yes. One must submit to Ca customs when coming in from the
> >> USA, its governments (state and local) ignore the U.S.
> >> Constitution and courts, law enforcement techniques are
> >> more like those in Iraq than in the U.S.A., etc., so ....
> >
> > TROLL ALERT
>
> He's got a point about the borders, Phil. California is the only state
> where, when traveling from another state, I've had to stop at border
> inspection stations manned by state employees, often backed by armed state
> troopers sitting in nearby vehicles, to answer questions about the contents
> of my vehicle. The only other place I've seen this here is on our national
> borders.

Actually, these are CA Dept. of Agriculture stations and for those not at the Mexican border, you will find that they may be as much as 100 miles IN FROM the state border. Usually, the stop for a passenger vehicle is 20 seconds or less.

1764. Re: Plop-Plop Fizz Fizz Oh What A Relief It Is...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 20:02:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304041202.2b176c81@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64001

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030403020722.05732.00000181@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> Plopped Lennie the Liar into the kill file for a while.

This must be the only way you can resist reading and ranting about Len.

He usually is
> able to insert at least SOMETHING into one of his tirades of some use or
> interest, but even those have long since withered on the vine.
>
> Brain is getting close.

My name is Brian, not brain. And this is yet another new thread rant.

Hmmm. What does it all mean?

1765. Re: Plop-Plop Fizz Fizz Oh What A Relief It Is...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 20:09:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304041209.73cf33c4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64002

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030403173218.11311.00000006@mb-fd.aol.com>...

> Remember, Real Hams work DX on HF with CW.

Ahem, please make that "with FAST CW."

1766. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 20:14:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304041214.5a33ebf8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64003

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304040709.28562587@posting.google.com>...

> There is another aspect to consider: It takes time to build the
> reflexes you mention. Cramming for and passing a 20 wpm code test for
> instance does not build the reflexes or demnonstrate proficiency, all
> it does is get the op past the test and nothing more. Unless the op
> actually uses the stuff on the air for some considerable amount of
> time his/her ability to copy 20 wpm usually drops like a rock shortly
> after the test. Thus it is that there is a second threshold which is
> defined by the number of hours it takes to create the reflexes which
> embed CW proficiency for life. The time required in the low ends of
> the bands running CW to get past this threshold is measured in the
> hundreds of hours.
>
> Simply passing a 10 wpm or any other "wpm test" don't mean squat when
> it comes to a useful working level of CW proficiency.
>
> w3rv

Which is why we need to remove the code-tape generals, advanced, and
extras from the rolls of the "proficient" when trying to quantify
Morse Code as a growth industry.

1767. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 21:03:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404160308.15625.00000028@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 64008

In article <b7d1465c.0304040256.531b15c7@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) writes:

>> Enjoyment is not the only criteria. Usefulness, relavance are important
>> criteria.
>
>With all do respect, your as wrong as two left feet here. CW's
>usefulness and relevance to amateur radio are two very important
>criteria IN FAVOR of learning the most basic (read entry-level) Morse
>code skills. Many find enjoyment AFTER learning the basic 5-wpm and
>find they wish to progress further.

Oh?

What is the International Amateur Radio Union's viewpoint on the relevancy of morse code testing? They are for eliminating it.

What is ARRL viewpoint? They were FOR it for decades but only lately have they taken a neutral stand, neither supporting nor against the code test.

What is the FCC viewpoint on code testing? FCC hasn't thought that the code test serves any purpose for 13 years.

What are SOME US amateur's viewpoints? Decidedly for it because they had to do it, therefore everyone else must do so.

With all due respect, Bert, I think you are full of snit... :-)

1768. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 21:03:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404160309.15625.00000029@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 64005

In article <20030403231755.24173.00000319@mb-ck.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From K4YZ:
>>I think what's "easy" Bert, is understanding the SBS, or Spoiled Brat
>>Syndrome.
>
>How did you get this from not wanting to learn code?

Forget the little man of "seven hostile actions." Anyone not agreeing with his insulting style is always treated to personal pejoratives of rather severe tone.

1769. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 21:03:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404160310.15625.00000030@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 64009

In article <20030403200913.24070.00000217@mb-ck.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> It's only embarrassing to see the amateurs spout off about things
>> they don't know. Poor them.
>
>Some Hams don't want to learn the truth.

There's plenty of evidence of that in this newsgroup. :-)

On the other hand, there are those who will use any
accomplishment to elevate themselves as "superior" in
some way or another. Morsemanship is one of those.

>>Chances are,
>> Miccolis doesn't really do any "engineering" at all.
>
>There's no shame in that. Thats probably true of most EEs. One big problem is
>many low level tasks are called Engineering. Some times a <real> technician
job
>can be better that one of these Engineer titled job. One example is
>"Component Engineer".

Amateurs who've never been in electronics engineering or even
engineering at any corporation will not know any of that. They
will pretend they do, but that is just another facet of their
fantasy existance. :-)

>>He doesn't
>> read RF Design magazine, a trade periodical.
>
>Real EEs don't Morse code.

:-)

>> Believers in the Way of Morse are fanatics
>
>True, it is advocated and code classes taught in a local club. Guest speaker
>from military came. Someone asked if they used Morse. Answer was no, Morse
>was not used.

Obviously a military guest who was mistaken or LIED! :-)

The Way of Morse does not permit infidels.

>Its self congradulation for learning an essentially worthless skill. This
skill

>(Morse code) is elevated in importance above anything else. Its easier to
learn
>this skill than a multiple of <worthwhile> skills.

I agree, but cults are cults.

In the USA the ARRL has been preaching the Way of Morse
for decades. Since ARRL publications are the main source of
US amateur radio information, whatever they wrote for so long
has become "true mythology." It's a fine example of the Big
Lie technique.

Even now, so close to WRC-03, ARRL takes a neutral stand
on revising all of ITU-R S25 despite the IARU recommending
a full overhaul of S25, including the elimination of the morse
code test requirement.

>>some use the same propaganda style
>
>In another club, club Pres announces everyone should learn Morse. HF rig was
>bought for club and it was claimed that this shows the club supports
>"advancement of the radio art".

Of course it shows it...for the 1940s... :-)

>Same club members hates homebrewing, but poses for homebrewing photo. Noone
>in the photo likes homebrewing, but homebrewing photo is still on club
website.

Image is everything sometimes. :-)

1770. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 21:03:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404160311.15625.00000031@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 64006

In article <20030403190545.24070.00000214@mb-ck.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From K4YZ:
>>>Only at
>>>this speed is one considered a "true" Ham.
>>
>> You will, of course, provide us a reference to this milrestone?
>
>Only those that are proficient at code are considered a "true" Ham, although
>some Hams forgive this and allow no-coders that are true to the other
>traditions.
>
>Actually, the proficiency speed is 10 wpm, not 13wpm. I did provide a
reference
>link in another post in this thread.

References are only acceptible if they support a PCTA viewpoint.

References which are against PCTA views are "mistakes,"
"erroneous," or simply "lies."

1771. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 21:03:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404160312.15625.00000032@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 64007

In article <b6kdt4$n1k$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>I have no idea what Larry did in the AF. But I can assure you that just
>because one is wearing AF Blue does NOT mean he wasn't in the 'crap'.

I'm sure the USAF has good facilities for human waste.

>Who do you think dropped down from the AF rescue choppers? Who do you think
>was on the ground with the Army/Marines putting in Combat Air Strikes? Who
>was walking around the perimeter of Ton Son Nhut, DaNang, Cam Rahn Bay, Bien
>Hoa, etc?

It wasn't me.

It wasn't Roll.

It wasn't the "veteran of seven hostile actions."

It wasn't the katapult king of secret bear photo sessions.

It wasn't the PA stealth factory engineer.

Who was it?

1772. Re: Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 21:03:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404160313.15625.00000034@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 64004

In article <20030403222732.00177.00000029@mb-cu.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Let's just hope that Masa-San doesn't try to applaud after he
>"craps his hands."

Don't you? :-)

1773. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 21:03:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404160313.15625.00000033@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 64011

In article <20030403222733.00177.00000030@mb-cu.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <BAA92F63.14A71%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
>writes:
>
>>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>>
>>> An important thing for loyal Americans to do is
>>> to be well informed. Any reasonably attentive
>>> student of history will be able to draw the
>>> conclusion that appeasement of dictators
>>> through diplomacy does not put an end to
>>> vicious, totalitarian regimes. They must be
>>> confronted with sufficient force to put them
>>> out of power, (snip)
>>
>>
>> And there are well informed Americans who disagree with the use of force
>>to solve problems. Does that make them less loyal?
>>
>>
>>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>Dwight:
>
>I'll have to say yes, it does. If any American, who enjoys the blessings
>of freedom and democracy which have been secured for him or her
>through the sacrifices made by those who willingly fought, suffered, and
>died to preserve them is not also willing to do so himself or herself, then
>they most definitely are NOT a "loyal Americans." They are merely cowards
>living under the protection of their moral superiors.

So...whatever Roll opines is the "superior moral view?"

Good grief...self-elevation of superiority by Roll has gone to
a higher altitude than any USAF desk he piloted once.

>Diplomacy will always be the preferred method for settling political
>differences between nations. However, when diplomacy fails, as it
>historically will when dealing with maniacal, totalitarian dictators such
>as Saddam Hussein, then military might is the correct response.
>Nobody likes war -- it is a last resort. However, it is a resort which must
>be taken to eliminate the evil in this world. If you disagree, consider
>yourself lucky to be living in America -- where millions of your fellow

>countrymen have sacrificed to give you the right to your disagreement.

Roll seems to be "clapping his hands" considerably in here,
having "sacrificed much" in order to become a "moral superior."

Part 97.1 (e): "Continuation and extension of the amateur's
unique ability to enhance international goodwill."

An examination of any Almanac covering world affairs will show
dozens of armed conflicts around the globe over the last half
century...nearly all involving countries which have amateur
radio licensees and are signatory to the International
Telecommunications Union. It would seem that the "unique
ability to enhance international goodwill" has not aided in
providing any aid to real international good will.

Any number of "moral superiors" in here show up from time
to time...such as the PCTA. Their essential "battlecry" is
simply Do As I Say Or Leave.

That's not diplomatic, just dictatorial.

That's not freedom of speech, just repression of dissent.

>73 de Larry, K3LT
>MSgt, USAF (Retired)
>Loyal American who supports our President, our Troops, and the
>War in Iraq

Leonard H. Anderson, ex-RA16408336
Veteran, United States Army, 1952-1960 (Honorable Discharge)
A citizen of the United States of America who supports the
Constitution of the United States and all the freedoms
contained therein.

1774. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 21:03:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404160315.15625.00000035@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 64010

In article <BAB2C744.1588E%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Phil Kane" wrote:
>>
>> On Thu, 03 Apr 2003 09:22:26 -0800, Vito wrote:
>>
>>> "D. Stussy" wrote:
>>>>
>>>> Are you saying that California is not part of the U.S.A.?
>>>
>>> Yes. One must submit to Ca customs when coming in from the
>>> USA, its governments (state and local) ignore the U.S.
>>> Constitution and courts, law enforcement techniques are
>>> more like those in Iraq than in the U.S.A., etc., so ....
>>
>> TROLL ALERT
>
> He's got a point about the borders, Phil. California is the only state
>where, when traveling from another state, I've had to stop at border
>inspection stations manned by state employees, often backed by armed state
>troopers sitting in nearby vehicles, to answer questions about the contents
>of my vehicle. The only other place I've seen this here is on our national
>borders.

Sorry, Dwight, but your implication of "inspection stations backed
by armed state troopers" seems a bit harsh.

California is a HUGE agricultural state. The gigantic San Joaquin
Valley is perhaps the best evidence of that...it takes a day to
drive its north-south length on Interstate 5. The mobility of the
public poses a threat to some of the agribusiness here through
(usually inadvertent) vectoring of insects which may damage
the fruit crops.

The California border inspection stations are there to reduce the
importation of certain products which may cause damage to the
large (principally fruit) crops. There are similar inspection stations
at California international airports and at harbors. It's a serious
thing to damage billions of dollars worth of crops that employ up
to a million workers. The economic consequences would not
be good for either California or the rest of the USA that enjoys
the agricultural products.

Are there "armed state troopers" at these "border crossings?"
Yes. California Highway Patrol is armed while on duty. Do they

have guns pointed at vehicles? No. By evidence of observation of many trips my wife and I have taken along I-5 up to Washington and back, there is seldom more than one CHP cruiser parked alongside the inspection station. Once we saw all of two such CHP cruisers, one empty and the other with only one CHP officer.

The questioning by (unarmed) California inspectors is a direct, perfunctory "are you carrying any fruit in the vehicle?" A simple answer of "no" will allow passage. Anyone who feels they have to argue the point will be requested to exit the vehicle while it is searched. Those individuals are naturally put out by not being able to give inspectors a hard time, poor things. The rest of us know the drill, obey the law, and we are inconvenienced only a few minutes of time.

California is the most populous state in the union with a large economy (approximately 16th largest national economy if the state was considered a separate nation). It is very large in terms of area and length (north-south driving distance will take 10 to 12 hours of continuous driving on highways at maximum lawful speed). Many easterners are against California for no other reason than pique and jealousy.

1775. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 21:03:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404160316.15625.00000036@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 64012

In article <20030403222611.08544.00000008@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>In article <3E8C65B2.8010208@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>>From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
>>Date: Thu, 03 Apr 2003 11:47:46 -0500
>>
>>
>>
>>Brian wrote:
>>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>>news:<c2356669.0304010900.5ade4b0f@posting.google.com>...
>>>
>>>>These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
>>>>licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>>>>
>>>>As of May 14, 2000:
>>>>
>>>>Novice - 49,329
>>>>Tech - 205,394
>>>>Tech Plus - 128,860
>>>>General - 112,677
>>>>Advanced - 99,782
>>>>Extra - 78,750
>>>>Total - 674,792
>>>>
>>>>As of March 31, 2003:
>>>>
>>>>Novice - 35,024 (decrease of 14,305)
>>>>Tech - 251,221 (increase of 46,715)
>>>>Tech Plus - 70,249 (decrease of 58,611)
>>>>General - 140,487 (increase of 27,810)
>>>>Advanced - 83,833 (decrease of 15,949)
>>>>Extra - 103,709 (increase of 24,959)
>>>>Total - 685,471 (increase of 10,679)
>>>>
>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>>
>>> In May 2000, there were 469,398 Morse Coded amateurs. In March 2003,
>>> there were 35,148 fewer coded hams.
>>>

>>> Assuming 13wpm as the exam level at which Morse proficiency is
>>> demonstrated, in May 2000, there were 291,209 Morse Code proficient
>>> amateurs (no accounting for waivered hams). In March 2003, I estimate
>>> there were 2,258 fewer Morse Code proficient hams. The estimation is
>>> based upon a generous 90% of the 2000 General class licensees (13wpm)
>>> renewing their licenses. The remaining 2003 General licensees
>>> (39078) are 5wpm examined, i.e., not proficient.
>>>
>>> There are fewer coded people in the USA today than there were 3 years
>>> ago. I just don't see Morse Code as a growth industry.
>>
>> Wow, Brian, that was some statistical work!
>
>Too bad it's so full of mistakes.
>
>>Your mistake is that mo one
>>is tested at 13 wpm any more. This means that no new hams can be
>>qualified as proficient.
>
>That's one mistake.
>
>>In addition, there is not a statistic on how
>>many of the new extras are upgrades from earlier (higher CW speed
>>tested) Generals or Advanced Hams. In their case we just don't know.
>
>That's another mistake.
>
>Here's the biggie:
>
>Brian writes:
>
>"In May 2000, there were 469,398 Morse Coded amateurs."
>
>How does he get this number?
>
>Total hams: 674,792
>- Technicians: 205,394
>
>Difference: 469,398
>
>"In March 2003, there were 35,148 fewer coded hams."
>
>Total hams: 685,471
>- Technicians: 251,221
>
>Difference: 434,250
>
> 469,398 - 434,250 = 35,148
>
>The problem is that Brian assumes all Technicians are not "coded". This is

>not
>a valid assumption, because FCC has been renewing all Technician and Tech
>Plus
>licenses as Techs since April 15, 2000. In addition, any Tech who passes
>Element 1 but doesn't pass any more written tests stays a Tech in the
>database
>even though they have Tech HF privs.
>
>Len Anderson made this same mistake a year or two ago and refused to
>acknowledge it despite repeated explanations. He even proclaimed that no
>Techs
>have HF privileges, with or without CSCEs for Element 1.
>
>Three mistakes so far.
>
>He concludes with:
>
>"There are fewer coded people in the USA today than there were 3 years
>ago. I just don't see Morse Code as a growth industry."
>
>which completely ignores the fact that what really matters is code USE, not
>code TESTS.

1776. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 21:15:03 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304041315.da3911e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64013

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030404065504.04484.00000188@mb-fr.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: A Bet With Vippy
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 4/3/2003 10:11 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030403231112.24173.00000318@mb-ck.aol.com>
>
> >From Bert, WA2SI:
> >>Sure you can. Take the bet, Vipul. It's easy money.
> >
> >No, I can't. I shouldn't mention this, but I have two other things which are
> >due Apr 30. These items are very important to accomplish by this date.
>
> But obviously NOT so important that you can afford to take time to argue
> and whine in here. Time that COULD have been applied to a study program.
>
> >Enjoyment is not the only criteria. Usefulness, relavance are important
> >criteria.
>
> Having no practical experience from which to judge this, you are simply
> spitting in the wind.
>
> >Also, it is not a "two-way street" as you suggest. Once you learn code by
> >reflex, you CANNOT forget it, according to some studies. So, I would not be
> >able to say "I don't like it, I won't use it anymore". It will stay with me.
>
> I guess you must have come with one of those "just so much" brains, huh,
> Vipul...?!?!? Because it will only hold "just so much" and you're afraid you
> might exceed your capacity?
>
> Steve

Brainiac the Second hath arrived.

w3rv

1777. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 21:25:40 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <b6kt8k$2d1m$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 64014

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote:
>"Phil Kane" wrote:
>>
>> On Thu, 03 Apr 2003 09:22:26 -0800, Vito wrote:
>>
>>> "D. Stussy" wrote:
>>>>
>>>> Are you saying that California is not part of the U.S.A.?
>>>
>>> Yes. One must submit to Ca customs when coming in from the
>>> USA, its governments (state and local) ignore the U.S.
>>> Constitution and courts, law enforcement techniques are
>>> more like those in Iraq than in the U.S.A., etc., so ....
>>
>> TROLL ALERT
>
>
> He's got a point about the borders, Phil. California is the only state
>where, when traveling from another state, I've had to stop at border
>inspection stations manned by state employees, often backed by armed state
>troopers sitting in nearby vehicles, to answer questions about the contents
>of my vehicle. The only other place I've seen this here is on our national
>borders.

Actually those stations are often quite far from the border, they are
Agriculture inspection stations and are placed somewhere convenient between
the border and the farm land.

I don't mind them at all since I find California fruit and vegetables
taste better than what was available in any of the other places I've
lived. Whatever they think they have to do to keep it that way is
fine with me.

Dennis Ferguson

1778. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 21:30:03 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <b6ktgr$2dtk$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 64015

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
> California is the most populous state in the union with a large
> economy (approximately 16th largest national economy if the
> state was considered a separate nation).

That's got to be an underestimate, California couldn't be worse than 5th or 6th. The G8 nations are supposed to be the 8 largest economies in the world, but the size of California's economy certainly exceeds that of Russia, Canada and Italy, and may exceed that of France (I'm too lazy to look).

Dennis Ferguson

1779. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 22:02:27 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304041402.17e50e04@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64016

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304041152.bcc43e6@posting.google.com>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0304021154.8f2d6b@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304020615.79e4d2f0@posting.google.com>...
> > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0304010900.5ade4b0f@posting.google.com>...
> > > > These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> > > > licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
> > > >
> > > > As of May 14, 2000:
> > > >
> > > > Novice - 49,329
> > > > Tech - 205,394
> > > > Tech Plus - 128,860
> > > > General - 112,677
> > > > Advanced - 99,782
> > > > Extra - 78,750
> > > > Total - 674,792
> > > >
> > > > As of March 31, 2003:
> > > >
> > > > Novice - 35,024 (decrease of 14,305)
> > > > Tech - 251,221 (increase of 46,715)
> > > > Tech Plus - 70,249 (decrease of 58,611)
> > > > General - 140,487 (increase of 27,810)
> > > > Advanced - 83,833 (decrease of 15,949)
> > > > Extra - 103,709 (increase of 24,959)
> > > > Total - 685,471 (increase of 10,679)
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > > In May 2000, there were 469,398 Morse Coded amateurs. In March 2003,
> > > there were 35,148 fewer coded hams.
> >
> > How did you arrive at those numbers?
>
> I used the science of mathematics and the number system.

Used them incorrectly, too.

1780. Re: Plop-Plop Fizz Fizz Oh What A Relief It Is...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 22:06:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404170643.23165.00000026@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 64017

In article <f45722ac.0304041209.73cf33c4@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030403173218.11311.00000006@mb-fd.aol.com>...
>
>> Remember, Real Hams work DX on HF with CW.
>
>Ahem, please make that "with FAST CW."

OK, but remember, "fast" is a four-letter word... :-)

Come to think of it, so is "code." :-)

1781. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-04 22:13:00 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304042212340.1236@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 64018

On Fri, 4 Apr 2003, Dennis Ferguson wrote:
> Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
> > California is the most populous state in the union with a large
> > economy (approximately 16th largest national economy if the
> > state was considered a separate nation).
>
> That's got to be an underestimate, California couldn't be worse than
> 5th or 6th. The G8 nations are supposed to be the 8 largest economies
> in the world, but the size of California's economy certainly exceeds
> that of Russia, Canada and Italy, and may exceed that of France (I'm
> too lazy to look).

I've heard 6th, and I live in "the people's republic of California."

1782. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 00:40:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404194020.00629.00000008@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 64020

In article <b6ktgr$2dtk$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) writes:

>Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>> California is the most populous state in the union with a large
>> economy (approximately 16th largest national economy if the
>> state was considered a separate nation).
>
>That's got to be an underestimate, California couldn't be worse than
>5th or 6th. The G8 nations are supposed to be the 8 largest economies
>in the world, but the size of California's economy certainly exceeds
>that of Russia, Canada and Italy, and may exceed that of France (I'm
>too lazy to look).

The actual dollar amounts are irrelevant in this newsgroup. One thing I am sure of is that the Gross State Product for 1998 was $1.1 TRILLION dollars. [that amounts to real money...:-)]

Another thing I'm sure of is some yahoo in the east getting all snarly and antagonistic and mumble something about "left coast" and other put-down attempts about "six land."

The best eating dates I've had come from Indio, California. :-)

1783. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 00:40:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404194021.00629.00000009@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 64019

In article <c2356669.0304041402.17e50e04@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>news:<f45722ac.0304041152.bcc43e6@posting.google.com>...
>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0304021154.8f2d6b@posting.google.com>...
>> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>news:<f45722ac.0304020615.79e4d2f0@posting.google.com>...
>> > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0304010900.5ade4b0f@posting.google.com>...
>> > > > These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
>> > > > licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>> > > >
>> > > > As of May 14, 2000:
>> > > >
>> > > > Novice - 49,329
>> > > > Tech - 205,394
>> > > > Tech Plus - 128,860
>> > > > General - 112,677
>> > > > Advanced - 99,782
>> > > > Extra - 78,750
>> > > > Total - 674,792
>> > > >
>> > > > As of March 31, 2003:
>> > > >
>> > > > Novice - 35,024 (decrease of 14,305)
>> > > > Tech - 251,221 (increase of 46,715)
>> > > > Tech Plus - 70,249 (decrease of 58,611)
>> > > > General - 140,487 (increase of 27,810)
>> > > > Advanced - 83,833 (decrease of 15,949)
>> > > > Extra - 103,709 (increase of 24,959)
>> > > > Total - 685,471 (increase of 10,679)
>> > > >
>> > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> > >
>> > > In May 2000, there were 469,398 Morse Coded amateurs. In March 2003,
>> > > there were 35,148 fewer coded hams.
>> >
>> > How did you arrive at those numbers?
>>
>> I used the science of mathematics and the number system.
>
>Used them incorrectly, too.

"Incorrectly?!?!?"

Of course. Anyone who doesn't promote the beauty, majesty, effectiveness, etc., is always "incorrect," "mistaken," or even "lying." That's a given in the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society chat room. :-)

1784. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 01:15:55 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <b6laobltd1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 64022

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
>> 10 wpm is the minimum speed where code can be copied by reflex and
>therefore is
>> the minimum speed for code proficiency.
[...]
>phone is a much better idea. My definition of "CW proficiency"
>therefore is some speed at or above the 15-25 wpm threshold depending
>on the individuals, 10 wpm is *not* a "proficient speed". Not
>counting weak signal and contest operations which are seldom
>conversational in nature.
>
>There is another aspect to consider: It takes time to build the

This was, however, kind of a trick question, since how "proficient"
it is theoretically possible to be depends on the channel (I
would have expected the original poster to know this).

One difference between 20 wpm code and 0.02 wpm code, according to
Nyquist*, is that the former minimally requires at least a
16.7 Hz bandwidth at the receiver to allow it to be copied, while
the latter should be possible to receive through a 0.0167 Hz bandwidth
filter at the receiver. This potential 30 dB improvement in signal-to-noise
ratio may be the only thing which enables a Morse code signal generated
in the UK on 136 kHz to be detected in Alaska at all.

That is, 20 wpm might be uncopiable at 136 kHz on a path between the
UK and Alaska no matter how much practice you've had and how good you've
gotten, and 0.02 wpm Morse code might be just about as proficient as
it is possible to be under those conditions.

At this point the skilled Morse basher would probably point out that
you should theoretically be able to get a net improvement in throughput
by broadening the channel bandwidth and obtaining coding gain through
clever use of some of the additional bits available to make up for the
loss in signal-to-noise ratio (i.e. instead of running narrowband at
0.0167 Hz channel bandwidth, run "spread spectrum" at 1.67 Hz bandwidth),
but my (very limited) experience is that it is sometimes hard to actually
get this to work the way it is supposed to in practice. I suspect 0.02 wpm
could be a fairly proficient rate under the conditions.

Dennis Ferguson

* H. Nyquist. Certain factors affecting telegraph speed. Bell
System Technical Journal, 3:324-346, 1924.

1785. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 01:26:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404202631.11628.00000010@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64021

In article <20030404160316.15625.00000036@mb-ch.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04 Apr 2003 21:03:16 GMT
>
>In article <20030403222611.08544.00000008@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>In article <3E8C65B2.8010208@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>>>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>>>From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
>>>Date: Thu, 03 Apr 2003 11:47:46 -0500
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Brian wrote:
>>>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>>>news:<c2356669.0304010900.5ade4b0f@posting.google.com>...
>>>>
>>>>>These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
>>>>>licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>>>>>
>>>>>As of May 14, 2000:
>>>>>
>>>>>Novice - 49,329
>>>>>Tech - 205,394
>>>>>Tech Plus - 128,860
>>>>>General - 112,677
>>>>>Advanced - 99,782
>>>>>Extra - 78,750
>>>>>Total - 674,792
>>>>>
>>>>>As of March 31, 2003:
>>>>>
>>>>>Novice - 35,024 (decrease of 14,305)
>>>>>Tech - 251,221 (increase of 46,715)
>>>>>Tech Plus - 70,249 (decrease of 58,611)
>>>>>General - 140,487 (increase of 27,810)
>>>>>Advanced - 83,833 (decrease of 15,949)
>>>>>Extra - 103,709 (increase of 24,959)
>>>>>Total - 685,471 (increase of 10,679)

>>>>>
>>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> In May 2000, there were 469,398 Morse Coded amateurs. In March 2003,
>>>> there were 35,148 fewer coded hams.
>>>>
>>>> Assuming 13wpm as the exam level at which Morse proficiency is
>>>> demonstrated, in May 2000, there were 291,209 Morse Code proficient
>>>> amateurs (no accounting for waivered hams). In March 2003, I estimate
>>>> there were 2,258 fewer Morse Code proficient hams. The estimation is
>>>> based upon a generous 90% of the 2000 General class licensees (13wpm)
>>>> renewing their licenses. The remaining 2003 General licensees
>>>> (39078) are 5wpm examined, i.e., not proficient.
>>>>
>>>> There are fewer coded people in the USA today than there were 3 years
>>>> ago. I just don't see Morse Code as a growth industry.
>>>
>>> Wow, Brian, that was some statistical work!
>>
>>Too bad it's so full of mistakes.
>>
>>>Your mistake is that mo one
>>>is tested at 13 wpm any more. This means that no new hams can be
>>>qualified as proficient.
>>
>>That's one mistake.
>>
>>>In addition, there is not a statistic on how
>>>many of the new extras are upgrades from earlier (higher CW speed
>>>tested) Generals or Advanced Hams. In their case we just don't know.
>>
>>That's another mistake.
>>
>>Here's the biggie:
>>
>>Brian writes:
>>
>>"In May 2000, there were 469,398 Morse Coded amateurs."
>>
>>How does he get this number?
>>
>>Total hams: 674,792
>>- Technicians: 205,394
>>
>>Difference: 469,398
>>
>>"In March 2003, there were 35,148 fewer coded hams."
>>
>>Total hams: 685,471

>>- Technicians: 251,221
>>
>>Difference: 434,250
>>
>> 469,398 - 434,250 = 35,148
>>
>>The problem is that Brian assumes all Technicians are not "coded". This is
>>not
>>a valid assumption, because FCC has been renewing all Technician and Tech
>>Plus
>>licenses as Techs since April 15, 2000. In addition, any Tech who passes
>>Element 1 but doesn't pass any more written tests stays a Tech in the
>>database
>>even though they have Tech HF privs.
>>
>>Len Anderson made this same mistake a year or two ago and refused to
>>acknowledge it despite repeated explanations. He even proclaimed that no
>>Techs
>>have HF privileges, with or without CSCEs for Element 1.
>>
>>Three mistakes so far.
>>
>>He concludes with:
>>
>>"There are fewer coded people in the USA today than there were 3 years
>>ago. I just don't see Morse Code as a growth industry."
>>
>>which completely ignores the fact that what really matters is code USE, not
>>code TESTS.
>
Well, there you have it.

A rrap post from Len Anderson that does not contain any insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general infantile behavior.

See, Dave? Len CAN do it.

1786. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 01:30:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E8E31EE.70902@adelphia.net>
Source record: 64023

N2EY wrote:
> In article <20030404160316.15625.00000036@mb-ch.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
>
>>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 04 Apr 2003 21:03:16 GMT
>>
>>In article <20030403222611.08544.00000008@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>writes:
>>
>>
>>>In article <3E8C65B2.8010208@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>>>>From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
>>>>Date: Thu, 03 Apr 2003 11:47:46 -0500
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Brian wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>>>>
>>>>news:<c2356669.0304010900.5ade4b0f@posting.google.com>...
>>>>
>>>>>>These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
>>>>>>licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>As of May 14, 2000:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Novice - 49,329
>>>>>>Tech - 205,394
>>>>>>Tech Plus - 128,860
>>>>>>General - 112,677
>>>>>>Advanced - 99,782
>>>>>>Extra - 78,750
>>>>>>Total - 674,792
>>>>>>
>>>>>>As of March 31, 2003:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Novice - 35,024 (decrease of 14,305)

>>>>>>Tech - 251,221 (increase of 46,715)
>>>>>>Tech Plus - 70,249 (decrease of 58,611)
>>>>>>General - 140,487 (increase of 27,810)
>>>>>>Advanced - 83,833 (decrease of 15,949)
>>>>>>Extra - 103,709 (increase of 24,959)
>>>>>>Total - 685,471 (increase of 10,679)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>In May 2000, there were 469,398 Morse Coded amateurs. In March 2003,
>>>>>there were 35,148 fewer coded hams.
>>>>>
>>>>>Assuming 13wpm as the exam level at which Morse proficiency is
>>>>>demonstrated, in May 2000, there were 291,209 Morse Code proficient
>>>>>amateurs (no accounting for waivered hams). In March 2003, I estimate
>>>>>there were 2,258 fewer Morse Code proficient hams. The estimation is
>>>>>based upon a generous 90% of the 2000 General class licensees (13wpm)
>>>>>renewing their licenses. The remaining 2003 General licensees
>>>>>(39078) are 5wpm examined, i.e., not proficient.
>>>>>
>>>>>There are fewer coded people in the USA today than there were 3 years
>>>>>ago. I just don't see Morse Code as a growth industry.
>>>>
>>>> Wow, Brian, that was some statistical work!
>>>
>>>Too bad it's so full of mistakes.
>>>
>>>
>>>>Your mistake is that mo one
>>>>is tested at 13 wpm any more. This means that no new hams can be
>>>>qualified as proficient.
>>>
>>>That's one mistake.
>>>
>>>
>>>>In addition, there is not a statistic on how
>>>>many of the new extras are upgrades from earlier (higher CW speed
>>>>tested) Generals or Advanced Hams. In their case we just don't know.
>>>
>>>That's another mistake.
>>>
>>>Here's the biggie:
>>>
>>>Brian writes:
>>>
>>>"In May 2000, there were 469,398 Morse Coded amateurs."
>>>
>>>How does he get this number?
>>>

>>>Total hams: 674,792
>>>- Technicians: 205,394
>>>
>>>Difference: 469,398
>>>
>>>"In March 2003, there were 35,148 fewer coded hams."
>>>
>>>Total hams: 685,471
>>>- Technicians: 251,221
>>>
>>>Difference: 434,250
>>>
>>>469,398 - 434,250 = 35,148
>>>
>>>The problem is that Brian assumes all Technicians are not "coded". This is
>>>not
>>>a valid assumption, because FCC has been renewing all Technician and Tech
>>>Plus
>>>licenses as Techs since April 15, 2000. In addition, any Tech who passes
>>>Element 1 but doesn't pass any more written tests stays a Tech in the
>>>database
>>>even though they have Tech HF privs.
>>>
>>>Len Anderson made this same mistake a year or two ago and refused to
>>>acknowledge it despite repeated explanations. He even proclaimed that no
>>>Techs
>>>have HF privileges, with or without CSCEs for Element 1.
>>>
>>>Three mistakes so far.
>>>
>>>He concludes with:
>>>
>>>"There are fewer coded people in the USA today than there were 3 years
>>>ago. I just don't see Morse Code as a growth industry."
>>>
>>>which completely ignores the fact that what really matters is code USE, not
>>>code TESTS.
>>
> Well, there you have it.
>
> A rrap post from Len Anderson that does not contain any insults, ridicule,
> name-calling, factual errors, ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive
> emoticons and/or general infantile behavior.
>
> See, Dave? Len CAN do it.

Did you swallow the hook, Jim?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1787. Re: Buying radio gear ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 01:32:05 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404203205.25985.00000356@mb-ff.aol.com>
Source record: 64024

>From: "Tom Molyneaux" ke3gk@cablespeed.com

>The Hamster Shack
>http://www.hamstershack.com

I see they have stuff for Hamsters. People who like amateur radio may be interested also.

1788. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 01:47:41 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404204741.25985.00000357@mb-ff.aol.com>
Source record: 64025

From K4YZ:
>>Enjoyment is not the only criteria. Usefulness, relavance are important
>>criteria.
>
> Having no practical experience from which to judge this, you are simply
>spitting in the wind.

Those with the practical experience apparently disagree about the usefulness of Morse code. The studies have been long done. The research is there. You just chose to ignore it.

1789. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 02:16:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304041816.1624ff55@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64026

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030403030258.05732.00000188@mb-fz.aol.com>...

> Shall I send this to your QRZ address?
>
> Steve

Oh, boy! Yet another new thread.

1790. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 02:19:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304041819.634c6f84@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64027

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030404160313.15625.00000033@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> In article <20030403222733.00177.00000030@mb-cu.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >In article <BAA92F63.14A71%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
> >writes:
> >
> >>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >>>
> >>> An important thing for loyal Americans to do is
> >>> to be well informed. Any reasonably attentive
> >>> student of history will be able to draw the
> >>> conclusion that appeasement of dictators
> >>> through diplomacy does not put an end to
> >>> vicious, totalitarian regimes. They must be
> >>> confronted with sufficient force to put them
> >>> out of power, (snip)
> >>
> >>
> >> And there are well informed Americans who disagree with the use of force
> >>to solve problems. Does that make them less loyal?
> >>
> >>
> >>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> >Dwight:
> >
> >I'll have to say yes, it does. If any American, who enjoys the blessings
> >of freedom and democracy which have been secured for him or her
> >through the sacrifices made by those who willingly fought, suffered, and
> >died to preserve them is not also willing to do so himself or herself, then
> >they most definitely are NOT a "loyal Americans." They are merely cowards
> >living under the protection of their moral superiors.
>
> So...whatever Roll opines is the "superior moral view?"
>
> Good grief...self-elevation of superiority by Roll has gone to
> a higher altitude than any USAF desk he piloted once.

Larry piloted a tea service cart. No claims of 7 hostile actions.

1791. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 02:21:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304041821.21a0b4e1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64028

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E8D1163.7A8CA8EE@att.net>...
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> > >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> > >From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
> > >Date: 4/3/2003 9:38 AM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <3E8C556E.43421AFD@att.net>
>
> > >Steve, don't confuse the poor lad. He hasn't heard of HF yet.
> >
> > Yeah, Dick...It's really embarrassing to see these "engineer" types get
> > confused with facts.
> >
> > Jim Miccolis is an engineer...How do you think he turned out to be an
> > alright guy, but these other "engineers" (ie Vipppy and Lennie) can't reason
> > thier way out of a paper bag?
> >
> > Funny, isn't it...?!?! (Or is it more pitiful? I haven't decided which
> > yet...
>
> You know how it is, Steve. There are Engineers and then there are, ahem,
> "Injuneers".
>
> Like "Yesterday I couldn't spell it, now I are one".

And you're a donkey, too.

1792. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 02:22:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304041822.437e418f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64029

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E8AF5C9.EA40AC17@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E891614.EBB46076@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8868ED.F78A9EB4@crosslink.net>...
>
> > > > Dave got a bug up his butt (no pun intended) and is badmouthing a
> > > > couple of world record setters going at 0.02wpm.
> > >
> > > You're certainly dancing around the truth more than a bit, Brian. At no
> > > time did I write anything derogatory about either op involved in the
> > > effort on 136 KHz.
> > >
>
> > You said that 0.02wpm couldn't possibly be their top end morse code speed.
> >
> > What if it is?
>
> Your lack of reading comprehension comes into play yet again. I've
> never written what you attempt to attribute to me.

Sure you did.

1793. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 02:26:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304041826.2917f1cb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64030

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E8AF56A.B876C62@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8A6DCD.7305D32D@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > Just stick to Morse code proficiency. We just might get through this
> > > > some day.
> > >
> > > I don't believe we will. You want someone to tell you that someone
> > > whose maximum morse speed is five words per minute is proficient in the
> > > use of morse. I'm not going to be the person to tell you that because I
> > > don't believe it to be true.
> >
> > Dave, you let your "feelings" get in the way of objective, rational
> > thought. You continually try to redirect the the conversation to
> > driving or shooting or make it something personal with me.
> >
> It is rational and objective thought which brings me to the conclusion
> that a person whose maximum morse speed is five words per minute is not
> proficient in the use or morse code.

Why should I believe you?

The driving, baseball hitting and
> shooting analogies are good comparisons. My views are not at all based
> upon feelings but upon experience and observation.

Let me know when the FCC substitutes rifle shooting, baseball, and
driving for Morse Code exams.

> > And you couldn't be more wrong about what "answer" will satisfy me.
> >
> Prove me wrong.

The only way to find out is to answer my question.

> > Too bad for you.
> >
> What are the possible "bad" consequences for me? There'll be no army of
> 5 wpm operators protesting in front of my home. My morse speed won't be
> effected. Those drivers, batters, shooters and morse users who are not
> skilled or expert will still not be skilled or expert.

But you'll still be wrong. Too bad for you.

1794. Re: Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 02:33:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304041833.17e39ea9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64031

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030403173224.11311.00000011@mb-fd.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0304030024.1102b1aa@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> You have to admit that this one would be difficult to forget.
> >> Masa's likely forgetten the whole thing by now and is likely sitting
> >> quietly at home--probabry sipping some Ripton Tea.
> >
> >Whatta jerk he was . . I popped him with a bunch of binaries he
> >couldn't handle which really ticked him off and called him "cootie
> >boy" to boot. Those were "unrestricted warfare days" in this village.
>
> You've managed to "destroy the village in order to save it?" :-)
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, some ethnic-racial improprieties used by Kellie's
> compatriot and worshipper of the PCTA Religion (SS chapter).
>
>
> >The Putz went ape when I got into the subject of the neighborhood CBer
> >who had a 35kW rig in his Chebby Suburban. Another memorable thread.
> >
> >Last I heard abt Cootie was that he'd sold all his ham gear and
> >evaporated.
>
> Evaporate yourself, olde-tymer. :-)

For a brief moment, in the heat of binary battle, Kelley probably
forgot all about his bran cereal and prune juice.

1795. Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 02:42:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304041842.6ea86684@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64032

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030403021530.05732.00000183@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Is THIS "Big Media" Enough...?!?!
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/30/2003 7:13 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303300513.3bb58fc@posting.google.com>
>
> >How's your therapy coming?
>
> For...?!?!
>
> So far I am not the one who's NOT a documented pathological liar.
>
> Neither are you (yet), but it sure seems "stupid" sure runs in your
> bloodline.
>
> Steve

You may have a point. You left Ohio. I moved back.

How are the taxes in Tennesee?

Is Algore still there?

1796. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 02:47:53 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404214753.25985.00000358@mb-ff.aol.com>
Source record: 64033

From K4YZ:
>>It doesn't break the law. I'm surprised you did not see that.
>
> Vippy, YOU said "No need to pass Morse code test to get General license
>or
>Extra license".
>
> Yes, thee IS a need. It's very specifically delineated in PArt 97.
>
> I am surprised YOU did not see that.

After reading Part 97 more carefully, I see its there.

>Without a name or callsign, your "comm prof" (sic) is just a figment of
>your imagination as far as I am concerned.

Other Profs, at the college, in the same field are not a Hams (I checked). Yes, its rare that comm Prof is a Ham, so I can see why you wouldn't believe me.

Antenna lab guy is a Ham, while Prof of that class is not a Ham (Possibly never heard of "Ham" radio). He wouldn't give me his call sign.

In one class meeting Comm Theory Prof said he said he was a Ham, and asked if anyone else is one. If antenna lab guy would not give me his call sign, surely a Prof would not give his callsign. And it would be wrong to ask your Prof's callsign.

>Ask him who killed Hoffa for all I care. I am sure you will make up a
>suitable answer either way.

The class covered many modulation schemes and their benefits/tradeoffs. Surely, I can ask him the benefit/tradeoffs of Morse code. It would be part of the subject matter.

I see Morse code as the least complex modulation scheme (from complexity chart). It does not place highest in BW or BER from the other comparison chart. Besides least complex, I can not see ANY benefits of Morse.

If I asked this question, perhaps you would not like the answer?

>It's not that important to YOU. That is an opinion, NOT a matter of fact.

It may be fun to some, but its not that important. Its not important to hospitals, EMTs, firemen, police, coast guard, FEMA, or the military. Now which emergency communication situation could I have missed? Surely they know of Morse's existance. Its not used because its NOT the most effective means of communications under these situation.

Morse code is only important to a certain segment of Hams.

>WRC-03 will, eventually, see the end of Morse Code
>testing as a prerequisite to an Amateur authorization on HF.

Thats even better than my compromise proposal. I hope that happens.

1797. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 03:35:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404223540.04143.00000012@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64034

In article <3E8E31EE.70902@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

> Did you swallow the hook, Jim?
>

Nope.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1798. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 03:35:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030404223540.04143.00000013@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64035

In article <f45722ac.0304041811.6fb12dbc@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0304041402.17e50e04@posting.google.com>...
>
>> > > How did you arrive at those numbers?
>> >
>> > I used the science of mathematics and the number system.
>>
>> Used them incorrectly, too.
>
>Show your work, oh wise one.

Why? You don't show yours.

Here's a hint:

Your numbers indicate that you consider the set of "noncoded" hams to be
equivalent to the set of hams with Technician licenses. That's simply not
correct.

1799. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 04:02:08 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hcuiqo2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 64036

On Fri, 04 Apr 2003 05:23:16 -0500, Dwight Stewart wrote:

> He's got a point about the borders, Phil. California is the only state
>where, when traveling from another state, I've had to stop at border
>inspection stations manned by state employees, often backed by armed state
>troopers sitting in nearby vehicles, to answer questions about the contents
>of my vehicle. The only other place I've seen this here is on our national
>borders.

This is an agricultural inspection to keep parasites and other
pests from decimating the state's crops (California is still the
number one state in agricultural production and export), and
other Western states did have similar inspection stations when
I was doing a lot of cross-country driving in the 60s and 70s.

If the other states have abandoned that program, it's their
loss. I've never been impeded while passing through those
stations. Most of the time I get waved through without
stopping.

FCalifornia has the right as well as the obligation to make
such inspections.

Co-located with the Ag Stations are California Highway Patrol
Truck Inspection Stations, accounting for the presence of
"armed state troopers sitting in nearby vehicles". Does the
visibilty of the CHP on California's highways bother you? I
rather welcome their presence.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1800. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 05:16:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E8E671B.E8580837@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64037

Dennis Ferguson wrote:

> I suspect 0.02 wpm could be a fairly proficient rate under the
> conditions.

I suspect that it could be *efficient* but it has nothing to do with
proficiency.

Dave K8MN

1801. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 05:19:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E8E676B.B16A5C60@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64038

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <20030404160316.15625.00000036@mb-ch.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 04 Apr 2003 21:03:16 GMT
> >
> >In article <20030403222611.08544.00000008@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >writes:
> >
> >>In article <3E8C65B2.8010208@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
> >>
> >>>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
> >>>From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
> >>>Date: Thu, 03 Apr 2003 11:47:46 -0500
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Brian wrote:
> >>>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> >>>news:<c2356669.0304010900.5ade4b0f@posting.google.com>...
> >>>>
> >>>>These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> >>>>licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
> >>>>
> >>>>As of May 14, 2000:
> >>>>
> >>>>Novice - 49,329
> >>>>Tech - 205,394
> >>>>Tech Plus - 128,860
> >>>>General - 112,677
> >>>>Advanced - 99,782
> >>>>Extra - 78,750
> >>>>Total - 674,792
> >>>>
> >>>>As of March 31, 2003:
> >>>>
> >>>>Novice - 35,024 (decrease of 14,305)
> >>>>Tech - 251,221 (increase of 46,715)
> >>>>Tech Plus - 70,249 (decrease of 58,611)
> >>>>General - 140,487 (increase of 27,810)
> >>>>Advanced - 83,833 (decrease of 15,949)

> >>>>>Extra - 103,709 (increase of 24,959)
> >>>>>Total - 685,471 (increase of 10,679)
> >>>>>
> >>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> In May 2000, there were 469,398 Morse Coded amateurs. In March 2003,
> >>>> there were 35,148 fewer coded hams.
> >>>>
> >>>> Assuming 13wpm as the exam level at which Morse proficiency is
> >>>> demonstrated, in May 2000, there were 291,209 Morse Code proficient
> >>>> amateurs (no accounting for waivered hams). In March 2003, I estimate
> >>>> there were 2,258 fewer Morse Code proficient hams. The estimation is
> >>>> based upon a generous 90% of the 2000 General class licensees (13wpm)
> >>>> renewing their licenses. The remaining 2003 General licensees
> >>>> (39078) are 5wpm examined, i.e., not proficient.
> >>>>
> >>>> There are fewer coded people in the USA today than there were 3 years
> >>>> ago. I just don't see Morse Code as a growth industry.
> >>>
> >>> Wow, Brian, that was some statistical work!
> >>
> >>Too bad it's so full of mistakes.
> >>
> >>>Your mistake is that mo one
> >>>is tested at 13 wpm any more. This means that no new hams can be
> >>>qualified as proficient.
> >>
> >>That's one mistake.
> >>
> >>>In addition, there is not a statistic on how
> >>>many of the new extras are upgrades from earlier (higher CW speed
> >>>tested) Generals or Advanced Hams. In their case we just don't know.
> >>
> >>That's another mistake.
> >>
> >>Here's the biggie:
> >>
> >>Brian writes:
> >>
> >>"In May 2000, there were 469,398 Morse Coded amateurs."
> >>
> >>How does he get this number?
> >>
> >>Total hams: 674,792
> >>- Technicians: 205,394
> >>
> >>Difference: 469,398
> >>
> >>"In March 2003, there were 35,148 fewer coded hams."

> >>
> >>Total hams: 685,471
> >>- Technicians: 251,221
> >>
> >>Difference: 434,250
> >>
> >> 469,398 - 434,250 = 35,148
> >>
> >>The problem is that Brian assumes all Technicians are not "coded". This is
> >>not
> >>a valid assumption, because FCC has been renewing all Technician and Tech
> >>Plus
> >>licenses as Techs since April 15, 2000. In addition, any Tech who passes
> >>Element 1 but doesn't pass any more written tests stays a Tech in the
> >>database
> >>even though they have Tech HF privs.
> >>
> >>Len Anderson made this same mistake a year or two ago and refused to
> >>acknowledge it despite repeated explanations. He even proclaimed that no
> >>Techs
> >>have HF privileges, with or without CSCEs for Element 1.
> >>
> >>Three mistakes so far.
> >>
> >>He concludes with:
> >>
> >>"There are fewer coded people in the USA today than there were 3 years
> >>ago. I just don't see Morse Code as a growth industry."
> >>
> >>which completely ignores the fact that what really matters is code USE, not
> >>code TESTS.
> >
> Well, there you have it.
>
> A rrap post from Len Anderson that does not contain any insults, ridicule,
> name-calling, factual errors, ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive
> emoticons and/or general infantile behavior.
>
> See, Dave? Len CAN do it.

He meant to do that. It was one of his carefully laid traps.

Dave K8MN

1802. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 05:28:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64039

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E8AF56A.B876C62@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8A6DCD.7305D32D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > > Just stick to Morse code proficiency. We just might get through this
> > > > > some day.
> > > >
> > > > I don't believe we will. You want someone to tell you that someone
> > > > whose maximum morse speed is five words per minute is proficient in the
> > > > use of morse. I'm not going to be the person to tell you that because I
> > > > don't believe it to be true.
> > >
> > > Dave, you let your "feelings" get in the way of objective, rational
> > > thought. You continually try to redirect the the conversation to
> > > driving or shooting or make it something personal with me.
> > >
> > It is rational and objective thought which brings me to the conclusion
> > that a person whose maximum morse speed is five words per minute is not
> > proficient in the use or morse code.
>
> Why should I believe you?

Where did you get the strange idea that I care if you believe me?

> The driving, baseball hitting and
> > shooting analogies are good comparisons. My views are not at all based
> > upon feelings but upon experience and observation.
>
> Let me know when the FCC substitutes rifle shooting, baseball, and
> driving for Morse Code exams.

What the FCC does or doesn't do is of no consequence. The FCC doesn't
certify morse, driving, shooting or baseball proficiency.

> > > And you couldn't be more wrong about what "answer" will satisfy me.
> > >
> > Prove me wrong.
>
> The only way to find out is to answer my question.

I've done so. My answer didn't satisfy you.

> > > Too bad for you.
> >
> > What are the possible "bad" consequences for me? There'll be no army of
> > 5 wpm operators protesting in front of my home. My morse speed won't be
> > effected. Those drivers, batters, shooters and morse users who are not
> > skilled or expert will still not be skilled or expert.

> But you'll still be wrong.

There is no answer which will satisfy you.

Too bad for you.

Apparently that doesn't mean anything.

Dave K8MN

1803. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 06:31:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405013153.17731.00000021@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 64040

In article <3E8E31EE.70902@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>> See, Dave? Len CAN do it.
>
> Did you swallow the hook, Jim?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Hook, line, sinker, the whole schmeer.

Sometimes I'm too subtle for those in the Ancient Radiotelegraphy
Society. :-)

1804. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 06:31:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405013154.17731.00000022@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 64041

In article <20030404202631.11628.00000010@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>>which completely ignores the fact that what really matters is code USE, not
>>>code TESTS.
>>
>Well, there you have it.
>
>A rrap post from Len Anderson that does not contain any insults, ridicule,
>name-calling, factual errors, ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive
>emoticons and/or general infantile behavior.
>
>See, Dave? Len CAN do it.

But Jimmie CANNOT. Poor baby. Still stuck in the 1940s in the constant re-creation of the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society. His little morsepride is hurt...

FCC doesn't care about morse code USE as long as all amateurs meet the regulations. ALL allocated modes are optional for ALL US radio amateurs.

What is being discussed is the TEST for morsemanship, NOT the use.

1805. Re: How's This For Courage?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 06:39:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405013919.05767.00000131@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64042

>Subject: How's This For Courage?
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 4/4/2003 9:44 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0304040744.52d0de4e@posting.google.com>

>http://www.msnbc.com/news/895233.asp?vts=040420030730

I know..this, and the incident where terrorists used a pregnant woman to lure soldiers into range of a car bomb stiffened my support for this action more than anything.

A pregnant woman...?!?!?! Can there be anything more loathesome than how they used her like that? I guess those idiots don't realize that doing stuff like that only raises the hair on an American's neck more and really drives them to fight harder.

I got a laugh from Saddam's "Information Minister" urging more car bombings. I think we should have "checkpoints" set up with cardboard "pop-ups" of soldiers...These rags can just drive up...the pop-ups will appear, and they can then save America the cost of the munitions to off them all by themselves! One less camel-fornicating, Trabant driving idiot to deal with.

Steve

1806. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 06:41:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405014131.05767.00000132@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64043

>Subject: Re: A Bet With Vippy
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/4/2003 7:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030404204741.25985.00000357@mb-ff.aol.com>

>Those with the practical experience apparently disagree about the usefulness
>of
>Morse code. The studies have been long done. The research is there. You just
>chose to ignore it.

Studies?

Research...?!?!?

BBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! !

Riiiiiiiiiight!

Steve

1807. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 06:42:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405014251.05767.00000133@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64044

>Subject: Re: A Bet With Vippy
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 4/4/2003 3:15 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0304041315.da3911e@posting.google.com>

>Brainiac the Second hath arrived.

No kidding...God save us from engineers and spoiled brat imports.

Steve

1808. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 06:55:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405015550.05767.00000134@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64045

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/4/2003 8:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030404214753.25985.00000358@mb-ff.aol.com>

>In one class meeting Comm Theory Prof said he said he was a Ham, and asked if
>anyone else is one. If antenna lab guy would not give me his call sign,
>surely
>a Prof would not give his callsign. And it would be wrong to ask your Prof's
>callsign.

It's wrong to ask your "prof" if the mole on his wife's inner thigh was
real or a paste on...You're squirming with this, Vipul, and it's fun to watch!

>If I asked this question, perhaps you would not like the answer?

Since you offer neither a name or callsign, I doubt you are talking about
a real person. Your stories are weak and references are absent.

>It may be fun to some, but its not that important. Its not important to
>hospitals, EMTs, firemen, police, coast guard, FEMA, or the military. Now
>which
>emergency communication situation could I have missed?

Vippy, you identified types of persons and agencies, NOT "emergency
communication situation(s)" However in the seven you make reference to, three
still have SOME use of Morse Code.

>Surely they know of
>Morse's existance. Its not used because its NOT the most effective means of
>communications under these situation.

Under WHAT situations? You do not set parameters of a "situation", you
simply made reference to certain types of persons or entities.

>Morse code is only important to a certain segment of Hams.

Oh? Then why is the Armed Forces still TEACHING it? Why are there still
ship-to-shore stations still passing traffic in Morse Code, Vippy? Why are
there still THOUSANDS of NAVAIDS identifying in Morse Code?

>Thats even better than my compromise proposal. I hope that happens.

Too bad you've been more interested in impressing Unca Lennie than paying
attention to what's going on around you, huh, Vippy...?!?!

Steve

1809. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 06:58:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405015851.05767.00000135@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64046

>Subject: Re: A Bet With Vippy
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 4/4/2003 8:16 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304041816.1624ff55@posting.google.com>

>Oh, boy! Yet another new thread.

While I am at it, I guess I'll just take a bit MORE trash to the curb...

Steve

1810. Re: Buying radio gear ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 08:22:35 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6m3nu$u2t$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64047

Vshah101 wrote:
>>From: "Tom Molyneaux" ke3gk@cablespeed.com
>
>
>>The Hamster Shack
>>http://www.hamstershack.com
>
>
> I see they have stuff for Hamsters. People who like amateur radio may be
> interested also.

This is a cheap insult from an ignorant troll. Experienced amateur radio operators know that only crank-fed "pit" guinea pigs have the stamina to maintain peak generating capacity when operating portable/mobile for extended periods.

73 Corry K4DOH

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/

"Here I am, the CEO of a multibillion-dollar company, and I'm having to answer about what some weirdo has said on a message board." - Richard Scrushy

1811. Re: Buying radio gear ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 09:54:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405045430.05732.00000217@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64048

>Subject: Re: Buying radio gear ?
>From: Unclaimed Mysteries k4doh@mindspring.com
>Date: 4/5/2003 2:22 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <b6m3nu$u2t$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>

>This is a cheap insult from an ignorant troll. Experienced amateur radio
>operators know that only crank-fed "pit" guinea pigs have the stamina to
>maintain peak generating capacity when operating portable/mobile for
>extended periods.

ROTMFFLMMFAO!

The problem is that Vippy is like Spock..."Humor" is a concept ill
understood.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1812. Yet Another Thread To Irk Brain

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 10:11:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405051151.05732.00000218@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64049

Nothing meaningful...Just another obsessive/compulsive need to irritate the irritating ! ! ! =)

Steve

1813. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 11:55:35 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0304050355.424bd3ec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64050

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030404160308.15625.00000028@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> In article <b7d1465c.0304040256.531b15c7@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net
> (Bert Craig) writes:
>
> >> Enjoyment is not the only criteria. Usefulness, relavance are important
> >> criteria.
> >>
> >With all do respect, your as wrong as two left feet here. CW's
> >usefulness and relevance to amateur radio are two very important
> >criteria IN FAVOR of learning the most basic (read entry-level) Morse
> >code skills. Many find enjoyment AFTER learning the basic 5-wpm and
> >find they wish to progress further.
>
> Oh?

Yeah.

> What is the International Amateur Radio Union's viewpoint on the
> relevancy of morse code testing? They are for eliminating it.

Then why are there various countries that have stated that they will
retain their code test requirements even if the ITU requirement is
dropped? Most notably, Russia and Germany. Sadly, many amateur radio
"organizations" do not echo the sentiments of the majority of their
constituency. A fair vote scares the crap out of the NCTAs.

> What is ARRL viewpoint? They were FOR it for decades but only
> lately have they taken a neutral stand, neither supporting nor
> against the code test.

The ARRL "leadership" is basically made up of psuedo-politicians.
Their biggest concern appears to be keeping their jobs, even if it
means perching themselves "on the fence" rather then taking a firm
stance for wishes of the majority of licensed US amatuers.

> What is the FCC viewpoint on code testing? FCC hasn't thought
> that the code test serves any purpose for 13 years.

Shrinking budget and limited manpower make paper reduction and
decreased administration QUITE attractive.

> What are SOME US amateur's viewpoints? Decidedly for it
> because they had to do it, therefore everyone else must do so.

SOME? Let's put it to a vote!

> With all due respect, Bert, I think you are full of snit... :-)

Coming from an unlicensed USENET newsgroupie, I'll take that as a compliment, Len. Take care now.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1814. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 13:26:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405082632.11628.00000012@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63901

In article <20030405013154.17731.00000022@mb-fk.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05 Apr 2003 06:31:54 GMT
>
>In article <20030404202631.11628.00000010@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>>>which completely ignores the fact that what really matters is code USE,
>not
>>>>code TESTS.
>>>
>>Well, there you have it.
>>
>>A rrap post from Len Anderson that does not contain any insults, ridicule,
>>name-calling, factual errors, ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive
>>emoticons and/or general infantile behavior.
>>
>>See, Dave? Len CAN do it.
>
> But Jimmie CANNOT.

CANNOT do what, Len?

> Poor baby. Still stuck in the 1940s in
> the constant re-creation of the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
> Society. His little morsepride is hurt...
>
Well, let's see. In just one paragraph Len demonstrates insults, ridicule,
name-calling, factual errors, and/or general infantile behavior. No emoticons
and no ethnic/racial/religious slurs.

Guess you're right back in form, Len.

> FCC doesn't care about morse code USE as long as all amateurs
> meet the regulations. ALL allocated modes are optional for ALL
> US radio amateurs.

Yup. FCC also doesn't care about SSB use, AM use, FM use, RTTY use, etc, etc.,
as long as all amateurs meet the regulations. ALL allocated modes are optional
for ALL US radio amateurs.

So? Is there a point to your repetition of this? Is it one of your mantras?

btw, FCC doesn't care about how old a ham is, nor how well they understand the material on the written tests, as long the tests are passed honestly and licensed amateurs meet the regulations.

> What is being discussed is the TEST for morsemanship, NOT
> the use.

Better catch up with the conversation, Len. And do check the subject line.

1815. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 13:26:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405082633.11628.00000013@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63902

In article <3E8E676B.B16A5C60@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

(N2EY wrote):
>> Well, there you have it.
>>
>> A rrap post from Len Anderson that does not contain any insults, ridicule,
>> name-calling, factual errors, ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive
>> emoticons and/or general infantile behavior.
>>
>> See, Dave? Len CAN do it.
>
>He meant to do that.

Which simply proves my point.

>It was one of his carefully laid traps.
>
What trap? Does the post contain any any insults, ridicule, name-calling,
factual errors, ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or
general infantile behavior? Not that I can see. So it IS possible - IOW, he CAN
help himself.

Of course he didn't write a single word of the post........

73 de Jim, N2EY

1816. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 14:17:17 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.05.14.17.16.913503.23211@arrl.org>
Source record: 63903

On Fri, 04 Apr 2003 23:02:08 -0500, Phil Kane wrote:
>
> Co-located with the Ag Stations are California Highway Patrol
> Truck Inspection Stations, accounting for the presence of
> "armed state troopers sitting in nearby vehicles". Does the
> visibilty of the CHP on California's highways bother you? I
> rather welcome their presence.

As well you should:
http://cartalk.cars.com/Radio/Back-Tracks/Audio/RA/ctm200214.ram

1817. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 15:26:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405102636.18459.00000008@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 63904

In article <f45722ac.0304050459.8980c7c@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 5 Apr 2003 04:59:24 -0800
>
>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030404223540.04143.00000013@mb-fb.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0304041811.6fb12dbc@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<c2356669.0304041402.17e50e04@posting.google.com>...
>> >
>> >> > > How did you arrive at those numbers?
>> >> >
>> >> > I used the science of mathematics and the number system.
>> >>
>> >> Used them incorrectly, too.
>> >
>> >Show your work, oh wise one.
>>
>> Why? You don't show yours.
>>
>> Here's a hint:
>>
>> Your numbers indicate that you consider the set of "noncoded" hams to be
>> equivalent to the set of hams with Technician licenses. That's simply not
>> correct.
>
>That is my assumption.

It's incorrect. Invalid. Untrue. The set of "noncoded" hams is not equivalent
to the set of hams with Technician licenses. Len Anderson made the same mistake
some time back.

> Why is it wrong?

Look it up. The answer was explained in detail on April 3 in this thread. It
was also repeatedly explained to Len when he made the same mistake.

1818. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 15:26:53 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405102653.24212.00000199@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 63905

From K4YZ:

I said:
>And it would be wrong to ask your Prof's
>>callsign.

Sorry, I do not know if Prof has callsign. He never said he had one.

In one class He asked "Is anyone in the class a Ham Radio operator". In same class he said "more people should get one.". From this, I assumed he had a Ham radio licence.

Noone claimed to be a Ham radio op, including those in companies that do work in the comm field. (I did not want to raise my hand).

I am no longer taking his class right now.

> Since you offer neither a name or callsign, I doubt you are talking about
>a real person.

Oh, really, You mean its fancy that there could be a Comm Theory Professor? How unlikely!

>Vippy, you identified types of persons and agencies, NOT "emergency
>communication situation(s)"

These agencies prepare for emegency situations.

>However in the seven you make reference to, three
>still have SOME use of Morse Code.

The word "SOS" is still used (see below). Any non-Ham knows SOS.

>Under WHAT situations? You do not set parameters of a "situation", you
>simply made reference to certain types of persons or entities.

How about survival situations. For example, in army survival manual, no mention of Morse code, except the word "SOS".

>Oh? Then why is the Armed Forces still TEACHING it? Why are there still
>ship-to-shore stations still passing traffic in Morse Code, Vippy? Why are
>there still THOUSANDS of NAVAIDS identifying in Morse Code?

Lots of systems are using old technologies, because they haven't updated their systems.Air traffic controllers often use outdated technology. Old technogies, equipment, and systems take time to update.

1819. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 15:59:08 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <9CA900783C953C46.E0CD7158F6CBB302.4FE0C4415FE87EC6@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 63906

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAB129D1.15717%stewart@say.net...
> "W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > Yep, you got that right for sure. There is nearly
> > no difference--the people get to go to the voting
> > booths...and I do...but why? Politicians turn
> > around and tell us we are too stupid to tell them
> > what we desire. And it doesn't matter *what*
> > political party it is, both/all do whatever the
> > hell they want while they are in office...with
> > our push of a button and at our expense.
>
>
> And, if you complain, they insist they have access to information you
> don't have - which does somewhat defeat the concept of a democratic
> government ran by the people, doesn't it? In reality, they get their
> information from the same sources we do (news agencies) and then slap a
> secret stamp on any information so we can't judge their actions.
>
>
> > Oh well...
>
>
> I'm sorry, Kim. The rant about political parties was a little off topic
> (even for the thread), so I didn't dwell on it. However, if you want to
> continue the discussion, I'm more than willing.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>

heh heh heh...You are much more patient than I, Dwight...because I don't *care* if a discussion is "off-topic" in this newsgroup. I love that argument, in fact, when someone decides "they" don't like what is being discussed. "That's off-topic;" "that has nothing to do with ham radio;" blah, blah, blah. But, if you go and check a few of their posts? hohoho, need I say more?

Anyway...naw, discussions about politics and politicians got boring years ago. All that's left to say is, literally, they do whatever they want.

Like I said, I still vote, but I don't even know why. My belief now is as long as they are not standing in my yard, I'm happy. They can have their idiotic playground...just leave me out of it. If it gets to the point I can't pay my taxes/work/etc, then I'll get upset. And, of course, they aren't going to let that happen to us, because then we do get restless....

Kim W5TIT

1820. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 16:01:50 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <E546ADE2836B93B5.00CEDC5692012862.025E53A61BB29681@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 63908

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0304030922.7165b709@posting.google.com...
>
> Here's a "what if" for ya....
>
> One of the main reasons for the war is to eliminate SH's WMDs. But no
> WMDs have been found by coalition forces yet - just lots of protective
> suits. Protective suits aren't proof that anyone has or will use WMDs
> - coalition troops have those suits, too.
>
> What if Bagdad falls and the regime changes, but no WMDs or evidence
> of same are ever found? Coalition will look like the aggressor and SH
> as a martyr who told the truth. Which may be his plan all along. Talk
> about a recruitment tool for OBL....
> >

Oh, here's my surprised look. The WMD argument is a red herring.

Kim W5TIT

1821. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 16:15:28 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <F85E4E5703CA10FA.3A51ABB72013B66A.D7B5C373BED6244C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 63907

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030403222733.00177.00000030@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <BAA92F63.14A71%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewart@say.net>
> writes:
>
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >>
> >> An important thing for loyal Americans to do is
> >> to be well informed. Any reasonably attentive
> >> student of history will be able to draw the
> >> conclusion that appeasement of dictators
> >> through diplomacy does not put an end to
> >> vicious, totalitarian regimes. They must be
> >> confronted with sufficient force to put them
> >> out of power, (snip)
> >>
> >>
> > And there are well informed Americans who disagree with the use of
force
> >to solve problems. Does that make them less loyal?
> >>
> >>
> >Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> Dwight:
>
> I'll have to say yes, it does. If any American, who enjoys the blessings
> of freedom and democracy which have been secured for him or her
> through the sacrifices made by those who willingly fought, suffered, and
> died to preserve them is not also willing to do so himself or herself,
then
> they most definitely are NOT a "loyal Americans." They are merely cowards
> living under the protection of their moral superiors.
>
> Diplomacy will always be the preferred method for settling political
> differences between nations. However, when diplomacy fails, as it
> historically will when dealing with maniacal, totalitarian dictators such
> as Saddam Hussein, then military might is the correct response.
> Nobody likes war -- it is a last resort. However, it is a resort which
must
> be taken to eliminate the evil in this world. If you disagree, consider
> yourself lucky to be living in America -- where millions of your fellow
> countrymen have sacrificed to give you the right to your disagreement.

>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> MSgt, USAF (Retired)
> Loyal American who supports our President, our Troops, and the
> War in Iraq
>

Man, what a crackpot...

Kim W5TIT

1822. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 16:20:59 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <4FE4982BA1B74B33.54B1FE846592E21F.A437FA8832FD93B4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 63909

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAB2B6FF.1588A%stewart@say.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >
> > I'll have to say yes, it does. If any American, who
> > enjoys the blessings of freedom and democracy which
> > have been secured for him or her through the sacrifices
> > made by those who willingly fought, suffered, and died
> > to preserve them is not also willing to do so himself
> > or herself, then they most definitely are NOT a
> > "loyal Americans." They are merely cowards living under
> > the protection of their moral superiors. (snip)
>
>
> That is absolute bull crap, Larry. First of all, a willingness to kill
> has never been, and should never be, the judge of someone's loyalty to
this
> country. Second, unless we now live in a military state, military service
> does not make one "superior" to other Americans. And finally, most who
> served in the military, including myself, will always strongly prefer a
> peaceful resolution over the failure of war.
>
>
> > (snip) If you disagree, consider yourself lucky to be
> > living in America -- where millions of your fellow
> > countrymen have sacrificed to give you the right to
> > your disagreement.
>
>
> Larry, as a Vietnam era vet, I served in the military just like you did,
> and certainly came as close to war as you ever did (actual combat is not
> exactly a big concern for the typical Air Force Sergeant), so don't sit
> there on your pompous butt talking about being "superior" or more loyal.
>
> The millions of fellow countrymen you described above didn't sacrifice
so
> you could describe yourself as superior and other Americans as inferior or
> yourself as more loyal with others less so. In reality, to proclaim
yourself
> more loyal or superior to other Americans is nothing more than a cruel
slap
> in the face of what they actually sacrificed for.
>
>

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

You sure do have that right, Dwight. I know a lot of former military (my father being one of them) who have no where near the sentiment nor attitude that Larry has. Soldiers like Larry didn't go off to war (if he even did) to defend "my" country. They went off to war to legally shoot, maim, and kill other people then tell all of us how superior they are.

Telling is all they can do...because it's the other soldiers I love and appreciate.

Kim W5TIT

1823. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 17:45:24 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6n4mr$82t$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63910

There in Syria. SH would NEVER destroy them.

Dan/W4NTI

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:E546ADE2836B93B5.00CEDC5692012862.025E53A61BB29681@lp.airnews.net...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0304030922.7165b709@posting.google.com...
> >
> > Here's a "what if" for ya....
> >
> > One of the main reasons for the war is to eliminate SH's WMDs. But no
> > WMDs have been found by coalition forces yet - just lots of protective
> > suits. Protective suits aren't proof that anyone has or will use WMDs
> > - coalition troops have those suits, too.
> >
> > What if Bagdad falls and the regime changes, but no WMDs or evidence
> > of same are ever found? Coalition will look like the aggressor and SH
> > as a martyr who told the truth. Which may be his plan all along. Talk
> > about a recruitment tool for OBL....
> > >
>
> Oh, here's my surprised look. The WMD argument is a red herring.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

1824. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 17:57:29 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6n5dfdht1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63911

Even from you I am amazed. I bet you would have made a good war protester in the 60s. Im sure General Giap would have personally given you the Hanoi peace prize.

You have just insulted anyone that has ever worn the uniform of this country, whether they actually 'went to war' or not. You own Larry and every Marine, Sailor, Soldier, Airman and Coast Guard member an apology.

ANY person, male of female, that served at ANY TIME, WAR OR PEACE deserves the RESPECT and GRATITUDE of the nation they served. NO EXCEPTIONS.

You being a 'military brat' should know of the day to day sacrifices they make. And when one does it for twenty or more years, then they deserve it even more.

Do you know of ANY National holiday for draft dodgers?

Dan/W4NTI

Soldiers like Larry didn't go off to war (if he even did)
> to defend "my" country. They went off to war to legally shoot, maim, and
> kill other people then tell all of us how superior they are.
>
> Telling is all they can do...because it's the other soldiers I love and
> appreciate.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

1825. Re: Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 18:18:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405131817.23238.00000008@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 63912

In article <f45722ac.0304041833.17e39ea9@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030403173224.11311.00000011@mb-fd.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0304030024.1102b1aa@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >> You have to admit that this one would be difficult to forget.
>> >> Masa's likely forgetten the whole thing by now and is likely sitting
>> >> quietly at home--probabry sipping some Ripton Tea.
>> >
>> >Whatta jerk he was . . I popped him with a bunch of binaries he
>> >couldn't handle which really ticked him off and called him "cootie
>> >boy" to boot. Those were "unrestricted warfare days" in this village.
>>
>> You've managed to "destroy the village in order to save it?" :-)
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk, some ethnic-racial improprieties used by Kellie's
>> compatriot and worshipper of the PCTA Religion (SS chapter).
>>
>>
>> >The Putz went ape when I got into the subject of the neighborhood CBer
>> >who had a 35kW rig in his Chebby Suburban. Another memorable thread.
>> >
>> >Last I heard abt Cootie was that he'd sold all his ham gear and
>> >evaporated.
>>
>> Evaporate yourself, olde-tymer. :-)
>
>For a brief moment, in the heat of binary battle, Kelley probably
>forgot all about his bran cereal and prune juice.

It's the strain of all those katapult krunches and the secret
missions for the USN on photographing bears. :-)

Kellie forgot that "binaries" don't get displayed here via most
URLs. He also didn't calculate anything for the "discussion"
about powering a multi-KW RF amplifier from a vehicle
electrical system in that way long-ago thread. That's okay
since Kellie might still believe that WW2 vehicles all had
28 VDC electrical systems. :-)

Too much morse will rot the brain, Brian, this is proof...

1826. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 19:07:48 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E8F2984.4070305@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 63917

W5TIT wrote:

>>I'll have to say yes, it does. If any American, who enjoys the blessings
>>of freedom and democracy which have been secured for him or her
>>through the sacrifices made by those who willingly fought, suffered, and
>>died to preserve them is not also willing to do so himself or herself,
>
> then
>
>>they most definitely are NOT a "loyal Americans." They are merely cowards
>>living under the protection of their moral superiors.
>>
>>Diplomacy will always be the preferred method for settling political
>>differences between nations. However, when diplomacy fails, as it
>>historically will when dealing with maniacal, totalitarian dictators such
>>as Saddam Hussein, then military might is the correct response.
>>Nobody likes war -- it is a last resort. However, it is a resort which
>
> must
>
>>be taken to eliminate the evil in this world. If you disagree, consider
>>yourself lucky to be living in America -- where millions of your fellow
>>countrymen have sacrificed to give you the right to your disagreement.
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>MSgt, USAF (Retired)
>>Loyal American who supports our President, our Troops, and the
>>War in Iraq
>>
>
>
> Man, what a crackpot...
>
> Kim W5TIT

Crackpot? I would say he is right on target.

1827. Re: How's This For Courage?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 19:26:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405142634.18459.00000010@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 63913

In article <20030405013919.05767.00000131@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>Subject: Re: How's This For Courage?
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 05 Apr 2003 06:39:19 GMT
>
>>Subject: How's This For Courage?
>>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>>Date: 4/4/2003 9:44 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <c2356669.0304040744.52d0de4e@posting.google.com>
>
>
>>http://www.msnbc.com/news/895233.asp?vts=040420030730
>
> I know..this, and the incident where terrorists used a pregnant woman to
>lure soldiers into range of a car bomb stiffened my support for this action
>more than anything.

Consider how much that fellow risked to help a coalition POW. That guy KNOWS what the regime would do to him and his if they ever found out.
>
> A pregnant woman...?!?!?!

Sure. After 20+ years of atrocities by the regime, why should anyone be surprised?

>Can there be anything more loathesome than how
>they used her like that?

You really don't want to know the answer to that question.

>I guess those idiots don't realize that doing stuff
>like that only raises the hair on an American's neck more and really drives
>them to fight harder.

Exactly.

I wish N0BK could comment on the surrealism of the Iraqi Information Minister's lies becoming more and more outrageous.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1828. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 20:20:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB4A4A6.159D0%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63914

"D. Stussy" wrote:

> Actually, these are CA Dept. of Agriculture
> stations and for those not at the Mexican
> border, you will find that they may be as
> much as 100 miles IN FROM the state border.
> Usually, the stop for a passenger vehicle
> is 20 seconds or less.

Actually, the inspection stations on I-10 and I-40 are both within a few miles of the state line, not "100 miles IN FROM the state border." At 100 miles in, they would be near San Bernardino or Riverside (which they obviously are not).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1829. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 20:20:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405152049.23756.00000034@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63915

In article <b6n5dfdht1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>ANY person, male of female, that served at ANY TIME, WAR OR PEACE
>deserves
>the RESPECT and GRATITUDE of the nation they served. NO EXCEPTIONS.

None? Not even John A. Walker, Jr.?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1830. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 21:02:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB4AE7E.159D2%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63916

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> Sorry, Dwight, but your implication of "inspection
> stations backed by armed state troopers" seems a
> bit harsh.

There is no implication other than the reality of the situation, Len. Those stations exist, state troopers are often parked there, and the only other place I've seen this is at our national borders.

> California is a HUGE agricultural state. The
> gigantic San Joaquin Valley is perhaps the best
> evidence of that...it takes a day to drive its
> north-south length on Interstate 5. The mobility
> of the public poses a threat to some of the
> agribusiness here through (usually inadvertent)
> vectoring of insects which may damage the fruit
> crops.

Len, many other states are involved in agricultural production without the use of state inspection stations along their borders. Why is California the only state in this country that stops American travelers at its borders, for this or any other reason? Why are travelers made to feel their food products are unclean because it was purchased elsewhere? Why aren't travelers reimbursed for the items seized at these inspection stations? I have traveled in and out of California many times in my life and have always felt uncomfortable about these inspection stations.

> The questioning by (unarmed) California inspectors
> is a direct, perfunctory "are you carrying any
> fruit in the vehicle?" A simple answer of "no"
> will allow passage. Anyone who feels they have
> to argue the point will be requested to exit the
> vehicle while it is searched. Those individuals
> are naturally put out by not being able to give
> inspectors a hard time, poor things. The rest
> of us know the drill, obey the law, and we are
> inconvenienced only a few minutes of time.

So anyone who doesn't liked to be stopped and questioned at state check points while traveling across this country is really just a troublemaker. Nonsense. As long as free and unrestricted travel across this country is a right of all citizens, I don't like to be stopped at state check points for this or any other reason. And, as long as I'm obeying this nation's laws, not some local law passed to benefit fruit growers, it is really nobody's business what I'm carrying in my vehicle - perhaps I like the Orange I have

better then what can be purchased in California.

> (snip) Many easterners are against California for no
> other reason than pique and jealousy.

Don't try to turn this into an California versus "easterners" thing, Len.
I grew up in California. I've lived in California many times throughout my life. Most of my family, and my wife's family, now lives in California. None of that changes my overall impression of these inspection stations.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1831. Re: Yet Another Thread To Irk Brain

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 21:20:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405162036.13308.00000042@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 63918

In article <20030405051151.05732.00000218@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>Nothing meaningful...Just another obsessive/compulsive need to irritate the
>irritating ! ! ! =)
>
>Steve

More trash to "take to the curb..."

1832. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 21:20:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405162039.13308.00000043@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 63920

In article <b7d1465c.0304050355.424bd3ec@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net
(Bert Craig) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030404160308.15625.00000028@mb-ch.aol.com>...
>> In article <b7d1465c.0304040256.531b15c7@posting.google.com>,
>wa2si@arrl.net
>> (Bert Craig) writes:
>>
>> >> Enjoyment is not the only criteria. Usefulness, relavance are important
>> >> criteria.
>> >
>> >With all do respect, your as wrong as two left feet here. CW's
>> >usefulness and relevance to amateur radio are two very important
>> >criteria IN FAVOR of learning the most basic (read entry-level) Morse
>> >code skills. Many find enjoyment AFTER learning the basic 5-wpm and
>> >find they wish to progress further.
>>
>> Oh?
>
>Yeah.

What of the many that -

1. Tried it and found it of NO enjoyment?

2. Have been in radio communications for years and never used it?

3. Noted that no other radio service uses it any more or never
planned to use it in that service at all?

4. Don't buy into the fantasy mystique of the Way of Morse?

5. Don't believe that time stands still with no progress in any
technology such as some olde-tyme amateurs?

>> What is the International Amateur Radio Union's viewpoint on the
>> relevancy of morse code testing? They are for eliminating it.
>
>Then why are there various countries that have stated that they will
>retain their code test requirements even if the ITU requirement is
>dropped? Most notably, Russia and Germany.

What about them? What has Russia done that is so notable
in either geopolitics or radio communications concerning
amateur radio?

Germany is at least venturing into some experimentation in
amateur radio technology (evidenced by European amateur
radio publications) but is no longer a world leader in radio
communications or electronics.

Nearly ALL countries are involved in expansion of commercial
radio-electronics with little regard for hobby-leisure pursuits
involving amateur radio and the furtherance of the morse code
state of the art.

>Sadly, many amateur radio
>"organizations" do not echo the sentiments of the majority of their
>constituency.

That applies to ARRL as well, the fence-straddler and do-little
organization for the ITU-R S25 restructuring who refuses to
take any position on the morse code issue now.

>A fair vote scares the crap out of the NCTAs.

It does NOT. Morse code mode is on the way of becoming
defunct, extinct to every other radio service in the world
except amateur radio. If the PCTAs continue their fantasy
and mythology of the Way of Morse, then they too will
become defunct, extinct, archaeological exhibits in a living
museum of archaic radio.

>> What is ARRL viewpoint? They were FOR it for decades but only
>> lately have they taken a neutral stand, neither supporting nor
>> against the code test.
>
>The ARRL "leadership" is basically made up of psuedo-politicians.
>Their biggest concern appears to be keeping their jobs, even if it
>means perching themselves "on the fence" rather then taking a firm
>stance for wishes of the majority of licensed US amatuers.

ARRL "leadership" is not my concern. They do NOT "represent"
me nor do they "represent" anyone but a minority of licensed
US radio amateur licensees.

ARRL does have a large enough membership and economic
means to lobby for the maintenance of the Archaic Radio-
telegraphy Society desires in a hobby pursuit and radio
regulations pertaining to amateur radio.

ARRL is not possessed of infinite wisdom in the radio arts
of any kind and is the survivor-champion of influence groups
in the USA in regards to amateur radio (the Radio Club of
America is the older survivor but does not concentrate on
amateur radio activities). Their propaganda has continued
in the vein of self-service and self-promotion for a half century.

>> What is the FCC viewpoint on code testing? FCC hasn't thought
>> that the code test serves any purpose for 13 years.

>
>Shrinking budget and limited manpower make paper reduction and
>decreased administration QUITE attractive.

NOT a viable reason considering that privatization of US radio
operator testing removes any, repeat ANY testing directly by
the FCC. That applied to commercial as well as amateur
licenses.

FCC is NOT an academic institution to "grade" amateur
proficiency in anything. They simply regulate US civil radio,
amateur radio being a small part of that. Operator licensing
is considered a tool of regulation, not a federal merit badge
of excellence in radio arts...as often thought by ARRL and
some fantasy/role-playing amateurs.

Believe it or not, the FCC has a record of progressiveness
in radio regulation...despite the politically-biased opinions
of political decisions forced on them. ARRL does not cover
that part of FCC activities despite the public evidence now
easily seen on the Web. Such is of "no concern" to ARRL
except as some space-filler newsy item in a publication or
useful in ARRL's self-promotion.

>> What are SOME US amateur's viewpoints? Decidedly for it
>> because they had to do it, therefore everyone else must do so.
>
>SOME? Let's put it to a vote!

Don't bother with the small sampling found in here.

The minority group "representative" called ARRL has created
the mythology and fantasy of radio excellence that has
become a Belief System embedded in the psyche of those
"some" radio amateurs. It is cultist in nature, founded on
the "leadership" espoused by ARRL and reinforced by years
of self-promotional propaganda.

The old-time licensees in here, achieving their "superiority"
in rank-title-status under the former US amateur radio
structure will have none of that. They fear loss of self-
esteem by being perceived as "lesser" under changes
lessening that beloved rank-title-status. They MUST
retain the code test in order to show their "superiority" in
one aspect of amateur radio. It matters not to them that
keeping such code testing affects thousands of others who
might also want to be licensed radio amateurs.

>> With all due respect, Bert, I think you are full of snit... :-)
>
>Coming from an unlicensed USENET newsgroupie, I'll take that as a
>compliment, Len. Take care now.

NO license is required to use the Internet or newsgroups. Never has been such.

News: I've been federally licensed in radio since 1956...just not in amateur radio.

1833. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 21:20:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405162041.13308.00000044@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 63921

In article <20030405015550.05767.00000134@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/4/2003 8:47 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030404214753.25985.00000358@mb-ff.aol.com>
>
>>In one class meeting Comm Theory Prof said he said he was a Ham, and asked
>if
>>anyone else is one. If antenna lab guy would not give me his call sign,
>>surely
>>a Prof would not give his callsign. And it would be wrong to ask your Prof's
>>callsign.
>
> It's wrong to ask your "prof" if the mole on his wife's inner thigh was
>real or a paste on...You're squirming with this, Vipul, and it's fun to
>watch!

Tsk, tsk, tsk. The veteran of "seven hostile actions" misdirects
to macho sex subjects and attempts to humiliate others.

Sociopathic behavior.

>>If I asked this question, perhaps you would not like the answer?
>
> Since you offer neither a name or callsign, I doubt you are talking about
>a real person. Your stories are weak and references are absent.

Example of "weak and absent references:" SEVEN HOSTILE
ACTIONS.

>>It may be fun to some, but its not that important. Its not important to
>>hospitals, EMTs, firemen, police, coast guard, FEMA, or the military. Now
>>which emergency communication situation could I have missed?
>
> Vippy, you identified types of persons and agencies, NOT "emergency
>communication situation(s)" However in the seven you make reference to,
>three still have SOME use of Morse Code.

They do NOT "use" morse code for radio communications.

The "seven hostile action" hero attempts repetition of mythology
and fantasy to prove his point. It does not prove a thing.

>>Surely they know of
>>Morse's existance. Its not used because its NOT the most effective means of

>>communications under these situation.
>
> Under WHAT situations? You do not set parameters of a "situation", you
>simply made reference to certain types of persons or entities.

Answer the question. If you can. It is doubtful you can.

>>Morse code is only important to a certain segment of Hams.
>
> Oh? Then why is the Armed Forces still TEACHING it? Why are there still
>ship-to-shore stations still passing traffic in Morse Code, Vippy? Why are
>there still THOUSANDS of NAVAIDS identifying in Morse Code?

Morse code cognition is taught solely for Military Intelligence
purposes on intercepting certain enemy communications. Morse
code is NOT used in US military radio communications.

Enumerate the "ship-to-shore stations still passing traffic in morse
code." In the USA and possessions, "morse code traffic" has been
done in anniversary celebrations for one-day periods.

Robeson has been informed of modern-day aircraft radio-
navigation procedures which were existance before he could
be qualified as any sort of aircrew. The HUNDREDS (not
"thousands") of US civil aircraft radionavigation ground stations
operate under regulations made in the 1950s. The automatic
morse code identifying tone keying has not been removed from
regulations in a half century.

Robeson should explain how "morse code identification" is
done on DME (Distance Measuring Equipment). Robeson
should explain how "morse code identification" is done on
TACAN (TACtical Area Navigation). Robeson should explain
how "morse code identification" is done on Glideslope.
Robeson should explain how "morse code identification" is
done on 75 MHz Marker Beacons. Robeson should explain
how "morse code identification" is done on ATC Interrogators.

Robeson cannot explain any of that because such morse
code identification is NOT DONE by those US aircraft
radionavigation stations.

>>Thats even better than my compromise proposal. I hope that happens.
>
> Too bad you've been more interested in impressing Unca Lennie than
>paying attention to what's going on around you, huh, Vippy...?!?!

The bottom line is that Robeson has NO valid statements made
since he does NOT know US aircraft radionavigation systems'
basic technology now or that over the last half century.

1834. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 21:20:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405162042.13308.00000046@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 63919

In article <F85E4E5703CA10FA.3A51ABB72013B66A.D7B5C373BED6244C@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>> MSgt, USAF (Retired)
>> Loyal American who supports our President, our Troops, and the
>> War in Iraq
>>
>
>Man, what a crackpot...

That may be but he claims to be your "moral superior..." :-)

1835. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 21:20:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405162042.13308.00000045@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 63923

In article <b6n5dfdht1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Even from you I am amazed. I bet you would have made a good war protester
>in the 60s. Im sure General Giap would have personally given you the Hanoi
>peace prize.

The Vietnam War was not the ONLY war fought by the USA since
the Korean War. Try refreshing your memory of what happened
since 1973...a mere 30 years. Try Grenada, Panama, Gulf War
1 and now Gulf War 2.

>You have just insulted anyone that has ever worn the uniform of this
>country, whether they actually 'went to war' or not. You own Larry and
>every Marine, Sailor, Soldier, Airman and Coast Guard member an apology.

As a veteran of the United States Army 1952-1960 I don't see
a single "insult" in Kim's remarks.

You owe ME an apology. So does Roll for his "moral superiority"
self-elevation.

>ANY person, male of female, that served at ANY TIME, WAR OR PEACE >deserves
>the RESPECT and GRATITUDE of the nation they served. NO EXCEPTIONS.

Except: Among radio amateurs who love to insult non-amateurs
by stating they were in "rear areas" during a war.

>You being a 'military brat' should know of the day to day sacrifices they
>make. And when one does it for twenty or more years, then they deserve it
>even more.

Are you also one of those "moral superiors" too?

1836. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 21:20:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405162043.13308.00000047@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 63922

In article <20030405102636.18459.00000008@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <f45722ac.0304050459.8980c7c@posting.google.com>,
>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>Date: 5 Apr 2003 04:59:24 -0800
>>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>>news:<20030404223540.04143.00000013@mb-fb.aol.com>...
>>> In article <f45722ac.0304041811.6fb12dbc@posting.google.com>,
>>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>>
>>> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>>> >news:<c2356669.0304041402.17e50e04@posting.google.com>...
>>> >
>>> >> > > How did you arrive at those numbers?
>>> >> >
>>> >> > I used the science of mathematics and the number system.
>>> >>
>>> >> Used them incorrectly, too.
>>> >
>>> >Show your work, oh wise one.
>>>
>>> Why? You don't show yours.
>>>
>>> Here's a hint:
>>>
>>> Your numbers indicate that you consider the set of "noncoded" hams to be
>>> equivalent to the set of hams with Technician licenses. That's simply not
>>> correct.
>>
>>That is my assumption.
>
>It's incorrect. Invalid. Untrue. The set of "noncoded" hams is not equivalent
>to the set of hams with Technician licenses. Len Anderson made the same
>mistake some time back.

No, you poor baby crying about a past argument you did not win.

My remarks on the pre-restructuring new licensees showed that
the OVERWHELMING majority of new licensees came from the
(then) NO-CODE Technician class. Those were responsible for

a license number growth of over 200,000 in the nine years of the
original NO-CODE Technican class. Without that class of
license the total amateur license numbers would have SHRUNK
noticeably.

You never wanted to admit what the numbers clearly stated.

What you did was borrow Sperioni's kind of statistical grouping
of lumping both (old and new) Technician classes together...and
then tried to make that the ONLY way to group them.

Bad form, OM.

>> Why is it wrong?
>
>Look it up. The answer was explained in detail on April 3 in this thread. It
>was also repeatedly explained to Len when he made the same mistake.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. It is "wrong" only because it does not put morse
code in a favorable position.

Miccolis cannot accept rational arguments against morse code.

It's that simple.

1837. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 21:20:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405162045.13308.00000048@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 63924

In article <20030405082632.11628.00000012@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>> Poor baby. Still stuck in the 1940s in
>> the constant re-creation of the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
>> Society. His little morsepride is hurt...
>>
>Well, let's see. In just one paragraph Len demonstrates insults, ridicule,
>name-calling, factual errors, and/or general infantile behavior. No emoticons
>and no ethnic/racial/religious slurs.

Poor baby. Morsepride is still hurt.

You continue to dwell on an old argument on technician groupings where you LOST. You LOST that one because you could not accept negatives about morse code.

Without the NO-CODE Technician class license created in 1990, today's total amateur radio licensees would likely be 200,000 LESS. That was pointed out to you (not just by me) but you would have none of it.

Face it. Morse is fast becoming obsolete. Only amateurs use it because older amateur morsemen insist it be forced down newcomers' throats. No validity other than some nebulous "tradition." Morse testing was always done in amateur radio therefore it must continue to be done. Invalid.

>Guess you're right back in form, Len.

And your little morsepride is still hurt. Poor baby.

>So? Is there a point to your repetition of this? Is it one of your mantras?

I wonder on the "point" of it myself since the morsemen in here are such religious fanatics that they cannot accept any situation where no code testing is done.

You cannot accept such a no-code-test situation so therefore we are at an impasse. But...we aren't there to all the other newsgroup readers. It is to them I point out the futility of maintaining the standards and practices of the 1930s in amateur radio.

>btw, FCC doesn't care about how old a ham is, nor how well they understand the
>material on the written tests, as long the tests are passed honestly and
>licensed amateurs meet the regulations.

Poor baby...trying to misdirect into other threads are you? :-)

MORSE CODE TESTING is directly involved in the "ARS License
Numbers" subject.

You lost the pre-restructuring numbers argument and cannot give
up. Insufferable pride you have, Yoda told me.

>> What is being discussed is the TEST for morsemanship, NOT
>> the use.
>
>Better catch up with the conversation, Len. And do check the subject line.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, I did check the subject line. Since you are NOT the
"conversation monitor" in here, I'm not forced to follow your
misdirections into "age" or "knowledge of questions." Nice try,
but it doesn't work.

The bottom line on ARS License Numbers is that the GROWTH
in total ARS licenses in the USA was due to the NO-CODE
Technician class prior to US amateur radio restructuring.

Without that NO-CODE class license created in 1990, today's
total ARS license numbers would have been much less.

1838. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 21:22:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB4B2C5.159D4%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63925

"Phil Kane" wrote:

> This is an agricultural inspection to keep
> parasites and other pests from decimating
> the state's crops (California is still the
> number one state in agricultural production
> and export), and other Western states did
> have similar inspection stations when I was
> doing a lot of cross-country driving in the
> 60s and 70s.
>
> (snip) California has the right as well as
> the obligation to make such inspections.

Phil, what is other states took the same position towards California? California often has fairly unique parasites and pests infesting their food products - the California Fruit Fly springs to mind. What if all other states routinely stopped travelers at their borders and seized food products from California? And not just during the California Fruit Fly scare, but for all time (these inspection stations have been at the California borders for decades). Californians would be absolutely outraged (and the fruit farmers would go ballistic), yet they expect residents of other states to say nothing when California does this very thing to them. Does California have a right to have these inspections? Obviously, they do. But that certainly doesn't change the impression it leaves.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1839. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 21:27:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405162705.23238.00000012@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 63926

In article <b6n4mr$82t$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>There in Syria. SH would NEVER destroy them.
>
How do you know, Dan? From his past behavior, I'd suspect that SH would destroy them before he'd ever let them fall into the hands of someone who he did not control 100%.

But suppose you're right, and they are now in Syria. That would put 'em that much closer to Israel, as a direct consequence of the war.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1840. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 21:27:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405162705.23238.00000011@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 63927

In article <E546ADE2836B93B5.00CEDC5692012862.025E53A61BB29681@lp.airnews.net>,
"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0304030922.7165b709@posting.google.com...
>>
>> Here's a "what if" for ya....
>>
>> One of the main reasons for the war is to eliminate SH's WMDs. But no
>> WMDs have been found by coalition forces yet - just lots of protective
>> suits. Protective suits aren't proof that anyone has or will use WMDs
>> - coalition troops have those suits, too.
>>
>> What if Bagdad falls and the regime changes, but no WMDs or evidence
>> of same are ever found? Coalition will look like the aggressor and SH
>> as a martyr who told the truth. Which may be his plan all along. Talk
>> about a recruitment tool for OBL....
>> >
>
>Oh, here's my surprised look. The WMD argument is a red herring.
>
Really? I thought it was probably the best argument the coalition has.

If WMDs are the red herring, what's the real reason?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1841. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 21:34:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB4B622.159D6%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63928

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:

> I have no idea what Larry did in the AF. But
> I can assure you that just because one is
> wearing AF Blue does NOT mean he wasn't in
> the 'crap'.

Dan, it wasn't a putdown of the Air Force, just a simple observation - actual combat is not exactly a big concern for the "TYPICAL" Air Force Sergeant. My father was in the Air Force and would agree with that observation (one of the arguments he used while trying to talk me into going into the Air Force instead of the Army - his point was service can be done many ways.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1842. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 22:08:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB4BE22.159D8%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63929

"W5TIT" wrote:

> (snip) Anyway...naw, discussions about politics
> and politicians got boring years ago. All that's
> left to say is, literally, they do whatever they
> want.

You're probably right, both about them doing whatever they want and that's all left to say - I don't see how I can easily expand on what I said in that long-winded rant.

> (snip) If it gets to the point I can't pay my
> taxes/work/etc, then I'll get upset. And, of
> course, they aren't going to let that happen
> to us, because then we do get restless....

You've got it figured out - take all they can, but keep everyone satisfied just enough not to revolt. It is a game played many times in history, sometimes not so successfully (witness the various revolutions). But, looking at the overall apathy in this country today, they are doing just fine with this game at the moment.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1843. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 22:11:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB4BEC5.159D9%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63930

"W5TIT" wrote:

> (snip) I know a lot of former military (my father
> being one of them) who have no where near the
> sentiment nor attitude that Larry has.

I hope few (military or otherwise) have the sentiments or attitudes Larry has.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1844. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 22:12:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405171203.08746.00000506@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63931

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/5/2003 9:26 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030405102653.24212.00000199@mb-fr.aol.com>

>In one class He asked "Is anyone in the class a Ham Radio operator". In same
>class he said "more people should get one.". From this, I assumed he had a
>Ham
>radio licence.

Do you not know the old saying about what "assuming" does, Vipul?

I know a lot of people who encourage others to stop smoking or learn CPR,
but it does not make them Nurses or Physicians!

>Noone claimed to be a Ham radio op, including those in companies that do work
>in the comm field. (I did not want to raise my hand).

WHOA! But...but...but...VIPUL! YOU stated in this very forum that YOU
support Amateur Radio in non-Amateur Radio forums... ! ! !

Did you lie about supporting Amateur Radio then or are you lying about
this now?

>I am no longer taking his class right now.

I am sure he's losing sleep over why you quit.

> > Since you offer neither a name or callsign, I doubt you are talking about
>>a real person.
>
>Oh, really, You mean its fancy that there could be a Comm Theory Professor?
>How
>unlikely!

There's nothing fancy about it, Vippy. You won't identify this person,
ergo I have to assume (yes...assume), in the face of no other evidence to the
contrary, that this "person" you are using as "support" for your arguments does
not exist.

>>Vippy, you identified types of persons and agencies, NOT "emergency
>>communication situation(s)"
>
>These agencies prepare for emegency situations.

Yes, they do, but thee is a diffrence between an "emergency situation" and
a person who responds to them.

Your lack of command of the language is glaring here.

>>However in the seven you make reference to, three
>>still have SOME use of Morse Code.
>
>The word "SOS" is still used (see below). Any non-Ham knows SOS.

"SOS". is not a word. It is a letter group. "SOS" is not used as a "word" to declare an emergency in voice communications...Either "MAYDAY" or "I am declaring an emergency" are recognized as such. ITU and ICAO refer.

>>Under WHAT situations? You do not set parameters of a "situation", you
>>simply made reference to certain types of persons or entities.
>
>How about survival situations. For example, in army survival manual, no
>mention
>of Morse code, except the word "SOS".

What "army survival manual", Vippy? When did you serve in the Armed Forces of the Untied States? Which branch and in what MOS? Did you attened SERE School? (if I have to tell you what it is, you didn't go...)

>>Oh? Then why is the Armed Forces still TEACHING it? Why are there still
>>ship-to-shore stations still passing traffic in Morse Code, Vippy? Why are
>>there still THOUSANDS of NAVAIDS identifying in Morse Code?
>
>Lots of systems are using old technologies, because they haven't updated
>their
>systems.Air traffic controllers often use outdated technology. Old
>technogies,
>equipment, and systems take time to update.

Morse Code identifiers are used on NAVAIDS because they are simple to implement, and non-English users who might have a problem with accent can simply look at the chart and "decode" the letters from the chart. (A dot/dash chart is provided on every aeronautical chart to "decode" the identifiers)

This is PART of the reason why Morse Code remains a favorite mode among those who enjoy "DXing" and rag-chewing on HF...One does not have to embarrass one's self with frequent requests to "say again" because of misunderstood accents or misapplied slang, etc.

Steve

1845. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 22:24:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB4C1D8.159DB%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63932

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:

> (snip) You have just insulted anyone that has
> ever worn the uniform of this country, whether
> they actually 'went to war' or not. You own
> Larry and every Marine, Sailor, Soldier, Airman
> and Coast Guard member an apology.

You misunderstood what she said, Dan. She was differentiating between those who join for self-serving reasons and those who serve for the defense of this country - stating the later were the soldiers she truly appreciated. As such, she owes nobody an apology because I'm sure most military personnel would fully agree with that (except perhaps the ones who joined for the self-serving reasons).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1846. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 22:39:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304051439.59b9bd5f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63933

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>...

> Apparently that doesn't mean anything.
>
> Dave K8MN

Most of what you say doesn't mean anything.

1847. Re: How's This For Courage?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 22:40:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405174046.11628.00000017@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63934

In article <20030405142634.18459.00000010@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>I guess those idiots don't realize that doing stuff
>>like that only raises the hair on an American's neck more and really drives
>>them to fight harder.
>
>Exactly.
>
>I wish N0BK could comment on the surrealism of the Iraqi Information Minister's
>lies becoming more and more outrageous.

It's no different than the PCTAs' strident arguments for the retention of the morse code test... :-)

1848. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 22:40:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405174046.11628.00000018@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63935

In article <BAB4B622.159D6%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
>> I have no idea what Larry did in the AF. But
>> I can assure you that just because one is
>> wearing AF Blue does NOT mean he wasn't in
>> the 'crap'.
>
> Dan, it wasn't a putdown of the Air Force, just a simple observation -
>actual combat is not exactly a big concern for the "TYPICAL" Air Force
>Sergeant. My father was in the Air Force and would agree with that
>observation (one of the arguments he used while trying to talk me into going
>into the Air Force instead of the Army - his point was service can be done
>many ways.

Dwight, not in here unless one was a veteran of "seven hostile
actions!" :-) :-) :-)

1849. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 22:40:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405174047.11628.00000019@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 63936

In article <BAB4AE7E.159D2%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>> Sorry, Dwight, but your implication of "inspection
>> stations backed by armed state troopers" seems a
>> bit harsh.
>
> There is no implication other than the reality of the situation, Len.
>Those stations exist, state troopers are often parked there, and the only
>other place I've seen this is at our national borders.

I've seen CHP armed troopers on all the freeways around here.
That's their job...to patrol the state highways (and freeways
going through several cities), inspect vehicles (for lots of things),
and generally enforce the state law.

> Len, many other states are involved in agricultural production without the
>use of state inspection stations along their borders. Why is California the
>only state in this country that stops American travelers at its borders, for
>this or any other reason?

I'd call it protection of the state. :-)

>Why are travelers made to feel their food products
>are unclean because it was purchased elsewhere?

Dirty food is unclean regardless of point of purchase.

>Why aren't travelers
>reimbursed for the items seized at these inspection stations?

Why?

>I have
>traveled in and out of California many times in my life and have always felt
>uncomfortable about these inspection stations.

Not our problem, Dwight. I'd suggest a better seat cushion or
replacement of shock absorbers if you feel uncomfortable.

> So anyone who doesn't liked to be stopped and questioned at state check
>points while traveling across this country is really just a troublemaker.

No. Those who try to give inspectors a difficult time are the
troublemakers.

>Nonsense. As long as free and unrestricted travel across this country is a
>right of all citizens, I don't like to be stopped at state check points for
>this or any other reason.

Dwight, you can be stopped by state or local police ANYWHERE
if they have reason to suspect you are breaking some law. That's
normal. "Free and unrestricted travel across this country" does
NOT mean some absolute freedom to do anything you want.

>And, as long as I'm obeying this nation's laws,
>not some local law passed to benefit fruit growers, it is really nobody's
>business what I'm carrying in my vehicle - perhaps I like the Orange I have
>better then what can be purchased in California.

Okay, you've made your point, namely YOU DON'T LIKE IT.

>> (snip) Many easterners are against California for no
>> other reason than pique and jealousy.
>
>Don't try to turn this into an California versus "easterners" thing, Len.
>I grew up in California. I've lived in California many times throughout my
>life. Most of my family, and my wife's family, now lives in California.

Okay, I was NOT born in California. I was born in Illinois, east
of the Mississippi River. I chose California to live in, to work in,
back in 1956.

Nonetheless, many easterners are against California for no
other reason than pique and jealousy.

I didn't say YOU had any "pique or jealousy," did I? :-)

>None
>of that changes my overall impression of these inspection stations.

Okay, whatever. Doesn't have anything to do with "No more FCC
regulation," does it? :-)

1850. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 22:54:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304051454.83d425e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63937

wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote in message
news:<b7d1465c.0304050355.424bd3ec@posting.google.com>...

> > What is ARRL viewpoint? They were FOR it for decades but only
> > lately have they taken a neutral stand, neither supporting nor
> > against the code test.
>
> The ARRL "leadership" is basically made up of psuedo-politicians.
> Their biggest concern appears to be keeping their jobs, even if it
> means perching themselves "on the fence" rather then taking a firm
> stance for wishes of the majority of licensed US amatuers.

Not true. The ARRL spent the better part of 12 years pissing off this
member on the issue. But I did prefer their professionalism in the
matter rather than their eyes rolled back, Code Forever constituincy.

Brian

1851. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 22:54:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304051454.766761c8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63938

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030405015851.05767.00000135@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: A Bet With Vippy
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 4/4/2003 8:16 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0304041816.1624ff55@posting.google.com>
>
> >Oh, boy! Yet another new thread.
>
> While I am at it, I guess I'll just take a bit MORE trash to the curb...
>
> Steve

Just don't let it pile up in your house.

1852. Re: Plop-Plop Fizz Fizz Oh What A Relief It Is...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 23:04:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304051504.73357f75@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63939

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030404170643.23165.00000026@mb-cv.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0304041209.73cf33c4@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030403173218.11311.00000006@mb-fd.aol.com>...
> >
> >> Remember, Real Hams work DX on HF with CW.
> >
> >Ahem, please make that "with FAST CW."
>
> OK, but remember, "fast" is a four-letter word... :-)
>
>
> Come to think of it, so is "code." :-)

So is rrap.

1853. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 23:12:25 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6nnrt$215$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63940

Len Over 21...we all have your number. Stir up the crap. Dont need it.
And DONT CARE WHAT YOU THINK...I put you on the dumbass list a long time
ago.

Dan/W4NTI

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030405162042.13308.00000045@mb-cj.aol.com...
> In article <b6n5dfdht1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Even from you I am amazed. I bet you would have made a good war
protester
> >in the 60s. Im sure General Giap would have personally given you the
Hanoi
> >peace prize.
>
> The Vietnam War was not the ONLY war fought by the USA since
> the Korean War. Try refreshing your memory of what happened
> since 1973...a mere 30 years. Try Grenada, Panama, Gulf War
> 1 and now Gulf War 2.
>
> >You have just insulted anyone that has ever worn the uniform of this
> >country, whether they actually 'went to war' or not. You own Larry and
> >every Marine, Sailor, Soldier, Airman and Coast Guard member an apology.
>
> As a veteran of the United States Army 1952-1960 I don't see
> a single "insult" in Kim's remarks.
>
> You owe ME an apology. So does Roll for his "moral superiority"
> self-elevation.
>
> >ANY person, male of female, that served at ANY TIME, WAR OR PEACE
>deserves
> >the RESPECT and GRATITUDE of the nation they served. NO EXCEPTIONS.
>
> Except: Among radio amateurs who love to insult non-amateurs
> by stating they were in "rear areas" during a war.
>
> >You being a 'military brat' should know of the day to day sacrifices they
> >make. And when one does it for twenty or more years, then they deserve
it
> >even more.
>
> Are you also one of those "moral superiors" too?

>
>

1854. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 23:13:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304051513.3c964711@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63941

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030403230214.08710.00000390@mb-fj.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 4/3/2003 6:05 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030403190545.24070.00000214@mb-ck.aol.com>
>
>
> >Only those that are proficient at code are considered a "true" Ham, although
> >some Hams forgive this and allow no-coders that are true to the other
> >traditions.
>
> Says who?
>
> >Actually, the proficiency speed is 10 wpm, not 13wpm. I did provide a
> >reference
> >link in another post in this thread.
>
> Oh...??? I am still awating to see what authoratative source made this
> milestone.
>
> Steve

Dave is the only authority that you'll ever need.

Dave says it's higher, but doesn't say how much higher. I suspect
he'll eventually say its 13wpm, but for the present time, all he's
said is that 20wpm is "more proficient" than 13wpm.

One retired FCC communications attorney alluded to the FCC
regulations, which presently specify a 5wpm exam speed.

Bill said 5wpm.

Trouble is brewing in rrap paradise.

1855. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 23:15:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6no1oerc1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63942

As long as SH (in his mind) has 'outsmarted the enemy' then he will have won. In his mind that is.

He probably put them in Syria long before we blew his army to atoms. Thus he expected to be able to retreive them at his will.

This is all an opinion of course.

Dan/W4NTI

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030405162705.23238.00000012@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <b6n4mr$82t$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >There in Syria. SH would NEVER destroy them.
> >
> How do you know, Dan? From his past behavior, I'd suspect that SH would destroy
> them before he'd ever let them fall into the hands of someone who he did not
> control 100%.
>
> But suppose you're right, and they are now in Syria. That would put 'em that
> much closer to Israel, as a direct consequence of the war.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

1856. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 23:19:12 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6no8k$3sn$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 63943

IF that is what she meant, then I agree and apologize. Lets see what she
has to say.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAB4C1D8.159DB%stewart@say.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
> > (snip) You have just insulted anyone that has
> > ever worn the uniform of this country, whether
> > they actually 'went to war' or not. You own
> > Larry and every Marine, Sailor, Soldier, Airman
> > and Coast Guard member an apology.
>
>
> You misunderstood what she said, Dan. She was differentiating between
> those who join for self-serving reasons and those who serve for the
defense
> of this country - stating the later were the soldiers she truly
appreciated.
> As such, she owes nobody an apology because I'm sure most military
personnel
> would fully agree with that (except perhaps the ones who joined for the
> self-serving reasons).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>
> ------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

1857. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-05 23:25:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304051525.5af48e1f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63944

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030403015945.05732.00000179@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 3/28/2003 11:44 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0303280944.152a8644@posting.google.com>
>
> >I didn't insist that you change the subject. You did that on your
> >own. It's part of your little problem.
>
> Hmmmm...Let's see....
>
> YOU insist that I am "obsessive compulsive", yet you continue to go
> tit-for-tat in these little exchanges despite having been given ample
> opportunity to tactfully withdraw.

I wouldn't even know what to "withdraw" from as you've completely
muddled the subject with your obsessive/compulsive subject changes and
personal attacks.

> You insist that your T5 operation was "authorized" yet you cannot (or will
> not) provide us with the name of the person who allegedly gave that permission.

I had permission. I will open my ARS to the FCC. Not to you, you
obsessive/compulsive tyrant.

> You further refuse to even make available any log excepts so that we can
> make some efforts to validate that you indeed DID operate from Somalia while
> deployed there.

You are not in my Somalia logs, so you didn't get a card. I will open
my ARS to the FCC. Not to you, you obsessive/compulsive tyrant.

> Youn further insist that I (and others on occassion) make assersions that
> we never did, then never provide the quote proving where we made the statement
> you insist upon.

"Youn" know that you're lying. You'll have ample opportunity to
'splain everything to St Peter.

> Seems YOU are the one with the problems, Brain. Truthfulness and a lack
> of facts being two of them.
>
> Hmmmmmmmmmmmm........
>
> Steve

No problem here. I operated with permission while in Somalia. Wish you had been there so that you'd at least have one honest hostile action.

73, Brian

1858. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 01:05:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405200514.13960.00000022@mb-co.aol.com>
Source record: 63945

In article <20030405171203.08746.00000506@mb-fj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/5/2003 9:26 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030405102653.24212.00000199@mb-fr.aol.com>
>
>
>>In one class He asked "Is anyone in the class a Ham Radio operator". In same
>>class he said "more people should get one.". From this, I assumed he had a
>>Ham radio licence.
>
> Do you not know the old saying about what "assuming" does, Vipul?

Tsk, tsk, tsk, Robeson ASSUMES too much.

Not a bad ploy for a redirection on the subject, but transparent.

> I know a lot of people who encourage others to stop smoking or learn
>CPR, but it does not make them Nurses or Physicians!

This isn't a newsgroup for agriculture, lifestyles, or the medical profession. Try to stay focussed.

>>Noone claimed to be a Ham radio op, including those in companies that do work
>>in the comm field. (I did not want to raise my hand).
>
> WHOA! But...but...but...VIPUL! YOU stated in this very forum that YOU
>support Amateur Radio in non-Amateur Radio forums... ! ! !
>
> Did you lie about supporting Amateur Radio then or are you lying about
>this now?

Robeson has one irritating presumption (a false one), that of anyone contradicting his viewpoints is "lying." :-)

That's tiring but it is standard newsgroup practice for Robeson.

>>I am no longer taking his class right now.
>
> I am sure he's losing sleep over why you quit.

Robeson assumes something. Does he not know the old saying about the word "assume?" :-)

>> > Since you offer neither a name or callsign, I doubt you are talking about
>>>a real person.

>>
>>Oh, really, You mean its fancy that there could be a Comm Theory Professor?
>>How unlikely!
>
> There's nothing fancy about it, Vippy. You won't identify this person,
>ergo I have to assume (yes...assume), in the face of no other evidence to the
>contrary, that this "person" you are using as "support" for your arguments
>does not exist.

Robeson has NOT identified his "seven hostile actions."

Ergo, Robeson's "hostile action" claim is false.

>>>Vippy, you identified types of persons and agencies, NOT "emergency
>>>communication situation(s)"
>>
>>These agencies prepare for emegency situations.
>
> Yes, they do, but thee is a diffrence between an "emergency situation"
>and a person who responds to them.

"Thee?" :-)

This is not a Public Safety Radio newsgroup.

> Your lack of command of the language is glaring here.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...Robeson does NOT want to go there. :-)

He lost his "command" some while ago, cannot regain it
during times of rage in here.

>>>However in the seven you make reference to, three
>>>still have SOME use of Morse Code.
>>
>>The word "SOS" is still used (see below). Any non-Ham knows SOS.
>
> "SOS". is not a word. It is a letter group.

That depends, oh mighty veteran of "seven hostile actions."

Those with previous military experience will recognize it as an
acronym standing for a particular breakfast meal. :-)

>"SOS" is not used as a
>"word" to declare an emergency in voice communications...Either "MAYDAY" or
>"I am declaring an emergency" are recognized as such. ITU and ICAO refer.

"ITU and ICAO refer"? What does that mean, oh commander
of the English language?

Just what does the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)
have to do with this? Is Robeson now doing some kind of ER
drops by HALO procedure? :-)

>
>>>Under WHAT situations? You do not set parameters of a "situation", you
>>>simply made reference to certain types of persons or entities.
>>
>>How about survival situations. For example, in army survival manual, no
>>mention of Morse code, except the word "SOS".
>
> What "army survival manual", Vippy?

Robeson has had ample opportunity to view, review, download US
Army Field Manuals and other public documents from the
General Dennis J. Reimer website of the Army Training and
Doctrine Digital Library. I've given the web addresses several
times in here. Robeson refuses to acknowledge any manuals
from the US Army.

>When did you serve in the Armed Forces of the Untied States?

I served from 1952 to 1960. Is that some kind of "prerequisite"
for talking about anything in here?

>Which branch and in what MOS?

Mine was Signal Corps with MOSs 1419 and 281.6 (MOS
numbering system revised while on active duty), microwave
radio relay operations and maintenance. Robeson has had
that described to him more than once but refuses to
acknowledge the correct MOS (Military Occupation Specialty)
and duties performed. Robeson has an irritating habit of
personally insulting any veteran that does not agree with him.

>Did you attened SERE School? (if I have to tell you what it is, you didn't
go...)

What is this "SERE School?" Explain.

Was it necessary for those undocumented "seven hostile actions?"
Explain.

>>Lots of systems are using old technologies, because they haven't updated
>>their
>>systems.Air traffic controllers often use outdated technology. Old
>>technogies,
>>equipment, and systems take time to update.
>
> Morse Code identifiers are used on NAVAIDS because they are simple to
>implement, and non-English users who might have a problem with accent can
>simply look at the chart and "decode" the letters from the chart. (A
>dot/dash
>chart is provided on every aeronautical chart to "decode" the identifiers)

Robeson seems to be a technical dunce in regards to civil aviation.

The agreed ATC (Air Traffic Control) language worldwide is English.

It has been so since 1955 under standards of the ICAO.

English language skills are REQUIRED in worldwide civil aviation
for ALL Air Traffic Control.

That's the way it is.

> This is PART of the reason why Morse Code remains a favorite mode among
>those who enjoy "DXing" and rag-chewing on HF...One does not have to
>embarrass
>one's self with frequent requests to "say again" because of misunderstood
>accents or misapplied slang, etc.

The slow speed of morse code on-off keying allows any user to hide
their ignorance of even the most basic communications knowledge.

On-off morse code communications disguises bad voices and bad
manners.

On-off morse code communications allows users to pretend they
are experts in radio, giving them time to pretend they have done
heroic deeds such as rescuing ships at sea or being heroes in
seven hostile actions.

1859. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 01:19:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405201920.18459.00000011@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 63946

In article <BAB4BE22.159D8%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
>Date: Sat, 05 Apr 2003 17:08:50 -0500
>
>Kim wrote:
>
>> (snip) Anyway...naw, discussions about politics
>> and politicians got boring years ago. All that's
>> left to say is, literally, they do whatever they
>> want.

"Politicians are like nappies. Both should be
changed regularly -- and for the same reason"
"Scotsman - Scotsman's Diary 12/97"

(I figure a Stewart would agree with that!)
>
> You're probably right, both about them doing whatever they want and that's
>all left to say - I don't see how I can easily expand on what I said in that
>long-winded rant.

>> (snip) If it gets to the point I can't pay my
>> taxes/work/etc, then I'll get upset. And, of
>> course, they aren't going to let that happen
>> to us, because then we do get restless....
>
> You've got it figured out - take all they can, but keep everyone satisfied
>just enough not to revolt. It is a game played many times in history,
>sometimes not so successfully (witness the various revolutions). But,
>looking at the overall apathy in this country today, they are doing just
>fine with this game at the moment.
>
I would not say there's overall apathy. I'd say it's a high rate of
satisfaction. Doesn't mean the USA is a utopia, just that most people feel they
are getting their needs met enough that revolution is a far thing from most
folks' minds.

And when people DO feel upset enough about something, they let their voices be
heard, even if the govt. doesn't do much about it. Look at how many people
turned out in anti-war demonstrations in the past few weeks/months. And how
many showed up to support our troops (regardless of their position on the war).
Whether you agree with them or not, you can't call those people apathetic. And
for every person who was demonstrating, there's probably somebody (or several

somebodys) who agrees with their position but had to be at home with the kids, had to work, etc.

I think what Kim's saying is that she's satsified enough not to make big waves.

A big reason the USA has not suffered more terrorism in the past has been the fact that the USA's freedom and satisfaction levels are historically so high that most wild-eyed radicals calm down after a while here and become at least semi-productive citizens. One of the shocking things about the Sept 11 hijackers was that they were able to live here in comfort for years and yet still desire to commit their crimes.

Consider the following:

During WW2, a number of German U-Boat crews were captured and sent to POW camps in the USA. Many of these POWs did not want to go back to Germany after the war, and more than a few stayed.

A number of these POWs managed to escape, and some were never recaptured. In a high percentage of cases, the escapees never went back to Germany - they assumed new identities and blended in. For decades after the war ended, every so often one of them would turn up at a government office and reveal his true identity. I think the last one turned himself in a few years ago.

These were not war criminals, just regular sailors who saw that life in the USA was so much better that they wanted to stay.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1860. Serious Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 01:22:07 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405202207.23174.00000364@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 63947

Is Brian and Len LOVERS?

1861. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 02:24:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405212440.04143.00000017@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 63948

In article <b6nnrt$215$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Len Over 21...we all have your number. Stir up the crap. Dont need it.
>And DONT CARE WHAT YOU THINK...I put you on the dumbass list a long time
>ago.

You seem to want to FIGHT. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

The Vietnam War ended on January 27, 1973.

That's over 30 years ago.

The "Chirac position on Iraq" is about the second Gulf War
going on right now.

That isn't even close to being a subject about amateur radio
policy, is it?

Do you wish to go to war in order to preserve the right to
tyranize newcomers by forcing them to test for morse
code? Seems like an odd thing to do. Doesn't "enhance
good will" at all, not even "uniquely" as described in 97.1 (e).

1862. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 02:25:29 UTC
From: averyfineman@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030405212529.04143.00000018@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 63949

In article <b6nnrt$215$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Len Over 21...we all have your number. Stir up the crap. Dont need it.
>And DONT CARE WHAT YOU THINK...I put you on the dumbass list a long time
>ago.

You seem to want to FIGHT. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

The Vietnam War ended on January 27, 1973.

That's over 30 years ago.

The "Chirac position on Iraq" is about the second Gulf War
going on right now.

That isn't even close to being a subject about amateur radio
policy, is it?

Do you wish to go to war in order to preserve the right to
tyranize newcomers by forcing them to test for morse
code? Seems like an odd thing to do. Doesn't "enhance
good will" at all, not even "uniquely" as described in 97.1 (e).

1863. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 03:42:26 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304051942.4a00deef@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63950

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304041214.5a33ebf8@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304040709.28562587@posting.google.com>...

. . . .

> > Simply passing a 10 wpm or any other "wpm test" don't mean squat when
> > it comes to a useful working level of CW proficiency.
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Which is why we need to remove the code-tape generals, advanced, and
> extras from the rolls of the "proficient" when trying to quantify
> Morse Code as a growth industry.

Right.

Makes huge sense.

Nitwit.

w3rv

1864. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 03:53:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E8FA4CF.9AB655AE@att.net>
Source record: 63851

N2EY wrote:

> In article <f45722ac.0304050459.8980c7c@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 5 Apr 2003 04:59:24 -0800
> >
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20030404223540.04143.00000013@mb-fb.aol.com>...
> >> In article <f45722ac.0304041811.6fb12dbc@posting.google.com>,
> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >>
> >> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> >> >news:<c2356669.0304041402.17e50e04@posting.google.com>...
> >> >
> >> >> > How did you arrive at those numbers?
> >> >>
> >> >> > I used the science of mathematics and the number system.
> >> >>
> >> >> Used them incorrectly, too.
> >> >
> >> >Show your work, oh wise one.
> >>
> >> Why? You don't show yours.
> >>
> >> Here's a hint:
> >>
> >> Your numbers indicate that you consider the set of "noncoded" hams to be
> >> equivalent to the set of hams with Technician licenses. That's simply not
> >> correct.
> >
> >That is my assumption.
>
> It's incorrect. Invalid. Untrue. The set of "noncoded" hams is not equivalent
> to the set of hams with Technician licenses. Len Anderson made the same mistake
> some time back.
>
> > Why is it wrong?
>
> Look it up. The answer was explained in detail on April 3 in this thread. It
> was also repeatedly explained to Len when he made the same mistake.

Cheez. Not only does poor Numbgnuts Slim not pay attention, he doesn't pay attention ALL the time. Never. Ever.

1865. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 03:57:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E8FA5C5.93C288D6@att.net>
Source record: 63852

JJ wrote:

> W5TIT wrote:
>
> >>I'll have to say yes, it does. If any American, who enjoys the blessings
> >>of freedom and democracy which have been secured for him or her
> >>through the sacrifices made by those who willingly fought, suffered, and
> >>died to preserve them is not also willing to do so himself or herself,
> >
> > then
> >
> >>they most definitely are NOT a "loyal Americans." They are merely cowards
> >>living under the protection of their moral superiors.
> >>
> >>Diplomacy will always be the preferred method for settling political
> >>differences between nations. However, when diplomacy fails, as it
> >>historically will when dealing with maniacal, totalitarian dictators such
> >>as Saddam Hussein, then military might is the correct response.
> >>Nobody likes war -- it is a last resort. However, it is a resort which
> >
> > must
> >
> >>be taken to eliminate the evil in this world. If you disagree, consider
> >>yourself lucky to be living in America -- where millions of your fellow
> >>countrymen have sacrificed to give you the right to your disagreement.
> >>
> >>73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>MSgt, USAF (Retired)
> >>Loyal American who supports our President, our Troops, and the
> >>War in Iraq
> >>
> >
> >
> > Man, what a crackpot...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Crackpot? I would say he is right on target.

She wuz looking in the mirror when she said it.

1866. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 03:59:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E8FA614.8ABD6D91@att.net>
Source record: 63853

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <F85E4E5703CA10FA.3A51ABB72013B66A.D7B5C373BED6244C@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >> MSgt, USAF (Retired)
> >> Loyal American who supports our President, our Troops, and the
> >> War in Iraq
> >>
> >
> >Man, what a crackpot...
>
> That may be but he claims to be your "moral superior..." :-)

You and Mogadishu Slim are on the bottom of the pile, right along with her.

1867. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 04:02:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E8FA6BC.86220D3C@att.net>
Source record: 63854

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Except: Among radio amateurs who love to insult non-amateurs
> by stating they were in "rear areas" during a war.

Hell, man, if you was, you was. Not a heck of a lot you could do about it - except to
refrain from misrepresening it. Just learn to live with it. We can't all be heros.

1868. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 04:04:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E8FA732.357174E6@att.net>
Source record: 63855

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Miccolis cannot accept rational arguments against morse code.

That could be true only in the eventuality that ther actually ever WAS one.

>
>
> It's that simple.

You certainly are.

1869. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 04:17:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E8FAA68.428F9A8C@att.net>
Source record: 63856

Brian wrote:

> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>...
>
> > Apparently that doesn't mean anything.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Most of what you say doesn't mean anything.

When you don't know anything nothing anyone says to you can mean anything.

1870. Re: How's This For Courage?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 04:29:45 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304052029.e4b55c1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63857

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030405142634.18459.00000010@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> In article <20030405013919.05767.00000131@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> I wish N0BK could comment on the surrealism of the Iraqi Information Minister's
> lies becoming more and more outrageous.

He could care less, the guy's credibility is the least of what he's about to lose.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1871. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 04:36:14 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304060418450.112@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 63858

On Sat, 5 Apr 2003, Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "D. Stussy" wrote:
>
> > Actually, these are CA Dept. of Agriculture
> > stations and for those not at the Mexican
> > border, you will find that they may be as
> > much as 100 miles IN FROM the state border.
> > Usually, the stop for a passenger vehicle
> > is 20 seconds or less.
>
> Actually, the inspection stations on I-10 and I-40 are both within a few
> miles of the state line, not "100 miles IN FROM the state border." At 100
> miles in, they would be near San Bernardino or Riverside (which they
> obviously are not).

I see that you're just as misinformed about this as about radio! :-)

The inspection station on I-15 coming from Las Vegas is in Yermo, right next to Barstow, about 100 miles in, and about 10 miles east of where I-10 and I-40 merge. Mile marker 86 is what I remember as the warning point when approaching it. The station along I-80 is 25 miles in from the Nevada border, west of Truckee, CA. I-5 has it about 50 miles south of the Oregon border. Along US-395, the station at Alturas, CA is about 25 miles in.

"As much as" usually means the extreme, and in this case, the extreme is the station at Yermo, which is roughly 100 miles in, just as I said. Also, clearly not all the stations are within a few miles of the state border.

1872. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 04:41:35 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304060437040.112@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 63859

On Sat, 5 Apr 2003, Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Phil, what is other states took the same position towards California?
> California often has fairly unique parasites and pests infesting their food
> products - the California Fruit Fly springs to mind. What if all other
> states routinely stopped travelers at their borders and seized food products
> from California? And not just during the California Fruit Fly scare, but for
> all time (these inspection stations have been at the California borders for
> decades). Californians would be absolutely outraged (and the fruit farmers
> would go ballistic), yet they expect residents of other states to say
> nothing when California does this very thing to them. Does California have a
> right to have these inspections? Obviously, they do. But that certainly
> doesn't change the impression it leaves.

The Mediterranean Fruit Fly is now suddenly the "California Fruit Fly?"

Only in your mind. It hasn't been here long enough to become its own species.

1873. Re: Serious Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 04:44:36 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304060443390.112@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 63860

On Sun, 6 Apr 2003, WA8ULX wrote:
> Is Brian and Len LOVERS?

If that were a serious question, you would have used proper grammar.

1874. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 04:46:23 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304060444320.112@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 63861

On Sat, 5 Apr 2003, Len Over 21 wrote:
> >None of that changes my overall impression of these inspection stations.
>
> Okay, whatever. Doesn't have anything to do with "No more FCC regulation,"
> does it? :-)

No more deviant than any other thread on this newsgroup. I've given up on
trying to stop that - it just won't ever happen here.

1875. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 05:44:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E8FBEB2.E9F5E987@att.net>
Source record: 63862

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
>
> The slow speed of morse code on-off keying allows any user to hide
> their ignorance of even the most basic communications knowledge.

The lack of even rudimentary skill in Morse code use sure doesn't prevent you from

displaying your complete lack of the most rudimentary basic radiocommunications
skill
OR knowledge. You do it here many times each day.

1876. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 05:53:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB52B13.15AF1%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63863

"D. Stussy" wrote:
>
> I see that you're just as misinformed about
> this as about radio! :-)
>
> The inspection station on I-15 coming from
> Las Vegas is in Yermo, right next to Barstow,
> about 100 miles in, and about 10 miles east
> of where I-10 and I-40 merge. (snip)

You need to get out a map. I-10 and I-40 don't merge. I-40 merges with I-15 in Barstow and I-15 then goes on to merge with I-10 near Riverside and San Bernardino. Regardless, I don't know anything about the inspection station you're talking about - the inspection stations on I-10 and I-40 at the state line between Arizona and California are very near that state line. I can't say exactly how many miles because I've never paid that much attention, but easily within ten to fifteen miles (if that). Anyway, how does the distance from the state line change anything I've said about the impression these inspection stations present to those traveling into the state of California?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1877. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 05:55:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB52B66.15AF2%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63864

"D. Stussy" wrote:
>
> The Mediterranean Fruit Fly is now suddenly the
> "California Fruit Fly?"

Sorry, you're right - the Mediterranean Fruit Fly.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1878. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 06:13:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB52FC2.15AF4%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63865

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote...
>>
>> There is no implication other than (snip)
>
> I've seen CHP armed troopers on all the freeways
> around here. That's their job...to patrol the state
> highways (and freeways going through several cities),
> inspect vehicles (for lots of things), (snip)

For fruits? Man, doesn't the CHP have better things to do? I wonder what would happen if someone ran one of these agricultural inspection stations? Would the CHP give pursuit? Would they be authorized to use deadly force to stop the vehicle? Can a person be placed in jail for having the wrong Orange or Apple in the vehicle?

> I'd call it protection of the state. :-)

I call it protection of the wealthy fruit farmers.

>> Why aren't travelers reimbursed for the items
>> seized at these inspection stations?
>
> Why?

Because the items seized are their property, seized without due process of law.

> (snip) "Free and unrestricted travel across this
> country" does NOT mean some absolute freedom to do
> anything you want.

Certainly not the freedom to bring whatever fruit I want with me into the state of California.

> Okay, whatever. Doesn't have anything to do
> with "No more FCC regulation," does it? :-)

Of course it does. You should know that by now. :)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1879. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 07:12:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB54B98.15AF6%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63866

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> (snip) I think you meant to right "in spite *of*
> the unwanted behavior". (snip)

You got it.

> - Can anyone who applies become an Israeli citizen,
> and get full voting rights?

I don't know the answer to that myself. I have not been able to find much independent information about Israel and the few Israeli I've tried to talk to seem evasive and even defensive. I've heard some jobs are now limited to just Jews - police, military, and so on. But I don't know that to be a fact - it could be just anti-Israeli propaganda.

> - What was Palestine like before 1948 in terms of
> agriculture, industry, education, civil rights?

Did Palestine exist as a separate entity prior to 1948? I honestly don't know.

> Which brings up the newest version of the old
> philosophical question: "MaryAnn or Ginger?"/"
> Bailey Quarters or Jennifer Marlowe?":
>
> "Robin Hartl or JoAnne Liebeler?"

Are you seeing through my thinly veiled attempts to slowly get out of this discussion, Jim? Anyway, to answer your question, I've always tended to prefer the wholesome girl-next-door type (even if it is just a character), so I guess my preferences would be MaryAnn and Bailey. I don't routinely watch fix-it shows, but, just on appearances, I guess the nod would go to Robin Hartl. [like I would fight any of them off]

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1880. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 07:27:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030406032731.23756.00000039@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63875

In article <3E8D14A3.65B9169A@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>> I'll have to say yes, it does. If any American, who enjoys the blessings
>> of freedom and democracy which have been secured for him or her
>> through the sacrifices made by those who willingly fought, suffered, and
>> died to preserve them is not also willing to do so himself or herself, then
>> they most definitely are NOT a "loyal Americans." They are merely cowards
>> living under the protection of their moral superiors.
>>
>> Diplomacy will always be the preferred method for settling political
>> differences between nations. However, when diplomacy fails, as it
>> historically will when dealing with maniacal, totalitarian dictators such
>> as Saddam Hussein, then military might is the correct response.
>> Nobody likes war -- it is a last resort. However, it is a resort which
>must
>> be taken to eliminate the evil in this world. If you disagree, consider
>> yourself lucky to be living in America -- where millions of your fellow
>> countrymen have sacrificed to give you the right to your disagreement.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>> MSgt, USAF (Retired)
>> Loyal American who supports our President, our Troops, and the
>> War in Iraq
>
>Well said, Larry! You cut right to the heart of the matter. All the
>pacifists seen oblovious to history and to them "It's all about me and
what *I* think".

Dick:

I have no problem with "pacifists." In fact, I consider myself to be one!
However, a preference for peaceful coexistence is not inconsistent with
a willingness to use force in order to counteract the oppression of a
totalitarian regime. Those who argue against this war, with their off-
the-shelf rantings about this being a "war for oil" and "a war for the
President's Daddy" and whatever else they're saying, are more truthfully
expressing their own cowardice than any rational political philosophy.
If one personally objects to the concept of killing, then they are entitled
to their beliefs, and should not be required to serve in the armed
forces, unless they voluntarily consent to do so in a purely support role.
Unfortunately, the present-day anti-war protesters don't make any
sense if they see themselves as being motivated by a desire for "peace."

The country of Iraq has been suffering under the barbarous regime
of Saddam Hussein for two decades. This madman has consolidated

his power through the institutional use of cold-blooded murder, rape, torture and extortion. He has categorically refused to cooperate with United Nations weapons inspections in spite of his having signed a treaty requiring him to do so. Twelve years of negotiating, debating, threatening, and imposing economic sanctions has yielded nothing in the way of an assurance that he will not produce and deploy weapons of mass destruction. However, the anti-war protesters insist that we are still not justified in using our nation's military power to overthrow this evil, corrupt, and bloodthirsty regime. They are so obviously wrong and apparently uninformed that they simply cannot be given any consideration whatsoever. Fortunately, we now have a President who will not cave in to their emotional pleas to allow innocent people to be tortured and killed in order to avoid warfare.

The anti-war protesters are an aspect of a free and pluralistic society that we must put up with. We do not, however, have to grant them any credibility.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1881. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 07:27:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030406032733.23756.00000040@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63869

In article <BAB2B6FF.1588A%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> I'll have to say yes, it does. If any American, who
>> enjoys the blessings of freedom and democracy which
>> have been secured for him or her through the sacrifices
>> made by those who willingly fought, suffered, and died
>> to preserve them is not also willing to do so himself
>> or herself, then they most definitely are NOT a
>> "loyal Americans." They are merely cowards living under
>> the protection of their moral superiors. (snip)
>
>
> That is absolute bull crap, Larry. First of all, a willingness to kill
>has never been, and should never be, the judge of someone's loyalty to this
>country.

Dwight:

In America, those who are unwilling to kill are not required to do so.
Even before we had an all-volunteer concept in the armed forces, those
who conscientiously objected killing were, if conscripted, allowed to
perform support duties which did not require them to to bear arms for
any reason other than self defense. Their service was of value to our
national security, and their loyalty is not questioned.

>Second, unless we now live in a military state, military service
>does not make one "superior" to other Americans.

I don't recall claiming that it did. It does, however, bestow honor and
prestige upon those who *have* faithfully served.

>And finally, most who
>served in the military, including myself, will always strongly prefer a
>peaceful resolution over the failure of war.

Amen. May it always be so. However, when diplomacy fails, we must
be prepared to use force to eliminate evil. This is a moral obligation of
a nation which is based on the concept of freedom and liberty.

>> (snip) If you disagree, consider yourself lucky to be
>> living in America -- where millions of your fellow
>> countrymen have sacrificed to give you the right to
>> your disagreement.
>

>
> Larry, as a Vietnam era vet, I served in the military just like you did,
>and certainly came as close to war as you ever did (actual combat is not
>exactly a big concern for the typical Air Force Sergeant), so don't sit
>there on your pompous butt talking about being "superior" or more loyal.

My own service to my country involved sacrificing the best and most
productive years of my adult life, working long hours under at times
difficult conditions, ensuring that personnel and materiel were transported
safely and efficiently, that people were well trained in their jobs, and
government resources were safeguarded and effectively utilized. I did
faced the dangers of possible armed conflict by virtue of having served in
a position requiring worldwide deployability, and indeed, I served overseas
for a number of years on permanent and temporary duty assignments.
No, I was not concerned about sitting in a foxhole with bullets whizzing
past my head. But those who were actually concerned with that sort
of thing depended on me and the people I worked with to give them the
support they needed to suceed. On the other hand, I had to depend on
many others for the support I needed to do my job. The thing that is
unique about military service is that there are no unimportant jobs when
it comes to achieving the overall objective -- which is the deterrence of
war and/or the successful use of military power to achieve peace in
the absence or failure of diplomacy.

> The millions of fellow countrymen you described above didn't sacrifice so
>you could describe yourself as superior and other Americans as inferior or
>yourself as more loyal with others less so. In reality, to proclaim yourself
>more loyal or superior to other Americans is nothing more than a cruel slap
>in the face of what they actually sacrificed for.

Well, Dwight, I see your point, but in this case, it was actually a very
highly directed slap in Kim's face! In fact, it was actually intended to be
a jaw-smashing, tooth-ejecting, blood-splattering knockout blow! However,
I'm sure that in Kim's case, as usual, it went whizzing safely right over
her haid!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1882. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 07:27:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030406032734.23756.00000042@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63868

In article <4FE4982BA1B74B33.54B1FE846592E21F.A437FA8832FD93B4@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Soldiers like Larry didn't go off to war (if he even did)
>to defend "my" country. They went off to war to legally shoot, maim, and
>kill other people then tell all of us how superior they are.

Kim:

I don't know who this "Larry" you're talking about is, but I sure hope
that there really aren't any soldiers who go to war JUST to legally shoot,
maim, and kill people! That doesn't sound very much like "moral
superiority" to me!

A soldier is like a policeman. He or she is trained in the use of
deadly force in order to resolve conflict. He or she then spends the
rest of their career praying that they never have to actually utilize
deadly force for that purpose. When they must put their training into
actual practical use, they utilize the force at their disposal with
the greatest possible efficiency in order to resolve the conflict at hand
quickly and at minimum cost in lives and property. Any soldier who
is doing his job just to have, as you put it, a legal right to kill, is not
the kind of person we want doing that job. There is a difference
between being a warrior and being a criminal; you don't seem to have
a very good grasp of that concept.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1883. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 07:27:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030406032734.23756.00000041@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63870

In article <F85E4E5703CA10FA.3A51ABB72013B66A.D7B5C373BED6244C@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>Man, what a crackpot...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

If appreciating and honoring the sacrifices of those who have ensured
my freedom makes me a "crackpot," then so be it! I will wear that
label with pride!

73 de Larry, K3LT
MSgt, USAF (Retired)
Loyal American Crackpot who supports our President, our Troops,
and the War in Iraq

1884. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 07:27:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030406032735.23756.00000043@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63872

In article <20030405152049.23756.00000034@mb-fj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>In article <b6n5dfdht1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
><w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
>>ANY person, male of female, that served at ANY TIME, WAR OR PEACE
>>deserves
>>the RESPECT and GRATITUDE of the nation they served. NO EXCEPTIONS.
>
>None? Not even John A. Walker, Jr.?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

I'm sure that Dan understands that proven traitors are not included in the most admirable comments he made above. The relatively few and notorious members of the armed forces who have sold our country's critical military secrets to our potential adversaries have counteracted whatever of their own valid contributions they made have made, and those of all of their fellow service members. They make the world a more dangerous place for everyone, and the damage they do must be repaired at a much greater cost in material resources and increased jeapordy of our loyal, trustworthy armed forces personnel. Dan knows this, I'm sure.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1885. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 07:27:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030406032736.23756.00000044@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63867

In article <3E8F2984.4070305@mailcity.moc>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>> Man, what a crackpot...
>>
>> Kim W5TIT
>
>Crackpot? I would say he is right on target.

JJ:

Thank you for your kind thoughts. However, being called a "crackpot"
by Kim, considering her own convoluted worldview displayed in this
newsgroup, is almost a badge of honor in itself.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1886. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 07:27:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030406032736.23756.00000045@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63873

In article <20030405162042.13308.00000046@mb-cj.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>
>>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>> MSgt, USAF (Retired)
>>> Loyal American who supports our President, our Troops, and the
>>> War in Iraq
>>>
>>
>>Man, what a crackpot...
>
> That may be but he claims to be your "moral superior..." :-)

Lennie:

It's not just a claim -- it's an actual, absolute, natural FACT. Of course, I will admit that it doesn't take much to be able to truthfully claim to be Kim's intellectual and moral superior -- based on the evidence of her own character and intelligence that she consistently displays in this newsgroup.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1887. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 07:27:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030406032737.23756.00000046@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63874

In article <BAB4BEC5.159D9%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"W5TIT" wrote:
>
>> (snip) I know a lot of former military (my father
>> being one of them) who have no where near the
>> sentiment nor attitude that Larry has.
>
>
> I hope few (military or otherwise) have the sentiments or attitudes Larry
>has.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Kim/Dwight:

I'm sorry to see you say that. Just exactly what are the sentiments or
attitudes of mine to which you object?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1888. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 07:27:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030406032738.23756.00000047@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 63871

In article <BAB4C1D8.159DB%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>
>"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
>> (snip) You have just insulted anyone that has
>> ever worn the uniform of this country, whether
>> they actually 'went to war' or not. You own
>> Larry and every Marine, Sailor, Soldier, Airman
>> and Coast Guard member an apology.
>
>
> You misunderstood what she said, Dan. She was differentiating between
>those who join for self-serving reasons and those who serve for the defense
>of this country - stating the later were the soldiers she truly appreciated.
>As such, she owes nobody an apology because I'm sure most military personnel
>would fully agree with that (except perhaps the ones who joined for the
>self-serving reasons).
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Dan/Dwight:

Joining the armed forces for "self serving" reasons isn't necessarily a
bad thing. I joined the Air Force because I always had an interest in
aviation and transportation, and saw it as a way to gain professional
training in that field. Only after I was in did I come to realize that I was
making an important contribution to our country's national security
during the most critical years of the "Cold War" against Russian
Communism. As an Air Force supervisor, one of my biggest
challenges was making my younger personnel understand that what
they were doing *was* critically important, and worthy of their best
effort at all times.

I'm sure that Private Jessica Lynch joined the Army with the primary
interest of using it as a stepping stone toward her goal of becoming
a teacher. Once in, I'm sure that she, like most other young people
in the military today, became aware of the importance of her role and
it's contribution to our national security. She probably never imagined
becoming a legitimate war hero, as she now certainly is. However,
even if she had not been deployed to Iraq, her contribution would have
meant that she was required to sacrifice some of the best years of
her life in order to support the efforts of those who did -- and whatever

"self serving" benefits she, and the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines who supported her -- derive from their service in the armed forces is the very least we can offer them in compensation.

73 de Larry, K3LT
MSgt, USAF (Retired)

1889. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 08:22:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB55C0A.15AF8%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63878

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> "Politicians are like nappies. Both should be
> changed regularly -- and for the same reason"
> "Scotsman - Scotsman's Diary 12/97"
>
> (I figure a Stewart would agree with that!)

You know how the Scots are, Jim - a strong mistrust of government and politicians is built-in.

> I would not say there's overall apathy. I'd say
> it's a high rate of satisfaction. Doesn't mean
> the USA is a utopia, just that most people feel
> they are getting their needs met enough that
> revolution is a far thing from most folks' minds.

Isn't that pretty much a rewording of what I said?

> (snip) And when people DO feel upset enough
> about something, they let their voices be
> heard, even if the govt. doesn't do much about
> it. Look at how many people turned out in
> anti-war demonstrations in the past few weeks/
> months. And how many showed up to support our
> troops (regardless of their position on the
> war). (snip)

I'm not sure this is represents a lowered apathy level. Are we seeing increased involvement or just the same people getting more vocal about their positions? Regardless, it is pleasant to see so many speaking out, whatever their positions might be.

> During WW2, a number of German U-Boat crews
> were captured and sent to POW camps in the
> USA. Many of these POWs did not want to go
> back to Germany after the war, and more than
> a few stayed.

As I understand it, thousands of POWs were sent here on returning troop ships - the actual number is unknown because the military has never released that data. However, I'm fairly certain many did choose to stay here after the war. But that is not really uncommon. Our own military has a problem with soldiers and civilian employees deciding to remain overseas - so much so that civilian employees are now limited on the amount of time they can work overseas for the military at any one time (active duty soldiers are

transferred regularly and the military has little control over soldiers leaving the service). It is estimated that as many as a million ex-GI's are now living in Germany alone, with perhaps another couple of million living in the UK, Spain, Italy, Japan, Korea, and so on.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1890. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 08:26:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406042623.12142.00000020@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 63876

In article <b6no1oerc1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
>Date: Sat, 5 Apr 2003 17:15:32 -0600
>
>As long as SH (in his mind) has 'outsmarted the enemy' then he will have
>won. In his mind that is.

Definitely sounds like a reasonable theory, Dan.
>
>He probably put them in Syria long before we blew his army to atoms. Thus
>he expected to be able to retreive them at his will.

Again, quite reasonable.
>
>This is all an opinion of course.
>
Sure. Here's another angle:

SH isn't the kind of guy who takes bad news lightly. Typical kill-the-messenger type. Long ago, those around him learned NEVER to give him bad news - instead, let somebody expendable do it. As a result, SH became more and more insulated from reality. So a lot of what is being broadcast from the regime may actually be intended to keep SH in the dark, rather than to fool anyone else.

Hopefully the fighting will be over very soon.

--

It's amazing how dictators manage to snatch failure from the jaws of success. Look at ol' Fidel, for instance. Takes over Cuba, the biggest island in the Caribbean, right at the beginning of the era of jet air travel. He could have made Cuba THE vacation destination of the whole area, offering more resort attractions than anywhere else (because Cuba is so big) and undercutting the competition on price (because Cuba could produce lots of things locally, instead of having to import almost everything, the way places like Bermuda have to do). Sitting on a gold mine but ideology cuts the place off from developing it.

SH has been sitting on the second largest known oil reserves in the world. Enough to make the whole country filthy rich and the envy of the world. Instead, the place is wracked by war, poverty, and misery, all due to a dumb, bad guy at the top who wants to be the next Joe Stalin.

Ya gotta wonder.

73 de jim, N2EY.

1891. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 08:26:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406042624.12142.00000021@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 63877

In article <f45722ac.0304051447.5120c060@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 5 Apr 2003 14:47:32 -0800
>
>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030405102636.18459.00000008@mb-cc.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0304050459.8980c7c@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >Date: 5 Apr 2003 04:59:24 -0800
>> >
>> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<20030404223540.04143.00000013@mb-fb.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <f45722ac.0304041811.6fb12dbc@posting.google.com>,
>> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >> >news:<c2356669.0304041402.17e50e04@posting.google.com>...
>> >> >
>> >> >> > > How did you arrive at those numbers?
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > I used the science of mathematics and the number system.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Used them incorrectly, too.
>> >> >
>> >> >Show your work, oh wise one.
>> >>
>> >> Why? You don't show yours.
>> >>
>> >> Here's a hint:
>> >>
>> >> Your numbers indicate that you consider the set of "noncoded" hams to be
>> >> equivalent to the set of hams with Technician licenses. That's simply
>not
>> >> correct.
>> >
>> >That is my assumption.
>>
>> It's incorrect. Invalid. Untrue. The set of "noncoded" hams is not

>equivalent
>> to the set of hams with Technician licenses. Len Anderson made the same
>mistake
>> some time back.
>>
>> > Why is it wrong?
>>
>> Look it up. The answer was explained in detail on April 3 in this thread.
>It
>> was also repeatedly explained to Len when he made the same mistake.
>
>Give me a number and I'll plug it in.

Why? You're the one pushing an agenda, you provide reasonable numbers.

>Keep it reasonable.

You are invited to do the research needed to support your claims. You obviously care much more about this than anyone else.
>
>It should be similar to me using 90% of 2000 Generals still on the
>rolls in 2003 rather than counting them as all 5wpm coders.

Why?

>Did you
>have a problem with me choosing 90%?
>
I don't have a problem. You do.

>Also, Kelley

Who is "Kelley"? Jim Kelley, AC6XG, hasn't posted here in ages. I wonder how he's doing. It was fun working him on the air, both times I did.

>was bitching in another thread about all the
>non-proficient hams who somehow passed 13 or 20wpm exams and never
>used the code, and cannot be considered proficient.

That's his beef. Argue with him.

>Make an
>estimation and I'll deduct them as well.
>
Why?

>We'll keep working the numbers until we can show Morse Code as a
>growth industry as one "great" DXer would like it to be.
>
"Growth industry"? Amateur Radio is "not for pecuniary interest", so it can't be an industry. Manufacturing and selling Amateur Radio hardware and software can be an industry, though.

And if we look at the number of manufacturers making and selling Morse Code related hardware and software today, as compared to 10, 20, 30 years ago, it's clear that part of the industry is growing. With or without a test.

1892. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 08:31:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB55E0F.15AFA%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 63879

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> (snip) From his past behavior, I'd suspect that
> SH would destroy them before he'd ever let them
> fall into the hands of someone who he did not
> control 100%.

I agree. Saddam is not that stupid. Syria would keep such weapons for themselves, leaving Iraq with no hope of ever getting them back after the hostilities are over and leaving Iraq with a neighbor armed with those weapons.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1893. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 11:56:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304060356.2feea8e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63880

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E8FAA68.428F9A8C@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > Apparently that doesn't mean anything.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Most of what you say doesn't mean anything.
>
> When you don't know anything nothing anyone says to you can mean anything.

Perhaps. You said that you were a donkey, too.

1894. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 12:07:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304060407.4bba0edd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 63881

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304051942.4a00deef@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304041214.5a33ebf8@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304040709.28562587@posting.google.com>...
>
> . . . .
>
> > > Simply passing a 10 wpm or any other "wpm test" don't mean squat when
> > > it comes to a useful working level of CW proficiency.
> > >
> > > w3rv
> >
> > Which is why we need to remove the code-tape generals, advanced, and
> > extras from the rolls of the "proficient" when trying to quantify
> > Morse Code as a growth industry.
>
> Right.
>
> Makes huge sense.
>
> Nitwit.
>
> w3rv

Brian, I was simply agreeing wichew. Or do you think morse code is a
growth industry, like one DXer on here?

1895. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 12:19:19 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <bXUja.48047$ja4.3023097@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 63882

Dwight Stewart posted:

> Phil, what is other states took the same position towards California?
> California often has fairly unique parasites and pests infesting their food
> products - the California Fruit Fly springs to mind. What if all other
> states routinely stopped travelers at their borders and seized food products
> from California? And not just during the California Fruit Fly scare, but for
> all time (these inspection stations have been at the California borders for
> decades). Californians would be absolutely outraged (and the fruit farmers
> would go ballistic), yet they expect residents of other states to say
> nothing when California does this very thing to them. Does California have a
> right to have these inspections? Obviously, they do. But that certainly
> doesn't change the impression it leaves.

FWIW, Arizona recently re-opened their agricultural inspection
stations with the objective of preventing the spread of a virus
that infects birds. They are now stopping all vehicles and asking
the drivers if they are carrying any live birds.

In the past, Arizona maintained a full set of inspection stations
on its borders with California, Nevada, Utah and New Mexico, but
has de-emphasized the program in recent years due to, one supposes,
better interstate coordination on agricultural pest problems. Or,
perhaps because Arizona's biggest cash crop has switched from citrus
to retirement housing.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb(at)arrl(dot)net
Glendale, Arizona

1896. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 13:45:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406094515.11012.00000017@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 63883

In article <BAB55E0F.15AFA%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
>Date: Sun, 06 Apr 2003 04:31:12 -0400
>
>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) From his past behavior, I'd suspect that
>> SH would destroy them before he'd ever let them
>> fall into the hands of someone who he did not
>> control 100%.
>
> I agree. Saddam is not that stupid.

I hope you're right, but who knows? SH was stupid enough to invade Kuwait in
1990 and think he could get away with it. He was stupid enough to think he
could play games with the UNSCOM folks and get away with it indefinitely.

Most of all, he's so stupid that even with total control of a country with the
world's second-largest oil reserves, his people live in poverty, misery and
fear, when they could live in luxury and comfort, all provided by oil money.

>Syria would keep such weapons for
>themselves, leaving Iraq with no hope of ever getting them back after the
>hostilities are over and leaving Iraq with a neighbor armed with those
>weapons.
>
I hope you are right about that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1897. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 13:48:30 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406094830.00320.00000363@mb-fs.aol.com>
Source record: 63884

From K4YZ:

>(I did not want to raise my hand).
>
> WHOA! But...but...but...VIPUL! YOU stated in this very forum that YOU
>support Amateur Radio in non-Amateur Radio forums... ! ! !
>
> Did you lie about supporting Amateur Radio then or are you lying about
>this now?

I didn't want to stand out in class.

>>I am no longer taking his class right now.
> I am sure he's losing sleep over why you quit.

I didn't quit. The class finished.

>I have to assume (yes...assume), in the face of no other evidence to the
>contrary, that this "person" you are using as "support" for your arguments
>does
>not exist.

There is a Comm Theory Prof there. I can check his office hrs. Do you not like what an expert in the field would say? How about I ask the following questions?

-How come Morse code was not even mentioned in your class? Some Hams say it is a most important communications mode.
-What are the advantages/disadvantages of Morse code?
-How come nobody uses Morse code?

>What "army survival manual", Vippy? When did you serve in the Armed
>Forces of the Untied States?

The Army survival manual is available in bookstore.

1898. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 13:53:30 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406095330.00320.00000364@mb-fs.aol.com>
Source record: 63885

From N2EY:
>And if we look at the number of manufacturers making and selling Morse Code
>related hardware and software today, as compared to 10, 20, 30 years ago,
>it's
>clear that part of the industry is growing. With or without a test.

Glad to see an EE advocating Morse code instead of Electrical Engineering. From the numbers, we know thats not a growth industry.

1899. Lennie Just Can't Stand Being Ignored!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 13:56:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406095641.24212.00000237@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 63886

Received from Lennie the Lame via E Mail. Guess The Lying One just can't stand being ignored. Espeically by somone who so effectively proves him a liar over and over.

And Brain calls ME "obsessive/complusive"...! ! ! !

Subj: CC
Date: 4/5/2003 8:05:11 PM Central Daylight Time
From: Len Over 21
To: K4YZ

In article <20030405171203.08746.00000506@mb-fj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/5/2003 9:26 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030405102653.24212.00000199@mb-fr.aol.com>

Rest of Lennie's post snipped due to lack of relevence and usual insulting and empty rhetoric.

Sorry Lennie...I put you in the Scumbag File for a reason. It's becasue you're a scumbag (The simplicity of THAT was overwhelming!)

Steve

1900. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 13:59:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406095926.24212.00000238@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 63888

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>Date: 4/5/2003 11:04 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3E8FA732.357174E6@att.net>

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>Miccolis cannot accept rational arguments against morse code.
>
>That could be true only in the eventuality that ther actually ever WAS one.

Whoa-boy...did THAT ever hit one on the head!

Steve

1901. Re: Serious Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:00:13 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406100013.00320.00000365@mb-fs.aol.com>
Source record: 63889

From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>If that were a serious question, you would have used proper grammar.

Don't worry about that. WA8ULX has a very limited vocabulary. He doesn't show any knowledge, just short antagonizing phrases. He is truly an idiot.

1902. Re: How's This For Courage?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:05:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406100546.24212.00000239@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 63891

>Subject: Re: How's This For Courage?
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 4/5/2003 11:29 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0304052029.e4b55c1@posting.google.com>

>> I wish N0BK could comment on the surrealism of the Iraqi Information
>Minister's
>> lies becoming more and more outrageous.
>
>He could care less, the guy's credibility is the least of what he's about to
>lose.

No kidding...I caught an "interview" with the Iraqi Information Minister this morning bragging about how they had repulsed American forces from the airport.

All the while they were doing a split-screen showing some of our guys on the ground at the airport with weapons either at sling arms or in a ready but not defensive posture.

This guy must have gone to the Lennie the Lame School of Tell The Lies Despite The Evidence To The Contrary.

What idiots.

Steve, K4YZ

1903. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:07:59 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <DB8F8D62FBA3227C.A80D1F5907B3342B.2CD38C1E834FCC63@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64103

Dan, what proof do you have of this? "We" the people were told that they were in Iraq. Now, we were told this by our President who, presumably, has the entire resources of our spying capabilities available to him. While "we're" not done in Iraq yet, have *YOU* noticed that there's been nothing in the way of WMD or biological or chemical weapons found?

Now, you are saying "they're in Syria." What resources are available to you? Or, is it just that you are among those who'd see to it that we progress through one country after another using our red herring, until we're tired of obliteration?

Good grief.

Kim W5TIT

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message news:b6n4mr$82t$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> There in Syria. SH would NEVER destroy them.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:E546ADE2836B93B5.00CEDC5692012862.025E53A61BB29681@lp.airnews.net...
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > news:c2356669.0304030922.7165b709@posting.google.com...
> > >
> > > Here's a "what if" for ya....
> > >
> > > One of the main reasons for the war is to eliminate SH's WMDs. But no
> > > WMDs have been found by coalition forces yet - just lots of protective
> > > suits. Protective suits aren't proof that anyone has or will use WMDs
> > > - coalition troops have those suits, too.
> > >
> > > What if Bagdad falls and the regime changes, but no WMDs or evidence
> > > of same are ever found? Coalition will look like the aggressor and SH
> > > as a martyr who told the truth. Which may be his plan all along. Talk
> > > about a recruitment tool for OBL....
> > > >
> >
> > Oh, here's my surprised look. The WMD argument is a red herring.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>

>

1904. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:15:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406101548.24212.00000240@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 63894

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/6/2003 8:48 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030406094830.00320.00000363@mb-fs.aol.com>

>> Did you lie about supporting Amateur Radio then or are you lying about
>>this now?
>
>I didn't want to stand out in class.

Uh huh. Sure.

> >>I am no longer taking his class right now.
>> I am sure he's losing sleep over why you quit.
>
>I didn't quit. The class finished.

Then I stand corrected.

>There is a Comm Theory Prof there. I can check his office hrs. Do you not
>like
>what an expert in the field would say? How about I ask the following
>questions?

Be my guest. But if you don't give us a name, institution and office, then
as far as I am concerned you are making this up.

>-How come Morse code was not even mentioned in your class? Some Hams say it
>is
>a most important communications mode.

Is the class organized to teach Amateur Radio? If not, then why would he
mention it other than in a historical case reference?

>-What are the advantages/disadvantages of Morse code?

Without any practical experience, how could he make an informed opinion on
this?

>-How come nobody uses Morse code?

If "nobody" used Morse Code, Vippy, we would not be having this
conversation.

Furthermore, Morse Code signals are not the exclusive domain of the
Amateur Radio service.

>>What "army survival manual", Vippy? When did you serve in the Armed
>>Forces of the Untied States?

>
>The Army survival manual is available in bookstore.

There are several DoD texts on survival skills, Vippy. To which one did you refer?

And you did not answer the question about whether or not YOU served in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Steve, K4YZ

1905. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:17:52 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <B50D1B4E57BF28D5.88B5A2DEF2656D4D.E60280E7F36AD68E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 63900

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b6n5dfdht1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> Even from you I am amazed. I bet you would have made a good war protester
> in the 60s. Im sure General Giap would have personally given you the
Hanoi
> peace prize.
>
> You have just insulted anyone that has ever worn the uniform of this
> country, whether they actually 'went to war' or not. You own Larry and
> every Marine, Sailor, Soldier, Airman and Coast Guard member an apology.
>

No, I've just insulted anyone who's ever worn the uniform of this country in the name of defending Democracy, who then turns around and displays behavior of a non-democratic nature. Telling a war protester to "go to Russia...Africa...Iraq" is not having the tolerance that it takes to accept and be a member of a democracy. If there are people who state they ":went to war" (i.e., wore a military uniform) for the benefit of democracy, then tell me that I'm wrong to think a certain way--then they don't even understand what they "went to war" for.

>
> ANY person, male of female, that served at ANY TIME, WAR OR PEACE
deserves
> the RESPECT and GRATITUDE of the nation they served. NO EXCEPTIONS.
>

I disagree. If that person comes back with some kind of superior attitude and feels they have a right to dictate how someone should think, they won't get my respect. Mind you, I haven't told them to go to Russia...Africa...Iraq. And, I haven't told you anything about how you are wrong for thinking the way you do. I won't. But, you also won't get my respect or agreement with what you say. The wars my heroes fought defended your right to believe however you wish. But, they were also fought to defend however I believe to think. And, I take it even further to believe that you deserve dignity, even though I may disagree with the way you think. It seems to me you are stopping way short of allowing anyone who thinks differently than you, any dignity at all.

>
> You being a 'military brat' should know of the day to day sacrifices they
> make. And when one does it for twenty or more years, then they deserve
it
> even more.
>

With no disrespect intended, Dan--it is not just soldiers/cops/fireman,
etc., who go out into this world ever day and make sacrifices.

>
> Do you know of ANY National holiday for draft dodgers?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

Uh, no, should there be one? Is that there is a National Holiday for
something that is the only time it has worth?

Kim W5TIT

> Soldiers like Larry didn't go off to war (if he even did)
> > to defend "my" country. They went off to war to legally shoot, maim,
and
> > kill other people then tell all of us how superior they are.
> >
> > Telling is all they can do...because it's the other soldiers I love and
> > appreciate.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
>

1906. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:17:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406101758.24212.00000242@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 63895

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/6/2003 8:53 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030406095330.00320.00000364@mb-fs.aol.com>

>Glad to see an EE advocating Morse code instead of Electrical Engineering.
>From
>the numbers, we know thats not a growth industry.

So, Vippy, is the ONLY thing YOU do in your life related to electrical engineering? No hobbies? No family? No political affiliations?

Steve

1907. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:18:38 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <1DB4B8B397C9A921.65C0B74CDF66DED2.01F1BC742B80D7B8@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64102

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030405152049.23756.00000034@mb-fj.aol.com...
> In article <b6n5dfdht1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >ANY person, male of female, that served at ANY TIME, WAR OR PEACE
> >deserves
> >the RESPECT and GRATITUDE of the nation they served. NO EXCEPTIONS.
>
> None? Not even John A. Walker, Jr.?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Thank you. 'nough said.

Kim W5TIT

1908. Re: Serious Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:20:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406102000.24212.00000243@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 63896

>Subject: Re: Serious Question
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/6/2003 9:00 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030406100013.00320.00000365@mb-fs.aol.com>
>
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>If that were a serious question, you would have used proper grammar.
>
>Don't worry about that. WA8ULX has a very limited vocabulary. He doesn't show
>any knowledge, just short antagonizing phrases. He is truly an idiot.

Sure took some courage on your part to print that, Vippy. You dropped
that grenade pretty close to your own foxhole.

Steve

1909. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:24:50 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <98304907109B80B1.BA538F6E4D8CD5F1.BC0D172B49A7B5D9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64101

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030405162705.23238.00000011@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article
<E546ADE2836B93B5.00CEDC5692012862.025E53A61BB29681@lp.airnews.net>,
> "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >news:c2356669.0304030922.7165b709@posting.google.com...
> >>
> >> Here's a "what if" for ya....
> >>
> >> One of the main reasons for the war is to eliminate SH's WMDs. But no
> >> WMDs have been found by coalition forces yet - just lots of protective
> >> suits. Protective suits aren't proof that anyone has or will use WMDs
> >> - coalition troops have those suits, too.
> >>
> >> What if Bagdad falls and the regime changes, but no WMDs or evidence
> >> of same are ever found? Coalition will look like the aggressor and SH
> >> as a martyr who told the truth. Which may be his plan all along. Talk
> >> about a recruitment tool for OBL....
> >> >
> > >
> > >Oh, here's my surprised look. The WMD argument is a red herring.
> > >
> > Really? I thought it was probably the best argument the coalition has.
>
> If WMDs are the red herring, what's the real reason?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

First, note that the fat lady hasn't sung yet. Although, I am pretty sure
the WMD won't materialize.

What's the *real* reason? Goodness, if I could get into the head(s) of the
President et al, maybe I could tell you. Maybe it's as simple as
vindication for a father who failed...I don't know. This will all come out
in the wash. But, with NATO such as it is now, the UN such as it is now,
world opinion such as it is now, it will be very interesting to see what the
future holds, and what legacy this President will leave behind. We, the
United States and Britain (for the most part), have a lot of 'splaining to
do--is what the rest of the world is thinking I'm sure. We'll (the world)
see what happens.

Kim W5TIT

1910. Re: Serious Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:25:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406102510.01733.00000498@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 63897

> Sure took some courage on your part to print that, Vippy. You dropped
>that grenade pretty close to your own foxhole.
>
>Steve
>

What is amazing is he will not answer the Question, I guess it must be true.

1911. Re: Serious Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:25:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406102558.01733.00000499@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 63898

>Don't worry about that. WA8ULX has a very limited vocabulary.

ThaTs all thats needed to talk to you.

1912. Re: Serious Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:26:46 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406102646.01733.00000500@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 63899

>If that were a serious question, you would have used proper grammar.
>
>

It was a serious question, do you know the answer?

1913. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:30:13 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <C315A43BB08395ED.714C476EBF37E52F.7E40421F1846E33E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64105

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAB4BE22.159D8%stewart@say.net...
> "W5TIT" wrote:
>
> > (snip) Anyway...naw, discussions about politics
> > and politicians got boring years ago. All that's
> > left to say is, literally, they do whatever they
> > want.
>
>
>
> You're probably right, both about them doing whatever they want and
that's
> all left to say - I don't see how I can easily expand on what I said in
that
> long-winded rant.
>
>
> > (snip) If it gets to the point I can't pay my
> > taxes/work/etc, then I'll get upset. And, of
> > course, they aren't going to let that happen
> > to us, because then we do get restless....
>
>
> You've got it figured out - take all they can, but keep everyone
satisfied
> just enough not to revolt. It is a game played many times in history,
> sometimes not so successfully (witness the various revolutions). But,
> looking at the overall apathy in this country today, they are doing just
> fine with this game at the moment.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>

Yep. they got us where they want us. And, we're too fat, happy, and stupid
to care or do anything but be fat, happy, and stupid. Note: the WTC, the
fall of financial giants/empires, the erosion of the
economy/workforce...etc. K? Got that picture? K. Everyone starts waking
up, getting dissatisfied, getting concerned, getting involved....etc. K?

Got that picture? K. War. Whoop. For whatever reason, for however it happened, now we're all back on board again. We are more worried about "that" (there's always a that) than we are about "this" (and there's always a this--some this's are just more bigger :) than other this's).

Kim W5TIT

1914. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:31:18 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <AA724170F73E909A.56127EC9BF11ABCA.C4B7175A25C24503@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64104

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAB4C1D8.159DB%stewart@say.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
> > (snip) You have just insulted anyone that has
> > ever worn the uniform of this country, whether
> > they actually 'went to war' or not. You own
> > Larry and every Marine, Sailor, Soldier, Airman
> > and Coast Guard member an apology.
>
>
> You misunderstood what she said, Dan. She was differentiating between
> those who join for self-serving reasons and those who serve for the
defense
> of this country - stating the later were the soldiers she truly
appreciated.
> As such, she owes nobody an apology because I'm sure most military
personnel
> would fully agree with that (except perhaps the ones who joined for the
> self-serving reasons).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>

You got it, Dwight.

Kim W5TIT

1915. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:33:05 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <621006F716BEC953.7321C9232B1D1774.DF61CBFF10F935F1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64106

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b6no8k$3sn$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> IF that is what she meant, then I agree and apologize. Lets see what she
> has to say.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

Yes, Dan. That is what I meant. But, you're so busy jumping to conclusions
and being rabid that you can't get out of the way of yourself. It was quite
clear in my original post.

Kim W5TIT

>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> news:BAB4C1D8.159DB%stewart@say.net...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
> >
> > > (snip) You have just insulted anyone that has
> > > ever worn the uniform of this country, whether
> > > they actually 'went to war' or not. You own
> > > Larry and every Marine, Sailor, Soldier, Airman
> > > and Coast Guard member an apology.
> >
> >
> > You misunderstood what she said, Dan. She was differentiating between
> > those who join for self-serving reasons and those who serve for the
> defense
> > of this country - stating the later were the soldiers she truly
> appreciated.
> > As such, she owes nobody an apology because I'm sure most military
> personnel
> > would fully agree with that (except perhaps the ones who joined for the
> > self-serving reasons).
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
> >
> >
> > ----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
> ==----------

> > http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> > -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
> =-----
>
>

1916. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:41:59 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <86987420107ABEA5.78EA7D5B9A7A5FCF.EB3BB65EA3AB3483@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64108

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030406032733.23756.00000040@mb-fj.aol.com...
> In article <BAB2B6FF.1588A%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewart@say.net>
> writes:
>
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >>
> >> I'll have to say yes, it does. If any American, who
> >> enjoys the blessings of freedom and democracy which
> >> have been secured for him or her through the sacrifices
> >> made by those who willingly fought, suffered, and died
> >> to preserve them is not also willing to do so himself
> >> or herself, then they most definitely are NOT a
> >> "loyal Americans." They are merely cowards living under
> >> the protection of their moral superiors. (snip)
> >>
> >>
> > That is absolute bull crap, Larry. First of all, a willingness to kill
> >has never been, and should never be, the judge of someone's loyalty to
this
> >country.
>
> Dwight:
>
> In America, those who are unwilling to kill are not required to do so.
> Even before we had an all-volunteer concept in the armed forces, those
> who conscientiously objected killing were, if conscripted, allowed to
> perform support duties which did not require them to to bear arms for
> any reason other than self defense. Their service was of value to our
> national security, and their loyalty is not questioned.
>
> >Second, unless we now live in a military state, military service
> >does not make one "superior" to other Americans.
>
> I don't recall claiming that it did. It does, however, bestow honor and
> prestige upon those who *have* faithfully served.
>
> >And finally, most who
> >served in the military, including myself, will always strongly prefer a
> >peaceful resolution over the failure of war.
>
> Amen. May it always be so. However, when diplomacy fails, we must
> be prepared to use force to eliminate evil. This is a moral obligation of

> a nation which is based on the concept of freedom and liberty.
>
> >> (snip) If you disagree, consider yourself lucky to be
> >> living in America -- where millions of your fellow
> >> countrymen have sacrificed to give you the right to
> >> your disagreement.
> >
> >
> > Larry, as a Vietnam era vet, I served in the military just like you
did,
> >and certainly came as close to war as you ever did (actual combat is not
> >exactly a big concern for the typical Air Force Sergeant), so don't sit
> >there on your pompous butt talking about being "superior" or more loyal.
>
> My own service to my country involved sacrificing the best and most
> productive years of my adult life, working long hours under at times
> difficult conditions, ensuring that personnel and materiel were
transported
> safely and efficiently, that people were well trained in their jobs, and
> government resources were safeguarded and effectively utilized. I did
> faced the dangers of possible armed conflict by virtue of having served in
> a position requiring worldwide deployability, and indeed, I served
overseas
> for a number of years on permanent and temporary duty assignments.
> No, I was not concerned about sitting in a foxhole with bullets whizzing
> past my head. But those who were actually concerned with that sort
> of thing depended on me and the people I worked with to give them the
> support they needed to suceed. On the other hand, I had to depend on
> many others for the support I needed to do my job. The thing that is
> unique about military service is that there are no unimportant jobs when
> it comes to achieving the overall objective -- which is the deterrence of
> war and/or the successful use of military power to achieve peace in
> the absence or failure of diplomacy.
>
> > The millions of fellow countrymen you described above didn't sacrifice
so
> >you could describe yourself as superior and other Americans as inferior
or
> >yourself as more loyal with others less so. In reality, to proclaim
yourself
> >more loyal or superior to other Americans is nothing more than a cruel
slap
> >in the face of what they actually sacrificed for.
>
> Well, Dwight, I see your point, but in this case, it was actually a very
> highly directed slap in Kim's face! In fact, it was actually intended to
be
> a jaw-smashing, tooth-ejecting, blood-splattering knockout blow! However,
> I'm sure that in Kim's case, as usual, it went whizzing safely right over
> her haid!

>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Yeah, right, Larry. Maybe you ought to start realizing that what you say to one is taken by many to be how you really think.

Kim W5TIT

1917. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:56:02 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <6eXja.3691$Xp3.2362099@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 63887

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030406094830.00320.00000363@mb-fs.aol.com...
> -How come Morse code was not even mentioned in your class? Some Hams say
it is
> a most important communications mode.
> -What are the advantages/disadvantages of Morse code?
> -How come nobody uses Morse code?

Since approximately 1/3 of the hams spend 75% or of their time (per a recent
ARRL survey), your last question is incorrect. Hams are certainly somebody.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

1918. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:58:12 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406105812.00320.00000367@mb-fs.aol.com>
Source record: 64107

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>And now Vipul manages to interpret the response as to mean exactly the
>opposite of what the poster actually said. Where do you get your data ??

Why do people misinterpret what I say? I agreed Morse code is a growth
industry, EE is not.

Pointing out the increased numbers is advocating Morse code. N2EY (an
Electrical Engineer) advocates Morse code, not Electrical Engineering.

1919. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 14:58:54 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <OgXja.3692$Xp3.2362860@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 63890

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:6eXja.3691$Xp3.2362099@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030406094830.00320.00000363@mb-fs.aol.com...
> > -How come Morse code was not even mentioned in your class? Some Hams say
> it is
> > a most important communications mode.
> > -What are the advantages/disadvantages of Morse code?
> > -How come nobody uses Morse code?
>
>
> Since approximately 1/3 of the hams spend 75% or of their time (per a
recent
> ARRL survey), your last question is incorrect. Hams are certainly
somebody.
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE

That should have read "... 75% or more of their radio communication time ...
"

1920. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 15:05:04 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <AmXja.3693$Xp3.2364644@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 63892

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030406095330.00320.00000364@mb-fs.aol.com...
> From N2EY:
> >And if we look at the number of manufacturers making and selling Morse
Code
> >related hardware and software today, as compared to 10, 20, 30 years ago,
> >it's
> >clear that part of the industry is growing. With or without a test.
>
> Glad to see an EE advocating Morse code instead of Electrical Engineering.
From
> the numbers, we know thats not a growth industry.

And now Vipul manages to interpret the response as to mean exactly the opposite of what the poster actually said. Where do you get your data ??

Morse code usage does indeed appear to be on the increase. There is not only the growth in the sales of the equipment to back it up but actual usage data. The ARRL has recently published an article about contest participation. The participation in the CW contests has increased 20% in the last few years. There has been almost no increase in the participation in phone contests.

1921. Re: Serious Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 15:07:34 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406110734.00320.00000368@mb-fs.aol.com>
Source record: 64109

From K4YZ:
>>Don't worry about that. WA8ULX has a very limited vocabulary. He doesn't
>show
>>any knowledge, just short antagonizing phrases. He is truly an idiot.

>Sure took some courage on your part to print that

Actually, based on WA8ULX's posts, it was easy. It didn't take any courage at
all.

1922. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 15:09:18 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <yqXja.3695$Xp3.2366045@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 63893

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0304051447.5120c060@posting.google.com...
> We'll keep working the numbers until we can show Morse Code as a
> growth industry as one "great" DXer would like it to be.
>
> 73, Brian

There's a very simple way to show it's growing. Check out the articles on the ARRL web site. The growth in participation in the phone contests has been insignificant yet the growth in participation in the CW contests has been a whopping 20% in the last few years. That's a lot of growth. Any business would take that kind of increase and celebrate.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

1923. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 15:20:16 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <DE2CDC9350690878.AF6F83EFDDD155C1.24E2C83F290E74F2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64113

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.04.06.15.20.23.430465.28928@arrl.org...
> On Sun, 06 Apr 2003 10:07:59 -0400, W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Dan, what proof do you have of this? "We" the people were told that
they
> > were in Iraq. Now, we were told this by our President who, presumably,
has
> > the entire resources of our spying capabilities available to him. While
> > "we're" not done in Iraq yet, have *YOU* noticed that there's been
nothing
> > in the way of WMD or biological or chemical weapons found?
>
> Jury's still out. Consider that if the Iraqis hid their WMD well, it may
> take a while to find them, particularly if while looking for them you
> have to pause every so often to respond to a pickup full of fedayeen with
> RPGs. So it's a bit early to draw conclusions.
>

Note that I did say "while we're not done in Iraq yet." My question to Dan
was to point out to him that it's not as definite as he seems to think it is
that Iraq has WMD. Yes, I agree with you. It is a bit (a lot) early to
draw conclusions. I also think it was a bit (a lot) much to ask the world
to get on board with this when it hasn't been proven. I also realize there
are those like Dan who believe--for some reason--that this is definite. It
bothers me when I am expected to "just accept" something...with no basis.

My skepticism is not based on a mistrust of the US government, nor really of
a non-violent attitude. I am very concerned about world repurcussions with
this action. I am even more concerned if there are no WMD found/discovered.

> >
> > Now, you are saying "they're in Syria." What resources are available to
> > you?
>
> It's the Israelis saying that:
> http://www.haaretzdaily.com/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo=278925
> Seems petty light on details, however.
>
> Jon
>

I glanced at so, admittedly, haven't researched the article nor gone any
further. The reason is because an article in a newspaper, or an opinion
from someone whomever they may be, is certainly great for debate. But as a

basis for decision making in matters of foreign policy and/or war? I know you know that, by the way...

Kim W5TIT

1924. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 15:20:23 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.06.15.20.23.430465.28928@arrl.org>
Source record: 64110

On Sun, 06 Apr 2003 10:07:59 -0400, W5TIT wrote:
>
> Dan, what proof do you have of this? "We" the people were told that they
> were in Iraq. Now, we were told this by our President who, presumably, has
> the entire resources of our spying capabilities available to him. While
> "we're" not done in Iraq yet, have *YOU* noticed that there's been nothing
> in the way of WMD or biological or chemical weapons found?

Jury's still out. Consider that if the Iraqis hid their WMD well, it may
take a while to find them, particularly if while looking for them you
have to pause every so often to respond to a pickup full of fedayeen with
RPGs. So it's a bit early to draw conclusions.

> Now, you are saying "they're in Syria." What resources are available to
> you?

It's the Israelis saying that:
http://www.haaretzdaily.com/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo=278925
Seems petty light on details, however.

Jon

1925. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 15:33:37 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <040B900E4D35D222.D9C72B8802B8CFE3.77962420419C92F1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64116

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.04.06.15.48.10.305942.28928@arrl.org...
> On Sun, 30 Mar 2003 21:53:45 -0500, W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > All the cries for "patriotism" (those of people who imply it is
unpatriotic
> > not to support and stand behind a President of the US), are probably
right
> > along party lines; i.e., would we find a Republican pleading for respect
and
> > admiration of a Democrat President or vice versa? hmmmmm....
>
> We already know that the answer to that is "no":
> http://www.newsmax.com/articles/?a=1998/12/18/51233
>
> Jon
>

heh heh...I do like the news sources you're providing. I have been
exploring the articles on the other site and now this... I really like
non-mainstream media resources.

Kim W5TIT

1926. Re: How's This For Courage?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 15:38:27 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.06.15.38.27.92014.28928@arrl.org>
Source record: 64111

On Sat, 05 Apr 2003 14:26:34 -0500, N2EY wrote:
>
> Sure. After 20+ years of atrocities by the regime, why should anyone be
> surprised?

Now, wait a second, Jim. Those atrocities never happened, and I have irrefutable proof. Recently there have been hundreds of thousands of people in the streets of cities in America, Europe, Asia and particularly the Middle East, protesting the deaths of Iraqi civilians in the present war. Obviously, people who care so deeply about the average Iraqi would have been protesting the Hussein regime's treatment of its citizens had atrocities such as you mention actually been happening for the last 20 years. But there have been no such protests against SH's regime. QED: There have been no atrocities.

(P.S.: Anyone who doesn't get the sardonic nature of the above shouldn't bother replying.)

Jon

1927. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 15:38:39 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406113839.00320.00000370@mb-fs.aol.com>
Source record: 64112

From K4YZ:
> Is the class organized to teach Amateur Radio? If not, then why would he
>mention it other than in a historical case reference?

Smith chart was very important, yet another prof did not cover it. (Probably because not enough time).

Classes don't always cover the material you need, so its possible Morse could not have been mentioned for other reasons than <lack of> merit.

>>-What are the advantages/disadvantages of Morse code?
>
> Without any practical experience, how could he make an informed opinion
>on
>this?

Proff really knows his stuff from a practical standpoint. He also claims this is the best way to learn. He mentions Ham radio, so he must have been a Ham. He was not a non-industry Prof. He worked in industry for several years, has designed many Comm Systems, and has written several papers. He is now a Prof.

The class covered tradeoffs of each mode. Very complicated codes such as Walsh codes and Turbo codes would be covered next class. Prof really knows the material on encoding schemes.

Its amazing that you would say that someone that teaches a class has no knowledge of the subject matter or practical experience.

Seems like you want me to ask the following irrelevant additional questions:
-Do you, or did you, have an amateur radio license.
-Do YOU know Morse code.

>And you did not answer the question about whether or not YOU served in the
>Armed Forces of the United States.

No, I did not. Just referring to US Army Survival Manual, in bookstore. FM 21-76, if that means anything.

1928. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 15:39:22 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <F5AC72C81861A1DB.E87706F0073610E5.623C8BA1AC781992@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64118

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.04.06.15.48.10.305942.28928@arrl.org...
> On Sun, 30 Mar 2003 21:53:45 -0500, W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > All the cries for "patriotism" (those of people who imply it is
unpatriotic
> > not to support and stand behind a President of the US), are probably
right
> > along party lines; i.e., would we find a Republican pleading for respect
and
> > admiration of a Democrat President or vice versa? hmmmmm....
>
> We already know that the answer to that is "no":
> http://www.newsmax.com/articles/?a=1998/12/18/51233
>
> Jon
>

Yep, as I said...there a little differences between political parties any more. To be a politician just means ya've got legal authority(?) to play puppeteer.

Kim W5TIT

1929. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 15:48:10 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.06.15.48.10.305942.28928@arrl.org>
Source record: 64114

```
On Sun, 30 Mar 2003 21:53:45 -0500, W5TIT wrote:
>
> All the cries for "patriotism" (those of people who imply it is unpatriotic
> not to support and stand behind a President of the US), are probably right
> along party lines; i.e., would we find a Republican pleading for respect and
> admiration of a Democrat President or vice versa? hmmmmm....

We already know that the answer to that is "no":
http://www.newsmax.com/articles/?a=1998/12/18/51233

Jon
```

1930. Get a life Robeson

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 15:54:46 UTC
From: Myself <Me@onthenet.net>
Message-ID: <fdj09vkci104jv2igmhe6n78k2619m8ohc@4ax.com>
Source record: 64115

```
Nuff said
```

1931. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 16:03:32 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406120332.00320.00000371@mb-fs.aol.com>
Source record: 64117

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>> -How come nobody uses Morse code?
>Since approximately 1/3 of the hams spend 75% or of their time (per a recent
>ARRL survey), your last question is incorrect.

Alot of people do things for fun. Morse code may be fun (to some people).
Morsers claim Morse code is also very useful.

>Hams are certainly somebody.

They sure are. Weird, overweight, antisocial. Just visit a Hamfest and you will
see the typical Ham.

1932. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 16:12:14 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406121214.00320.00000372@mb-fs.aol.com>
Source record: 64119

From Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
>That should have read "... 75% or more of their radio communication time ...

In the 22th century, how many Morse coders will you need to replace a light
source?
Five. One to actually do it, and four to reminisce about how much better the
old tubes were.

How do Morse coders traditionally greet each other?
"Hi. I'm better than you."

Why can't a gorilla do Morse code?
He's too sensitive.

Why did the Morse coder learn code?
So he wouldn't be mistaken for for a CBer.

1933. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 16:26:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E90553A.8080806@adelphia.net>
Source record: 64120

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
>>And now Vipul manages to interpret the response as to mean exactly the
>>opposite of what the poster actually said. Where do you get your data ??
>
>
> Why do people misinterpret what I say? I agreed Morse code is a growth
> industry, EE is not.

It was not clear from your post. I thought that was whay you meant, but as you see, others thought you meant something else.

Maybe some classes in expressing yourself, and possibly a Dale Carnegie course would help (not trying to be rude here - I recommend the second course all the time to most everyone)

> Pointing out the increased numbers is advocating Morse code. N2EY (an
> Electrical Engineer) advocates Morse code, not Electrical Engineering.

How do you draw that conclusion? Another of my hobbies is amateur astronomy. By your logic, I am advocating people to stay out of my professional field? Does not make sense. Jim is doing what he likes to do on his personal time. And if that includes "beeping", then that's just fine and dandy.

Why your obsession with what Jim does in his spare time?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1934. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 16:26:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406122617.00629.00000024@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 64122

In article <20030406032735.23756.00000043@mb-fj.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 06 Apr 2003 07:27:35 GMT
>
>In article <20030405152049.23756.00000034@mb-fj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>
>>In article <b6n5dfdht1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
>><w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>>
>>>ANY person, male of female, that served at ANY TIME, WAR OR PEACE
>>>deserves
>>>the RESPECT and GRATITUDE of the nation they served. NO EXCEPTIONS.
>>
>>None? Not even John A. Walker, Jr.?
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Jim:
>
>I'm sure that Dan understands that proven traitors are not included in
>the most admirable comments he made above.

Maybe. But he did make a big point of "NO EXCEPTIONS".

>The relatively few

I'd say "extremely few"

>and
>notorious members of the armed forces who have sold our country's
>critical military secrets to our potential adversaries have counteracted
>whatever of their own valid contributions they made have made, and
>those of all of their fellow service members. They make the world a
>more dangerous place for everyone, and the damage they do must be
>repaired at a much greater cost in material resources and increased
>jeapordy of our loyal, trustworthy armed forces personnel. Dan knows
>this, I'm sure.

Perhaps it just slipped his mind. IOW, honest mistake.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1935. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 16:26:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406122618.00629.00000025@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 64121

In article <20030406095330.00320.00000364@mb-fs.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 06 Apr 2003 13:53:30 GMT
>
>From N2EY:
>>And if we look at the number of manufacturers making and selling Morse Code
>>related hardware and software today, as compared to 10, 20, 30 years ago,
>>it's clear that part of the industry is growing. With or without a test.
>
>Glad to see an EE advocating Morse code instead of Electrical Engineering.

Who is doing that? Can't be me. In case you didn't notice, I advocate all sorts of amateur radio activites, not just Morse code. Like homebrewing.

>From
>the numbers, we know thats not a growth industry.
>
What is not a "growth industry"?

--

Here's two simple questions for you, Len, N0IMD, and anybody else who wants to answer it:

Currently there are more than 250,000 US amateur radio licensees shown in the database as "Technician". Have any of them passed code tests? Do any of them have HF amateur privileges?

1936. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 16:36:42 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <uIYja.46920$B8.13893475@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 64123

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030405162039.13308.00000043@mb-cj.aol.com...
> In article <b7d1465c.0304050355.424bd3ec@posting.google.com>,
wa2si@arrl.net
> (Bert Craig) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030404160308.15625.00000028@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> >> In article <b7d1465c.0304040256.531b15c7@posting.google.com>,
> >wa2si@arrl.net
> >> (Bert Craig) writes:
> >>
> >> >> Enjoyment is not the only criteria. Usefulness, relavance are
important
> >> >> criteria.
> >> >
> >> >With all do respect, your as wrong as two left feet here. CW's
> >> >usefulness and relevance to amateur radio are two very important
> >> >criteria IN FAVOR of learning the most basic (read entry-level) Morse
> >> >code skills. Many find enjoyment AFTER learning the basic 5-wpm and
> >> >find they wish to progress further.
> >>
> >> Oh?
> >
> >Yeah.
>
> What of the many that -
>
> 1. Tried it and found it of NO enjoyment?

My nightly 10m ragchewing partner is an 82 yr. old General who understood
what was required for HF privies, satisfied that requirement w/o the crying
and moaning and never looked back. CW was/is not his preferred mode. His
enjoyment came from "earning the privilege" to utilize his preferred mode
and frequencies.

> 2. Have been in radio communications for years and never used it?

Lots of folk passed their respective code tests to ear their HF privies and
then never used code again. There's certainly nothing wrong with that.

> 3. Noted that no other radio service uses it any more or never
> planned to use it in that service at all?

Apples and oranges, Len?

> 4. Don't buy into the fantasy mystique of the Way of Morse?

I didn't buy into anything and nobody sold it to me either. I wanted to become an ARO and operate on HF. I researched the requirements. I studied to satisfy said requirements. All in all, MUCH less arduous than whining about the unfairness of it all. In studying for and passing Element 1, I found that I kinda liked the code. I learned at approx. 15-wpm w/a character spacing of 5-wpm. Now, I'm up to 25-wpm w/a character spacing of 6-wpm. Does that mean I'm "proficient?" Heck no! Element 1 was just an entry level exam designed to give one a "taste." The resulting ticket is just a license to learn. (But it has always been the individual's choice as to how far and in what dir'n they wish to progress.)

> 5. Don't believe that time stands still with no progress in any
> technology such as some olde-tyme amateurs?

So retaining Element 1 retards the growth of other technologies in AR? LMAO!

> >> What is the International Amateur Radio Union's viewpoint on the
> >> relevancy of morse code testing? They are for eliminating it.
> >
> >Then why are there various countries that have stated that they will
> >retain their code test requirements even if the ITU requirement is
> >dropped? Most notably, Russia and Germany.
>
> What about them? What has Russia done that is so notable
> in either geopolitics or radio communications concerning
> amateur radio?

What do they have to prove to you?

> Germany is at least venturing into some experimentation in
> amateur radio technology (evidenced by European amateur
> radio publications) but is no longer a world leader in radio
> communications or electronics.

Guess their not up to your standards, Len.

> Nearly ALL countries are involved in expansion of commercial
> radio-electronics with little regard for hobby-leisure pursuits
> involving amateur radio and the furtherance of the morse code
> state of the art.

The PARTICIPANTS of hobby radio take care of that. Get it, Len? That's why the NCTA's cry (Very appropriate word.) of "well, the FCC says so" is childish. That's also why the NCTA's are scared to death of a honest vote by the some odd 685,000 licensed US ARO's re. the retention of Element 1.

> >Sadly, many amateur radio
> >"organizations" do not echo the sentiments of the majority of their
> >constituency.
>
> That applies to ARRL as well, the fence-straddler and do-little
> organization for the ITU-R S25 restructuring who refuses to

> take any position on the morse code issue now.

I violently agree! :-)

> >A fair vote scares the crap out of the NCTAs.
>
> It does NOT.

Sure it does. The mere suggestion of a fair vote brings out the "well, daddy (The FCC) says so" :-p responses, when it's clear that "daddy" couldn't care less. Prettty lame, Len.

> Morse code mode is on the way of becoming
> defunct, extinct to every other radio service in the world
> except amateur radio.

Reread your statement, Len. It's saying something.

> If the PCTAs continue their fantasy
> and mythology of the Way of Morse, then they too will
> become defunct, extinct, archaeological exhibits in a living
> museum of archaic radio.

You mean like me, Len? I'm a newbie and I like Morse code. How about mu 5-yr. old lass, perhaps she'll be "laughing at the lazy" when I'm an OT?

> >> What is ARRL viewpoint? They were FOR it for decades but only
> >> lately have they taken a neutral stand, neither supporting nor
> >> against the code test.
> >
> >The ARRL "leadership" is basically made up of psuedo-politicians.
> >Their biggest concern appears to be keeping their jobs, even if it
> >means perching themselves "on the fence" rather then taking a firm
> >stance for wishes of the majority of licensed US amatuers.
>
> ARRL "leadership" is not my concern.

What is your concern, Len?

> They do NOT "represent"
> me nor do they "represent" anyone but a minority of licensed
> US radio amateur licensees.

Agreed.

> ARRL does have a large enough membership and economic
> means to lobby for the maintenance of the Archaic Radio-
> telegraphy Society desires in a hobby pursuit and radio
> regulations pertaining to amateur radio.

We'll take what we can get.

>>Snipped for brevity. You were rambling again, Len.<<

> NO license is required to use the Internet or newsgroups. Never
> has been such.

True.

> News: I've been federally licensed in radio since 1956...just not
> in amateur radio.

So why are you here, Len? This is an AMATEUR RADIO newsgroup.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1937. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 17:17:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304060917.37fbd879@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64124

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E8E671B.E8580837@earthlink.net>...
> Dennis Ferguson wrote:
>
> > I suspect 0.02 wpm could be a fairly proficient rate under the
> > conditions.
>
> I suspect that it could be *efficient* but it has nothing to do with
> *proficiency*.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave scours the web looking for any and all "proficiency" definition infractions.

1938. Re: Serious Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 17:33:53 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406133353.28606.00000455@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 64125

Hey VSHAH are you still one of them No-COde CBplussers?

1939. Re: Serious Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 18:10:46 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406141046.25992.00000755@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 64126

From (WA8ULX):
> Hey VSHAH are you still one of them No-COde CBplussers?

Yes.

-In the 22th century, how many Morse coders will you need to replace a light source?
Five. One to actually do it, and four to reminisce about how much better the old tubes were.

-How do Morse coders traditionally greet each other?
"Hi. I'm better than you."

-Why can't a gorilla do Morse code?
He's too sensitive.

-Why did the Morse coder learn code?
So he wouldn't be mistaken for for a CBer.

1940. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 18:13:11 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304061013.22b09fde@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64127

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030405162042.13308.00000045@mb-cj.aol.com>...
> In article <b6n5dfdht1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Even from you I am amazed. I bet you would have made a good war protester
> >in the 60s. Im sure General Giap would have personally given you the Hanoi
> >peace prize.
>
> The Vietnam War was not the ONLY war fought by the USA since
> the Korean War. Try refreshing your memory of what happened
> since 1973...a mere 30 years.

- - - - -

Hey Putz, then who was that who was fighting the 'Cong and the PRNV
after we supposedly left in '73 according to your calendar and April
'75 when the fighting stopped? The Aussies? The Turks? RTTY repeater
rear widget mercenaries? Who?

Ya blew it *again*.

If ya just gotta make an ass of yerself at least work at getting
well-known recent history straight before you spout off.

Whatta PUUUUUTZ!

- - - - -

> Try Grenada, Panama, Gulf War
> 1 and now Gulf War 2.
>
> >You have just insulted anyone that has ever worn the uniform of this
> >country, whether they actually 'went to war' or not. You own Larry and
> >every Marine, Sailor, Soldier, Airman and Coast Guard member an apology.
>
> As a veteran of the United States Army 1952-1960 I don't see
> a single "insult" in Kim's remarks.
>
> You owe ME an apology. So does Roll for his "moral superiority"
> self-elevation.
>
> >ANY person, male of female, that served at ANY TIME, WAR OR PEACE >deserves
> >the RESPECT and GRATITUDE of the nation they served. NO EXCEPTIONS.
>
> Except: Among radio amateurs who love to insult non-amateurs

> by stating they were in "rear areas" during a war.
>
> >You being a 'military brat' should know of the day to day sacrifices they
> >make. And when one does it for twenty or more years, then they deserve it
> >even more.
>
> Are you also one of those "moral superiors" too?

. . . duh . .

w3rv

1941. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 18:23:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304061023.ef5df7e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64128

averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman) wrote in message
news:<20030405212529.04143.00000018@mb-fb.aol.com>...
> In article <b6nnrt$215$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21...we all have your number. Stir up the crap. Dont need it.
> >And DONT CARE WHAT YOU THINK...I put you on the dumbass list a long time
> >ago.
>
> You seem to want to FIGHT. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
> The Vietnam War ended on January 27, 1973.

WRONG! Again. 1975. You're a disgrace to the rest of the putzes.

w3rv

1942. Re: Serious Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 18:26:36 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406142636.28474.00000632@mb-fv.aol.com>
Source record: 64129

Oh I see you still dont have the Brain Power to get a Dumbed Down License. Just hang in there your Welfare License will be here before long.

1943. Re: How's This For Courage?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 18:45:57 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304061045.2191681e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64130

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030406100546.24212.00000239@mb-fr.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: How's This For Courage?
> >From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
> >Date: 4/5/2003 11:29 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <d22b54c3.0304052029.e4b55c1@posting.google.com>
>
> >> I wish N0BK could comment on the surrealism of the Iraqi Information
> Minister's
> >> lies becoming more and more outrageous.
> >
> >He could care less, the guy's credibility is the least of what he's about to
> >lose.
>
> No kidding...I caught an "interview" with the Iraqi Information Minister
> this morning bragging about how they had repulsed American forces from the
> airport.
>
> All the while they were doing a split-screen showing some of our guys on
> the ground at the airport with weapons either at sling arms or in a ready but
> not defensive posture.
>
> This guy must have gone to the Lennie the Lame School of Tell The Lies
> Despite The Evidence To The Contrary.

The Putz just ain't a right person, can't get anything right, facts
and otherwise.

>
> What idiots.

Sunday afternoon and we have 7,000 troops at the airport and the first
Herky has landed. Still won't shut him up. Andersonian personality.

>
> Steve, K4YZ

w3rv

1944. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 19:10:22 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6pu24$la4$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64131

I dont need proof. It just makes common sense.
I am able to think and rationalize. Im not a braindead liberal.

Dan/W4NTI

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:DB8F8D62FBA3227C.A80D1F5907B3342B.2CD38C1E834FCC63@lp.airnews.net...
> Dan, what proof do you have of this? "We" the people were told that they
> were in Iraq. Now, we were told this by our President who, presumably,
has
> the entire resources of our spying capabilities available to him. While
> "we're" not done in Iraq yet, have *YOU* noticed that there's been nothing
> in the way of WMD or biological or chemical weapons found?
>
> Now, you are saying "they're in Syria." What resources are available to
> you? Or, is it just that you are among those who'd see to it that we
> progress through one country after another using our red herring, until
> we're tired of obliteration?
>
> Good grief.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b6n4mr$82t$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> > There in Syria. SH would NEVER destroy them.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> >
news:E546ADE2836B93B5.00CEDC5692012862.025E53A61BB29681@lp.airnews.net...
> > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > > news:c2356669.0304030922.7165b709@posting.google.com...
> > > >
> > > > Here's a "what if" for ya....
> > > >
> > > > One of the main reasons for the war is to eliminate SH's WMDs. But
no
> > > > WMDs have been found by coalition forces yet - just lots of
protective
> > > > suits. Protective suits aren't proof that anyone has or will use
WMDs
> > > > - coalition troops have those suits, too.

> > > >
> > > > What if Bagdad falls and the regime changes, but no WMDs or evidence
> > > > of same are ever found? Coalition will look like the aggressor and
SH
> > > > as a martyr who told the truth. Which may be his plan all along.
Talk
> > > > about a recruitment tool for OBL....
> > > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Oh, here's my surprised look. The WMD argument is a red herring.
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
>
>

1945. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 20:07:14 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406160714.26062.00000698@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 64134

TO(not From) K4YZ:
>He
>> was not a non-industry Prof. He worked in industry for several years, has
>> designed many Comm Systems, and has written several papers. He is now a
>Prof.

K4YZ accuse me of creating non-real Prof. More and more facts revealed. Now Prof also worked in industry and designed Communication Systems.

Either this is an <out of control> growing fancy- or it must be true.

Also, I don't know Prof's ans. to Morse Question? I sincerely doubt that it has the qualities that make it most important mode.

Morse code could be:
(1) most fun mode, since manual realtime encoding/decoding is fun.
(2) least complex modulation mode (as listed on chart of modulation schemes).

I doubt Morse code has:
(1) highest information rate - other modes seem to beat it.
(2) lowest Bit Error Rate

(3) practical use for emergency comm - otherwise it would be in use.

1946. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 20:22:31 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <b00ka.3785$Xp3.2475180@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64132

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030406113839.00320.00000370@mb-fs.aol.com...
> Proff really knows his stuff from a practical standpoint. He also claims
this
> is the best way to learn. He mentions Ham radio, so he must have been a
Ham. He
> was not a non-industry Prof. He worked in industry for several years, has
> designed many Comm Systems, and has written several papers. He is now a
Prof.

That is a fallacious deduction. Just because he mentions ham radio does NOT imply that he is a ham. People in the various radio communications fields have at least heard of us and have a rough idea of what we do. Designing industrial comm systems does not mean that he is intimately familiar with the activities of the ham community.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1947. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 20:26:39 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <340ka.3787$Xp3.2477091@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64133

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030406120332.00320.00000371@mb-fs.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
> >> -How come nobody uses Morse code?
> >Since approximately 1/3 of the hams spend 75% or of their time (per a
recent
> >ARRL survey), your last question is incorrect.
>
> Alot of people do things for fun. Morse code may be fun (to some people).
> Morsers claim Morse code is also very useful.
>
> >Hams are certainly somebody.
>
> They sure are. Weird, overweight, antisocial. Just visit a Hamfest and you
will
> see the typical Ham.

Whether they are using it for fun or other reasons, they are still using it in significant numbers. Therefore your statement that nobody uses it is wrong.

I go to lots of hamfests. They aren't weird, overweight or antisocial. I know a lot of skinny hams. Afterall, someone needs to be available to climb the towers for antenna work. Our local ham club has 5 officers. Only 2 of us could be considered overweight. When I look at the general membership in attendance at a meeting, there is no higher percentage of overweight hams than there are in the general population.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

1948. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 20:28:31 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406162831.26062.00000701@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 64135

>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>Just because he mentions ham radio does NOT
>imply that he is a ham. People in the various radio communications fields
>have at least heard of us

Interestingly, in two other rf class, both Profs made no mention of amateur radio. Probably, has never heard of it.

In one class a list of books was given. All were scholarly books. Other than that IEEE paper articles were referenced.

Not even one reference to an ARRL publication or article or about amateur radio.

Actually, in my opinion, that would have made the class even better. I mean this from an academic viewpoint, not from a biased Ham viewpoint. The examples in the ARRL books were well explained, unlike the textbook examples. ARRL books often had more practical consideration, rather than showing an ideal circuit that the textbook shows. And the books did not sacrifice on the rigorous math.

Since a list of books was mentioned, at least one ARRL pub. would have made the class better. The class did not have a lab, and some of the projects, in one book, would make good lab projects.

In one antenna class proj, I used an ARRL pub. and this help me get the project done faster and better. I got the ARRL pub from someone in a local Ham club. I mentioned I had a class assignment, and asked if anyone built a similar antenna or knew anything about it.

1949. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 20:45:06 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304062040510.336@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 64136

On Sun, 6 Apr 2003, Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "D. Stussy" wrote:
> >
> > I see that you're just as misinformed about
> > this as about radio! :-)
> >
> > The inspection station on I-15 coming from
> > Las Vegas is in Yermo, right next to Barstow,
> > about 100 miles in, and about 10 miles east
> > of where I-10 and I-40 merge. (snip)
>
>
> You need to get out a map. I-10 and I-40 don't merge. I-40 merges with
> I-15 in Barstow and I-15 then goes on to merge with I-10 near Riverside and
> San Bernardino. Regardless, I don't know anything about the inspection
> station you're talking about - the inspection stations on I-10 and I-40 at
> the state line between Arizona and California are very near that state line.
> I can't say exactly how many miles because I've never paid that much
> attention, but easily within ten to fifteen miles (if that). Anyway, how
> does the distance from the state line change anything I've said about the
> impression these inspection stations present to those traveling into the
> state of California?

That was a typo. I-15 (not I-10) and I-40 merge.

It changes the view that California isn't there to protect its BORDERS against agricultural infestations - especially if it takes more than an hour from the border to come across the inspection station. 100 miles in gives no such impression, and there are other ways in (not so major highways) where one may not reach any inspection station at all.

The question should be: What does that say for those who live in Baker and places on the "outbound" side of the stations yet are within California borders?

1950. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 20:45:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406164544.11012.00000019@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 64137

In article <98304907109B80B1.BA538F6E4D8CD5F1.BC0D172B49A7B5D9@lp.airnews.net>,
"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>Date: Sun, 6 Apr 2003 09:24:50 -0500
>
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030405162705.23238.00000011@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> In article
><E546ADE2836B93B5.00CEDC5692012862.025E53A61BB29681@lp.airnews.net>,
>> "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> >news:c2356669.0304030922.7165b709@posting.google.com...
>> >>
>> >> Here's a "what if" for ya....
>> >>
>> >> One of the main reasons for the war is to eliminate SH's WMDs. But no
>> >> WMDs have been found by coalition forces yet - just lots of protective
>> >> suits. Protective suits aren't proof that anyone has or will use WMDs
>> >> - coalition troops have those suits, too.
>> >>
>> >> What if Bagdad falls and the regime changes, but no WMDs or evidence
>> >> of same are ever found? Coalition will look like the aggressor and SH
>> >> as a martyr who told the truth. Which may be his plan all along. Talk
>> >> about a recruitment tool for OBL....
>> >> >
>> >
>> >Oh, here's my surprised look. The WMD argument is a red herring.
>> >
>> Really? I thought it was probably the best argument the coalition has.
>>
>> If WMDs are the red herring, what's the real reason?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>First, note that the fat lady hasn't sung yet.

Last I heard, the Marines were digging in the yard of a girls' school, on a tip
from an informant that a cache of chemical weapons had been buried there.

>Although, I am pretty sure
>the WMD won't materialize.

>
Actually, they don't have to. Documents or traces of them will prove the point. But it would be best for everyone if the WERE found - and destroyed.

>What's the *real* reason? Goodness, if I could get into the head(s) of the
>President et al, maybe I could tell you.

Here are some possibilities:

- Bush & Blair have information they can't reveal that proves the war is worth the risk.

- They are being fed false information by folks who want SH gone.

- It's about the oil

- Distraction from economic and terrorism issues at home

>Maybe it's as simple as
>vindication for a father who failed...I don't know.

Did Papa Bush really "fail"? As I understand it, during GW1, coalition forces were rolling towards B'dad at a furious pace but were ORDERED to stop because Kuwait had been freed, which was the avowed goal of GW1. Why wasn't Stormin' Norman allowed to finish the job? I've never seen an official answer to that question.

>This will all come out
>in the wash.

If we live long enough.

>But, with NATO such as it is now, the UN such as it is now,
>world opinion such as it is now, it will be very interesting to see what the
>future holds, and what legacy this President will leave behind.

Recall that after GW1, Papa Bush had extremely high approval ratings - so high that none of the top Dems wanted to run against him. Bill Clinton was initially a sacrificial-lamb candidate like Christie Whitman when she first ran for NJ governor.

But the economy went bust in 92, and then Ross Parrot (I mean Perot) divided the conservative vote. So we got 8 years of Slick Willy, who, despite a booming economy and the perception of peace and security, got himself impeached and couldn't help his VP get elected.

>We, the
>United States and Britain (for the most part), have a lot of 'splaining to
>do--is what the rest of the world is thinking I'm sure.

Probably. OTOH, many of those other govts. may be very happy to have us do their dirty work for them. Ya think Putin has billions to spend getting rid of a regime that used to be a good customer, and is possibly a competitor in the world oil market? I don't.

> We'll (the world) see what happens.

Hopefully we'll get the straight story. Someday.

--

Ever see the beginning of the movie "Gladiator", where the over-matched barbarians are simply wiped out by the Roman legions?

One line that comes to mind is "some people should know when they're beaten" or something like that. After the battle, it turns out that the main reason for the campaign was because Rome felt threatened, and just that feeling would cause Rome to squash the perceived threat.

Are we entering an era of Pax Americana?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1951. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 20:47:42 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304062045530.336@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 64138

On Sun, 6 Apr 2003, Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Len Over 21" wrote:
> >
> > Dwight Stewart wrote...
> >>
> >> There is no implication other than (snip)
> >
> > I've seen CHP armed troopers on all the freeways
> > around here. That's their job...to patrol the state
> > highways (and freeways going through several cities),
> > inspect vehicles (for lots of things), (snip)
>
>
> For fruits? Man, doesn't the CHP have better things to do? I wonder what
> would happen if someone ran one of these agricultural inspection stations?
> Would the CHP give pursuit? Would they be authorized to use deadly force to
> stop the vehicle? Can a person be placed in jail for having the wrong Orange
> or Apple in the vehicle?
>
>
> > I'd call it protection of the state. :-)
>
>
> I call it protection of the wealthy fruit farmers.
>
>
> >> Why aren't travelers reimbursed for the items
> >> seized at these inspection stations?
> >
> > Why?
>
>
> Because the items seized are their property, seized without due process of
> law.

Same thing can be said at U.S. Customs stations, either at the borders or at other ports of entry (airports and shipyards).

1952. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 20:56:46 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <AD43C302B4C8CF4F.3DCF5E784DCE1DD2.DD03BCD5ADD612F3@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64145

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b6pu24$la4$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> I dont need proof. It just makes common sense.
> I am able to think and rationalize. Im not a braindead liberal.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

You're serious?! Oh well... Suffice it to say that with your "feelings"
about things, it is just as well that you aren't the one making the
decisions for the military. Although, I have a feeling you share the same
intelligence as the one(s) who is/are. And, I am no liberal.

Kim W5TIT

>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:DB8F8D62FBA3227C.A80D1F5907B3342B.2CD38C1E834FCC63@lp.airnews.net...
> > Dan, what proof do you have of this? "We" the people were told that
they
> > were in Iraq. Now, we were told this by our President who, presumably,
> has
> > the entire resources of our spying capabilities available to him. While
> > "we're" not done in Iraq yet, have *YOU* noticed that there's been
nothing
> > in the way of WMD or biological or chemical weapons found?
> >
> > Now, you are saying "they're in Syria." What resources are available to
> > you? Or, is it just that you are among those who'd see to it that we
> > progress through one country after another using our red herring, until
> > we're tired of obliteration?
> >
> > Good grief.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:b6n4mr$82t$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > There in Syria. SH would NEVER destroy them.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > >

> news:E546ADE2836B93B5.00CEDC5692012862.025E53A61BB29681@lp.airnews.net...
> > > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > > > news:c2356669.0304030922.7165b709@posting.google.com...
> > > > >
> > > > > Here's a "what if" for ya....
> > > > >
> > > > > One of the main reasons for the war is to eliminate SH's WMDs. But
> no
> > > > > WMDs have been found by coalition forces yet - just lots of
> protective
> > > > > suits. Protective suits aren't proof that anyone has or will use
> WMDs
> > > > > - coalition troops have those suits, too.
> > > > >
> > > > > What if Bagdad falls and the regime changes, but no WMDs or
evidence
> > > > > of same are ever found? Coalition will look like the aggressor and
> SH
> > > > > as a martyr who told the truth. Which may be his plan all along.
> Talk
> > > > > about a recruitment tool for OBL....
> > > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Oh, here's my surprised look. The WMD argument is a red herring.
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
> >
>

1953. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 20:58:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E9094FD.60508@adelphia.net>
Source record: 64139

Vshah101 wrote:
> From Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
>>That should have read "... 75% or more of their radio communication time ...
>
>
> ----------
> In the 22th century, how many Morse coders will you need to replace a light
> source?
> Five. One to actually do it, and four to reminisce about how much better the
> old tubes were.

How many no-coders does it take to screw in a light bulb:

One to whine about how unfair it is that he has to know how to unscrew
the bulb.

One more to whine about how with florescent bulbs and those cool
lights used on Indiglo watches, that its unfair because light bulbs were
invented by Thomas Edison soooooo long ago, and light bulbs are obsolete

One more to whine about how people who know how to unscrew light bulbs
are so mean.

And one more to reconcile the others about how all they have to do is
wait, and all the light bulbs will go away soon.

So in the end, they all sit around in the dark, waiting, whining,
wringing their hands, and feeling sorry for themselves.

> How do Morse coders traditionally greet each other?
> "Hi. I'm better than you."

How do no-coders greet each other?

They don't. No one is going to force them to learn a language. Its unfair

> Why can't a gorilla do Morse code?
> He's too sensitive.

yawn

> Why did the Morse coder learn code?
> So he wouldn't be mistaken for for a CBer.

He learned so he could get the HF privileges.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1954. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 21:04:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406170420.05951.00000160@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64141

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 4/6/2003 1:13 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0304061013.22b09fde@posting.google.com>

>Hey Putz, then who was that who was fighting the 'Cong and the PRNV
>after we supposedly left in '73 according to your calendar and April
>'75 when the fighting stopped? The Aussies? The Turks? RTTY repeater
>rear widget mercenaries? Who?

There wasn't any "Signal Batallion" left there so Lennie had no one to
claim afiliation with.

Of course the unit that evac'd the embassy was Marine Corps Heavy
Helicopter Squadron 462, a unit that I was later attached to.(80-83, then
87-88)

I guess under Lennie's rules-of-engagement, I can qualify for a Vietnam
Campaign ribbon, huh...?!?!

Nah...I don't want something I didn't earn. That's The Putzy One's
schtick.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1955. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 21:07:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406170741.05951.00000161@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64142

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/6/2003 9:58 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030406105812.00320.00000367@mb-fs.aol.com>

>Why do people misinterpret what I say? I agreed Morse code is a growth
>industry, EE is not.

Then I owe you an apology if that's what you truly meant. Same is
herewith offered.

>Pointing out the increased numbers is advocating Morse code. N2EY (an
>Electrical Engineer) advocates Morse code, not Electrical Engineering.

...but then you go and say this! Where did you EVER get the idea that Jim
does not "advocate" electrical engineering...?!?! He's promoted the
occupational field on NUMEROUS occassions!

Now the turn to offer an apology is yours, Sir!

Steve, K4YZ

1956. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 21:09:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406170948.05951.00000162@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64143

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 4/6/2003 11:26 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3E90553A.8080806@adelphia.net

>Why your obsession with what Jim does in his spare time?

Some people just do not "multi-task" very well and they assume others
can't either. I know many nurses who MUST do one thing at a time and are
unable to do it any other way. They do not last in the ER...that's for sure!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1957. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 21:11:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E909821.3010309@adelphia.net>
Source record: 64144

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030406120332.00320.00000371@mb-fs.aol.com...
>
>>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>>
>>>>-How come nobody uses Morse code?
>>>
>>>Since approximately 1/3 of the hams spend 75% or of their time (per a
>>
> recent
>
>>>ARRL survey), your last question is incorrect.
>>
>>Alot of people do things for fun. Morse code may be fun (to some people).
>>Morsers claim Morse code is also very useful.
>>
>>
>>>Hams are certainly somebody.
>>
>>They sure are. Weird, overweight, antisocial. Just visit a Hamfest and you
>
> will
>
>>see the typical Ham.
>
>
>
> Whether they are using it for fun or other reasons, they are still using it
> in significant numbers. Therefore your statement that nobody uses it is
> wrong.
>
> I go to lots of hamfests. They aren't weird, overweight or antisocial. I
> know a lot of skinny hams. Afterall, someone needs to be available to climb
> the towers for antenna work. Our local ham club has 5 officers. Only 2 of
> us could be considered overweight. When I look at the general membership in
> attendance at a meeting, there is no higher percentage of overweight hams
> than there are in the general population.

Last hamfest I went to, there was only one person who was grossly
overweight. That was the guy selling computers. The rest looked like
people you would see on a trip to the mall.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1958. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 21:30:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406173040.05951.00000164@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64146

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/6/2003 10:38 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030406113839.00320.00000370@mb-fs.aol.com>

>From K4YZ:
>> Is the class organized to teach Amateur Radio? If not, then why would he
>>mention it other than in a historical case reference?
>
>Smith chart was very important, yet another prof did not cover it. (Probably
>because not enough time).

The question was "Is the class organized to teach Amateur Radio?"

What did that have to do with Smith Charts?

>Classes don't always cover the material you need, so its possible Morse could
>not have been mentioned for other reasons than <lack of> merit.

The question was "Is the class organized to teach Amateur Radio?"

You didn't answer the question. Why?

>Proff really knows his stuff...(SNIP)

Except his name, obviously.

>The class covered tradeoffs of each mode. Very complicated codes such as
>Walsh
>codes and Turbo codes would be covered next class. Prof really knows the
>material on encoding schemes.

Well, get him to encode his name in Morse Code, OK?

>Its amazing that you would say that someone that teaches a class has no
>knowledge of the subject matter or practical experience.

First of all, you refuse to identify this fountain of knowledge.
Secondly, you avoid the question as to wether the class was structured to
teach Amateur Radio. It obviously wasn't, but that answer in and of itself
disposes of your other rants as to why Amateur Radio related topics would be
discussed in that class.

>Seems like you want me to ask the following irrelevant additional questions:
>-Do you, or did you, have an amateur radio license.
>-Do YOU know Morse code.

How can anyone make an informed, balanced presentation on ANY subject
without practical experience in the subject matter, Vipul? By reading some

paper on it and then claiming "experience?

Would YOU want to undergo surgery by a surgeon who had actually done a surgical residency, or a guy who walked into the surgical suite reading "Brain Surgery Made Easy"...?!?!

The same goes for Amateur Radio. Have you ever attended an Amateur Radio related forum that was taught by somone who didn't have some practical experience in the subject matter? Would you know the difference?

>>And you did not answer the question about whether or not YOU served in the
>>Armed Forces of the United States.
>
>No, I did not. Just referring to US Army Survival Manual, in bookstore. FM
>21-76, if that means anything.

Yes it does. It means you found a book title that you can quote without having had any practical experience in the subject matter.

Steve

1959. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 21:39:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406173924.05951.00000165@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64147

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/6/2003 3:07 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030406160714.26062.00000698@mb-fd.aol.com>

>K4YZ accuse me of creating non-real Prof. More and more facts revealed. Now
>Prof also worked in industry and designed Communication Systems.

What "facts", Vipul? You "tell" us this person allegedly did "this and
that", but you don't identify the person, nor do you tell us what companies,
schools, organizations, etc etc.

>Either this is an <out of control> growing fancy- or it must be true.

There's nothing fancy about anything you have presented. Of course I
don't think you meant "fancy", but you DO keep re-using the term.

>Also, I don't know Prof's ans. to Morse Question? I sincerely doubt that it
>has
>the qualities that make it most important mode.

The "most important mode" it the one that get's your data through when it
has to get through, regardless of wether you are talking about Morse Code,
voice or digital.

Although there are numerous Morse Code supporters in this forum as it
pertains to Amateur Radio, NO ONE, except you and Lennie, have claimed that
ANYONE has asserted Morse Code was the "most important mode", Vipul.

>Morse code could be:
>(1) most fun mode, since manual realtime encoding/decoding is fun.
>(2) least complex modulation mode (as listed on chart of modulation schemes).

Could be. You'll have to try to find out.

>I doubt Morse code has:
>(1) highest information rate - other modes seem to beat it.
>(2) lowest Bit Error Rate

Again, you'll have to try it to find out.

>(3) practical use for emergency comm - otherwise it would be in use.

It is in use. Tune to the bottom of any of the Amateur HF bands and take
a listen.

Steve, K4YZ

1960. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 21:43:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406174314.05951.00000166@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64149

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/6/2003 3:28 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030406162831.26062.00000701@mb-fd.aol.com>

>Interestingly, in two other rf class, both Profs made no mention of amateur
>radio. Probably, has never heard of it.

Or it could be that it just wasn't germane to the class objectives, Vipul.
I taught Advanced Avionics in the Marines and not once was Amateur Radio a
part of any formal lesson plan.

>Not even one reference to an ARRL publication or article or about amateur
>radio.

Or it could be that it just wasn't germane to the class objectives, Vipul.

Steve, K4YZ

1961. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 21:43:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304061343.547b5db9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64148

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304060407.4bba0edd@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304051942.4a00deef@posting.google.com>...

>
> Brian, I was simply agreeing wichew. Or do you think morse code is a
> growth industry, like one DXer on here?

I have no idea neither does anybody else, how do you count the number of cw Qs and/or the number operators per year who use cw and come up with any rigorous stats? Ya can't, that's ridiculous.

However I see three factors which are in the direction of at least maintaining the use of ham cw at it's present levels as a minimum. 1. The huge growth in interest in QRP operations where the advantages of cw really shine. 2. The modest growth in the number of participants in the cw dx contests. 3. The big bubble of aging baby boomers who came up thru the hobby in the 5/13/20 wpm regimes and who are now coming up on retirement and will have more time to play with their radios than they had when they were plodding thru the rat race.

Gonna be one helluva long time before anybody hears the last beep-beep.

w3rv

1962. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 21:45:51 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304061345.7e2a86b6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64150

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304061023.ef5df7e@posting.google.com>...
> averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman) wrote in message
news:<20030405212529.04143.00000018@mb-fb.aol.com>...
> > In article <b6nnrt$215$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >Len Over 21...we all have your number. Stir up the crap. Dont need it.
> > >And DONT CARE WHAT YOU THINK...I put you on the dumbass list a long time
> > >ago.
> >
> > You seem to want to FIGHT. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
> >
> > The Vietnam War ended on January 27, 1973.
>
> WRONG! Again. 1975. You're a disgrace to the rest of the putzes.
>
> w3rv

It ended in 1973 for the people with "real military experience," i.e.,
combatants. It ended in 1975 for the paper pushers.

1963. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 21:49:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304061349.79bcef4c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64201

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.06.15.48.10.305942.28928@arrl.org>...
> On Sun, 30 Mar 2003 21:53:45 -0500, W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > All the cries for "patriotism" (those of people who imply it is unpatriotic
> > not to support and stand behind a President of the US), are probably right
> > along party lines; i.e., would we find a Republican pleading for respect and
> > admiration of a Democrat President or vice versa? hmmmmm....
>
> We already know that the answer to that is "no":
> http://www.newsmax.com/articles/?a=1998/12/18/51233
>
> Jon

BS. There are many patriots who could care less about which party is
trying to outspend the other of our tax dollars. Many were even
patriots when being a patriot was a bad thing.

1964. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 21:57:05 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Ro1ka.4198$Xp3.2510734@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64140

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030406162831.26062.00000701@mb-fd.aol.com...
> >Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >Just because he mentions ham radio does NOT
> >imply that he is a ham. People in the various radio communications
fields
> >have at least heard of us
>
> Interestingly, in two other rf class, both Profs made no mention of
amateur
> radio. Probably, has never heard of it.

Universities are NOT in the business of teaching amateur radio so there is
no reason to mention. That one professor did and two others didn't doesn't
mean a thing.

>
> In one class a list of books was given. All were scholarly books. Other
than
> that IEEE paper articles were referenced.
>
> Not even one reference to an ARRL publication or article or about amateur
> radio.

Repeat: Universities are not in the business of teaching amateur radio. So
there is no need to reference ARRL publications.

>
> Actually, in my opinion, that would have made the class even better. I
mean
> this from an academic viewpoint, not from a biased Ham viewpoint. The
examples
> in the ARRL books were well explained, unlike the textbook examples. ARRL
books
> often had more practical consideration, rather than showing an ideal
circuit
> that the textbook shows. And the books did not sacrifice on the rigorous
math.
>
> Since a list of books was mentioned, at least one ARRL pub. would have
made the
> class better. The class did not have a lab, and some of the projects, in
one
> book, would make good lab projects.

Professors use either the books they themselves have written or those their collegues have written. They aren't going to use books writte by what are to them "outsiders." They want to keep the money in their own circle.

> In one antenna class proj, I used an ARRL pub. and this help me get the project
> done faster and better. I got the ARRL pub from someone in a local Ham club. I
> mentioned I had a class assignment, and asked if anyone built a similar antenna
> or knew anything about it.
>

Again college professors will almost never list publications by those outside academia.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1965. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 21:57:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304061357.314c62c3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64202

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<yqXja.3695$Xp3.2366045@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0304051447.5120c060@posting.google.com...
> > We'll keep working the numbers until we can show Morse Code as a
> > growth industry as one "great" DXer would like it to be.
> >
> > 73, Brian
>
> There's a very simple way to show it's growing. Check out the articles on
> the ARRL web site. The growth in participation in the phone contests has
> been insignificant yet the growth in participation in the CW contests has
> been a whopping 20% in the last few years. That's a lot of growth. Any
> business would take that kind of increase and celebrate.
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE

Dee, that's great! Let's celebrate. Wohooo!

1966. Honest code elimination question... flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 22:12:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304061412.3aa2e055@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64203

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030406121214.00320.00000372@mb-fs.aol.com>...

> How do Morse coders traditionally greet each other?
> "Hi. I'm better than you."

That's interesting, and telling.

But it applies even if both parties aren't "coders." Only one coder
is necessary for this to take place. For example, this is how Dave
greeted me. And this is how Larry greets virtually all newcomers.

1967. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 22:19:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304061419.3c0bc091@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64204

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E8FBEB2.E9F5E987@att.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > The slow speed of morse code on-off keying allows any user to hide
> > their ignorance of even the most basic communications knowledge.
>
>
>
> The lack of even rudimentary skill in Morse code use sure doesn't prevent you from
>
> displaying your complete lack of the most rudimentary basic radiocommunications
> skill
> OR knowledge. You do it here many times each day.

Do tell, DICK. How does Len's lack of rudimentary psycho-motor,
modem-emulating skill translate to a lack of basic
radio-communications skill and/or knowledge?

Most intelligent people think that one has nothing to do with the
other. But then, you're not particularly intelligent, as you show
here at least a few times each day. Donkey. DICK.

1968. Re: Get a life Robeson

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 22:22:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304061422.597d89b4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64205

Myself <Me@onthenet.net> wrote in message
news:<fdj09vkci104jv2igmhe6n78k2619m8ohc@4ax.com>...
> Nuff said

No. Not enough. You forgot: "Get help!"

1969. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 22:26:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406182624.11012.00000020@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 64206

In article <b00ka.3785$Xp3.2475180@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Just because he mentions ham radio does NOT
>imply that he is a ham. People in the various radio communications fields
>have at least heard of us and have a rough idea of what we do. Designing
>industrial comm systems does not mean that he is intimately familiar with
>the activities of the ham community.

Exactly, Dee.

My ham radio experience (licensed at the age of 13) always made me lean towards the practical end of things. I went to EE school (Moore School of EE, part of the University of Pennsylvania, class of 1976, birthplace of ENIAC, world's first general-pupose high-speed digital electronic computer) in part because of ham radio.

The emphasis at that school was on theory, but they told us WHY they did it that way. Technology changes so fast and unpredictably that the only way to keep up is to understand the underlying theory.

A true story from those days:

In electronic circuits class, we had Dr. Fred Ketterer. Excellent teacher, really knowledgeable and practical.

One day he draws a resistance-coupled common-source JFET amplifier on the board, asks what it will do. Everybody says "amplify the input signal". "Correct", says Prof. K.

Then he redraws it to use parallel-tuned LC input and output circuitsinstead of the resistors, both tuned to about the same RF frequency. Again he asks what it will do. Everybody but me says "amplify the input signal if it is near the tuned circuit frequency". I say "it may amplify, but it will probably oscillate". Rest of class thinks I'm nuts. Prof. K looks at me, smiles, says "You're a ham radio operator, aren't you?" Everyone was surprised because ham radio wasn't usually a class subject.

He went on to explain to the class that if the tuned circuit values were correct and the internal capacitances of the FET were adequate, the circuit would indeed oscillate. 'You have to use the right model" he said "the simplified model that ignored Cgd is not adequate for this analysis". Nobody ever forgot his practical examples.

Then there's the story of Prof. Weygandt and the impossible transmission line.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1970. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 22:27:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304061427.4be185a9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64207

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BAB2C744.1588E%stewart@say.net>...
> "Phil Kane" wrote:
> >
> > On Thu, 03 Apr 2003 09:22:26 -0800, Vito wrote:
> >
> >> "D. Stussy" wrote:
> >>>
> >>> Are you saying that California is not part of the U.S.A.?
> >>
> >> Yes. One must submit to Ca customs when coming in from the
> >> USA, its governments (state and local) ignore the U.S.
> >> Constitution and courts, law enforcement techniques are
> >> more like those in Iraq than in the U.S.A., etc., so ....
> >
> > TROLL ALERT
>
>
> He's got a point about the borders, Phil. California is the only state
> where, when traveling from another state, I've had to stop at border
> inspection stations manned by state employees, often backed by armed state
> troopers sitting in nearby vehicles, to answer questions about the contents
> of my vehicle. The only other place I've seen this here is on our national
> borders.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Look up APHIS and phyto-sanitary certificate.

Then pile California's Ag Dept. on top of all that.

bb

1971. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-06 23:58:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6qf42jur1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64208

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:DB8F8D62FBA3227C.A80D1F5907B3342B.2CD38C1E834FCC63@lp.airnews.net...
> Dan, what proof do you have of this? "We" the people were told that they
> were in Iraq. Now, we were told this by our President who, presumably,
has
> the entire resources of our spying capabilities available to him. While
> "we're" not done in Iraq yet, have *YOU* noticed that there's been nothing
> in the way of WMD or biological or chemical weapons found?

Who cares, so what?

Even if no WMD are found, the Iraqi regime was so inherently
evil that the ending of that regime is of far more value towards
global and regional stabilization than any WMD aspect.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1972. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 00:05:50 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6qfjavtp1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64209

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:98304907109B80B1.BA538F6E4D8CD5F1.BC0D172B49A7B5D9@lp.airnews.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030405162705.23238.00000011@mb-fy.aol.com...
> > In article
> <E546ADE2836B93B5.00CEDC5692012862.025E53A61BB29681@lp.airnews.net>,
> > "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >
> > >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > >news:c2356669.0304030922.7165b709@posting.google.com...
> > >>
> > >> Here's a "what if" for ya....
> > >>
> > >> One of the main reasons for the war is to eliminate SH's WMDs. But no
> > >> WMDs have been found by coalition forces yet - just lots of
protective
> > >> suits. Protective suits aren't proof that anyone has or will use WMDs
> > >> - coalition troops have those suits, too.
> > >>
> > >> What if Bagdad falls and the regime changes, but no WMDs or evidence
> > >> of same are ever found? Coalition will look like the aggressor and SH
> > >> as a martyr who told the truth. Which may be his plan all along. Talk
> > >> about a recruitment tool for OBL....
> > >> >
> > >
> > >Oh, here's my surprised look. The WMD argument is a red herring.
> > >
> > Really? I thought it was probably the best argument the coalition has.
> >
> > If WMDs are the red herring, what's the real reason?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> First, note that the fat lady hasn't sung yet. Although, I am pretty sure
> the WMD won't materialize.
>
> What's the *real* reason? Goodness, if I could get into the head(s) of
the
> President et al, maybe I could tell you. Maybe it's as simple as
> vindication for a father who failed...I don't know. This will all come
out
> in the wash. But, with NATO such as it is now, the UN such as it is now,
> world opinion such as it is now, it will be very interesting to see what

the
> future holds, and what legacy this President will leave behind. We, the
> United States and Britain (for the most part), have a lot of 'splaining to
> do--is what the rest of the world is thinking I'm sure.

Frankly Scarlet, I don't give a damn what they think.
The Germans are already "rethinking" their opposition.
The French? Who cares?
China? Yeah, they opposed us going in because they had
sold Saddam current rockets.
The list goes on.

> We'll (the world) see what happens.
> Kim W5TIT

Looks to me like the freed Iraqi's themselves are the ones that are
making a positive statement.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

>
>

1973. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 00:09:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6qfp0qof1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64210

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030406032731.23756.00000039@mb-fj.aol.com...
> In article <3E8D14A3.65B9169A@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
writes:
>
> >> I'll have to say yes, it does. If any American, who enjoys the
blessings
> >> of freedom and democracy which have been secured for him or her
> >> through the sacrifices made by those who willingly fought, suffered,
and
> >> died to preserve them is not also willing to do so himself or herself,
then
> >> they most definitely are NOT a "loyal Americans." They are merely
cowards
> >> living under the protection of their moral superiors.
> >>
> >> Diplomacy will always be the preferred method for settling political
> >> differences between nations. However, when diplomacy fails, as it
> >> historically will when dealing with maniacal, totalitarian dictators
such
> >> as Saddam Hussein, then military might is the correct response.
> >> Nobody likes war -- it is a last resort. However, it is a resort which
> >must
> >> be taken to eliminate the evil in this world. If you disagree,
consider
> >> yourself lucky to be living in America -- where millions of your fellow
> >> countrymen have sacrificed to give you the right to your disagreement.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >> MSgt, USAF (Retired)
> >> Loyal American who supports our President, our Troops, and the
> >> War in Iraq
> >
> >Well said, Larry! You cut right to the heart of the matter. All the
> >pacifists seen oblovious to history and to them "It's all about me and
> what *I* think".
>
> Dick:
>
> I have no problem with "pacifists." In fact, I consider myself to be one!
> However, a preference for peaceful coexistence is not inconsistent with
> a willingness to use force in order to counteract the oppression of a
> totalitarian regime. Those who argue against this war, with their off-
> the-shelf rantings about this being a "war for oil" and "a war for the

> President's Daddy" and whatever else they're saying, are more truthfully
> expressing their own cowardice than any rational political philosophy.
> If one personally objects to the concept of killing, then they are
entitled
> to their beliefs, and should not be required to serve in the armed
> forces, unless they voluntarily consent to do so in a purely support role.
> Unfortunately, the present-day anti-war protesters don't make any
> sense if they see themselves as being motivated by a desire for "peace."
>
> The country of Iraq has been suffering under the barbarous regime
> of Saddam Hussein for two decades. This madman has consolidated
> his power through the institutional use of cold-blooded murder, rape,
> torture and extortion. He has categorically refused to cooperate with
> United Nations weapons inspections in spite of his having signed a
> treaty requiring him to do so. Twelve years of negotiating, debating,
> threatening, and imposing economic sanctions has yielded nothing in
> the way of an assurance that he will not produce and deploy weapons
> of mass destruction. However, the anti-war protesters insist that we
> are still not justified in using our nation's military power to overthrow
> this evil, corrupt, and bloodthirsty regime. They are so obviously
> wrong and apparently uninformed that they simply cannot be given
> any consideration whatsoever. Fortunately, we now have a President
> who will not cave in to their emotional pleas to allow innocent people
> to be tortured and killed in order to avoid warfare.
>
> The anti-war protesters are an aspect of a free and pluralistic society
> that we must put up with. We do not, however, have to grant them any
> credibility.

Well said Larry! and I'll add that when the protestors block
streets and buildings then they violate MY rights and they should
have their butts arested and tossed in jail. Free speech never included
breaking the law...especially when it endangers others access.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1974. Re: How's This For Courage?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 00:53:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304061653.3c7d7c70@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64211

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.06.15.38.27.92014.28928@arrl.org>...
> On Sat, 05 Apr 2003 14:26:34 -0500, N2EY wrote:
> >
> > Sure. After 20+ years of atrocities by the regime, why should anyone be
> > surprised?
>
> Now, wait a second, Jim. Those atrocities never happened, and I have
> irrefutable proof. Recently there have been hundreds of thousands of
> people in the streets of cities in America, Europe, Asia and particularly
> the Middle East, protesting the deaths of Iraqi civilians in the present
> war. Obviously, people who care so deeply about the average Iraqi would
> have been protesting the Hussein regime's treatment of its citizens had
> atrocities such as you mention actually been happening for the last 20
> years. But there have been no such protests against SH's regime. QED:
> There have been no atrocities.
>
> (P.S.: Anyone who doesn't get the sardonic nature of the above shouldn't
> bother replying.)
>
> Jon

Welcome back Jon . . you din miss a thing . . nothing.

Is the Labmeister still among the breathing?

w3rv

1975. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 01:00:43 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406210043.13084.00000140@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 64212

From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>How does Len's lack of rudimentary psycho-motor,
>modem-emulating skill translate to a lack of basic
>radio-communications skill and/or knowledge?

Thats a good point. One skill has nothing to do with they other.

In Ham radio, there is heavy emphasis on learning <the Morse code> realtime encoding skill. Recruitment of new Hams focuses on this area.

Hams don't want to learn the electronics aspect.

1976. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 01:10:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030406211049.04042.00000046@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 64213

In article <98304907109B80B1.BA538F6E4D8CD5F1.BC0D172B49A7B5D9@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>First, note that the fat lady hasn't sung yet. Although, I am pretty sure
>the WMD won't materialize.

Kim:

Hmmm -- interesting. Just what, precisely, is your basis for that statement?
What is it that makes you "pretty sure" that Iraq doesn't have any WMD's?
Before you answer, you may want to consider the fact that the UN's chief
weapons inspector, Hans Brakob -- er, sorry, I mean Hans Blix -- has
categorically confirmed the fact that Iraq does, indeed, possess WMD's and
the ability to produce them. It's just a matter of being able to find them --
which has been virtually impossible due to the deliberately deceitful
nature of the SH regime.

>What's the *real* reason? Goodness, if I could get into the head(s) of the
>President et al, maybe I could tell you. Maybe it's as simple as
>vindication for a father who failed...I don't know. This will all come out
>in the wash. But, with NATO such as it is now, the UN such as it is now,
>world opinion such as it is now, it will be very interesting to see what the
>future holds, and what legacy this President will leave behind. We, the
>United States and Britain (for the most part), have a lot of 'splaining to
>do--is what the rest of the world is thinking I'm sure. We'll (the world)
>see what happens.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Just exactly how is the UN and NATO now, Kim? What is it that you
think the US and Britain need to explain? Perhaps the role we had in
putting an end to a brutal, totalitarian regime that was ruling through
the daily use of torture and murder?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1977. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 01:23:50 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406212350.13084.00000141@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 64214

From K4YZ:
>The question was "Is the class organized to teach Amateur Radio?"
> You didn't answer the question. Why?

The class was not organized to teach amateur radio. I don't see how the application is relavant.

The class covered modulation schemes, including On-Off Keying. Therefore, one should be able to compare various modulation modes and know the advantages/disadvantages of each.

>First of all, you refuse to identify this fountain of knowledge.

Prof J Weitzen. What purpose does that serve? I hope you don't email him or something. I hope I don't regret this.

>How can anyone make an informed, balanced presentation on ANY subject
>without practical experience in the subject matter, Vipul?

Sorry, but I cannot see your point. I believe Prof really knows the material.

Prof did not just read about it. Prof has practical experience. He's worked in industry.

He knows the math behind the tradeoffs. In terms of modulation schemes, he has knowledge of how some of the most advanced modulation schemes work, their mathmatical derrivation, applications, advantages, disadvantages.

And you are saying he does not know where Morse code fits in?

>It means you found a book title that you can quote without
>having had any practical experience in the subject matter.

Please find a source that gives praise to Morse code. We know it has some benefit (least complex modulation mode), easy to build.

Now, why is Morse code so important that it is in between the General (written) test and required for HF.

1978. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 01:27:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E90D406.B5479797@att.net>
Source record: 64215

Bert Craig wrote:

> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

> >: I've been federally licensed in radio since 1956...just not
> > in amateur radio.
>
> So why are you here, Len? This is an AMATEUR RADIO newsgroup.
>

Hey, Bert, It's because the pros won't have anything to do with him either.
You'd think he'd
get the message eventually.

1979. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 01:37:02 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <94747B2B5A50BF12.DC06DC5B1570EDAC.15CD574D5721AB1B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64221

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b6qf42jur1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:DB8F8D62FBA3227C.A80D1F5907B3342B.2CD38C1E834FCC63@lp.airnews.net...
> > Dan, what proof do you have of this? "We" the people were told that
they
> > were in Iraq. Now, we were told this by our President who, presumably,
> has
> > the entire resources of our spying capabilities available to him. While
> > "we're" not done in Iraq yet, have *YOU* noticed that there's been
nothing
> > in the way of WMD or biological or chemical weapons found?
>
> Who cares, so what?
>
> Even if no WMD are found, the Iraqi regime was so inherently
> evil that the ending of that regime is of far more value towards
> global and regional stabilization than any WMD aspect.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

Bill, I understand your sentiment. I also agree that evil is a bad thing.
But I'm not so sure that the US gov't. or military needs to start marching
in and changing things here and there. So far, we're only talking about
Iraq. My fear is what next? I don't know...I just don't think it's right.
I really don't. I think getting into messes like that is biting off much
more than we can chew, militarily, politically, etc.

Kim W5TIT

1980. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 01:38:33 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <4985B662362555E8.ECC8CA3634793A56.66445593EC88746F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64222

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b6qfja$vtp$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:98304907109B80B1.BA538F6E4D8CD5F1.BC0D172B49A7B5D9@lp.airnews.net...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030405162705.23238.00000011@mb-fy.aol.com...
> > > In article
> > <E546ADE2836B93B5.00CEDC5692012862.025E53A61BB29681@lp.airnews.net>,
> > > "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> > >
> > > >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > > >news:c2356669.0304030922.7165b709@posting.google.com...
> > > >>
> > > >> Here's a "what if" for ya....
> > > >>
> > > >> One of the main reasons for the war is to eliminate SH's WMDs. But
no
> > > >> WMDs have been found by coalition forces yet - just lots of
> protective
> > > >> suits. Protective suits aren't proof that anyone has or will use
WMDs
> > > >> - coalition troops have those suits, too.
> > > >>
> > > >> What if Bagdad falls and the regime changes, but no WMDs or
evidence
> > > >> of same are ever found? Coalition will look like the aggressor and
SH
> > > >> as a martyr who told the truth. Which may be his plan all along.
Talk
> > > >> about a recruitment tool for OBL....
> > > >>>
> > > >
> > > >Oh, here's my surprised look. The WMD argument is a red herring.
> > > >
> > > Really? I thought it was probably the best argument the coalition has.
> > >
> > > If WMDs are the red herring, what's the real reason?
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> >
> > First, note that the fat lady hasn't sung yet. Although, I am pretty
sure
```

> > the WMD won't materialize.
> >
> > What's the *real* reason? Goodness, if I could get into the head(s) of
> the
> > President et al, maybe I could tell you. Maybe it's as simple as
> > vindication for a father who failed...I don't know. This will all come
> out
> > in the wash. But, with NATO such as it is now, the UN such as it is
now,
> > world opinion such as it is now, it will be very interesting to see what
> the
> > future holds, and what legacy this President will leave behind. We, the
> > United States and Britain (for the most part), have a lot of 'splaining
to
> > do--is what the rest of the world is thinking I'm sure.
>
> Frankly Scarlet, I don't give a damn what they think.
> The Germans are already "rethinking" their opposition.
> The French? Who cares?
> China? Yeah, they opposed us going in because they had
> sold Saddam current rockets.
> The list goes on.
>
> > We'll (the world) see what happens.
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Looks to me like the freed Iraqi's themselves are the ones that are
> making a positive statement.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
> >
> >
>
>

I think that's being a little short-sighted, Bill. But, we'll see, right?

Kim W5TIT

1981. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 01:40:01 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406214001.13084.00000142@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 64216

From K4YZ:
>>Interestingly, in two other rf class, both Profs made no mention of amateur
>>radio. Probably, has never heard of it.
>
> Or it could be that it just wasn't germane to the class objectives,

For antenna class, it probably was not relavant. The class had advanced math equations every single week. Maxwell's eq, field eqs., boundary cond, etc were utilized.

>>Not even one reference to an ARRL publication or article or about amateur
>>radio.
>
>Or it could be that it just wasn't germane to the class objectives,
>Vipul.

For rf devices class, ARRL pub was very relavant to the class objectives.

Class notes were from textbooks and from IEEE articles. The device models and circuit applications were better explained in an ARRL book than the textbook. If the ARRL pub book gave better explanation on a topic, it should have been utilized.

1982. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 01:52:51 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406215251.13084.00000143@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 64217

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>Universities are not in the business of teaching amateur radio. So
>there is no need to reference ARRL publications.

The subject was (active) rf devices, not amateur radio. There are ARRL publications on technical topics, in case you did not know.

Any technical publication which covers the class topic could be utilized. This prof did not use ARRL pub, probably because he has never seen one in academics.

The ARRL pub did cover the topic better that the textbook. There was a better explaination, practical examples, construction info. And, it did not sacrifice on the math.

If an ARRL pub. teaches the subject matter better, it should be utilized.

1983. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 01:54:58 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406215458.13084.00000144@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 64218

From: Mike Coslo

>How many no-coders does it take to screw in a light bulb:
>
> One to whine about how unfair it is that he has to know how to unscrew
>the bulb.
>
> One more to whine about how with florescent bulbs and those cool
>lights used on Indiglo watches, that its unfair because light bulbs were
>invented by Thomas Edison soooooo long ago, and light bulbs are obsolete
>
> One more to whine about how people who know how to unscrew light bulbs
>are so mean.

>And one more to reconcile the others about how all they have to do is
>wait, and all the light bulbs will go away soon.
>
> So in the end, they all sit around in the dark, waiting, whining,
>wringing their hands, and feeling sorry for themselves.

Thats a good one.

1984. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 01:56:25 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406215625.13084.00000145@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 64219

From: Mike Coslo
> The rest looked like
>people you would see on a trip to the mall.

Are the people at the mall 95% male and generally older?

1985. Re: How to read Jap ham gear manuals "101"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 02:01:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030406220108.04042.00000047@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 64220

In article <3e8cfbdf@snipnews.snip.net>, "bignose ham" <bign oseh3@juno.com>
writes:

>
>The source: http://www.engrish.com
>
>ROTFLMAO: http://www.engrish.com/recent/

This is web site very interest making and amusement. For a funny time
watch this site and please often. To see regularly this site will catch for
many amusing funny things of interest and of Japanese Engrish.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1986. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 02:21:39 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6qngd$jo8$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64223

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:94747B2B5A50BF12.DC06DC5B1570EDAC.15CD574D5721AB1B@lp.airnews.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b6qf42jur1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> >
news:DB8F8D62FBA3227C.A80D1F5907B3342B.2CD38C1E834FCC63@lp.airnews.net...
> > > Dan, what proof do you have of this? "We" the people were told that
> they
> > > were in Iraq. Now, we were told this by our President who,
presumably,
> > has
> > > the entire resources of our spying capabilities available to him.
While
> > > "we're" not done in Iraq yet, have *YOU* noticed that there's been
> nothing
> > > in the way of WMD or biological or chemical weapons found?
> >
> > Who cares, so what?
> >
> > Even if no WMD are found, the Iraqi regime was so inherently
> > evil that the ending of that regime is of far more value towards
> > global and regional stabilization than any WMD aspect.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> Bill, I understand your sentiment. I also agree that evil is a bad thing.

Exactly. And evil wins when honorable and honest people
stand by and do nothing when confronted by evil.

> But I'm not so sure that the US gov't. or military needs to start marching
> in and changing things here and there.

Sadly, you sound like too many of the anti-war groupies
who believe that because we do one thing in Iraq, we will or
must do the same thing in other places. The lesson to be learned
here is that we are not impotent nor unwilling to take needed
action when it warrants such.

> So far, we're only talking about
> Iraq. My fear is what next? I don't know...I just don't think it's
right.

> I really don't. I think getting into messes like that is biting off much
> more than we can chew, militarily, politically, etc.

I strongly disagree with your sentiments. We enjoy a democratic
system and the fruits of that system's 200+ years of success.
We have (IMHO) a moral obligation to confront extreme
evil when it threatens us in the long run.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1987. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 02:23:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6qnkfqmo1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64224

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:4985B662362555E8.ECC8CA3634793A56.66445593EC88746F@lp.airnews.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b6qfjavtp1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> >
news:98304907109B80B1.BA538F6E4D8CD5F1.BC0D172B49A7B5D9@lp.airnews.net...
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20030405162705.23238.00000011@mb-fy.aol.com...
> > > > In article
> > > <E546ADE2836B93B5.00CEDC5692012862.025E53A61BB29681@lp.airnews.net>,
> > > > "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> > > >
> > > > >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > > > >news:c2356669.0304030922.7165b709@posting.google.com...
> > > > >>
> > > > >> Here's a "what if" for ya....
> > > > >>
> > > > >> One of the main reasons for the war is to eliminate SH's WMDs.
But
> no
> > > > >> WMDs have been found by coalition forces yet - just lots of
> > protective
> > > > >> suits. Protective suits aren't proof that anyone has or will use
> WMDs
> > > > >> - coalition troops have those suits, too.
> > > > >>
> > > > >> What if Bagdad falls and the regime changes, but no WMDs or
> evidence
> > > > >> of same are ever found? Coalition will look like the aggressor
and
> SH
> > > > >> as a martyr who told the truth. Which may be his plan all along.
> Talk
> > > > >> about a recruitment tool for OBL....
> > > > >> >
> > > > >
> > > > >Oh, here's my surprised look. The WMD argument is a red herring.
> > > > >
> > > > Really? I thought it was probably the best argument the coalition
has.
> > > >
> > > > If WMDs are the red herring, what's the real reason?

> > > >
> > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > > >
> > >
> > > First, note that the fat lady hasn't sung yet. Although, I am pretty
> sure
> > > the WMD won't materialize.
> > >
> > > What's the *real* reason? Goodness, if I could get into the head(s)
of
> > the
> > > President et al, maybe I could tell you. Maybe it's as simple as
> > > vindication for a father who failed...I don't know. This will all
come
> > out
> > > in the wash. But, with NATO such as it is now, the UN such as it is
> now,
> > > world opinion such as it is now, it will be very interesting to see
what
> > the
> > > future holds, and what legacy this President will leave behind. We,
the
> > > United States and Britain (for the most part), have a lot of
'splaining
> to
> > > do--is what the rest of the world is thinking I'm sure.
> >
> > Frankly Scarlet, I don't give a damn what they think.
> > The Germans are already "rethinking" their opposition.
> > The French? Who cares?
> > China? Yeah, they opposed us going in because they had
> > sold Saddam current rockets.
> > The list goes on.
> >
> > > We'll (the world) see what happens.
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Looks to me like the freed Iraqi's themselves are the ones that are
> > making a positive statement.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> I think that's being a little short-sighted, Bill. But, we'll see, right?
> Kim W5TIT

Short sighted? Why? Are you following
the realities of what the freed Iraqi's are saying
when the yoke of their oppresion is lifted and
the fear of reprisal is gone?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1988. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 02:33:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E90E398.8080906@adelphia.net>
Source record: 64225

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo
>
>>The rest looked like
>>people you would see on a trip to the mall.
>
>
> Are the people at the mall 95% male and generally older?

Well, since you asked, the mix was about 65 percent male. The age distribution was all over the place. There were husbands and wives, of which I'm not sure which was the ham. Many of them had their family with them. There were some late teen/early twenty hams with their girlfriends. I didn't see any babies; the youngest person there was around 5 y.o. or so. There was an amazingly elderly fellow, I would guess upper 90's. He looked ancient, but was getting along well, bless him. Pretty much all age groups were represented. The only stereotypical person was that computer salesperson, and I felt sorry for him. He must have been carrying 500 pounds.

The most nerdy thing was the call sign hats. But how is *that* considered nerdy when NASCAR fans can run around with the number of their favorite racer on a hat, and put decals of that cartoon character "Calvin" urinating on their least favorite drivers number on the back of their pickup truck window? And lastly, how did I do at making a big run-on sentence? 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1989. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 03:41:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406234141.25340.00000087@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 64232

In article <uIYja.46920$B8.13893475@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030405162039.13308.00000043@mb-cj.aol.com...
>> In article <b7d1465c.0304050355.424bd3ec@posting.google.com>,
>wa2si@arrl.net
>> (Bert Craig) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20030404160308.15625.00000028@mb-ch.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <b7d1465c.0304040256.531b15c7@posting.google.com>,
>> >wa2si@arrl.net
>> >> (Bert Craig) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >> Enjoyment is not the only criteria. Usefulness, relavance are
>important
>> >> >> criteria.
>> >> >
>> >> >With all do respect, your as wrong as two left feet here. CW's
>> >> >usefulness and relevance to amateur radio are two very important
>> >> >criteria IN FAVOR of learning the most basic (read entry-level) Morse
>> >> >code skills. Many find enjoyment AFTER learning the basic 5-wpm and
>> >> >find they wish to progress further.
>> >>
>> >> Oh?
>> >
>> >Yeah.
>>
>> What of the many that -
>>
>> 1. Tried it and found it of NO enjoyment?
>
>My nightly 10m ragchewing partner is an 82 yr. old General who understood
>what was required for HF privies, satisfied that requirement w/o the crying
>and moaning and never looked back. CW was/is not his preferred mode. His
>enjoyment came from "earning the privilege" to utilize his preferred mode
>and frequencies.

Title 47 United States Code is NOT made to satisfy any
octogenarians or promote morse code use. It is simply the
regulations pertaining to ALL United States civil radio.

Now hear this: In the last half century I've operated more
frequencies, more power, more modes than was ever

allocated to US radio amateurs ever. That is NOT the
subject.

The subject is NOT about working, striving, resolute
sacrifice or any other dumas thing about morse code...or
any "crying or moaning in privies."

This particular thread is all about one antagonistic sociopathic
amateur shouting and barking orders to another he wishes to
humiliate. It's that simple.

>> 2. Have been in radio communications for years and never used it?
>
>Lots of folk passed their respective code tests to ear their HF privies and
>then never used code again. There's certainly nothing wrong with that.

There MUST be when the only radio service still using morse
code for communications in the USA is amateur radio. Aren't
you a full member of the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society?

>> 3. Noted that no other radio service uses it any more or never
>> planned to use it in that service at all?
>
>Apples and oranges, Len?

No fruit involved. See another thread where certain folks are
all upset about California agricultural inspection stations.

>> 4. Don't buy into the fantasy mystique of the Way of Morse?
>
>I didn't buy into anything and nobody sold it to me either. I wanted to
>become an ARO and operate on HF.

I operated on HF a half century ago as of the end of February.

Never used any morse code anything. Never HAD to.

>I researched the requirements. I studied to
>satisfy said requirements. All in all, MUCH less arduous than whining about
>the unfairness of it all. In studying for and passing Element 1, I found
>that I kinda liked the code.

That's nice. But you are not a role model for the retention of any
morse code test for thousands upon thousands of new licensees
in the future, are you?

Some people like anything. Others have great difficulty with
morse code. Most are indifferent and don't even bother to use
it. I've never had to use morse code in ANY radio service in
the past half century.

>I learned at approx. 15-wpm w/a character
>spacing of 5-wpm. Now, I'm up to 25-wpm w/a character spacing of 6-wpm. Does
>that mean I'm "proficient?" Heck no! Element 1 was just an entry level exam

>designed to give one a "taste." The resulting ticket is just a license to
>learn. (But it has always been the individual's choice as to how far and in
>what dir'n they wish to progress.)

Personal experience stories are always interesting. However,
only a certain KIND of experience is "acceptible" to the PCTA.

>> 5. Don't believe that time stands still with no progress in any
>> technology such as some olde-tyme amateurs?
>
>So retaining Element 1 retards the growth of other technologies in AR? LMAO!

Yes. In the 9 years before the recent US amateur radio
restructuring, the number of new licensees granted were
for the NO-CODE Technician class. Over 200,000 such.

Had it not been for the NO-CODE Technician class license,
today's total US amateur radio licensees would be shrinking
in number, not creeping slowly higher.

PCTAs in here cannot accept that fact and remain in denial
of the truth as if they were in the spirit of the Iraqi Ministry
of Information. Not my problem. Theirs.

>> >> What is the International Amateur Radio Union's viewpoint on the
>> >> relevancy of morse code testing? They are for eliminating it.
>> >
>> >Then why are there various countries that have stated that they will
>> >retain their code test requirements even if the ITU requirement is
>> >dropped? Most notably, Russia and Germany.
>>
>> What about them? What has Russia done that is so notable
>> in either geopolitics or radio communications concerning
>> amateur radio?
>
>What do they have to prove to you?

What has Russia proved to you? You brought them up.

>> Germany is at least venturing into some experimentation in
>> amateur radio technology (evidenced by European amateur
>> radio publications) but is no longer a world leader in radio
>> communications or electronics.
>
>Guess their not up to your standards, Len.

They aren't quite up to the standards of radio amateurs in the
UK, Denmark, Sweden, or the Netherlands.

"Get out more" and read up on what European amateurs are
doing...not just the hand-picked snippets of information allowed
to be seen by the editors of QST.

>> Nearly ALL countries are involved in expansion of commercial
>> radio-electronics with little regard for hobby-leisure pursuits
>> involving amateur radio and the furtherance of the morse code
>> state of the art.
>
>The PARTICIPANTS of hobby radio take care of that. Get it, Len?

Circular logic, Bert. You are going in circles.

To become a participant in something, such as amateur radio,
one has to get into it. To do that with a license having below-
30-MHz privileges requires demonstrating morse code
cognition in a test. That's the law. [are you with me so far?]

There are several things wrong with the above. First of all,
the HOBBY of radio does not necessarily require any license
whatsoever. No illegal transmission, no license needed.
That is ALSO the law. [read all the parts, not just one]

There has always been a morse code test for an amateur
radio license. That is true through the four different federal
radio regulatory agencies that existed in the USA since 1912.
Does that mean that a morse code test will ALWAYS be
required for an amateur radio license?

-> NO <-

No divine will has stated that any morse code test MUST be
kept as law forever more. There is NO technical reason to
require any such morse code test. The only reason is some
archaic statement by olde-tymer amateurs who have
demanded that be included under ITU-R regulations years ago.
The FCC wants to drop morse code testing but cannot...the
US administration must keep to its UN membership and follow
the ITU in matters of communications.

>That's why
>the NCTA's cry (Very appropriate word.) of "well, the FCC says so" is
>childish.

No. Not "childish."

What is CHILDISH, ILLOGICAL, INVALID is a minority desiring
to control a majority over a minor emotional matter that requires
a particular physical-mental aptitude for licensing.

FCC grants US amateur radio licenses...not the "ARS community,"
not Bert Craig, not some 82-year-old ragchew partner, not a bunch
of appliance operators whose only "radio knowledge and
experience" is working DX on HF with CW.

The FCC wanted to drop morse code testing in 1990. It said that
again in 1999. Publicly.

>That's also why the NCTA's are scared to death of a honest vote by
>the some odd 685,000 licensed US ARO's re. the retention of Element 1.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, Bert. You have Delusions of Grandeur! Get help!

YOU don't have ANY such honest tally of "685,000 licensed
AROs" who allegedly support the "retention of Element 1."

That's such a bogus statement that my only question is "when
were you in Baghdad working for the Iraqi Ministry of
Information?" [I don't really want to know...the FBI might...]

>> >Sadly, many amateur radio
>> >"organizations" do not echo the sentiments of the majority of their
>> >constituency.
>>
>> That applies to ARRL as well, the fence-straddler and do-little
>> organization for the ITU-R S25 restructuring who refuses to
>> take any position on the morse code issue now.
>
>I violently agree! :-)
>
>> >A fair vote scares the crap out of the NCTAs.
>>
>> It does NOT.
>
>Sure it does. The mere suggestion of a fair vote brings out the "well, daddy
>(The FCC) says so" :-p responses, when it's clear that "daddy" couldn't care
>less. Prettty lame, Len.

No. What is "lame" is your Delusional statement above.

>> Morse code mode is on the way of becoming
>> defunct, extinct to every other radio service in the world
>> except amateur radio.
>
>Reread your statement, Len. It's saying something.

Morse code mode is on the way of becoming defunct,
extinct. [honest truth in worldwide radio use]

Morse code is used solely by the minority in amateur radio
that love morse code mode.

Do you want to dictate what the other "685,000" should like?

Why?

>> If the PCTAs continue their fantasy
>> and mythology of the Way of Morse, then they too will
>> become defunct, extinct, archaeological exhibits in a living
>> museum of archaic radio.
>
>You mean like me, Len? I'm a newbie and I like Morse code. How about mu
>5-yr. old lass, perhaps she'll be "laughing at the lazy" when I'm an OT?

If the PCTAs continuetheir fantasy and mythology of
the Way of Morse, then they too will become defunct,
extinct, archaeological exhibits in a living museum of
archaic radio.

Feel free to identify with what I wrote any way you want.

>> ARRL "leadership" is not my concern.
>
>What is your concern, Len?

It isn't concern for you.

It isn't concern for members of the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
Society.

It isn't for the Gang of Four in here.

I said some while ago that my purpose in here was to argue
against the continuation of a morse code test for any US radio
amateur license. That is an on-going purpose.

>> They do NOT "represent"
>> me nor do they "represent" anyone but a minority of licensed
>> US radio amateur licensees.
>
>Agreed.
>
>> ARRL does have a large enough membership and economic
>> means to lobby for the maintenance of the Archaic Radio-
>> telegraphy Society desires in a hobby pursuit and radio
>> regulations pertaining to amateur radio.
>
>We'll take what we can get.

That's ALL you will get. You will get what ARRL decides you
should get. No more.

>> News: I've been federally licensed in radio since 1956...just not
>> in amateur radio.
>
>So why are you here, Len? This is an AMATEUR RADIO newsgroup.

My purpose here is to argue for the elimination of all morse
code tests for any US amateur radio license.

"Amateur radio" doesn't have to equate with Archaic Radiotelegraphy,
does it?

The Gang of Four doesn't like my presence in here. Apparently you
don't either. TS.

Try not to act like a newsgroup cop. Your Kode Kop badge is dirty.

1990. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 03:41:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406234142.25340.00000088@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 64226

In article <20030406094830.00320.00000363@mb-fs.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
(Vshah101) writes:

>From K4YZ:
>
>>(I did not want to raise my hand).
>>
>> WHOA! But...but...but...VIPUL! YOU stated in this very forum that YOU
>>support Amateur Radio in non-Amateur Radio forums... ! ! !
>>
>> Did you lie about supporting Amateur Radio then or are you lying about
>>this now?
>
>I didn't want to stand out in class.
>
> >>I am no longer taking his class right now.
>> I am sure he's losing sleep over why you quit.
>
>I didn't quit. The class finished.
>
>>I have to assume (yes...assume), in the face of no other evidence to the
>>contrary, that this "person" you are using as "support" for your arguments
>>does not exist.
>
>There is a Comm Theory Prof there. I can check his office hrs. Do you not like
>what an expert in the field would say? How about I ask the following
>questions?

[he can't say anything in detail about his "seven hostile actions"]

>-How come Morse code was not even mentioned in your class? Some Hams say it
>is
>a most important communications mode.
>-What are the advantages/disadvantages of Morse code?
>-How come nobody uses Morse code?
>
>>What "army survival manual", Vippy? When did you serve in the Armed
>>Forces of the Untied States?
>
>The Army survival manual is available in bookstore.

A number of current US Army training documents are available
at the Army's Training and Doctrine Digital Library (named for
General Dennis Reimer, former four-year Army Chief of Staff).

http://www.adtdl.army.mil/atdls.htm

Click on the "Library" button (one of eight). Then click on "Official Documents" on the Library page. That allows anyone to view or download any training circular, field manual (FM), or technical manual (TM) released for public distribution. Those are all free. [the US government cannot copyright its own publications in case anyone doesn't know that]

I've had a copy of FM 24-24 for over five years now, a virtual catalog of ALL US Signal equipment as of 1994. There are over 300 other FMs available free of charge at www.adtdl.army.mil, and hundreds more documents.

What might be of interest to military-interest types is a new FM recently added, FM 3-06.11 (formerly FM 90-10-1 under the older numbering system). It is dated 2002 and describes, in detail, doctrine for "UO" or Urban Operations. It is very detailed on urban sites worldwide, even to describing building types and typical structural arrangements. The release date is timely considering the present Gulf War... :-)

1991. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 03:41:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406234143.25340.00000089@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 64230

In article <20030406122618.00629.00000025@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030406095330.00320.00000364@mb-fs.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
>(Vshah101) writes:
>
>>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 06 Apr 2003 13:53:30 GMT
>>
>>From N2EY:
>>>And if we look at the number of manufacturers making and selling Morse Code
>>>related hardware and software today, as compared to 10, 20, 30 years ago,
>>>it's clear that part of the industry is growing. With or without a test.
>>
>>Glad to see an EE advocating Morse code instead of Electrical Engineering.
>
>Who is doing that? Can't be me. In case you didn't notice, I advocate all
>sorts
>of amateur radio activites, not just Morse code. Like homebrewing.
>
>>From
>>the numbers, we know thats not a growth industry.
>>
>What is not a "growth industry"?
>
>--
>
>Here's two simple questions for you, Len, N0IMD, and anybody else who wants
>to answer it:
>
>Currently there are more than 250,000 US amateur radio licensees shown in the
>database as "Technician". Have any of them passed code tests? Do any of them
>have HF amateur privileges?

Here's a simple request for you:

Fund a personal DSL line or send me a CD-ROM with the full FCC
amateur radio database on it and I might write a search program
and totalization for any field of data...then present the totals in here
free of charge.

I'm NOT going to limit searches to some pre-biased conclusion
reaching. I'm NOT going to bias anything.

There's one problem and why I wrote "might" instead of "will"
above:

You can't handle the truth.

The present database size from the FCC prohibits downloading
over dial-up telephone lines in any reasonable amount of time.
DSL service makes it reasonable. Program writing is a trivial
task...I can even do it in FORTRAN. Database file size is not
a problem here...I have a 40 GB hard disk with 34 GB free. :-)

In the past the FCC database information on amateurs was
sectioned off by postal zip-code groups with smaller file sizes.

In doing some past raw database information sorting, I've
presented number results. The end result in here was:

You can't handle the truth.

There's really no point in continuing with the farcical charade
of your "simple questions." You continue to insist on biased
sorting and statistical interpretations to fit your agenda.

No problem. Your requests are denied.

1992. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 03:41:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406234144.25340.00000090@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 64227

In article <3E90553A.8080806@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:
>> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>>
>>>And now Vipul manages to interpret the response as to mean exactly the
>>>opposite of what the poster actually said. Where do you get your data ??
>>
>> Why do people misinterpret what I say? I agreed Morse code is a growth
>> industry, EE is not.
>
> It was not clear from your post. I thought that was whay you meant, but

>as you see, others thought you meant something else.
>
> Maybe some classes in expressing yourself, and possibly a Dale Carnegie

>course would help (not trying to be rude here - I recommend the second
>course all the time to most everyone)

Did you pass your finals in that Dale Carnegie course?

>> Pointing out the increased numbers is advocating Morse code. N2EY (an
>> Electrical Engineer) advocates Morse code, not Electrical Engineering.
>
> How do you draw that conclusion? Another of my hobbies is amateur
>astronomy. By your logic, I am advocating people to stay out of my
>professional field?

Are you a professional astronomer?

If not, what IS your professional field?

I know a farmer who is out standing in his field...

>Does not make sense. Jim is doing what he likes to
>do on his personal time. And if that includes "beeping", then that's
>just fine and dandy.

So, antagonistic pro-morsemanship and keeping the code test
forever is "fine and dandy?"

> Why your obsession with what Jim does in his spare time?

What is your obsession with antagonizing NCTAs?

1993. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 03:41:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406234146.25340.00000091@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 64233

In article <20030406042624.12142.00000021@mb-fr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <f45722ac.0304051447.5120c060@posting.google.com>,
>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>Date: 5 Apr 2003 14:47:32 -0800
>>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>>news:<20030405102636.18459.00000008@mb-cc.aol.com>...
>>> In article <f45722ac.0304050459.8980c7c@posting.google.com>,
>>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>>
>>> >Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>>> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>> >Date: 5 Apr 2003 04:59:24 -0800
>>> >
>>> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>>> >news:<20030404223540.04143.00000013@mb-fb.aol.com>...
>>> >> In article <f45722ac.0304041811.6fb12dbc@posting.google.com>,
>>> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>> >>
>>> >> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>>> >> >news:<c2356669.0304041402.17e50e04@posting.google.com>...
>>> >> >
>>> >> >> > > How did you arrive at those numbers?
>>> >> >> >
>>> >> >> > I used the science of mathematics and the number system.
>>> >> >>
>>> >> >> Used them incorrectly, too.
>>> >> >
>>> >> >Show your work, oh wise one.
>>> >>
>>> >> Why? You don't show yours.
>>> >>
>>> >> Here's a hint:
>>> >>
>>> >> Your numbers indicate that you consider the set of "noncoded" hams to
>be
>>> >> equivalent to the set of hams with Technician licenses. That's simply
>>not
>>> >> correct.

>>> >
>>> >That is my assumption.
>>>
>>> It's incorrect. Invalid. Untrue. The set of "noncoded" hams is not
>>equivalent
>>> to the set of hams with Technician licenses. Len Anderson made the same
>>mistake
>>> some time back.
>>>
>>> > Why is it wrong?
>>>
>>> Look it up. The answer was explained in detail on April 3 in this thread.
>>It
>>> was also repeatedly explained to Len when he made the same mistake.
>>
>>Give me a number and I'll plug it in.
>
>Why? You're the one pushing an agenda, you provide reasonable numbers.

Provide some reasonable handling of raw numbers and we
might take your interpretation seriously.

You are a PCTA. You have to keep the morse code test.

You can't envision US amateur radio as anything but a
transistorized Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society.

>>Keep it reasonable.
>
>You are invited to do the research needed to support your claims. You
>obviously care much more about this than anyone else.

Research has been done by others, with accurate numbers
and reasonable presentations. You refuse to accept such
reasonable presentations. You have an agenda. You are
PCTA.

>>We'll keep working the numbers until we can show Morse Code as a
>>growth industry as one "great" DXer would like it to be.
>>
>"Growth industry"? Amateur Radio is "not for pecuniary interest", so it can't
>be an industry. Manufacturing and selling Amateur Radio hardware and software
>can be an industry, though.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Arguing about metaphor use. :-)

Metaphors be with you, morseman.

Aggression and antagonism aren't "reasonable."

You are a PCTA. You have an agenda.

>And if we look at the number of manufacturers making and selling Morse Code
>related hardware and software today, as compared to 10, 20, 30 years ago,

>it's clear that part of the industry is growing. With or without a test.

ANTIQUE collecting is a continual growing industry.

There's even two antique shows on television covering appraisals of antiques. There are thousands of eastern USA shops specializing in antiques.

There are no TV programs about morse code in the USA. In fact, there is stagnation (and some arguable drop-off) in the number of shops specializing in amateur radio equipment.

Come to think of it, there are no TV programs about amateur radio in the USA cable or broadcast schedule listings. Never have been.

There are at least two TV programs about antiques in those cable and broadcast schedule listings. Those weren't there 30 years ago.

To paraphrase, you have a morse key and everything looks like beeping to you.

1994. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 03:41:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406234148.25340.00000092@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 64234

In article <98304907109B80B1.BA538F6E4D8CD5F1.BC0D172B49A7B5D9@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030405162705.23238.00000011@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> In article
><E546ADE2836B93B5.00CEDC5692012862.025E53A61BB29681@lp.airnews.net>,
>> "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> >news:c2356669.0304030922.7165b709@posting.google.com...
>> >>
>> >> Here's a "what if" for ya....
>> >>
>> >> One of the main reasons for the war is to eliminate SH's WMDs. But no
>> >> WMDs have been found by coalition forces yet - just lots of protective
>> >> suits. Protective suits aren't proof that anyone has or will use WMDs
>> >> - coalition troops have those suits, too.
>> >>
>> >> What if Bagdad falls and the regime changes, but no WMDs or evidence
>> >> of same are ever found? Coalition will look like the aggressor and SH
>> >> as a martyr who told the truth. Which may be his plan all along. Talk
>> >> about a recruitment tool for OBL....
>> >
>> >Oh, here's my surprised look. The WMD argument is a red herring.
>> >
>> Really? I thought it was probably the best argument the coalition has.
>>
>> If WMDs are the red herring, what's the real reason?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>First, note that the fat lady hasn't sung yet. Although, I am pretty sure
>the WMD won't materialize.

Hopefully it won't. No one knows for sure. There are NO
certainties in life or warfare. There are only probabilities
based on past events. These are:

Iraq has used chemical weapons against Iran in the 8-year
Iraq-Iran war.

Iraq has used chemical weapons to kill thousands of its own
people who were against the Ba'ath Party in power.

Hundreds, perhaps thousands of gas masks and protective
gear kits have been found in Iraqi military supply caches so
far by coalition forces.

UN inspectors have found evidence of some limited capability
of the Iraqi military to use chemical weapons, biological
weapons and has been researching the design and use of
atomic weapons.

>What's the *real* reason? Goodness, if I could get into the head(s) of the
>President et al, maybe I could tell you. Maybe it's as simple as
>vindication for a father who failed...I don't know. This will all come out
>in the wash. But, with NATO such as it is now, the UN such as it is now,
>world opinion such as it is now, it will be very interesting to see what the
>future holds, and what legacy this President will leave behind. We, the
>United States and Britain (for the most part), have a lot of 'splaining to
>do--is what the rest of the world is thinking I'm sure. We'll (the world)
>see what happens.

One very "real" reason is staring everyone in the face yet so many
appear oblivious or in such deep denial that they cannot see it.

"(the world)" has very recently - in less than a century past - seen
a number of dictatorships rise up and carry their nations into a
path of conquest by force of arms. After a relatively bloodless
military takeover of government, Japan started on a path of military
conquest of Asia in the 1930s and was well on its way on that
path before the USA became involved. The USSR began the
Cold War just after WW2, bent on the Communist goals of
converting the entire world to communism...first with the political
annexation of much of middle Europe and including the physical
separation of east and west Germanies, the Berlin Blockade of
1948, attempted communist revolutions in Greece, Indonesia,
the Philippines. [the Indonesian Civil War was brutal and
bloody, very down-played in USA news] North Korea, under a
communist regime, invaded South Korea in 1950, Communist
China aiding them militarily a short half year or so after invasion.
Communist Vietnamese forces drove out the French from
French Indochina (as it was called) in an 8-year civil war that
began during the last year of WW2. Israel and neighboring
Arab states erupted in four separate wars (two started by each
side) after 1948...and, in addition, the UK and France took over
(briefly) the Suez Canal territory with the USA remaining a
neutral and later being part of the UN Peacekeeping force in the
Sinai. "(the world)" reacted to most of that with great reluctance
to get involved in friends and neighbors open warfare.

We can touch on the National Socialist Party of Germany in the
1930s to 1940s. They were open military aggressors of Europe
leading Germany as the conquering invader of nearly all of it.
NAZI Germany practiced a religious genocide so massive, so
ugly, that over 6 million humans were put to death...while "(the
world)" did nothing or turned a blind eye to what was happening.

Advance to 1980. The Ba'ath Party had taken over Iraq and Saddam Hussein had become the dictatorial leader of Iraq. They went to war with Iran, kept that war going for 8 years. "(the world)" reported it but did nothing.

Skip to 1990. Iraq invaded Kuwait, a much smaller country but wealthy in oil reserves. "(the world)" or rather a part of it, finally did something by pushing Iraq back out of Kuwait. A problem was that "(the world)" didn't want to do anything more...they did not really punish Iraq or its dictator, just hemmed them in with embargoes and no-fly zones. Saddam Hussein remained in absolute power for a dozen years more, tightening his control over Iraq, building up his military from oil profits that could have been used for Iraqi citizens. He also ordered the slaughter of dissident Kurds in northern Iraq by chemical weapons.

"(the world)" didn't do much. Some of "(the world)" thought that UN inspectors were enough...even though they were few and unarmed. Most of "(the world)" simply turned away from the problem of known Iraqi aggression hoping it would solve itself. "(the world)" has exhibited a regular denial of growing problems for more than a century of recorded history...doing nothing until some aggressor finally invaded another country. The examples literally fill books of history just for the past century.

There hasn't been any case of "(the world)" doing ANY pre-emptory action in that past century until 2003 and the combined UK and USA militaries in Iraq. The danger was clear and present for two decades. "(the world)" could continue to do nothing until the final acts, then maybe try to do something after many died needlessly in fighting the aggressors.

"(the world)" has reached an important place in human history...the USA and UK have decided to take action NOW and stop the cancer of aggression, remove it before it spreads and requires needless killing on a much larger scale later. That's a gutsy decision, but it may turn out to be of greater overall world benefit than sitting back and doing nothing. It may also be a faulty decision but that won't be known beforehand either. "(the world)" has had a habit of doing nothing for a century until it was too late to stop some power-hungry megalomaniac from killing millions of human beings.

Sitting back and doing nothing is very safe. No one gets involved. Everything happens somewhere else and concerns others. Nobody at home gets hurt. Nobody has invaded the USA with any military force. No problem.

That's what the USA thought on a peaceful Sunday on the 7th of December, 1941.

1995. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 03:41:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406234150.25340.00000093@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 64228

In article <B50D1B4E57BF28D5.88B5A2DEF2656D4D.E60280E7F36AD68E@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:b6n5dfdht1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
>> Even from you I am amazed. I bet you would have made a good war protester
>> in the 60s. Im sure General Giap would have personally given you the
>Hanoi
>> peace prize.
>>
>> You have just insulted anyone that has ever worn the uniform of this
>> country, whether they actually 'went to war' or not. You own Larry and
>> every Marine, Sailor, Soldier, Airman and Coast Guard member an apology.
>
>No, I've just insulted anyone who's ever worn the uniform of this country in
>the name of defending Democracy, who then turns around and displays behavior
>of a non-democratic nature. Telling a war protester to "go to
>Russia...Africa...Iraq" is not having the tolerance that it takes to accept
>and be a member of a democracy. If there are people who state they ":went
>to war" (i.e., wore a military uniform) for the benefit of democracy, then
>tell me that I'm wrong to think a certain way--then they don't even
>understand what they "went to war" for.

Good statement, Kim!

>> ANY person, male of female, that served at ANY TIME, WAR OR PEACE
>deserves
>> the RESPECT and GRATITUDE of the nation they served. NO EXCEPTIONS.
>
>I disagree. If that person comes back with some kind of superior attitude
>and feels they have a right to dictate how someone should think, they won't
>get my respect.

Nor mine...and I did serve the military of the USA for 8 years.

>Mind you, I haven't told them to go to
>Russia...Africa...Iraq. And, I haven't told you anything about how you are
>wrong for thinking the way you do. I won't. But, you also won't get my
>respect or agreement with what you say. The wars my heroes fought defended
>your right to believe however you wish. But, they were also fought to
>defend however I believe to think. And, I take it even further to believe
>that you deserve dignity, even though I may disagree with the way you think.

Only a slight disagreement with the last. As a veteran, I can
speak with as much "authority" to any other veteran of the
military. They will not always accept such "authority" since

the military's primary task is fighting. [one sees evidence in
here that some cannot stop fighting long after service days]

But, that disagreement with you is very small compared to the
overall issue of actually behaving under democratic principles.

>It seems to me you are stopping way short of allowing anyone who thinks
>differently than you, any dignity at all.

That's an unfortunate truism.

>> You being a 'military brat' should know of the day to day sacrifices they
>> make. And when one does it for twenty or more years, then they deserve it
>> even more.
>
>With no disrespect intended, Dan--it is not just soldiers/cops/fireman,
>etc., who go out into this world ever day and make sacrifices.

Sorry, strong disagreement when talking of war and warfare.

"Sacrifice" of a life is ultimate. Worry, concern, etc., expressed
by parents, friends, acquaintences is not really sacrifice...unless
used by journalists loading their stories with emotional bias in
hopes of winning Pulitzer Prizes.

There is a HUGE gulf separating those "back home" watching
and listening to news, reading their newspapers with a cup of
coffee, and imagining "what it is like" compared to actually
being out in the field facing the distinct possibility of wounding
and death 24/7 whether remote or up-close and personal.

1996. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 03:41:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406234151.25340.00000094@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 64229

In article <20030406032736.23756.00000045@mb-fj.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20030405162042.13308.00000046@mb-cj.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>>> MSgt, USAF (Retired)
>>>> Loyal American who supports our President, our Troops, and the
>>>> War in Iraq
>>>
>>>Man, what a crackpot...
>>
>> That may be but he claims to be your "moral superior..." :-)
>
>Lennie:
>
>It's not just a claim -- it's an actual, absolute, natural FACT.

Only in your mind.

>Of course,
>I will admit that it doesn't take much to be able to truthfully claim to be
>Kim's intellectual and moral superior -- based on the evidence of her
>own character and intelligence that she consistently displays in this
>newsgroup.

You really should NOT drive routes like those.

It only displays a remarkable self-inflation of your own little ego.

You seem to hate women. You hate them even more when
they display an intellect. You utterly despise them when they
do not worship yourself for existing. Not a beautiful mind.

Please go away and try to impress another group. Try the
FIDO Net.

1997. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 03:41:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030406234152.25340.00000095@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 64231

In article <BAB52FC2.15AF4%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>> Dwight Stewart wrote...
>>>
>>> There is no implication other than (snip)
>>
>> I've seen CHP armed troopers on all the freeways
>> around here. That's their job...to patrol the state
>> highways (and freeways going through several cities),
>> inspect vehicles (for lots of things), (snip)
>
> For fruits? Man, doesn't the CHP have better things to do?

The CHP does and does many things 24/7.

>I wonder what
>would happen if someone ran one of these agricultural inspection stations?

Pursuit with their vehicle identified to the CHP network.
It happens rarely, but it does happen.
Breaking the law is breaking the law.

>Would the CHP give pursuit? Would they be authorized to use deadly force to
>stop the vehicle?

Why do you take your comments to the absurd?

Someone "running" (failing to stop) an inspection station will
be pursued one way or another. That makes them subject to
arrest since they did not obey a lawful order to submit to a
vehicle inspection.

If you jaywalk a city street are city police going to use "deadly
force" to stop your jaywalking? That's the sort of absurd
question just like what you asked.

>Can a person be placed in jail for having the wrong Orange
>or Apple in the vehicle?

No. Failure to submit to an inspection could be taken as
resisting lawful orders. "Running" an inspection station could
be taken as resisting arrest.

Being held for an arrest is not an automatic imprisonment.
That is not always being "placed in jail."

>> I'd call it protection of the state. :-)
>
> I call it protection of the wealthy fruit farmers.

I'd call it protection for farmers and about a million or so
farm workers depending on reasonably disease-free
agricultural products.

If you harbor resentment over the wealth of fruit farmers, you
can take passive action by not buying their products. If no
one buys their products they cannot remain "wealthy." That
way you can also make a million or so farm workers
unemployed, resentful at some paranoid do-gooders who
think that they have the freedom to live an anarchic life.

>>> Why aren't travelers reimbursed for the items
>>> seized at these inspection stations?
>>
>> Why?
>
> Because the items seized are their property, seized without due process of
>law.

Sorry, invalid. There IS law on the subject. Has been for quite a
while now. You are invited to pursue the subject further through
higher California state courts.

>> (snip) "Free and unrestricted travel across this
>> country" does NOT mean some absolute freedom to do
>> anything you want.
>
> Certainly not the freedom to bring whatever fruit I want with me into the
>state of California.

Very well, do you wish to extend this to a "freedom" of being
able to carry a virus or bacteria into the state to spread
disease instead? How about SAR? Carriers of disease may
be free of symptoms yet are able to infect others.

>> Okay, whatever. Doesn't have anything to do
>> with "No more FCC regulation," does it? :-)
>
> Of course it does. You should know that by now. :)

...grant someone an amateur radio license and they suddenly
"know everything about everything." Tsk, tsk, tsk.

1998. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 04:14:39 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.07.04.14.38.840562.32723@arrl.org>
Source record: 64235

On Sun, 06 Apr 2003 17:49:37 -0400, Brian wrote:
> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:<pan.2003.04.06.15.48.10.305942.28928@arrl.org>...
>> On Sun, 30 Mar 2003 21:53:45 -0500, W5TIT wrote:
>> >
>> > All the cries for "patriotism" (those of people who imply it is
>> > unpatriotic not to support and stand behind a President of the US),
>> > are probably right along party lines; i.e., would we find a
>> > Republican pleading for respect and admiration of a Democrat
>> > President or vice versa? hmmmmm....
>>
>> We already know that the answer to that is "no":
>> http://www.newsmax.com/articles/?a=1998/12/18/51233
>>
>> Jon
>
> BS. There are many patriots who could care less about which party is
> trying to outspend the other of our tax dollars.

The problem is not a lack of patriots, it's that many think only those
with whom they agree are patriots.

> Many were even patriots when being a patriot was a bad thing.

When, exactly, was being a patriot a bad thing?

Jon

1999. Remote Weather Station Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 04:36:42 UTC
From: Fritz Wuehler <fritz@rodent.frell.eu.org>
Message-ID: <151ef060b2a8d5a8a559d7b25fc3c158@remailer.frell.eu.org>
Source record: 64236
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Greetings - I'm a new Tech. licensee interested in building a remote weather station for use on the coast to monitor wind conditions. The technology is not a problem for me (MSEE with 10 years experience in UHF wireless), but I can't figure out the regulatory end of it (IANAL).

What I want: an autonomous weather station that broadcasts wind data at least every three minutes. Just to give you an idea of how much data I'm talking about, a few 1200 baud APRS (e.g. with the TAPR APRS PIC-E system) packets would be plenty - it's not much data.

My concerns: this is not a backyard affair attached to my personal station - it would be a standalone broadcast unit (or perhaps an autoresponder?). I don't think my personal callsign is legal for use here. It seems like a lot of people do what I'm talking about via APRS, but I'm not so sure about the autonomous station issue. Repeaters get their own licenses - what about weather stations?

I've thought about going to Part 18 ISM rules instead with a 902 MHz line-of-sight link, but that's not a clear regulatory option, either. Neither is Part 15 (I don't want to have to certify compliance). I think it really is a HAM-related activity, but I don't understand the operations portion.

Does anyone have an idea of the basis on which I might license such a station?

Thanks!

Bill Alexander
KG6PNN

2000. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 04:43:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407004334.13960.00000029@mb-co.aol.com>
Source record: 64238

In article <20030406215625.13084.00000145@mb-cr.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: Mike Coslo
>> The rest looked like
>>people you would see on a trip to the mall.
>
>Are the people at the mall 95% male and generally older?

...don't forget predominently white. :-)

2001. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 04:43:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407004335.13960.00000030@mb-co.aol.com>
Source record: 64239

In article <d22b54c3.0304061023.ef5df7e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman) wrote in message
>news:<20030405212529.04143.00000018@mb-fb.aol.com>...
>> In article <b6nnrt$215$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
>> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>> The Vietnam War ended on January 27, 1973.
>
>WRONG! Again. 1975. You're a disgrace to the rest of the putzes.

Kellie, get SOME kind of mood drug or medical help. You've
replied twice to the same person without realizing it...

See my other posting for your correction.

2002. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 04:43:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407004336.13960.00000031@mb-co.aol.com>
Source record: 64237

In article <d22b54c3.0304061013.22b09fde@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030405162042.13308.00000045@mb-cj.aol.com>...
>> In article <b6n5dfdht1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
>> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >Even from you I am amazed. I bet you would have made a good war protester
>> >in the 60s. Im sure General Giap would have personally given you the Hanoi
>> >peace prize.
>>
>> The Vietnam War was not the ONLY war fought by the USA since
>> the Korean War. Try refreshing your memory of what happened
>> since 1973...a mere 30 years.
>
>- - - - -
>
>Hey Putz, then who was that who was fighting the 'Cong and the PRNV
>after we supposedly left in '73 according to your calendar and April
>'75 when the fighting stopped? The Aussies? The Turks? RTTY repeater
>rear widget mercenaries? Who?
>
>Ya blew it *again*.
>
>If ya just gotta make an ass of yerself at least work at getting
>well-known recent history straight before you spout off.
>
>Whatta PUUUUUTZ!

1. The US Department of Defense marks the end of the Vietnam War as 27 January 1973.

2. There was a negotiated cease-fire that was supposed to have begun on 27 January 1973. That never happened.

3. The reunification of the Republic of Vietnam happened officially on 2 July 1976.

4. Kellie NEVER served in the US military in any capacity.

5. Kellie needs to have his Prozac prescription refilled.

>> Are you also one of those "moral superiors" too?
>
>. . . duh . .

Evidently Kellie is one of those moral superiors in his mind.
He is a morseman. He is experiencing the onset of
some kind of Alzheimer's...

2003. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 04:45:49 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.07.04.45.49.372435.32723@arrl.org>
Source record: 64240

On Sun, 06 Apr 2003 16:45:44 -0400, N2EY wrote:
> Did Papa Bush really "fail"? As I understand it, during GW1, coalition
> forces were rolling towards B'dad at a furious pace but were ORDERED to
> stop because Kuwait had been freed, which was the avowed goal of GW1.
> Why wasn't Stormin' Norman allowed to finish the job? I've never seen an
> official answer to that question.

You must not have looked very hard because the topic was discussed thoroughly at the time and later. The key reasons were 1) that the coalition was created specifically to eject Iraq from Kuwait and was operating under a UN Security Council resolution limited to that purpose; 2) that there was a reluctance among some members of the coalition, particularly Arab states, to extend the mission to the military overthrow of Saddam for fear that Iraq would break apart in ethnic warfare that would spread to the neighboring Arab states; 3) that the mission had been accomplished at a cost in coalition lives dramatically lower than even the most optimistic prewar projection and that good fortune was unlikely to continue if the forces continued on to Baghdad; and 4) that there was an expectation that Saddam had been weakened enough that he was nearly certain to be overthrown from within anyway.

Quotes:

The ending wasn't quite as clean as it might have been if Saddam Hussein had come to that tent [at Safwan on March 3, 1991], laid down his thing and maybe left office ... I miscalculated. I thought he'd be gone ... We might have handled the flying of helicopters differently. So I think there's room for some ex post facto criticism here ... [But] I think history will say we did the right thing.
--Former President George Bush, PBS interview with David Frost, aired January 1996 (taped Dec. 12, 1995).

We had a crucial but limited objective in the Gulf War: to reverse Iraqi aggression, and to cripple Saddam's offensive military capabilities ... Occupying Iraq with thousands of American troops for the indefinite future and creating a gaping power vacuum in the Persian Gulf for Iran to fill [is what would have happened] if we had pressed on to Baghdad in 1991.
--Brent Scowcroft, national security adviser, 1991. "Why We Stopped the Gulf War," Newsweek, Sept. 23, 1996, p. 3.

I was just damned glad to have the victory in our hands with the minimum loss of casualties, and I was willing to settle for that because that's a hell of a lot more than anybody's had in a war as long as I can remember.
--Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf, commander, U.S. Central Command, "The Gulf War," Frontline, Jan. 9-10, 1996.

So of all the criticism of Bush Administration decision-making during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, it is this marching-to-Baghdad canard that has the least merit. As a diplomatic, political or even military matter, marching to Baghdad would have been a disaster in the making.
Iraq might have fragmented in unpredictable ways, which would have played into the hands of the mullahs in Iran. The mullahs could have exported their brand of Islamic fundamentalism with the help of Iraq's Shiites and quickly transformed themselves into the dominant regional power. (Past tense added.)
--James A. Baker, III, secretary of state, 1989-92. "Why U.S. Did Not March on to Baghdad," Washington Times, Sept. 11, 1996.

2004. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 04:59:03 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.07.04.59.03.228521.32723@arrl.org>
Source record: 64241

On Sun, 06 Apr 2003 22:21:39 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:94747B2B5A50BF12.DC06DC5B1570EDAC.15CD574D5721AB1B@lp.airnews.net...
>
> Exactly. And evil wins when honorable and honest people stand by and do
> nothing when confronted by evil.
>
>> But I'm not so sure that the US gov't. or military needs to start
>> marching in and changing things here and there.
>
> Sadly, you sound like too many of the anti-war groupies who believe that
> because we do one thing in Iraq, we will or must do the same thing in
> other places.

But doesn't "evil [win] when honorable and honest people stand by and do nothing when confronted by evil"? If you truly belive that, why don't you think that the US should eliminate evil everywhere? Is there any reason other than practicalities that should check the US from attacking evil regimes wherever they exist? And what are the characteristics of a regime that make it evil?

Those are the questions that makes a lot of people in the world nervous about the Bush administration's preemptive war doctrine.

> The lesson to be learned
> here is that we are not impotent nor unwilling to take needed action
> when it warrants such.

Ah, but the "when it warrants" is the problem. There is a fear outside the borders of the US that the present US government will pay no attention to what anyone outside the US thinks or to how US actions will affect them. And based on its behavior to date, that's not an unrealistic concern.

Jon

2005. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 06:22:24 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b6rrb6$892b0$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 64161

Even if someone who never used morse code before, they could do better than
that speed even if they were looking it up on a chart!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> You said that 0.02wpm couldn't possibly be their top end morse code speed.
>
> What if it is?

2006. Re: Plop-Plop Fizz Fizz Oh What A Relief It Is...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 06:43:12 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b6rrb7$892b0$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 64162

No.... it would be FAST MORSE CODE, not FAST CW. CW is a method of
transmission and morse code is the encoding/decoding stream sent over the
transmission signal. There is a difference.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0304041209.73cf33c4@posting.google.com...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030403173218.11311.00000006@mb-fd.aol.com>...
>
> > Remember, Real Hams work DX on HF with CW.
>
> Ahem, please make that "with FAST CW."

2007. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 06:52:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB69886.15B82%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64242

"K7JEB" wrote:
>
> FWIW, Arizona recently re-opened their
> agricultural inspection stations with
> the objective of preventing the spread
> of a virus that infects birds. They
> are now stopping all vehicles and asking
> the drivers if they are carrying any
> live birds.

LOL. Well, so far, I haven't routinely carried live birds across the state line, but it is something to keep in mind if I ever do.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2008. ARNewsline 1338 - April 4 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 06:59:24 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407025924.25918.00000741@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 64243

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1338 April 4, 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1338 with a release date of Friday, April 4th, 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. A day to honor ham radio operators world-wide and a ham satellite on hold. These stories are first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1338 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RADIO HONORS: WORLD AMATEUR RADIO DAY

Amateur Radio Supporting Education' is theme for World Amateur Radio Day. Its coming up real soon. RSGB newsreader Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, is here with the details:

--

The theme of this year's IARU World Amateur Radio Day is to be 'Amateur Radio supporting technology education in the classroom'.

World Amateur Radio Day is marked on the 18th of April each year to commemorate the anniversary of the founding of the International Amateur Radio Union on that date in 1925.

Ole Garpestad, LA2RR, the Chairman of IARU Region 1 writes: "There is no doubt that the future of amateur radio belongs to those that are now in the classroom. In keeping with this theme, I would like to encourage every society in the Region to let our young people know that amateur radio is a unique hobby - simultaneously sport, scientific study, personal pleasure and collective activity. And that radio amateurs today are voluntary and selfless researchers in the technological field of amateur radio, an important resource to every country, and something to be proud of."

"But the 18th of April is not only a day to think about our future, it is our day, a day for celebration. All of us, societies and individuals, can celebrate in our various ways - organizing presentations, club meetings, parties, honoring senior radio amateurs who go back to the early years of IARU, or just putting our equipment on the air and making just a single QSO on this day, so realizing how large our ham community is."

Jeramy Boot, G4NJH

--

Again, the date for this years World Amateur Radio Day is Friday, April 18th. (GB2RS)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: PROJECT EAGLE ON HOLD

Plans to launch one of two new ham radio satellites have been put on hold. The reason for the setback can be traced to one word: Funding.

The bird in question is named Project Eagle. It, along with the Project Echo ham-sat is one of two birds that AMSAT had previously announced for development.

According to AMSAT North America President Robin Haighton, VE3FRH, the current levels of contributions to the amateur satellite organization are not enough to pay for building and launching both future satellites. One of two projects has to be put on hold and furloughing Eagle has been the decision.

Up until now AMSAT North America had been working on both new satellites simultaneously. While ECHO is still on schedule for possible launch later this year, the launch of Eagle has been delayed indefinitely. (AMSAT)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: TWO-HAM CREW HEADED TO THE ISS

Just as ARISS Chaiman Frank Bauer, KA3HDO, predicted a few weeks ago, two ham radio operators will be replacing the current three man crew on board the International Space Station. A NASA announcement identifies the latest space adventures as U-S astronaut Ed Lu and Russian cosmonaut Yuri Malenchenko.

Lu holds the call sign KC5WKJ while Malenchenko is RK3DUP. They will comprise the Expedition 7 crew, replacing Expedition 6 astronauts and Ken Bowersox, KD5JBP, Don Pettit, KD5MDT, and Russian cosmonaut Nikolai Budarin.

NASA and its partners decided on manning the ISS with two space explorers instead of three as an interim measure until the U-S space shuttles are flying again. A two man crew conserves on the amount of vital supplies needed for on-orbit life.

Three person crews will resume when the Columbia disaster investigation is concluded and the space shuttles take to the sky again. The three remaining Shuttles in NASA's fleet Endeavour, Atlantis, and Discovery have been grounded until the cause of the Columbia accident can be determined and safety changes implemented.

NASA's Return to Flight team has been told to complete their initial tasks in time to support the earliest possible launch date, which would be this fall. But officials of the space agency say that it could take

months longer to prepare the shuttles to fly again. (From published news reports)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Metro-Comm Repeaters serving Binghamton New York

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAM RADIO AT WAR: DOING BATTLE WITHIN

Ham radio is supposed to transcend international politics, but you would never know this by the on-air antics of one unnamed Ukrainian radio amateur and a few stateside hams.

Lets start with a post on the QCWA remailer by Bob Harvey, K2PI. Harvey says that he heard the Ukrainian operating a contest on March 30th. Thats not news in itself except that the Ukrainian was refusing to work United States or U-K amateurs because of the war in Iraq.

Harvey writes that the Ukrainian said to call him only if you supported his view that the United States was conducting an illegal and evil war. Needless to he had no QSO's with any American or British hams.

But theres another side to it. John Sielke, W2AGN comments over the same QCWA remailer on the plight of a French ham friend of his. W2AGN says that the guy was harassed off of another ham radio remailer only because he was French and the other hams did not agree with France's anti-war stand. Sielke says that the unidentified French ham was truly vilified even though he had made no comments concerning Iraq or politics. He was just attacked purely because he was French. (QCWA Reflector)

**

RADIO RULES: FCC CONSIDERS INTERFERENCE IMMUNITY FOR RECIEVERS

We predicted a month ago that it would happen. Now comes word that the FCC has issued a Notice of Inquiry, seeking comments on possibly requiring receiver manufacturers to build in a certain level of interference immunity. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has more:

--
As noted on the CQ Magazine website and elsewhere in cyberspace, amateurs have been frustrated for years by trying to explain to neighbors that interference problems were really the result of poor design. Bad engineering in their TVs, stereos, cordless phones and other receivers.

Now, because of the need to protect Digital Television transmissions, the FCC is seeking comments on the current immunity performance and interference tolerance of existing receivers. Its also looking at the possibilities for improving receiver immunity in the not to distant future.

The FCC says that it is soliciting input from the public on possible approaches to achieving desired levels of receiver immunity. This runs the gammit from better product warning labels to the possibility of implementing mandatory standards governing the manufacture, import and sale of consumer electronics reception gear.

It is all in FCC E-T Docket 03-65. You will find it on the web by using the document search engine at www.fcc.gov.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF

--

Again the inquirtey into interference immunity standards can be found in FCC E-T Docket 03-65. (CQ Website, FCC)

**

FCC: VANITY FEES MAY BE GOING UP

If you are planning to go for a vanity call sign, do it now or be prepared to pay a few cents more. The proposed hike to $16.30 for a vanity call comes in an FCC Notice of Proposed Rule Making dealing with fee collection matters released on March 26th. Its all in M-D Docket No. 03-83 and comments on it are due no later than April 25th. (From FCC release)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC - YOU SOLVE THE PROBLEM

The FCC has told the operators of two competing repeaters that its not going to solve the dispute between them. The agency's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, explains:

--

Duckworth: "The Enforcement Bureau has written to Grearal Gogue of Conway Arkansas, David Stone of Morrelton, Arkansas and Tom Lee of Jerusalem, Arkansas, regarding repeaters AC5RU and KD5CYA. In the letter it was stated after reviewing the submissions of all relevant information, we declined to intervene in this dispute. It is our position, that in this case, both parties are responsible for solving the interference and we urged them to so in the best interests of Amateur Radio."

--

In this case, two repeaters sharing the same frequency claim mutual interference. On May 24, 2000, the FCC opened an inquiry about

allegations that Lee's AC5RU system was causing harmful interference to coordinated repeater KD5CYA, licensed to Gerald Hogue. The allegations stated that Lee's repeater was uncoordinated because the coordination had been forfeited by numerous changes in location.

On August 14, 2000, the FCC notified Lee that it was his responsibility to prevent interference to KD5CYA inasmuch as it appeared to be the coordinated repeater. On September 14, 2000, after reviewing Lee's lengthy response, the FCC rescinded its requirement that Lee solve the interference to the KD5CYA repeater. This is because it was unclear to the FCC as to which repeater was properly coordinated. The Commission said that it was not an appropriate matter for enforcement action. It also urged the parties to take advantage of the mediation and dispute resolution program of the ARRL but one declined.

Lee submitted additional information on January 5, 2001. On February 8, 2001, after receiving additional documents from all parties, the FCC stated that although it failed to see why mediation or arbitration would not be a viable option, we nevertheless agreed to review the matter once again. In response to allegations of deliberate interference, we cautioned everyone involved to cooperate in the resolution of this matter.

Now, almost two years later the FCC has again said its not going to act. It says that after reviewing the submissions and all relevant information, that it will not intervene in this dispute. The agency says that in this case, both parties are responsible for solving the interference and it urges them to do so in the best interests of Amateur Radio. (FCC, RAIN)

**

AT THE FCC: MULETA NEW WTB CHIEF

John Muleta is the new Chief of the FCC's Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, which regulates amateur radio along with other two-way radio services. According to the ARRL, Muleta worked for the FCC from 1994 to 1998 and his positions included Chief of the Enforcement Division. He has also worked in the private sector since 1998. Muleta succeeds Thomas Sugrue, who headed the bureau the last four years. (ARRL)

**

RADIO LAW: CONGRESS APPROVES DIFFERENT AMBER ALERT MEASURES

The United States House of Representatives has approved creation of a nationwide Amber Alert network. The action came on Thursday, March 27th after politicians on both sides of the aisle attached several additional child protection measures to the bill.

The bill, approved by a 410 to 14 vote, now goes to the Senate, which earlier approved legislation authorizing only the nationwide child kidnapping alert network. President Bush has commended the House on

acting on legislation to help expand an Amber Alert system across the nation. He says that he looks forward to signing a reconciled version of the bill. (Published news reports)

**

RESCUE RADIO: UK POLICE ASK HAMS TO HELP SOLVE ROAD MURDER

Police in Surrey are asking U-K hams and C-B operators to help solve a case of murder by road-rage. Just after midnight UTC, on Friday the 21st of March, a truck driver on the M3 motorway was driving northbound when someone threw an object at the cab of his vehicle. It smashed the windshield and hit the driver and fatally injuring him. He was able to bring the truck to a safe halt before loosing conciousness. He died at the scene.

Investigators belive that the object was thrown from a footbridge over the highway. They are asking any ham or C-B operator who was driving in the area that night to call in and let them know if they saw anything. Surrey Police say that any leads would be appreciated. (GB2RS)

**

RESCUE RADIO: HAMS HELP SAVE YOUNG BURN VICTIM IN HONDURAS

The ARRL Letter says that quick action on the part of a group of ham radio operators may have saved the life of an young burn victim in Honduras. The 8 year old girl was seriously burned late last month. Amateur Radio operators and volunteers at the International Health Service clinic in a remote village in southeastern Honduras and stateside hams worked together on the air to bring needed treatment to the child. With ham radio to coordinate the move, the youngster was evacuated by air to the nearest town with a hospital. From there she was taken to the capital city of Tegucigalpa, where the University of Honduras Medical Center has a burn trauma unit. (ARRL)

**

WELCOMING THE YOUNG: W9SM AT THE WAUSAU CHILDRENS FESTIVAL

The Wisconsin Valley Radio Association will be sponsoring a special event station W9SM, at the 30th Annual Children's Festival in Wausau, Wisconsin.

The date is Saturday April 5th. The Children's Festival features hands-on activities at numerous booths run by various community groups.

The special event station will operate between 1600 UTC and 2200 UTC on April 5th. This, in the General portions of the 10, 15, 20 or 40 meter bands both SSB and CW.

While in operation the station will demonstrate several aspects of amateur radio to the children attending, including APRS and High Frequecy operations. The kids who stop by will also have the

opportunity to get on the air.

The Festival is sponsored by the Children's Festival Committee and the Wausau and Marathon County Parks and the Recreation and Forestry Department. QSL via WB2TLQ at his callbook address. (WB2TLQ)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: NAB HAM RADIO RECEPTION - APRIL 9

On the convention scene, the annual Amateur Radio Reception at the National Association of Broadcasters Convention is slated for 6 to 8 p.m. on Wednesday April 9th. The venue is the Hilton Hotel in Las Vegas Nevada, right next door to the famed Las Vegas Convention Center.

This years hosts are again CQ Magazine and Kenwood Communications. Publisher Dick Ross, K2MGA and Editor Rich Moseson, W2VU will be there representing CQ. Paul Middleton, K4NUH, will be on hand for Kenwood.

Between 800 to 1000 hams in the broadcast industry attend this yearly ham radio social get together. Among them will be top ARRL officials and some of the folks from Amateur Radio Newsline.

The National Association of Broadcasters Convention is one of the largest held each year in Las Vegas. It typically draws over 100,000 attendees. More information is on the web at www.nab.org/conventions/nab2003 (ARNewsline™)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAMFESTS AND CONVENTIONS: GO SEE THE TV COMMERCIAL

Ever see a television commercial for a ham radio convention? Well the Rochester Hamfest has one and its now on-line so that you can see and hear it.

The commercial comes courtesy of the Rochester Hamfest. That show is slated for May 30th through June 1st at the Monroe County Fairgrounds in Rocheter New York.

To view or download the T-V spot go to www.rochesterhamfest.org. Then scroll down to the words "click here to see our new TV commerrcial."

And oh yes. A high speed connection is recommended. This is because it is a 5.9 Mega Byte file that opens in most recent media players

including Apple Quicktime and Real Player One. (Rochester Hamfest)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: THE 2003 AMSAT-UK SPACE COLLOQUIUM

And the 18th AMSAT U-K Space Colloquium will be held from July 25th to the 27th at Surrey University, Guildford in Surrey England. This year speakers are a bit hard to find. So planners have relaxed the requirement for a printed paper to accompany the talk. AMSAT says that in 2003 this will not be mandatory.

Other changes this year include "Beginners' Sessions" on both Friday and Saturday afternoons and an earlier start of talks. These will begin right after lunch on Friday but alternate planned tours will be available all day.

Full information about the 2003 Colloquium is on the AMSAT-UK web site. You will find it in cyberspace at www.uk.amsat.org/colloquium.htm. (AMSAT-UK)

**

INTERNATIONAL - UK: CB RULES AND FREQUUENCIES TO CHANGE

On the international freont, look for some major changes to happen to 11 meter Citizens Radio in the United Kingdom over the next several years. This, as the result of the British equivlant of our Notice of Inquirey being issued by their Radiocommunications Agency on March 25th.

The Consultation Document -- as it is known -- contains a proposal to deregulate Citizens' Band radio in the United Kingdom and withdraw the 40 U-K only CB channels by 2010. It also proposes removing the need for individual licensing in 2004.

Not changed would be the current technical equipment requirements and the current operating rules. The deleted U-K only channels would be replaced by the 40 pan-European C-B channels. A press release from the U-K Radiocommunications Agency says that this deregulatory move is intended to provide easier access to C-B and to enhance enjoyment of the hobby. (GB2RS)

**

INTERNATIONAL - INDONESIA: WORLD-WIDE CB DIRECTORY

The Indonesian DX Club is inviting Citizen's Band operators around the world to register their callsigns for the IDXC's C-B Radio Callsign Directory. IDXC is the only one DX listeners club located in Indonesia, and regularly listed in the World Radio TV Handbook. To learn more about the club and register take your web browser www.idxc.org/callsign and explore a rather interesting spot in cyberspace. (IDXC)

**

AWARDS: GET YOUR SWL CERTIFICATE

Duane Fischer, W8DBF, says that the beautiful Hallicrafters Ccollectors International Short-Wave Achievement Certificate is still available. You get it for verified reception of 25, 50, 75, 100 or more countries. Proof of reception is not required as the award runs on the honor system. You can see a low resolution copy and get more information on line at the Hallicrafters Ccollectors International website. Irts in cyberspace at www.w9wze.org (W8DBF)

**

DX

In DX, word from KA2AEV that a group from the recently formed Antigua & Barbuda Radio Club will be traveling to their sister island of Barbuda April 18th to the 21st. Plans call for stations on 160 through 10 mters plus a 2 meter station for local contacts using the call sign V21BBQ. Organizers say that to their knowledge, there has never been any ham activity from Barbuda. In addition to racking up contacts the operators hope to expose the islands residents to the magic of the hobby while familiarizing the worlds ham community with Barbuda. QSL to the Antigua & Barbuda Radio Club, P.O. Box 965, St.John's, Antigua, West Indies. (KA2AEV)

Also, PS7AHR is the official station of The Brazilian Amateur Radio Historical Archive . According to Ronaldo Reis, PS7AB, this is an organization devoted to documenting and preserving the history of amateur radio in Brazil. If you happen to contact it, please QSL via the bureau or direct to P.O. Box 2021, Natal/RN, 59094-970, Brazil. More information, in Spanish and English, can be found on the web at www.ps7ab.com.br (PS7AB)

**

THAT FINAL "APRIL 1ST" ITEM: RADIO THAT CAN MAKE YOU SICK

And finally this week, it appears that some hams may be facing a new health threat ... especially if they eat while operating the radio. Roving correspondent Pierre Pullinmyleg is back from his self imposed exile and filed this report on Tuesday, April 1st:

--

For decades, wives of radio amateurs have said that ham radio makes them sick to their stomachs. Now, it seems that ham radio may actually DO that.

The French Office of Oohs and Lalas, or FOOL, has been studying reports of amateurs falling ill after eating while operating during certain band openings on 6 and 10 meters. Officials at FOOL have determined that the problem occurs only during periods of sporadic-E propagation and believe that the radio waves carry with them into the shack of ham some of the ionization from the E-layer of the ionosphere.

If food is present at the amateur's operating position, then the ions apparently interact with bacteria present in the food to cause food poisoning. The scientists have determined that this is a type of E-Coli contamination which they have named Sporadic-E-Coli, both because it occurs only sporadically and because it appears to be caused by sporadic-E radio signals. They recommend using audio filtration in order to "cleanse" the signals before they reach the speaker, which appears to be the major medium of transmission.

Reporting from the E-layer, this is Pierre Pullinmyleg for Newsline.

--

Pierre says that another option, of course, is to eat in the shack only during periods of F-layer propagation -- and then -- to only munch on chocolate F2 layer cake. (A Pierre Pullinmyleg Annual April 1st Exclusive Report)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

Don't forget that the nominating period for the 2003 Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year Award is now open. You will find all the rules and a fill-in-the blank nominating form in cyberspace at www.yhoty.org

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Jim Damron, N8TMW, and I'm Jeff Clark, K8JAC, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

--
Terminal break
--

RAIN Promo

2009. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 07:04:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB69B2C.15B84%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64244

"D. Stussy" wrote:
>
> That was a typo. I-15 (not I-10) and I-40 merge.

You had me worried there for a moment.

> It changes the view that California isn't there
> to protect its BORDERS against agricultural
> infestations - especially if it takes more than
> an hour from the border to come across the
> inspection station. 100 miles in gives no such
> impression, and there are other ways in (not so
> major highways) where one may not reach any
> inspection station at all.

Okay, I'll accept your claim that the stations are further from the state line for now, but I'll watch for this a little closer next time I go through.

> The question should be: What does that say for
> those who live in Baker and places on the
> "outbound" side of the stations yet are within
> California borders?

I guess it says they can eat insect infested foods like people in the rest of the country does.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2010. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 07:16:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB69E11.15B86%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64245

"D. Stussy" wrote:
>
> Same thing can be said at U.S. Customs stations,
> either at the borders or at other ports of entry
> (airports and shipyards).

Not exactly. People are aware they'll have to go through customs when traveling from country to country (a well publicized bit of information), but very few first time visitors to California realize they'll have to pass through an agricultural inspection station which impounds fruits and veggies illegally imported from other states.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2011. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 07:22:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB69F5D.15B89%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64246

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart writes:
>>
>> For fruits? Man, doesn't the CHP have better
>> things to do?
>
> The CHP does and does many things 24/7.

It was a rhetorical question, Len.

>> Would the CHP give pursuit? Would they be
>> authorized to use deadly force to stop the
>> vehicle?
>
> Why do you take your comments to the absurd?

Because it is fun to do and fun to read the responses.

> Very well, do you wish to extend this to a
> "freedom" of being able to carry a virus or
> bacteria into the state to spread disease
> instead? How about SAR? Carriers of disease
> may be free of symptoms yet are able to
> infect others.

And you say I take my comments to the absurd?

> ...grant someone an amateur radio license
> and they suddenly "know everything about
> everything." Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Not everything, just most things.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2012. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 07:54:32 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB6A6F8.15B8B%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64247

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:

> Well, Dwight, I see your point, but in this case,
> it was actually a very highly directed slap in
> Kim's face! In fact, it was actually intended to
> be a jaw-smashing, tooth-ejecting, blood-splattering
> knockout blow! However, I'm sure that in Kim's
> case, as usual, it went whizzing safely right over
> her haid!

Well, perhaps I misunderstood the intended target because it was written in response to a question I posed to you. However, I agree with your overall response to the specific issues raised.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2013. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 07:58:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB6A7FC.15B8D%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64248

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> Loyal American Crackpot who supports our
> President, our Troops, and the War in Iraq

The overriding question is whether one can be done without the other. For example, can one not support the President yet still support the troops? Or, can one support the troops yet not support the war?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2014. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 08:05:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB6A994.15B8F%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64249

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> I'm sorry to see you say that. Just exactly what
> are the sentiments or attitudes of mine to which
> you object?

Given your consistent claims in this newsgroup of intellectual and moral superiority over almost everyone, I'll assume that is a rhetorical question.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2015. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 08:21:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB6AD3D.15B91%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64250

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> (snip) I'm sure that Private Jessica Lynch joined
> the Army with the primary interest of using it as
> a stepping stone toward her goal of becoming a
> teacher.

Considering the present educational benefits, I'm not so sure about that, Larry. The present system is a partial matching funds system that requires small withholdings over many years of service, or significant chunks of monthly paychecks for those leaving after one enlistment, to gather enough money for a college education today. Of course, her new found fame will ease that burden considerably.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2016. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 08:48:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB6B399.15B93%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64151

"Bill Sohl" wrote:
>
> Short sighted? Why? Are you following the realities
> of what the freed Iraqi's are saying when the yoke of
> their oppresion is lifted and the fear of reprisal
> is gone?

Don't take what they say too seriously, Bill. What would you say when talking to reporters with the armed soldiers from the military that just killed, and is killing, many thousands of your countrymen?

Everyone shouting about Saddam seems to forget that we're also killing many thousands of their men and women who joined their military simply to serve their country. Most know no more about WMD than our soldiers did during the Manhattan Project of the early 40's. In fact, I'm sure most don't even understand our reasons for invading their country - many Americans are not even certain of that (and even fewer around the world are).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2017. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 09:21:57 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304070121.4cd76396@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64152

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304061345.7e2a86b6@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304061023.ef5df7e@posting.google.com>...
> > averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman) wrote in message
news:<20030405212529.04143.00000018@mb-fb.aol.com>...
> > > In article <b6nnrt$215$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
> > >
> > > >Len Over 21...we all have your number. Stir up the crap. Dont need it.
> > > >And DONT CARE WHAT YOU THINK...I put you on the dumbass list a long time
> > > >ago.
> > >
> > > You seem to want to FIGHT. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
> > >
> > > The Vietnam War ended on January 27, 1973.
> >
> > WRONG! Again. 1975. You're a disgrace to the rest of the putzes.
> >
> > w3rv
>
> It ended in 1973 for the people with "real military experience," i.e.,
> combatants. It ended in 1975 for the paper pushers.

Tell that to the Hmong and the Special Forces guys who stayed in
battle mode until after the papers were pushed.

w3rv

2018. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 10:24:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304070224.7a27e50b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64153

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.07.04.14.38.840562.32723@arrl.org>...
> On Sun, 06 Apr 2003 17:49:37 -0400, Brian wrote:
> > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > news:<pan.2003.04.06.15.48.10.305942.28928@arrl.org>...
> >> On Sun, 30 Mar 2003 21:53:45 -0500, W5TIT wrote:
> >> >
> >> > All the cries for "patriotism" (those of people who imply it is
> >> > unpatriotic not to support and stand behind a President of the US),
> >> > are probably right along party lines; i.e., would we find a
> >> > Republican pleading for respect and admiration of a Democrat
> >> > President or vice versa? hmmmmm....
> >>
> >> We already know that the answer to that is "no":
> >> http://www.newsmax.com/articles/?a=1998/12/18/51233
> >>
> >> Jon
> >
> > BS. There are many patriots who could care less about which party is
> > trying to outspend the other of our tax dollars.
>
> The problem is not a lack of patriots, it's that many think only those
> with whom they agree are patriots.

Such as?

> > Many were even patriots when being a patriot was a bad thing.
>
> When, exactly, was being a patriot a bad thing?

When it was commonly used as slang for militia.

2019. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 10:29:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407062901.01663.00000178@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64154

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/6/2003 8:23 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030406212350.13084.00000141@mb-cr.aol.com>

>The class was not organized to teach amateur radio. I don't see how the
>application is relavant.

Because, Vippy, you keep ahrping upon how your "comm prof" didn't address certain topics in the class.

Obviously, if they didn't pertain to the course objectives, they weren't discussed. Did they happen to discuss Foley catheterization or central venous access in your "comm theory" class either?

>The class covered modulation schemes, including On-Off Keying. Therefore, one
>should be able to compare various modulation modes and know the
>advantages/disadvantages of each.

"On-off keying" pertains to many different modulation schemes, Vippy. Not just the relevence of Morse Code as it pertains to Amatuer Radio licensure.

>Prof J Weitzen. What purpose does that serve? I hope you don't email him or
>something. I hope I don't regret this.

Why should you? Is there something this person might have to say about you if we asked?

>>How can anyone make an informed, balanced presentation on ANY subject
>>without practical experience in the subject matter, Vipul?
>
>Sorry, but I cannot see your point. I believe Prof really knows the material.

Because, Vipul, we are discussing AMATEUR RADIO here...NOT electrical engineering, SINCGARS or professional broadcasting.

>Prof did not just read about it. Prof has practical experience. He's worked
>in
>industry.

Your frequent references to him are vis-a-vis what he said or DIDN'T say about Mose Code or Amateur Radio...The question was what experience does he have in AMATEUR RADIO...I could care less what he knows about commerical, military or engineering.

>He knows the math behind the tradeoffs. In terms of modulation schemes, he
>has
>knowledge of how some of the most advanced modulation schemes work, their

>mathmatical derrivation, applications, advantages, disadvantages

Great...then if he just adds in the few regulatory things that are specific to Amateur Radio, he can get a No Code Tech just like mere mortals.

>And you are saying he does not know where Morse code fits in?

The proper question is "Does he know where Morse Code fits in to AMATEUR RADIO?", Vipul. YOU are the one who dragged this poor soul into this.

>>It means you found a book title that you can quote without
>>having had any practical experience in the subject matter.
>
>Please find a source that gives praise to Morse code.

Who said anythign about "praise", Vippy?

>Now, why is Morse code so important that it is in between the General
>(written)
>test and required for HF.

BECAUSE IT'S THE LAW! United States regulations are written so as to embrace and meet international regulations that the United States is signatory to.

Morse Code is STILL the most basic and universally understood method of communications. I may not understand the frantic calls for assistance of a yacht skipper speaking Lower Slobovian, but I sure can understand "SOS SOS SOS DE ZZ3ZZ/MM QTH W136R52R10 N10R10R05 PSE K"

2020. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 10:30:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407063003.01663.00000179@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64155

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/6/2003 8:40 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030406214001.13084.00000142@mb-cr.aol.com>

>If the ARRL pub book gave better explanation on a topic, it should have been
>utilized.

I agree. Now what have YOU done to correct this oversight?

Steve

2021. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 10:34:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407063438.01663.00000180@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64156

>Subject: Re: A Bet With Vippy
>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>Date: 4/6/2003 8:27 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3E90D406.B5479797@att.net>

>> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>> >: I've been federally licensed in radio since 1956...just not
>> > in amateur radio.

Still can't talk the FCC out of a four-letter suffixed callsign so you can
get "N0CALL", eh Lennie?

>> So why are you here, Len? This is an AMATEUR RADIO newsgroup.

> Hey, Bert, It's because the pros won't have anything to do with him either.
>You'd think he'd
>get the message eventually.

Or no one is using a SINCGARS set to send him the message. Maybe the
local Army-Navy Surplus can find us one...?!?!

Steve

2022. Re: Remote Weather Station Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 10:46:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407064614.01663.00000181@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64157

>Subject: Remote Weather Station Licensing
>From: Fritz Wuehler fritz@rodent.frell.eu.org
>Date: 4/6/2003 11:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <151ef060b2a8d5a8a559d7b25fc3c158@remailer.frell.eu.org>

>It seems like a lot of people do what I'm talking about via APRS, but I'm not
>so sure about the autonomous station issue. Repeaters get their own licenses
>- what about weather stations?

Just FYI, Bill, but repeaters operate under the callsign of thier trustee...not a seperate license. That was once true, but not any longer.

As long as your station is operating on frequencies authorized for auxiliary or remote base (222mHz and above) and identifies as it shoud (once every 10 minutes) and does not otherwise cause harmful interference to other stations, I doubt that you'd be in any violation of Part 97.

>I've thought about going to Part 18 ISM rules instead with a 902 MHz
>line-of-sight link, but that's not a clear regulatory option, either.
>Neither is Part 15 (I don't want to have to certify compliance). I think it
>really is a HAM-related activity, but I don't understand the operations
>portion.

There's so little activity at 902mHz as far as Amateur Radio goes, that I still think that if yuo observe the basic rules-of-the-road, you'd not be in any violation.

More FYI, but under current bandplanning for the 33cm band, 904 to 906Mhz and 915 to 918MHz is reserved for "data" modes...certainly your TAPR-based telemetry would meet this criteria.

And last but not least...you might consider an e-mail to Riley Hollingsworth, the FCC's "enforcement" guru, and ask him the same question directly.

Please share your findings...I hang glide and would like to put a remote station at the launch site which is a considerable (read that as too far for Part 15!) distance from my home.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2023. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 10:51:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407065108.01663.00000182@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64158

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: Dwight Stewart stewart@say.net
>Date: 4/7/2003 2:58 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <BAB6A7FC.15B8D%stewart@say.net>

>Or, can one support the troops yet not support the war?

In this case, I'd say "no", Dwight. At least not if you openly protest the war.

Open protest of our government's actions when we are already at war gives aid and comfort to the enemy in as much as they can hope that if they "tough it out" they can perhaps prevail.

The longer they resist, the greater the potential for casualties on BOTH sides.

Disagree with the war if that's your opinion, certainly...but open protest is aid and comfort to the enemy.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2024. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 10:57:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407065725.01663.00000183@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64159

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 4/7/2003 4:21 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0304070121.4cd76396@posting.google.com>

>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>news:<f45722ac.0304061345.7e2a86b6@posting.google.com>...
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0304061023.ef5df7e@posting.google.com>...
>> > averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman) wrote in message
>news:<20030405212529.04143.00000018@mb-fb.aol.com>...
>> > > In article <b6nnrt$215$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
>> > > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>> > >
>> > > >Len Over 21...we all have your number. Stir up the crap. Dont need
>it.
>> > > >And DONT CARE WHAT YOU THINK...I put you on the dumbass list a long
>time
>> > > >ago.
>> > >
>> > > You seem to want to FIGHT. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>> > >
>> > > The Vietnam War ended on January 27, 1973.
>> >
>> > WRONG! Again. 1975. You're a disgrace to the rest of the putzes.
>> >
>> > w3rv
>>
>> It ended in 1973 for the people with "real military experience," i.e.,
>> combatants. It ended in 1975 for the paper pushers.
>
>Tell that to the Hmong and the Special Forces guys who stayed in
>battle mode until after the papers were pushed.
>
>w3rv

Whew.....Lennie's an idiot who can't keep track of current events
including the ending of one of the most bitter wars this nation has ever
endured, and Brain, allegedly a combat veteran himself, insults and demeans
those who DID fight in that war, even to the end.

A PAIR of idiots.

Sheesh.

Steve

2025. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 12:19:31 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.07.12.19.31.119577.27440@arrl.org>
Source record: 64160

On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 06:24:56 -0400, Brian wrote:
>
>> The problem is not a lack of patriots, it's that many think only those
>> with whom they agree are patriots.
>
> Such as?

Where have you been? Spend 5 minutes on Google. You'll find plenty of
examples. (Helpful search terms: Daschle, Dixie Chicks)

>> When, exactly, was being a patriot a bad thing?
>
> When it was commonly used as slang for militia.

Commonly? By anyone other than the members of the so-called militias?

Jon

2026. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 12:36:23 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.07.12.36.22.955447.27440@arrl.org>
Source record: 64163

On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 06:51:08 -0400, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
>>Or, can one support the troops yet not support the war?
>
> In this case, I'd say "no", Dwight. At least not if you openly
> protest the
> war.

http://www.ctnow.com/news/local/hc-signs0407.artapr07,0,4996863.story

> Open protest of our government's actions when we are already at war
> gives
> aid and comfort to the enemy in as much as they can hope that if they
> "tough it out" they can perhaps prevail.
>
> The longer they resist, the greater the potential for casualties on
> BOTH
> sides.

Unless, of course, those open protests cause the US to end the war, in which case the number of casualties would be reduced. That's what most protesters against the war say they are trying to achieve. I happen to believe their assessment of the situation is faulty, but I don't see that as an intent on their part to not support the troops.

Jon

2027. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 12:43:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407084302.01733.00000160@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64164

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: Jon Bloom jbloom@arrl.org
>Date: 4/7/2003 7:19 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <pan.2003.04.07.12.19.31.119577.27440@arrl.org>

>> When it was commonly used as slang for militia.
>
>Commonly? By anyone other than the members of the so-called militias?

A more accurate term here is "rump" militia, Jon. There ARE legal and responsible militia organizations in the United States: CT has one, as does Tennessee, Texas, California, New York, Ohio and others.

Some of them are more social or ceremonial in nature, others have viable state-supported and mandated missions.

It's a shame that we allow cowards and murderers like Tim McViegh to steal away the good name of Americans who do volunteer to serve (in legal militias) in thier home states in this way.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2028. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 12:50:02 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.07.12.50.01.883385.27440@arrl.org>
Source record: 64165

On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 04:21:18 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:
> The present system is a partial matching funds system that requires
> small withholdings over many years of service, or significant chunks of
> monthly paychecks for those leaving after one enlistment, to gather
> enough money for a college education today.

I'm not conversant with the details of the current benefits, but I do know my airman nephew is receiving full tuition for the college courses he's taking. I believe it's via this program:
http://www.af.mil/news/Feb2001/n20010222_0266.shtml

Jon

2029. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 13:00:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407090059.01733.00000161@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64166

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: Jon Bloom jbloom@arrl.org
>Date: 4/7/2003 7:36 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <pan.2003.04.07.12.36.22.955447.27440@arrl.org>

>Unless, of course, those open protests cause the US to end the war, in
>which case the number of casualties would be reduced. That's what most
>protesters against the war say they are trying to achieve. I happen to
>believe their assessment of the situation is faulty, but I don't see that
>as an intent on their part to not support the troops.

One of the "lessons learned" from Vietnam and the Gulf War, Jon, was to
not commit troops to battle until you were certain that diplomacy ahd failed
and that you were commited to making sure you fought the battle to the end.

G. W. is not about to stop where he is and bring the troops home because
of a bunch of citizens who express their opinions about the war by blocking
busy business thoroughfares with illegal traffic stoppages and therefore
imposing thier own illegal economic sanctions on private businesses.

Again...HOW do you "support the troops" by making it harder for them to do
what they were sent to do? By "bringing them home" before they finish the
mission they were sent to do? That means we just threw the lives of the
Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen and Marines who died doing what their country asked
of them away.

The time for protest was over the last 12 years. Now it's time to get it
over with and done. THEN we can bring the troops home.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2030. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 13:41:40 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.07.13.41.39.918100.6360@arrl.org>
Source record: 64167

On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 09:00:59 -0400, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> One of the "lessons learned" from Vietnam and the Gulf War, Jon, was to
> not commit troops to battle until you were certain that diplomacy ahd
> failed and that you were commited to making sure you fought the battle
> to the end.

Yes, and there are many who feel that the Bush administration failed the first part of that test, having abandoned diplomacy before all avenues were exhausted.

> The time for protest was over the last 12 years. Now it's time to get
> it over with and done. THEN we can bring the troops home.

I agree with you, Steve. That's what I meant when I said that "I happen to believe their assessment of the situation is faulty." I'm simply saying that those who do disagree with you do not intend to be unsupportive of the troops. Fortunately, in this particular case, I don't think public protest in the US will make any difference in how Iraqis behave. Those who have been terrorizing their fellow Iraqis, and those they terrorize, are going to fight or run away irrespective of anything that happens in the streets of New York. In different circumstances, public protests might be a matter of more concern. And I do think that questioning the process by which we got into this war is valid, now and in the future.

We've lost over 100 good people so far, with more losses almost certain to come. If we don't continue to ask tough questions about whether their loss could have been avoided, I think we're doing our military people a disservice. History is rife with examples of wars begun for bad reasons. Acknowledging that doesn't detract one whit from the honor and gratitude we ought to show to those who fought in those wars. But we don't honor them by refusing to learn from our mistakes.

Jon

2031. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 14:00:50 UTC
From: Hambone the Magnificent <921d2will@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e91c18e@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 64182

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030405013919.05767.00000131@mb-fz.aol.com...

> A pregnant woman...?!?!?! Can there be anything more loathesome than
how
> they used her like that? I guess those idiots don't realize that doing
stuff
> like that only raises the hair on an American's neck more and really
drives
> them to fight harder.

We may find it loathesome with our Western morals and
values Steve, but the mere fact that a pregnant woman (!!)
would sacrifice herself as a "human guided bomb" for her
religion (Islam) *speaks volumes* of the will of belief and
extremes these people are willing to go thru and do!

They are modern Kamakazie

2032. Re: Lennie Just Can't Stand Being Ignored!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 14:22:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407102258.01733.00000162@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64168

I put Lennie in the Scumbag File only to receive this in the RRAP backchannel. Thanks to the correspondent, who knows I am a pilot, for bringing it to my attention, but I have been enjoying NOT reading his foolishness.

But once again, Lennie the Lame tries to push off his bullying, arrogant "knowledge" against practical experience and facts. And once again the Licenseless One flops on his face.

To wit:

Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
Date: 4/3/2003 5:32 PM Central Daylight Time
Message-id: <20030403173213.11311.00000003@mb-fd.aol.com>

In article <20030403031657.05732.00000189@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve the Air Ace) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 3/29/2003 5:25 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030329182528.18686.00000108@mb-fn.aol.com>

Usual anti-Morse Code, "morsemen", "no one knows better than me" stuff snipped. Nothing new there.

>>Pilots, the Coast Guard and the Military DO use Morse Code, Vipul.

>Private and Commercial aircraft pilots are NOT tested for morsemanship by the FAA or any other agency.

No one said they were, Your Idiotness. I said they use it.

>The US Military does NOT USE morse code for any sort of radio communications.

Yes, they do.

>US Military Intelligence does teach
>morse code cognition for interception of enemy communications
>as part of electronic intelligence gathering activities but it does
>NOT USE morse code skills for communications.

Yes, they do.

>>No nearly as prolificly as years ago, but they DO use it.

>The US Military DOES NOT USE MORSE CODE for radio communications.

Yes, they do.

>>I suggest that
>>you take any receiver capable of tuning below 500 kHz and tune slowly. Morse
>>Code signals abound.

>"Abound?!?" So does QRN and QRM.

>There are NO US amateur bands allocated below MF. None.

Where did I say there were, Your Scumminess? There is still maritime
Morse Code traffic in the MF bands. There is still maritime Morse Code traffic
throughout HF. It's there. It's real. Get over it.

>>Also tune from 108.0 to 118.0 MHz. Even more Morse code
>>signals.

>Oh, wow, the automatic ID keyer requirement means "morse
>is USED in air navigation?!?!?" No, no, no. That automatic
>keyer is there as a left-over requirement from 50+ years ago.

Yes, yes, yes. Morse Code, NOT packet, ASCII, voice, or any other mode is
used to ID those VOR's, etc. I never said HOW it was "encoded", I simply said
it is used.

>>Those are VOR's and VORTAC's use by civil and military pilots to
>>navigate by.

>Not quite.

"Not quite"...?!?! VORs and VORTAC'S are NOT used by civil and military
pilots to navigate by?

>VORs (Very high frequency Omnidirectional Ranges)
>and Localizer beams share that, interleaved on 0.1 MHz
>increments. Localizers are rather narrow azimuth beams for
>aircraft positioning to set up approach for landing. VOR was
>developed from the US Military TACAN (TACtical Area Navigation)
>and shares much of the technical basis of operation with TACAN.
>TACAN operates in low L-band microwave frequencies, not VHF.
>Decades ago the US Military and FAA cooperated on installing
>both TACAN and VOR on many ground stations and the combined
>equipment service was dubbed "VORTAC" (an acronym of
>acronyms).

...and not one word of this "disproves" anything I said.

>Only a fanatic morseman would think that "pilots use morse to
>navigate by."

I never said "pilots use morse to navigate by". I said pilot's use Morse
Code to identify the beacons that they DO navigate by.

(Ya shudda taken an extra English course or two in that 15 years of night
school, Your Scumminess)

>In actual practice there's absolutely NO need to
>use any sort of morse code if a pilot knows approximately where

>he/she is within several hundred miles.

Of course you KNOW this by years as a licensed and EXPERIENCED aviator, Lennie? Just like your years of licensure and experience in Amateur Radio, Lennie?

WHERE in the FAA database is YOUR name? Mine's there. Mine's also in the FCC database. I see you are absent from both.

>FAA has set up VORs
>such that there isn't any possibility of one VOR interfering with
>another by high-altitude aircraft.

VORs operate in the 108-118MHZ range and are succeptible to the same propagation anomalies that produce all sorts of bearing and "skip" errors that are known to Amateurs operating in the same general portion of the electromagnetic spectrum.

That was part of the reason for the development of TACAN, Lennie.

This INCLUDES occassional misnavigation due to tracking the wrong VOR due to propagational anomalies. An error avoided by ID'ing the right VOR...A point made to me by both my CFI and the Examiner I rode with. Neither were Amateurs, but made certain I knew to cross check the VOR ID by listening to it and making sure I had the right beacon.

>VOR receivers are crystal-controlled.

Not since the late 70's, Lennie. Where have YOU been? (Now Lennie is an Avionics expert! Whooiee!)

>Reception is line-of-sight. Relatively low-power VOR ground stations are either there or not there to aircraft. It
>is quite easy to determine which VOR is which without any need for "reading" the slow-speed morse automatic ID >keyer.

In most cases, this is reasonable. The pilot that doesn't make SURE, however, is an idiot looking for a place to have an accident.

>Since that keying is audio tone and carried on the "voice" mid-band of
>VORs, any ground station has the opportunity to use the voice
>part as supplementary control information...the keying would not
>be heard under such conditions.

More evidence of yet another LennieRant promulgated by an idiot with no practical experience in that which he rants about.

Please, Lennie, do tell us about your last cross-country flight as pilot in command while using VOR or VORTAC as your primary navigational aid...And DO tell us about being able to listen for remote-site FSS communications through that aid.

>VORs use 30 Hz AM...(SNIP)

Thanks for the technical spiel. Interesting, but not germane.

>VOR's inception dates to 1955 for the International Civil Aviation
>Organization, slightly earlier for the USA which developed the
>elegant (for vacuum tube based receivers) system. There was
>more morse used 48 years ago than today and it was common
>practice to have ground stations use automatic keying IDs in
>several services...by regulation. There has been no movement
>to eliminate the automatic keyers since their reliability keeps
>them auto-keying away on audio (not the carrier) and the audio
>voice portion exists since it is an AM system for both azimuth
>phases. Any use of the audio portion for ground-to-air
>communications will override the keying.

So you ARE saying that Morse Code get's through, huh..??? That's a switch. You have very aggressively told us how Morse Code is NOT useful, utilitarian or reliable. But right here you say it IS reliable...AND in a radio service in which accuracy and reliability are not only paramount, but crucial to safety of life.

>Frequencies and general characteristics of US civil aviation
>radio service is found in Part 87, Title 47 CFR. Any local
>aviation publication store will have "sectional" charts from the
>US government showing all details on ground station
>frequencies, their ID, even the dot-dash coding for the slow-
>speed automatic ID keying shown in dot and dash symbols.

That's what I said, Your Plagerizingness.

>Civil aviation pilot license tests do NOT require morse code
>cognition "by ear" tests in the USA.

I never said it did.

Rest of LennieRant snipped and dismissed.

Screwed up again, Lennie. Ya tried to pass yourself off as "knowing" something from just reading about it, when what you did was make yourself completely stupid looking in the face of facts to the contrary.

As usual.

If you intend to respond and expect an answer from me, "CC" it. You ARE KF'ed.

Steve
Steven J Robeson, LPN

2033. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 15:30:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB711F0.15C83%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64170

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote...
>>
>> Or, can one support the troops yet not support the war?
>
> In this case, I'd say "no", Dwight. At least
> not if you openly protest the war.
>
> Open protest of our government's actions when
> we are already at war gives aid and comfort to
> the enemy in as much as they can hope that if
> they "tough it out" they can perhaps prevail.

Well, I wasn't necessarily talking about protests. However, since you brought it up, when does one protest a war one feels is wrong? After the war is over and the wrong is done? When does one protest an aspect of the war one disagrees with? For example, in the early stages of the Vietnam War (the war often cited by those opposed to protests), most supported the war. That support changed as that long war changed and expanded. Were people supposed to sit back in silence as the situation changed simply because the war had already begun?

I truly believe the best way to support our troops is to take our responsibilities under the Constitution seriously. That includes openly speaking out on the issues surrounding war - yes, even when that speech involves protest. I think it is irresponsible to elect people to extreme power with no challenge after that on the issues affecting us and our troops. Likewise, it is equally irresponsible to allow those people to send our troops off to war to kill and be killed without challenging those people on each and every aspect surrounding that war.

Our soldiers in the foxhole have little freedoms. During wartime, they depend on the people back home to keep the government and military in check. Their lives depend on it. I hope Americans never fail those soldiers by just sitting back in silence as the government and military does whatever they want with our men and women in the military.

If a healthy Democracy gives our opposition false hope, then so be it - they will eventually realize we are actually stronger because of it. That, not silence, is what makes America great, and powerful.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2034. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 15:51:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB716AE.15C85%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64171

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" wrote:
>
> A more accurate term here is "rump" militia,
> Jon. There ARE legal and responsible militia
> organizations in the United States: CT has
> one, as does Tennessee, Texas, California,
> New York, Ohio and others.
>
> (snip) It's a shame that we allow cowards and
> murderers like Tim McViegh to steal away the
> good name of Americans who do volunteer to
> serve (in legal militias) in their home states
> in this way.

And South Carolina. However, there is nothing illegal about private, non-state sponsored, militia groups - many exist today, known by local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies. One exists right here in the next county, with several local law enforcement officers as members.

Also, as I understand it, Tim McViegh looked into militia membership but walked away when they didn't fit into his way of thinking. Am I wrong about that?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2035. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 16:15:21 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304070815.56710d2c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64172

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.07.04.45.49.372435.32723@arrl.org>...
> On Sun, 06 Apr 2003 16:45:44 -0400, N2EY wrote:
> > Did Papa Bush really "fail"? As I understand it, during GW1, coalition
> > forces were rolling towards B'dad at a furious pace but were ORDERED to
> > stop because Kuwait had been freed, which was the avowed goal of GW1.
> > Why wasn't Stormin' Norman allowed to finish the job? I've never seen an
> > official answer to that question.
>
> You must not have looked very hard because the topic was discussed
> thoroughly at the time and later.

Hello Jon

> The key reasons were 1) that the
> coalition was created specifically to eject Iraq from Kuwait and was
> operating under a UN Security Council resolution limited to that purpose;
> 2) that there was a reluctance among some members of the coalition,
> particularly Arab states, to extend the mission to the military overthrow
> of Saddam for fear that Iraq would break apart in ethnic warfare that
> would spread to the neighboring Arab states; 3) that the mission had been
> accomplished at a cost in coalition lives dramatically lower than even the
> most optimistic prewar projection and that good fortune was unlikely to
> continue if the forces continued on to Baghdad; and 4) that there was an
> expectation that Saddam had been weakened enough that he was nearly
> certain to be overthrown from within anyway.

Understood. So the answer to my question:

'Did Papa Bush really "fail"?'

is a resounding "NO! - all of the GW1 coalition's goals were
accomplished."

> Quotes:
>
> The ending wasn't quite as clean as it might have been if Saddam Hussein
> had come to that tent [at Safwan on March 3, 1991], laid down his thing
> and maybe left office ... I miscalculated. I thought he'd be gone ... We
> might have handled the flying of helicopters differently. So I think
> there's room for some ex post facto criticism here ... [But] I think
> history will say we did the right thing.
> --Former President George Bush, PBS interview with David Frost, aired
> January 1996 (taped Dec. 12, 1995).

Well, there you have it from the man hisself.
>
> We had a crucial but limited objective in the Gulf War: to reverse Iraqi
> aggression, and to cripple Saddam's offensive military capabilities ...
> Occupying Iraq with thousands of American troops for the indefinite future
> and creating a gaping power vacuum in the Persian Gulf for Iran to fill
> [is what would have happened] if we had pressed on to Baghdad in 1991.
> --Brent Scowcroft, national security adviser, 1991. "Why We Stopped the
> Gulf War," Newsweek, Sept. 23, 1996, p. 3.

Instead, the US had to keep forces in the region to enforce the no-fly
zones and try to keep SH contained.
>
> I was just damned glad to have the victory in our hands with the minimum
> loss of casualties, and I was willing to settle for that because that's a
> hell of a lot more than anybody's had in a war as long as I can remember.
> --Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf, commander, U.S. Central Command, "The Gulf
> War," Frontline, Jan. 9-10, 1996.
>
> So of all the criticism of Bush Administration decision-making during
> Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, it is this marching-to-Baghdad
> canard that has the least merit.
> As a diplomatic, political or even
> military matter, marching to Baghdad would have been a disaster in the
> making.
> Iraq might have fragmented in unpredictable ways, which would have played
> into the hands of the mullahs in Iran. The mullahs could have exported
> their brand of Islamic fundamentalism with the help of Iraq's Shiites and
> quickly transformed themselves into the dominant regional power. (Past
> tense added.)
> --James A. Baker, III, secretary of state, 1989-92. "Why U.S. Did Not
> March on to Baghdad," Washington Times, Sept. 11, 1996.

Maybe - or maybe not. Point is, coalition troops are in Bagdad now, so
coulda/woulda/shoulda will soon become reality. What would be really
neat is if much of the occupation/rebuilding could be turned over to
the UN.

Thanks for the quotes, Jon.

One thing none of the above folks really foresaw was that the presence
of "infidel" foreign troops in Saudi Arabia would be a prime
recruitment tool and motivator for anti-US terrorism. Even though the
troops are there at the express request of the Saudi royal family, to
keep SH under control.

Latest news is that a cache of chemical drums testing positive for
nerve and blister agents has been discovered. Experts are on the way
to analyze the find. A dozen barrels doesn't sound like much until
somebody uses them in a city.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2036. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 16:20:01 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304070820.2e59a14@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64173

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3E90553A.8080806@adelphia.net>...
> Vshah101 wrote:
>
> > Pointing out the increased numbers is advocating Morse code.

No, it isn't. It's just reporting facts. Can't you handle those facts?
Do you want the truth to be suppressed?

> > N2EY (an
> > Electrical Engineer) advocates Morse code, not Electrical Engineering.

What utter nonsense.
>
> How do you draw that conclusion? Another of my hobbies is amateur
> astronomy. By your logic, I am advocating people to stay out of my
> professional field? Does not make sense. Jim is doing what he likes to
> do on his personal time. And if that includes "beeping", then that's
> just fine and dandy.
>
> Why your obsession with what Jim does in his spare time?

Simple, Mike - it fills out the circle. Len is obsessed with what I do
for a living, and Vipul is obsessed with what I do in my spare time.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2037. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 16:34:56 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.07.16.34.56.685007.30182@arrl.org>
Source record: 64174

On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 12:15:21 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>
> Understood. So the answer to my question:
>
> 'Did Papa Bush really "fail"?'
>
> is a resounding "NO! - all of the GW1 coalition's goals were
> accomplished."

One can criticize Bush-I for not forseeing all of the consequences of the decision to stop the war. Of course, once you start damning people for not being clairvoyant the list of the damned gets a bit lengthy.

> Maybe - or maybe not. Point is, coalition troops are in Bagdad now, so
> coulda/woulda/shoulda will soon become reality. What would be really
> neat is if much of the occupation/rebuilding could be turned over to the
> UN.

I agree, as long as there is a specific plan for evolving control of the country to the Iraqis themselves as soon as the country can be de-Baath'ed.

> Thanks for the quotes, Jon.

My pleasure.

> One thing none of the above folks really foresaw was that the presence
> of "infidel" foreign troops in Saudi Arabia would be a prime recruitment
> tool and motivator for anti-US terrorism. Even though the troops are
> there at the express request of the Saudi royal family, to keep SH under
> control.

OBL and crowd aren't much happier with the Saudis than they are with the US.

Jon

2038. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 16:36:36 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.07.16.36.34.559944.30182@arrl.org>
Source record: 64175

On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 12:20:01 -0400, N2EY wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3E90553A.8080806@adelphia.net>...
>> Why your obsession with what Jim does in his spare time?
>
> Simple, Mike - it fills out the circle. Len is obsessed with what I do
> for a living, and Vipul is obsessed with what I do in my spare time.

Ah, but what do you do while you're asleep? The whole world wonders.

Jon

2039. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 16:41:47 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB7228B.15C87%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64176

"Jon Bloom" wrote:
>
> I'm not conversant with the details of the current
> benefits, but I do know my airman nephew is receiving
> full tuition for the college courses he's taking.
> I believe it's via this program: (snip)

Thanks for the heads up, Jon. I heard about this some time ago, but nothing was said about it after the initial reports (leaving most to wonder if it was ever going to happen). Anyway, as mentioned in the article, it is a tuition assistance program offered in addition to the current MGIB (the partial matching fund program I mentioned). It doesn't extend to those who have left the military, but does allow education during active duty while still leaving MGIB benefits intact for continued education after leaving the service. However, if tuition costs exceed the tuition assistance amount, money is borrowed from future MGIB benefits (reducing the amount of benefits available after leaving the service). Regardless, while not as nice as the old educational benefits, it is still a significant improvement over the current MGIB program alone. By combining the two (classes while on active duty with the remainder after leaving service), a soldier leaving with less time in service could afford enough college to get a degree. In fact, if might even be possible to complete a degree program while on active duty, especially for those who stay in long enough to accumulate enough funds under the MGIB and actually have enough time between work to attend classes.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2040. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 16:57:39 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304070857.1ccaa986@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64177

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030406234143.25340.00000089@mb-fe.aol.com>...
> In article <20030406122618.00629.00000025@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
> >--
> >
> >Here's two simple questions for you, Len, N0IMD, and anybody else who wants
> >to answer it:
> >
> >Currently there are more than 250,000 US amateur radio licensees shown in the
> >database as "Technician". Have any of them passed code tests? Do any of them
> >have HF amateur privileges?
>
> Here's a simple request for you:

Just answer the questions, Len. They're not a trap. Just simple,
direct questions about FCC rules and the database.

> Fund a personal DSL line or send me a CD-ROM with the full FCC
> amateur radio database on it and I might write a search program
> and totalization for any field of data...then present the totals in here
> free of charge.

Why on earth should I do any of that? You won't even answer the two
simple questions posed above.

Let's see - you want ME to present the FCC database to you, on my own
time and expense. When said database is provided, you might - just
might - put together some software and present your results. Or you
might not. The software, presuming it is actually written, might
function correctly, or it might not. The results might be correct, or
they might not.

And we're supposed to trust YOU on all of this. Right.

> I'm NOT going to limit searches to some pre-biased conclusion
> reaching. I'm NOT going to bias anything.

Uh huh. Sure. We're supposed to just take your word on that, right?
We're all supposed to ASSUME you're going to be completely impartial,
fair, and error-free, even though you don't admit errors pointed out
by those who don't agree with you.

Why should we trust you, Len, given your long record of behavior here?

Why should anyone trust you when you won't even answer two simple
questions?

> There's one problem and why I wrote "might" instead of "will"
> above:
>
> You can't handle the truth.

Just answer the questions, Len.
>
> The present database size from the FCC prohibits downloading
> over dial-up telephone lines in any reasonable amount of time.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor baby - doesn't "the radio-electronics
professional" have access to a broadband connection?
;-);-);-);

> You continue to insist on biased
> sorting and statistical interpretations to fit your agenda.

More nonsense from Len Anderson. Just no other word for it.

Why not just answer the questions. Or are you too afraid of the
answers?
>
> No problem. Your requests are denied.

As expected. You're afraid of the answers to those two simple, direct
questions. Can't handle them.

Here are some truths you obviously can't handle:

- FCC has been renewing all Technician and Technician Plus licenses as
Technician for almost three years now.

- The increase in US amateur radio licenses from early 1991 (when the
Tech lost its code test) to April 2000 (restructuring) was within a
few percent of the increase in US amateur radio licenses for an equal
period preceding the 1991 removal of the code test from the Tech
license.

- After April 15, 2000, Novices who pass Element 2, and Technicians
who pass Element 1, show up in the FCC database as Technicians, even
though they are "coded" and have some HF privileges.

- The current FCC database shows over 250,000 Technician class
licenses issued to individuals. Of these, most have not passed any
code test. But to claim that ALL of them are "noncoded" is simply not
true. You and N0IMD have made that mistake here.

- The numbers I post here bimonthly do not come from AH0A or his
website. They are derived directly from the FCC database - but not by
me. I just repost them.

- The numbers I post here bimonthly list the current license classes
of the various licensees and keep Technician Pluses separate from
Technicians.

Just answer the questions, Len. Don't be afraid. The truth won't hurt
you.

2041. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 17:24:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E91B452.8558231D@att.net>
Source record: 64178

Vito wrote:

> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > Many easterners are against California for no
> > other reason than pique and jealousy.
>
> No, Americans dispise California's culture because it is Unamerican.
>
> I went to Jr and Sr Hi School there and left when I was 25. I spent
> another year in San Diego in 1978. Nothing had changed for the better.
> Police rightly arrested one of my subordinates for being drink, but then
> kept him in jail 3 working days before he even saw a magistrate. That
> doesn't happen in America. The S.D. police murdered nearly a dozen
> innocent citizens, this in addition to a few criminals. They're so
> trigger happy that two of them got into a gunfight over who'd drive!
> AFAIK, that doesn't *routinely* happen in America either. Not long ago I
> read that El Monte NARCs broke into a house in Compton and murdered an
> 80 year old man because a drug dealer had lived in the same house over
> 20 years before!! And guess what: Compton PD didn't arrest the killer!
> And what's really weird is that Californians *like* it that way. Cops
> gun down a jogger? Shouldn't have been running! Cops kill a man in his
> own back yard? Shouldn't have been out there cleaning his guns! Sorry
> dudes but that isn't America.

Ask any seasoned cop outside California about "That California attitude".

2042. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 17:34:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E91B689.69D1F09F@att.net>
Source record: 64179

N2EY wrote:

> Just answer the questions, Len. Don't be afraid. The truth won't hurt
> you.

That's one of the very few times you happen to be wrong, Jim. It scares him to death.

2043. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 17:57:57 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6sec3$305$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64180

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.04.07.04.59.03.228521.32723@arrl.org...
> On Sun, 06 Apr 2003 22:21:39 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> >
news:94747B2B5A50BF12.DC06DC5B1570EDAC.15CD574D5721AB1B@lp.airnews.net...
> >
> > Exactly. And evil wins when honorable and honest people stand by and do
> > nothing when confronted by evil.
> >
> >> But I'm not so sure that the US gov't. or military needs to start
> >> marching in and changing things here and there.
> >
> > Sadly, you sound like too many of the anti-war groupies who believe that
> > because we do one thing in Iraq, we will or must do the same thing in
> > other places.
>
> But doesn't "evil [win] when honorable and honest people stand by and do
> nothing when confronted by evil"? If you truly belive that, why don't you
> think that the US should eliminate evil everywhere?

One need not directly intervene everywhere to bring pressure
to bear on other evils. The Soviet Union fell on its own accord.
The biggest thing that evil regimes fear is a population that is
both educated and has direct access to free communications.
The lessons of Iraq can and will be shared without needing to
directly intervene everywhere.

Is there any reason
> other than practicalities that should check the US from attacking evil
> regimes wherever they exist?

Practicality is a very real limiting factor. Costs also are as measured
in terms of lives and dollars.

> And what are the characteristics of a regime
> that make it evil?

Jon, I'm disappointed you even have to ask. I have no doubt as
to being able to recognize evil for what it is and where it is.
If the judgement is in doubt, then discretion would indicate
it isn't bad enough. What is totally pathetic is the fact (IMHO)
that some of those that opposed us going to Iraq, opposed our
engagement because they didn't believe the SH Iraqi regime
was evil enough to warrant intervention.

> Those are the questions that makes a lot of people in the world nervous
> about the Bush administration's preemptive war doctrine.

And isn't it wonderful that you live in this country and that
you and others can freely express your doubts and opinions.

> > The lesson to be learned
> > here is that we are not impotent nor unwilling to take needed action
> > when it warrants such.
>
> Ah, but the "when it warrants" is the problem. There is a fear outside the
> borders of the US that the present US government will pay no attention to
> what anyone outside the US thinks or to how US actions will affect them.
> And based on its behavior to date, that's not an unrealistic concern.

Many of those outside the borders of the US sure don't
have my respect after their shameful behavior in the UN.
As to considering other's opinions, I trust that is certainly
of major concern in evolving US world policy. Your
mileage may vary.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2044. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 18:04:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6sep3hgl1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64181

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAB6B399.15B93%stewart@say.net...
> "Bill Sohl" wrote:
> >
> > Short sighted? Why? Are you following the realities
> > of what the freed Iraqi's are saying when the yoke of
> > their oppresion is lifted and the fear of reprisal
> > is gone?
>
>
> Don't take what they say too seriously, Bill. What would you say when
> talking to reporters with the armed soldiers from the military that just
> killed, and is killing, many thousands of your countrymen?

The same thing the Germans said after the SS was keilled along with many
German regular army. There was NO organized or disorganized
post surrender disappointment or ongoing hostilities.

> Everyone shouting about Saddam seems to forget that we're also killing
> many thousands of their men and women who joined their military simply to
> serve their country.

Try a different news channel. Most of the Iraqi army were conscripted.
Even those that may have volunteered probably did so as the better
alternative to the plight of civilians in Iraq.

> Most know no more about WMD than our soldiers did
> during the Manhattan Project of the early 40's. In fact, I'm sure most
don't
> even understand our reasons for invading their country - many Americans
are
> not even certain of that (and even fewer around the world are).

The fact that any American doesn't understand why is simply
an indication that whoever that person/persons are, they are
either dumber than a rock or they have NO access to media
coverage of the events leading to and the execution of the war
itself over the last 20 days.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2045. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 18:06:24 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3E91BE20.595F5BF6@crosslink.net>
Source record: 64169

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> Many easterners are against California for no
> other reason than pique and jealousy.

No, Americans dispise California's culture because it is Unamerican.

I went to Jr and Sr Hi School there and left when I was 25. I spent another year in San Diego in 1978. Nothing had changed for the better. Police rightly arrested one of my subordinates for being drink, but then kept him in jail 3 working days before he even saw a magistrate. That doesn't happen in America. The S.D. police murdered nearly a dozen innocent citizens, this in addition to a few criminals. They're so trigger happy that two of them got into a gunfight over who'd drive! AFAIK, that doesn't *routinely* happen in America either. Not long ago I read that El Monte NARCs broke into a house in Compton and murdered an 80 year old man because a drug dealer had lived in the same house over 20 years before!! And guess what: Compton PD didn't arrest the killer! And what's really weird is that Californians *like* it that way. Cops gun down a jogger? Shouldn't have been running! Cops kill a man in his own back yard? Shouldn't have been out there cleaning his guns! Sorry dudes but that isn't America.

2046. FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 18:17:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6sfjfptl1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64183

We should all be encouraging this and commenting that manufacturers
SHOULD be required to design and market products that have a
specified resistance to interference (IMHO).

Bill K2UNK
----------see below:

From ARNewsline 1338 4/4/03:

RADIO RULES: FCC CONSIDERS INTERFERENCE IMMUNITY FOR RECIEVERS

We predicted a month ago that it would happen. Now comes word that the
FCC has issued a Notice of Inquiry, seeking comments on possibly
requiring receiver manufacturers to build in a certain level of
interference immunity. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has more:

--
As noted on the CQ Magazine website and elsewhere in cyberspace,
amateurs have been frustrated for years by trying to explain to
neighbors that interference problems were really the result of poor
design. Bad engineering in their TVs, stereos, cordless phones and
other receivers.

Now, because of the need to protect Digital Television transmissions,
the FCC is seeking comments on the current immunity performance and
interference tolerance of existing receivers. Its also looking at the
possibilities for improving receiver immunity in the not to distant
future.

The FCC says that it is soliciting input from the public on possible
approaches to achieving desired levels of receiver immunity. This runs
the gammit from better product warning labels to the possibility of
implementing mandatory standards governing the manufacture, import and
sale of consumer electronics reception gear.

It is all in FCC E-T Docket 03-65. You will find it on the web by using
the document search engine at www.fcc.gov.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF

2047. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 18:31:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6sgd1$k3t$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64184

"Hambone the Magnificent" <921d2will@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3e91c18e@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030405013919.05767.00000131@mb-fz.aol.com...
>
> > A pregnant woman...?!?!?!
> > Can there be anything more loathesome than how they used
> > her like that? I guess those idiots don't realize that doing stuff
> > like that only raises the hair on an American's neck more and
> > really drives them to fight harder.
>
> We may find it loathesome with our Western morals and
> values Steve, but the mere fact that a pregnant woman (!!)
> would sacrifice herself as a "human guided bomb" for her
> religion (Islam) *speaks volumes* of the will of belief and
> extremes these people are willing to go thru and do!
>
> They are modern Kamakazie

The reality, however, is that Saddam was/is a secular person
rather than a religious supporter of any extent.
Apparently even Bin Laden has no great love for SH
in terms of any SH's non-commitment to Islam.

Is it loathsome, of course it is. So is human sacrifice...
or is that too just my narrow minded western upbringing.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2048. Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 19:09:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E91CCEB.34DD26D4@att.net>
Source record: 64185

Way, **WAY** too late, even for HDTV. Millions of new unprotected
sets have already been sold.

Bill Sohl wrote:

> We should all be encouraging this and commenting that manufacturers
> SHOULD be required to design and market products that have a
> specified resistance to interference (IMHO).
>
> Bill K2UNK
> ----------see below:
>
> From ARNewsline 1338 4/4/03:
>
> RADIO RULES: FCC CONSIDERS INTERFERENCE IMMUNITY FOR RECIEVERS
>
> We predicted a month ago that it would happen. Now comes word that the
> FCC has issued a Notice of Inquiry, seeking comments on possibly
> requiring receiver manufacturers to build in a certain level of
> interference immunity. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has more:
>
> --
> As noted on the CQ Magazine website and elsewhere in cyberspace,
> amateurs have been frustrated for years by trying to explain to
> neighbors that interference problems were really the result of poor
> design. Bad engineering in their TVs, stereos, cordless phones and
> other receivers.
>
> Now, because of the need to protect Digital Television transmissions,
> the FCC is seeking comments on the current immunity performance and
> interference tolerance of existing receivers. Its also looking at the
> possibilities for improving receiver immunity in the not to distant
> future.
>
> The FCC says that it is soliciting input from the public on possible
> approaches to achieving desired levels of receiver immunity. This runs
> the gammit from better product warning labels to the possibility of
> implementing mandatory standards governing the manufacture, import and
> sale of consumer electronics reception gear.
>
> It is all in FCC E-T Docket 03-65. You will find it on the web by using
> the document search engine at www.fcc.gov.
>

> For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF

2049. Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 19:48:15 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E91D5FF.EE295970@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 64186

>
>
> RADIO RULES: FCC CONSIDERS INTERFERENCE IMMUNITY FOR RECIEVERS
>

About f---in' time!

2050. Re: Remote Weather Station Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 20:30:05 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <b6sn4d$2rp8$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 64190
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Fritz Wuehler <fritz@rodent.frell.eu.org> wrote:
>What I want: an autonomous weather station that broadcasts wind data at
>least every three minutes. Just to give you an idea of how much data
>I'm talking about, a few 1200 baud APRS (e.g. with the TAPR APRS PIC-E
>system) packets would be plenty - it's not much data.

I think you are describing an "automatically controlled digital
station". This is covered by 97.221. You are free to do this
at VHF and higher frequencies, as well as in selected portions of
the HF bands.

>My concerns: this is not a backyard affair attached to my personal
>station - it would be a standalone broadcast unit (or perhaps an
>autoresponder?). I don't think my personal callsign is legal for use
>here. It seems like a lot of people do what I'm talking about via APRS,
>but I'm not so sure about the autonomous station issue. Repeaters get
>their own licenses - what about weather stations?

Your personal callsign is fine. Callsigns no longer identify the
locations of stations or anything like that, but rather just tell
the FCC who to talk to if the station screws up. I suspect an arrangement
where you polled the data out of the station via an autoresponder
might be slightly better than broadcasting, all other things being equal.
You are responsible for having a way to shut down the station in a hurry
if it bothers someone, and having the station stay silent until polled
is an effective way to do that under normal circumstances.

>I've thought about going to Part 18 ISM rules instead with a 902 MHz
>line-of-sight link, but that's not a clear regulatory option, either.
>Neither is Part 15 (I don't want to have to certify compliance). I
>think it really is a HAM-related activity, but I don't understand the
>operations portion.

Part 18 really isn't applicable, but Part 15 would probably work okay
if its constraints were compatible with your applicaton. Section 15.23
says:

15.23 Home-built devices.

(a) Equipment authorization is not required for devices that are not
marketed, are not constructed from a kit, and are built in quantities of
five or less for personal use.

(b) It is recognized that the individual builder of home-built
equipment may not possess the means to perform the measurements for
determining compliance with the regulations. In this case, the builder

is expected to employ good engineering practices to meet the specified technical standards to the greatest extent practicable. The provisions of Sec. 15.5 apply to this equipment.

If you assembling the equipment yourself it need not be FCC-authorized, you just need to do your best to build the equipment in a way which complies with the technical constraints of some section in Part 15 (just the way you'll need to build it to conform to Part 97 if you operate under amateur regulations instead).

Since some of the best Part 15 frequencies overlap amateur bands, however, and since the modes available under Part 15 are usually also legal under Part 97, it would probably still be appropriate to identify with your callsign regardless given that it might help someone find you if the station screws up. If the equipment technically complies with the requirements of both Parts, the somewhat academic discussion of which Part it was actually operating under can probably be left for the very unlikely event that you need to talk to the FCC about it.

Dennis Ferguson

2051. Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 20:47:33 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304072044210.542@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 64188

I think that the first issue here is that we should stop that spammer from posting his drivel in this newsgroup where it shouldn't be and get him to post it in "rec.radio.info" where it was approved to be back in 1996 (or so) and is supposed to be.

Only when he does things correctly will it be worth anyone's time to listen. However, you should note on how many things he has reported on incorrectly in the past as well. Based on my knowledge of his stories, he's no better than the National Enquirer as compared against the New York Times.

On Mon, 7 Apr 2003, Bill Sohl wrote:
> We should all be encouraging this and commenting that manufacturers
> SHOULD be required to design and market products that have a
> specified resistance to interference (IMHO).
>
> Bill K2UNK
> ----------------------see below:
>
> From ARNewsline 1338 4/4/03:
[Mindless drivel deleted.]

2052. Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 21:11:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6spocpkl1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64189

I'd say, better late than never.

The existence of such requirements would give more credence
to the ham when pointing out the junk foisted on the consumer
in the current environment.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3E91CCEB.34DD26D4@att.net...
> Way, **WAY** too late, even for HDTV. Millions of new unprotected
> sets have already been sold.
> -------------------------
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > We should all be encouraging this and commenting that manufacturers
> > SHOULD be required to design and market products that have a
> > specified resistance to interference (IMHO).
> >
> > Bill K2UNK
> > ----------------------see below:
> >
> > From ARNewsline 1338 4/4/03:
> >
> > RADIO RULES: FCC CONSIDERS INTERFERENCE IMMUNITY FOR RECIEVERS
> >
> > We predicted a month ago that it would happen. Now comes word that the
> > FCC has issued a Notice of Inquiry, seeking comments on possibly
> > requiring receiver manufacturers to build in a certain level of
> > interference immunity. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has more:
> >
> > --
> > As noted on the CQ Magazine website and elsewhere in cyberspace,
> > amateurs have been frustrated for years by trying to explain to
> > neighbors that interference problems were really the result of poor
> > design. Bad engineering in their TVs, stereos, cordless phones and
> > other receivers.
> >
> > Now, because of the need to protect Digital Television transmissions,
> > the FCC is seeking comments on the current immunity performance and
> > interference tolerance of existing receivers. Its also looking at the
> > possibilities for improving receiver immunity in the not to distant
> > future.

> >
> > The FCC says that it is soliciting input from the public on possible
> > approaches to achieving desired levels of receiver immunity. This runs
> > the gammit from better product warning labels to the possibility of
> > implementing mandatory standards governing the manufacture, import and
> > sale of consumer electronics reception gear.
> >
> > It is all in FCC E-T Docket 03-65. You will find it on the web by using
> > the document search engine at www.fcc.gov.
> >
> > For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF
>

2053. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 21:29:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <d5mka.4773$Xp3.2935953@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64187

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030406215251.13084.00000143@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
> >Universities are not in the business of teaching amateur radio. So
> >there is no need to reference ARRL publications.
>
> The subject was (active) rf devices, not amateur radio. There are ARRL
> publications on technical topics, in case you did not know.
>
> Any technical publication which covers the class topic could be utilized.
This
> prof did not use ARRL pub, probably because he has never seen one in
academics.
>
>
> The ARRL pub did cover the topic better that the textbook. There was a
better
> explaination, practical examples, construction info. And, it did not
sacrifice
> on the math.
>
> If an ARRL pub. teaches the subject matter better, it should be utilized.

In academia, it is "publish or perish". The professors will NOT use any material outside that written by colleagues unless that is the only choice. The quality or ease of understanding the material is irrelevant to the professors. They are contributing to each other's financial welfare and that is the basis on which they select text books. This has been going on ever since there were universities. To think otherwise is incredibly naive.

I've many reference books that I bought in my field because the college texts were next to impossible to understand. Why didn't the professors use these better books? They knew about them and they also knew that neither they nor other college professors authored them.

By the way, TURN ON YOUR SPELL CHECKER.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2054. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 22:53:18 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.07.22.53.17.874763.9024@arrl.org>
Source record: 64191

On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 13:57:57 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:pan.2003.04.07.04.59.03.228521.32723@arrl.org...
>
>> Is there any reason
>> other than practicalities that should check the US from attacking evil
>> regimes wherever they exist?
>
> Practicality is a very real limiting factor. Costs also are as measured
> in terms of lives and dollars.

So it's okay to NOT intervene against evil if it's going to cost you. But is that the ONLY limiting factor? Is it utterly unimportant if some people disagree that the attack is justified? How about if a LOT of people disagree? How about if everybody except Bill Sohl disagrees with you? At what point do you begin to say to yourself, "hmmm, maybe I should take their views into account"?

>> And what are the characteristics of a regime that make it evil?
>
> Jon, I'm disappointed you even have to ask. I have no doubt as to being
> able to recognize evil for what it is and where it is.

That's nice. What is the evil-versus-cost balancing point, Bill? How do you measure the evil of a regime and balance that against the costs of eliminating it to make the decision whether to attempt to destroy the regime by force or to destroy it by more peaceful, albeit slower, means? Is there a universal equation that answers all such questions? Or do you believe that the answers are necessarily going to be determined in part by one's experiences, values and culture?

> If the judgement is in doubt, then discretion would indicate it isn't
> bad enough. What is totally pathetic is the fact (IMHO) that some of
> those that opposed us going to Iraq, opposed our engagement because they
> didn't believe the SH Iraqi regime was evil enough to warrant
> intervention.

As did the Bush administration, or so they said. This was presented as a case of elimination of WMD, remember. The Administration said they would be satisifed if Iraq openly and completely complied with the UNSC demand to eliminate its weapons of mass destruction -- no elimination of the SH regime required. You're not suggesting that the Administration was lying, are you?

As for those who opposed force, maybe they thought the costs were too high. One can disagree with that, but it's not a black-and-white issue. I

find it troubling that people on both sides of this question quickly retreat to simplistic moralizing. If you're against the war you're in favor of an evil regime; if you're for the war you're willing to slaughter the innocent for oil. Neither position characterizes the opposing point of view at all. Both are attempts to win an argument rather than to reach consensus. (Well, duh, Jon, welcome to RRAP!)

>> Those are the questions that makes a lot of people in the world nervous
>> about the Bush administration's preemptive war doctrine.
>
> And isn't it wonderful that you live in this country and that you and
> others can freely express your doubts and opinions.

Yep. Sure is. I wish everyone could. What costs are you willing to bear to ensure that the folks in North Korea can, for example? (I'm guessing you're not in favor of attacking them.)

> Many of those outside the borders of the US sure don't have my respect
> after their shameful behavior in the UN.

Are you aware that many outside the US feel exactly the same way about the US?

> As to considering other's
> opinions, I trust that is certainly of major concern in evolving US
> world policy.

I wish I shared your trust. The present administration seems daily less interested in hearing the opinions of anyone.

Jon

2055. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-07 22:59:54 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.07.22.59.53.838883.9024@arrl.org>
Source record: 64192

On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 12:41:47 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:
> In fact, if might
> even be possible to complete a degree program while on active duty,
> especially for those who stay in long enough to accumulate enough funds
> under the MGIB and actually have enough time between work to attend
> classes.

It would be nice to think that we'd improve those benefits, especially considering the present sterling service being demonstrated by our armed forces. But the plain truth is, it's not in the best interests of the services to make it possible to receive all of the educational benefits you need by serving only one hitch.

Jon

2056. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 00:22:27 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <7Doka.50275$ja4.3194329@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 64193

> > FWIW, Arizona.... ....asking
> > the drivers if they are carrying any
> > live birds.

> LOL. Well, so far, I haven't routinely carried live birds across the state
> line, but it is something to keep in mind if I ever do.

If you are carrying one, you will have to give
the Inspection Officer the bird as you drive
through.

JIM, K7JEB, Somewhere, Aridzona

2057. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 00:49:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407204927.11628.00000030@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64194

In article <20030407065108.01663.00000182@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 07 Apr 2003 10:51:08 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>>From: Dwight Stewart stewart@say.net
>>Date: 4/7/2003 2:58 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <BAB6A7FC.15B8D%stewart@say.net>
>
>>Or, can one support the troops yet not support the war?
>
> In this case, I'd say "no", Dwight. At least not if you openly protest
>the war.

I disagree! Freedom of speech demands that those who oppose the war, on whatever grounds, be allowed to have their say, as long as they do not reveal military secrets, damage property, or restrict the rights of others (say, by illegally blocking traffic). Being against a government policy does not mean someone is against those who have to carry out that policy. For example, disagreement with the old 55 mph speed limit does not mean someone hates police officers.

During the Vietnam era, some anti-war folks made the stupid Jane Fonda-esque mistake of verbally attacking the troops themselves rather than opposing the policies of those who gave the orders those troops were sworn to carry out. Calling a returning soldier a babykiller won't stop a war.
>
> Open protest of our government's actions when we are already at war
>gives aid and comfort to the enemy in as much as they can hope that if they
>"tough it out" they can perhaps prevail.

> The longer they resist, the greater the potential for casualties on BOTH
>sides.
>
> Disagree with the war if that's your opinion, certainly...but open
>protest is aid and comfort to the enemy.

Just the opposite, Steve. Open expression of political opinion isn't just a right, it's a duty. It shows the other side that America lives by what it preaches.

One doesn't have to go down the "don't protest during wartime" policy very far before the argument can be made to suspend national elections during wartime.

After all, if someone runs against the incumbent president, they oppose his policies and disagree with his decisions - by definition. And "wartime" covers a lot of ground - how long did the Cold War last?

Or consider this thought experiment:

Suppose President Bush announced that he wants to create a new $1/gallon federal tax on retail sales of gasoline. Suppose he says the money from this new tax would go to pay for the war, fight terrorism, and reduce America's dependence on imported oil. Suppose he further announces that govt. agencies and certain key industries would be exempt from the tax, but everyone else would have to pay it. $1 per gallon of gasoline - other fuels exempt.

Most of all, suppose he said "the country needs this tax as part of the war effort".

How do you think people would react?

Would anyone who spoke against this hypothetical new tax be giving aid and comfort to the enemy?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2058. Re: Plop-Plop Fizz Fizz Oh What A Relief It Is...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 01:15:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407211502.06237.00000054@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 64196

In article <b6rrb7$892b0$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>No.... it would be FAST MORSE CODE, not FAST CW. CW is a method of
>transmission and morse code is the encoding/decoding stream sent over the
>transmission signal. There is a difference.

Yes, Ryan, there IS a technical difference.

However, for decades, the two-letter "CW" has been a colloquial
term for any on-off keying code of a continuous wave RF carrier.

You have pulled out a very old Troll subject in here.

You know better than this. :-)

2059. Re: A Bet With Vippy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 01:15:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407211504.06237.00000055@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 64301

In article <20030407063438.01663.00000180@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: A Bet With Vippy
>>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>>Date: 4/6/2003 8:27 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <3E90D406.B5479797@att.net>
>
>>> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>>> >: I've been federally licensed in radio since 1956...just not
>>> > in amateur radio.
>
> Still can't talk the FCC out of a four-letter suffixed callsign so you
>can get "N0CALL", eh Lennie?

No need.

>>> So why are you here, Len? This is an AMATEUR RADIO newsgroup.
>
>> Hey, Bert, It's because the pros won't have anything to do with him either.
>>You'd think he'd get the message eventually.
>
> Or no one is using a SINCGARS set to send him the message. Maybe the
>local Army-Navy Surplus can find us one...?!?!

SINCGARS (SINgle Channel Ground Air Radio System) is the basic small-unit radio of the US military for ground-ground and ground-air operations and has been operational in the US Army, USAF, and USMC since 1989.

As of 2002, both ITT Fort Wayne, IN, and General Dynamics Land Division, Fort Lauderdale, FL, have built 240,000 radios for the US military. ITT Fort Wayne is still in production of the "SIP" (Sincgars ImProvement) units. Final production finish will result in over a quarter million radio units.

No doubt those will eventually turn up in electronic surplus markets. However, the basic design and performance is so good that this will not be something taking place in the near future.

SINCGARS operates over 30 to 88 MHz with selectable clear-channel voice and data or frequency-hopping spread spectrum mode with built-in communications security of the digitized voice. The basic radio unit can be manpack (lithium-ion battery internal), vehicular or aircraft mounted

with or without a power amplifier add-on (using vehicular electrical power). In the FHSS mode using COMMSEC it is both jamming-proof and has no known evidence of decoded communication security codes. Those radios are presently with the coalition forces in Iraq.

2060. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 01:15:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407211509.06237.00000057@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 64195

In article <20030407063003.01663.00000179@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/6/2003 8:40 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030406214001.13084.00000142@mb-cr.aol.com>
>
>>If the ARRL pub book gave better explanation on a topic, it should have been
>>utilized.
>
> I agree. Now what have YOU done to correct this oversight?

What has the aggressor of the Gang of Four done?

All he seems to be able to do is to issue orders to others. :-)

2061. Re: Lennie Just Can't Stand Being Ignored!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 01:15:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407211509.06237.00000056@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 64303

In article <20030407102258.01733.00000162@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> I put Lennie in the Scumbag File only to receive this in the RRAP
>backchannel. Thanks to the correspondent, who knows I am a pilot, for
>bringing it to my attention, but I have been enjoying NOT reading his
foolishness.

Can't handle it, ey? :-)

> But once again, Lennie the Lame tries to push off his bullying, arrogant
>"knowledge" against practical experience and facts. And once again the
>Licenseless One flops on his face.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. I do have a radio license. :-)

Not only do I have knowledge and experience but so do thousands
of other radio professionals, some of whom might be amateurs as
well.

Robeson is not a professional in radio or electronics.

At best he was just a purchasing agent for less than a year.
Purchasing agents pursue paperwork, not electronics.

> Usual anti-Morse Code, "morsemen", "no one knows better than me" stuff
>snipped. Nothing new there.

Robeson cannot admit ignorance of the wider field of radio beyond
amateur radio.

Admitting ignorance will cause him lack of self-esteem. Can't have
that, can he? :-)

>>>Pilots, the Coast Guard and the Military DO use Morse Code, Vipul.
>
>>Private and Commercial aircraft pilots are NOT tested for morsemanship by
>>the FAA or any other agency.
>
> No one said they were, Your Idiotness. I said they use it.

You "said" wrong.

The only on-off keying codes used by the USCG are for blinker
light signalling. USN too. Light frequency is above the 300 GHz
allocation limit of all radio regulation agencies.

>>The US Military does NOT USE morse code for any sort of radio
>communications.

>
> Yes, they do.

Nope. Voice and data, facsimile, video is the extent of it.

>>US Military Intelligence does teach
>>morse code cognition for interception of enemy communications
>>as part of electronic intelligence gathering activities but it does
>>NOT USE morse code skills for communications.
>
> Yes, they do.

No. There's no evidence of its use in communications.

>>>No nearly as prolificly as years ago, but they DO use it.
>
>>The US Military DOES NOT USE MORSE CODE for radio communications.
>
> Yes, they do.

No. Robeson is in deep denial.

> Where did I say there were, Your Scumminess? There is still maritime
>Morse Code traffic in the MF bands. There is still maritime Morse Code
>traffic throughout HF. It's there. It's real. Get over it.

The maritime morse code use is almost extinct now. A listen
over the maritime bands on LF to HF here in Southern California
turns up very few...but much voice and data.

>>>Also tune from 108.0 to 118.0 MHz. Even more Morse code
>>>signals.
>
>>Oh, wow, the automatic ID keyer requirement means "morse
>>is USED in air navigation?!?!?" No, no, no. That automatic
>>keyer is there as a left-over requirement from 50+ years ago.
>
> Yes, yes, yes. Morse Code, NOT packet, ASCII, voice, or any other mode
is
>used to ID those VOR's, etc. I never said HOW it was "encoded", I simply said
>it is used.

Pilots do NOT use it...unless they are morse-fanatic amateurs.

Pilots do NOT HAVE TO USE IT. It's that simple. If they know
their position within about 200 NM, they simply pull out their
sectionals, consult the VOR frequencies on the map, dial it up
and they will have the VOR. A quick eyeball of the sectional
will let them know approximately where they are...triangulation
of at least one other station via the OBS and they will be quite
close.

Note: Pilots can also use the en-route charts if they wish, showing
a wider area. For more precise civil air navigation, the frequency-

aligned DME (if there is one) will present range while the VOR shows
azimuth (relative to magnetic north, local). Sectionals are more
common maps in civil general aviation.

NO morse code identification is used with ATC Transponders.
Those will reply in Octal coding for ID and altitude (if a coded
sealed altitude unit is connected). Ground stations do not ID
their ATC Iterrogators but do use double-pulse spacings to
indicate mode (civil or military) and desired ID or altitude request.
Octal code is 3 bits in a 1-2-4 binary weighting.

>>>Those are VOR's and VORTAC's use by civil and military pilots to
>>>navigate by.
>
>>Not quite.
>
> "Not quite"...?!?! VORs and VORTAC'S are NOT used by civil and military
>pilots to navigate by?

Watch your sentence structure.

Few civil aircraft are equipped with TACAN. A "VORTAC" is a VOR
with a TACAN alongside in a ground station. A DME is usually
coincident in that ground station. TACAN is for military aircraft flying
civil airways and provides both azimuthal bearing and distance to
the ground station. TACAN ground stations are NOT morse code
IDed and, like DME, operate solely in low L-band..

> ...and not one word of this "disproves" anything I said.
>
>>Only a fanatic morseman would think that "pilots use morse to
>>navigate by."

Watch your English sentence structure or you will be admonished
for not being able to use English as a native language.

Robeson displays such an abysmal lack of modern (in the last 48
years) civil aircraft radionavigation that a mini-tutorial on basic
radionav had to be given by myself.

> I never said "pilots use morse to navigate by". I said pilot's use Morse
>Code to identify the beacons that they DO navigate by.

Very, very few do. Pilots DO NOT HAVE TO LISTEN FOR ID in
US general aviation flying-navigating.

> (Ya shudda taken an extra English course or two in that 15 years of
>night school, Your Scumminess)

Robeson's writing doesn't indicate that English language is
familiar to him...he could use some Remedial English
Writing classes to bring him up to high school level.

As another suggested, a Dale Carnegie class would be helpful
in trying to get along with others. Robeson has much difficulty
in getting along with others who have different opinions.

>>In actual practice there's absolutely NO need to
>>use any sort of morse code if a pilot knows approximately where
>>he/she is within several hundred miles.
>
> Of course you KNOW this by years as a licensed and EXPERIENCED aviator,
>Lennie? Just like your years of licensure and experience in Amateur Radio,
>Lennie?

The "within 200 NM" unofficial rule is taught in ground schools
and known (almost, but not quite, instinctively) to experienced
general aviation pilots who've used sectionals and VORs for
air navigation. It is fairly simple. When airborne, the LOS is
quite long, free of obstructions for VHF through L-band. Ground
station output power is sufficient to insure a good, stable signal
out to 200 NM. Not a problem.

Ground station frequency assignments have long since been
made to insure that there will be no interference from other
ground stations.

> WHERE in the FAA database is YOUR name? Mine's there. Mine's also in
>the FCC database. I see you are absent from both.

No aviation license is required to learn, experience, and know air
radionavigation...not even for celestial navigation.

I've had several years of experience in the design of civil and
military avionics, especially so in regards to aircraft radio-
navigation systems, methods, techniques, and standards.

Does the acronym ARINC mean anything to Robeson?

>>FAA has set up VORs
>>such that there isn't any possibility of one VOR interfering with
> >another by high-altitude aircraft.
>
> VORs operate in the 108-118MHZ range and are succeptible to the same
>propagation anomalies that produce all sorts of bearing and "skip" errors that
>are known to Amateurs operating in the same general portion of the
>electromagnetic spectrum.

Robeson is talking through the hat on his balding head.

Mid-VHF propagation characteristics were known when the
ICAO standards were adopted for worldwide civil aviation in
the mid-1950s. There's been almost a half century to show
any anamolies of these alleged "bearing errors" and "skip
errors" (presumably meaning interference from other ground
stations). None of those have shown up.

Bearing errors on VORs are a result of the ground station
installation, not from "propagation disturbances." Those are
correctible and most ground station equipment suppliers
have such correction kits.

Robeson is invited to peruse any group of sectionals or en-
route charts to show the slightest possibility of his alleged
"skip errors." The maximum slant range at LOS is easily
computed from simple geometric trigonometry and is a
function of altitude. With absolutely no, repeat NO, terrain
masking when at altitude, the received VOR signal will be
at a maximum.

> That was part of the reason for the development of TACAN, Lennie.

TACAN was developed first in a USN contract with ITT. It came
to be before DME and VOR.

DME (Distance Measuring Equipment) uses the same essentials
as the slant range measurement in TACAN. DME and TACAN
are usually provided by the same ground station.

VOR is a VHF compromise in design, generally based on the
TACAN "rotating beam" of AM for the basic ground station
bearing azimuth. Where VOR differs is in the reference phase
for the rotating beam, VOR using a 9.96 KHz sub-carrier with
the 30 Hz reference phase FMing the sub-carrier.

VOR is really an elegant system for a simple airborne receiver
based on vacuum tubes (it was developed in the early 1950s).
The VOR reference phase is easily separated despite a 30%
AM rotating beam and the refernce phase FM does not impact
the azimuth bearing AM. Any inaccuracies in a VOR receiver
are due to its internal design and calibration.

There CAN be some minor azimuthal errors due to shadowing
of the aircraft structure at certain look-angles but those are
minor and can be found through ordinary antenna range tests
on models. Such aircraft errors are individual to the aircraft
and not a part of the VOR system.

> This INCLUDES occassional misnavigation due to tracking the wrong VOR
>due to propagational anomalies.

Pilot or navigator error is not part of the system.

Robeson can look at any group of sectionals or en-route charts
and note the ground station frequencies of VORs. He can then
(with all those alleged years of navigation experience) note the
range separation...far enough that "skip" (rare at VHF) will not
be a factor in any "errors."

If Robeson finds some anamoly, his DUTY to country and "fellow
pilots" should be to contact the FAA immediately and report that
badness.

>An error avoided by ID'ing the right VOR...A point
>made to me by both my CFI and the Examiner I rode with. Neither were
>Amateurs,
>but made certain I knew to cross check the VOR ID by listening to it and
>making sure I had the right beacon.

You were obviously noted to be an LPN at the time, therefore
you were brought up to speed on basic basics...if we can
believe you. [few of us can]

>>VOR receivers are crystal-controlled.
>
> Not since the late 70's, Lennie. Where have YOU been? (Now Lennie is
>an Avionics expert! Whooiee!)

I have much more technical knowledge on civil air avionics than
Robeson.

The very first VOR receivers were manually-tuned. This gave way
to the two-LO-matrix crystal switching of double-superheterodyne
architecture to minimize the total number of quartz crystals. That
was in the late 1950s with the 1960s marking one of the first uses
of DC-biased silicon diodes to replace the switch contacts in the
same bank/matrix of quartz crystals. By the 1970s there was the
introduction of the PLL in VOR receivers to reduce the number of
quartz crystals (in the receiver proper) to one. OBS circuitry may
have a separate crystal for timing of the microprocessor.

>>Since that keying is audio tone and carried on the "voice" mid-band of
>>VORs, any ground station has the opportunity to use the voice
>>part as supplementary control information...the keying would not
>>be heard under such conditions.
>
> More evidence of yet another LennieRant promulgated by an idiot with no
>practical experience in that which he rants about.

FAA has many VORs arranged so that a local tower or TRACON
can use the "mid-band" audio as another voice link to any
aircraft. In such an arrangement, switching to local voice to the
aircraft removes the automatic keying ID tone while the switch-
over is in effect. In such a case there is NO need to "ID" since
the listening aircraft has ALREADY located itself and knows who
and where the ground station is relative to aircraft's position.

This supplementary link to an aircraft is a valuable courtesy
extended to busy pilots, quite useful if the pilot is in an
emergency or near-emergency situation. As has been the
case at BUR, the Burbank (Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena
Airport, formerly Lockheed Air Terminal) local weather has
been on a recorded loop over the local VOR using voice for
weather and additional information (usually the tape loop ends
with "advise Burbank tower you have received Information
Delta <or whatever the alphabetic-sequence the loop has

currently>).

> Please, Lennie, do tell us about your last cross-country flight as pilot
>in command while using VOR or VORTAC as your primary navigational aid...And
>DO tell us about being able to listen for remote-site FSS communications
through
>that aid.

I've not used TACAN in a civil aviation craft, only the VOR, DME,
Localizer, Glideslope, Marker Beacon, and ATC Transponder.
I've used TACAN on military aircraft along with the expanded
(Mode 4) Transponder fully set for the IFF code of the day.

At all times sectionals or their military equivalent were available
for identifying ground stations without any reference to morse
code IDs. None was necessary.

> So you ARE saying that Morse Code get's through, huh..??? That's a
switch.
> You have very aggressively told us how Morse Code is NOT useful, utilitarian
>or reliable. But right here you say it IS reliable...AND in a radio service
>in which accuracy and reliability are not only paramount, but crucial to
safety
>of life.

I've NOT said anything about "morse code getting through."

I've explained the optional voice patch-through the FAA has
available. When such voice supplementary communications
is done, the voice displaces the automatic ID keying tone.

> Screwed up again, Lennie. Ya tried to pass yourself off as "knowing"
>something from just reading about it, when what you did was make yourself
>completely stupid looking in the face of facts to the contrary.
>
> As usual.

Poor baby. Still having a hard time "playing wth others?" :-)

Get some mental help, Robeson. You need it badly.

You are outclassed and outgunned on technical knowledge of
the civil aircraft radionavigation systems you brag about as an
alleged "expert" on them. Sad case.

> If you intend to respond and expect an answer from me, "CC" it. You ARE
>KF'ed.
>
>Steve
>Steven J Robeson, LPN

Poor baby. Does "LPN" stand for "Low Power Nitwit?"

2062. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 01:15:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407211511.06237.00000058@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 64200

In article <20030407062901.01663.00000178@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/6/2003 8:23 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030406212350.13084.00000141@mb-cr.aol.com>
>
>>The class was not organized to teach amateur radio. I don't see how the
>>application is relavant.
>
> Because, Vippy, you keep ahrping upon how your "comm prof" didn't
>address certain topics in the class.

How does one "ahrp" about anything?

> Obviously, if they didn't pertain to the course objectives, they weren't
>discussed. Did they happen to discuss Foley catheterization or central
>venous access in your "comm theory" class either?

Communications theory does not yet involve medical care
theory about "catherization" or "venous access."

It MIGHT be about "venous access" if one has to mainline the
CW drug to stay high on morse code... :-)

Does Robeson wish to talk about Foley Stages? No problem
with me on Foley Stages. Those are used every day out here.
One of my neighbors knows even more about Foley Stages
since he works with them. Those only involve audio electronics,
though, not "comm theory."

How is "catherization" or "venous access" involved in amateur
radio?

> "On-off keying" pertains to many different modulation schemes, Vippy.
>Not just the relevence of Morse Code as it pertains to Amatuer Radio
licensure.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, not only does everyone have to know how to "ahrp"
but now Robeson wants to call hams as "amatuers" again.

Bad form, OM.

>>>How can anyone make an informed, balanced presentation on ANY subject
>>>without practical experience in the subject matter, Vipul?
>>
>>Sorry, but I cannot see your point. I believe Prof really knows the

>material.
>
> Because, Vipul, we are discussing AMATEUR RADIO here...NOT electrical
>engineering, SINCGARS or professional broadcasting.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...FCC does not require ANY staff or commissioners
to have "amatuer licensure" in order to REGULATE US amateur
radio.

Shah did not mention SINCGARS at all. I did. Try to stay with
the program. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

> Your frequent references to him are vis-a-vis what he said or DIDN'T say
>about Mose Code or Amateur Radio...The question was what experience does he
>have in AMATEUR RADIO...I could care less what he knows about commerical,
>military or engineering.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Robeson "doesn't care" about anything except what
he says. In debate that would call for the comment "bad form, OM."

> The proper question is "Does he know where Morse Code fits in to AMATEUR
>RADIO?", Vipul. YOU are the one who dragged this poor soul into this.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. The aggressor member of the Gang of Four insists
on the narrow, tunnel-vision focus to amateur radio...then tried
to interject "catherization" and "venous access" as pertinent to
amateur radio. :-)

> BECAUSE IT'S THE LAW! United States regulations are written so as to
>embrace and meet international regulations that the United States is
>signatory to.

Heah come de raddio kop...heah come de raddio kop! :-)

Robeson's "knowledge" of FCC regulation origins is as faulty as
his thinking that "catherization" and "venous access" are
necessary subjects for amateur radio policy... :-)

> Morse Code is STILL the most basic and universally understood method of
>communications.

SETI doesn't think it is "universal." SETI has been analyzing
the hydrogen line at 1.4 GHz for years, doesn't bother searching
the Universe for morse code signals. :-)

Terrestrially, Robeson is off the deep end due to ignorance.

1. There are approximately 50 to 100 million cellular telephones
in the USA alone. That number far out-does all the morse
code transmitters ever made worldwide; there are
approximately 300 million cellular telephones in the world.
No cell phone uses morse code for communications.

2. The number of non-morse-code PLMRS radios of all kinds
is well over a half million in the USA...NOT counting CB,

R/C, FRS, or GMRS radios (which don't use morse code,
either).

3. See below...

>I may not understand the frantic calls for assistance of a
>yacht skipper speaking Lower Slobovian, but I sure can understand "SOS SOS
>SOS DE ZZ3ZZ/MM QTH W136R52R10 N10R10R05 PSE K"

Robeson must think that GMDSS hasn't been activated or that
every maritime vessel isn't required to have a morse operator.

The Global Marine Distress and Safety System...enacted first
by the maritime community...doesn't use morse code or
require a morseman to operate.

The USCG has ceased monitoring the old 500 KHz international
distress frequency as have many other nations.

Evidently Robeson has the fantasy picture of radio amateurs
"keeping watch" on maritime frequencies (which are not in the
HF ham bands) in order to save lives at sea. Pity that. Not.

The aggessor-antagonist of the Gang of Four keeps on with
his foolishness and role-playing of the raddio kop in here. :-)

2063. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 01:15:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407211514.06237.00000060@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 64199

In article <c2356669.0304070820.2e59a14@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E90553A.8080806@adelphia.net>...
>> Vshah101 wrote:
>>
>> > Pointing out the increased numbers is advocating Morse code.
>
>No, it isn't. It's just reporting facts. Can't you handle those facts?
>Do you want the truth to be suppressed?
>
>> > N2EY (an
>> > Electrical Engineer) advocates Morse code, not Electrical Engineering.
>
>What utter nonsense.

Mr. N2EY does "NOT" advocate morse code?!?!?

What does one call all the biased-in-favor-of-morse-code
comments and biased "interpretations" of statistics in here
over the years? :-)

>> How do you draw that conclusion? Another of my hobbies is amateur
>> astronomy. By your logic, I am advocating people to stay out of my
>> professional field? Does not make sense. Jim is doing what he likes to
>> do on his personal time. And if that includes "beeping", then that's
>> just fine and dandy.
>>
>> Why your obsession with what Jim does in his spare time?
>
>Simple, Mike - it fills out the circle. Len is obsessed with what I do
>for a living, and Vipul is obsessed with what I do in my spare time.

Poor baby. Mr. N2EY seems obsessed only with himself...thinking
he is so important and wonderful that he imagines others are
"obsessed" with his actions! :-)

That's sort of like the "moral superior" in here, another in the Gang
of Four.

2064. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 01:15:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407211514.06237.00000059@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 64304

In article <c2356669.0304070857.1ccaa986@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030406234143.25340.00000089@mb-fe.aol.com>...
>> In article <20030406122618.00629.00000025@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>> >--
>> >
>> >Here's two simple questions for you, Len, N0IMD, and anybody else who
>wants
>> >to answer it:
>> >
>> >Currently there are more than 250,000 US amateur radio licensees shown in
>the
>> >database as "Technician". Have any of them passed code tests? Do any of
>them
>> >have HF amateur privileges?
>>
>> Here's a simple request for you:
>
>Just answer the questions, Len. They're not a trap. Just simple,
>direct questions about FCC rules and the database.

Fulfill my request and I will give you the answer.

>> Fund a personal DSL line or send me a CD-ROM with the full FCC
>> amateur radio database on it and I might write a search program
>> and totalization for any field of data...then present the totals in here
>> free of charge.
>
>Why on earth should I do any of that? You won't even answer the two
>simple questions posed above.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. In order to "answer" your pre-biased "questions,"
the request must be honored.

You've gotten into a habit of asking "do-you-still-beat-your-wife"
questions. Bad form, OM.

>Let's see - you want ME to present the FCC database to you, on my own
>time and expense. When said database is provided, you might - just
>might - put together some software and present your results. Or you
>might not. The software, presuming it is actually written, might
>function correctly, or it might not. The results might be correct, or

>they might not.

Mr. N2EY won't honor a damn thing anyone does that puts the
least negative aspect to morse code. Everyone in here knows
that. Every single comment anyone else makes about morse
code that isn't something positive is called "faulty," "a mistake,"
"in error" or similar.

>And we're supposed to trust YOU on all of this. Right.

Why not? Arthur B. Andersen Company did ARRL's federal
income tax. :-)

>> I'm NOT going to limit searches to some pre-biased conclusion
>> reaching. I'm NOT going to bias anything.
>
>Uh huh. Sure. We're supposed to just take your word on that, right?
>We're all supposed to ASSUME you're going to be completely impartial,
>fair, and error-free, even though you don't admit errors pointed out
>by those who don't agree with you.

I won't admit to "errors" that are not errors.

Why do you pre-bias questions in favor of morse code?

Are you the ARRL?

Why is everyone supposed to trust you?

>Why should we trust you, Len, given your long record of behavior here?

Poor baby. Mr. N2EY thinks this newsgroup is for the promotion
of morse code...any deviation from that is "bad behavior?"

Just honor the request I made and I might answer your question.

If you don't honor it then you are considered dishonorable.

>Why should anyone trust you when you won't even answer two simple
>questions?

I don't beat my wife. Ask an unbiased question and you might
get an answer.

>> You can't handle the truth.
>
>Just answer the questions, Len.

Sorry, you won't honor any answers. As far as unbiased debate
is concerned your actions in regard to morse code in here are
considered dishonorable.

>Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor baby - doesn't "the radio-electronics
>professional" have access to a broadband connection?

No.

>;-)

Juvenile "comment."

Try some maturity. It won't hurt. Search ARRL for some maturity,
I'm sure they will claim that they know what is good for you. You
will have to pay shipping charges if ordered from Newington.

>Here's a hint: Start the download just before bedtime and let it run
>while you sleep.

Here's a hint: Supply my request and you might get an answer.

It won't do any good since you are dishonorable in public debate.

Any answer not favoring morse code will be remarked as "faulty,"
"in error," a "mistake" or other pejorative comments.

You are dishonorable in public debate on the subject of morse
code. It is as simple as that.

>> DSL service makes it reasonable.
>
>So sign up. Do you want a welfare handout from me?

Don't need it. Honor my request or be considered dishonorable.

>So go ahead and do it. Fortran is obsolete, btw.

FORTRAN is considered obsolete by "with-it" C++ programmers.
:-)

Nonetheless, there are thousands of FORTRAN programs out
there being used every day worldwide. :-)

I have four FORTRAN-written programs out on the freeware
net distribution for circuit design. They still work fine and
give correct answers.

>> Database file size is not
>> a problem here...I have a 40 GB hard disk with 34 GB free. :-)
>
>Lots of empty space, huh?

Tsk, tsk, tsk, still being antagonistic, aren't you? You keep
wandering off on misdirections all the time. Bad form, OM.

>Just answer the two questions.

"Do you still beat your wife?" :-)

Honor my request or be considered as dishonorable as the other
three in the Gang of Four.

>> The end result in here was:
>>

>> You can't handle the truth.
>
>Nonsense.

You can't handle the truth about morse code. That is evident.

>The charade is that you won't answer them. Why not? Afraid of the
>answers? Afraid of the truth?

Not at all. You won't accept the truth on morse code. You are
afraid.

>> You continue to insist on biased
>> sorting and statistical interpretations to fit your agenda.
>
>More nonsense from Len Anderson. Just no other word for it.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...your questions are still biased.

No other word for it.

>Why not just answer the questions. Or are you too afraid of the
>answers?
>>
>> No problem. Your requests are denied.
>
>As expected. You're afraid of the answers to those two simple, direct
>questions. Can't handle them.

I still don't beat my wife. :-)

>Here are some truths you obviously can't handle:

I've handled them no problem.

You MUST misdirect by using those since the bias you use is
in favor of morse code.

You've biased those additional questions to fit your agenda of
promoting your personal interest in morse code.

You've never admitted that the NO-CODE Technician class
licenses kept the total US ARS license numbers from shrinking.

That truth is out there. You won't acknowledge it.

Ergo, you are dishonorable in debate about morse code.

>Just answer the questions, Len. Don't be afraid. The truth won't hurt
>you.

I've lost interest in this farcical "debate" over morse code.

Mr. N2EY is a PCTA and a member of the Gang of Four.

2065. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 01:15:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407211515.06237.00000061@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 64198

In article <pan.2003.04.07.12.36.22.955447.27440@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 06:51:08 -0400, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>
>>>Or, can one support the troops yet not support the war?
>>
>> In this case, I'd say "no", Dwight. At least not if you openly
>> protest the
>> war.
>
>http://www.ctnow.com/news/local/hc-signs0407.artapr07,0,4996863.story
>
>> Open protest of our government's actions when we are already at war
>> gives
>> aid and comfort to the enemy in as much as they can hope that if they
>> "tough it out" they can perhaps prevail.
>>
>> The longer they resist, the greater the potential for casualties on
>> BOTH
>> sides.
>
>Unless, of course, those open protests cause the US to end the war, in
>which case the number of casualties would be reduced. That's what most
>protesters against the war say they are trying to achieve. I happen to
>believe their assessment of the situation is faulty, but I don't see that
>as an intent on their part to not support the troops.

Be careful, Jon. Don't forget this individual is a veteran of
"seven hostile actions." He might make it 8 if you don't
honor and respect every single word he writes... :-)

2066. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 01:15:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407211516.06237.00000062@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 64197

In article <d22b54c3.0304070121.4cd76396@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>news:<f45722ac.0304061345.7e2a86b6@posting.google.com>...
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0304061023.ef5df7e@posting.google.com>...
>> > averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman) wrote in message
>news:<20030405212529.04143.00000018@mb-fb.aol.com>...
>> > > In article <b6nnrt$215$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
>> > > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>> > >
>> > > >Len Over 21...we all have your number. Stir up the crap. Dont need
>it.
>> > > >And DONT CARE WHAT YOU THINK...I put you on the dumbass list a long
>time
>> > > >ago.
>> > >
>> > > You seem to want to FIGHT. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>> > >
>> > > The Vietnam War ended on January 27, 1973.
>> >
>> > WRONG! Again. 1975. You're a disgrace to the rest of the putzes.
>> >
>> > w3rv
>>
>> It ended in 1973 for the people with "real military experience," i.e.,
>> combatants. It ended in 1975 for the paper pushers.
>
>Tell that to the Hmong and the Special Forces guys who stayed in
>battle mode until after the papers were pushed.

Was Kelly there with first-hand accounts of the "action?"

Was he catapulted over to 'Nam to shoot bears?

Was he on a super-secret mission to extract Marlon Brando
so he could star in a motion picture made by Coppola?

What is Kelly's experience with Special Forces?

Polish.

2067. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 01:15:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407211517.06237.00000063@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 64302

In article <BAB6B399.15B93%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Bill Sohl" wrote:
>>
>> Short sighted? Why? Are you following the realities
>> of what the freed Iraqi's are saying when the yoke of
>> their oppresion is lifted and the fear of reprisal
>> is gone?
>
> Don't take what they say too seriously, Bill. What would you say when
>talking to reporters with the armed soldiers from the military that just
>killed, and is killing, many thousands of your countrymen?

Is that a "rhetorical" question?

> Everyone shouting about Saddam seems to forget that we're also killing
>many thousands of their men and women who joined their military simply to
>serve their country.

The primary mission of the US military is "to close with, and
destroy the enemy."

>Most know no more about WMD than our soldiers did
>during the Manhattan Project of the early 40's.

This time frame isn't the "early 1940s." It is 60 years later.

>In fact, I'm sure most don't
>even understand our reasons for invading their country - many Americans are
>not even certain of that (and even fewer around the world are).

Pacifists want to sit back and do nothing. That is "safe."
They feel secure doing nothing. By doing nothing they
will not be responsible for any nasty action.

Now why don't you tell us all about the 1940s and the super
secret Manhattan Project? You had direct exposure to that,
didn't you? I was alive then and in grade school. I can't
remember any teachers mentioning the Manhattan Project
in grade school. We did find out more after 1945. Quite a
bit, in fact.

2068. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 01:15:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030407211545.00629.00000032@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 64305

In article <pan.2003.04.07.16.36.34.559944.30182@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
>Date: Mon, 07 Apr 2003 12:36:36 -0400
>
>On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 12:20:01 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E90553A.8080806@adelphia.net>...
>>> Why your obsession with what Jim does in his spare time?
>>
>> Simple, Mike - it fills out the circle. Len is obsessed with what I do
>> for a living, and Vipul is obsessed with what I do in my spare time.
>
>Ah, but what do you do while you're asleep?

Rest and recover.

> The whole world wonders.
>
Turkey trots to water.

October 25, 1944

73 de Jim, N2EY

2069. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 01:21:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304071721.22779ed7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64306

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.07.12.19.31.119577.27440@arrl.org>...
> On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 06:24:56 -0400, Brian wrote:
> >
> >> The problem is not a lack of patriots, it's that many think only those
> >> with whom they agree are patriots.
> >
> > Such as?
>
> Where have you been? Spend 5 minutes on Google. You'll find plenty of
> examples. (Helpful search terms: Daschle, Dixie Chicks)
>
> >> When, exactly, was being a patriot a bad thing?
> >
> > When it was commonly used as slang for militia.
>
> Commonly? By anyone other than the members of the so-called militias?
>
> Jon

Do you think that the Daschle Chicks are patriots? If so, why?

I was a member of the military and most of us considered ourselves
patriots. Was that bad?

2070. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 01:25:40 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304071725.1f7d3d21@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64307

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030407065725.01663.00000183@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
> >From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
> >Date: 4/7/2003 4:21 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <d22b54c3.0304070121.4cd76396@posting.google.com>
>
> >brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
> >news:<f45722ac.0304061345.7e2a86b6@posting.google.com>...
> >> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
> news:<d22b54c3.0304061023.ef5df7e@posting.google.com>...
> >> > averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman) wrote in message
> news:<20030405212529.04143.00000018@mb-fb.aol.com>...
> >> > > In article <b6nnrt$215$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> >> > > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
> >> > >
> >> > > >Len Over 21...we all have your number. Stir up the crap. Dont need
> it.
> >> > > >And DONT CARE WHAT YOU THINK...I put you on the dumbass list a long
> time
> >> > > >ago.
> >> > >
> >> > > You seem to want to FIGHT. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
> >> > >
> >> > > The Vietnam War ended on January 27, 1973.
> >> >
> >> > WRONG! Again. 1975. You're a disgrace to the rest of the putzes.
> >> >
> >> > w3rv
> >>
> >> It ended in 1973 for the people with "real military experience," i.e.,
> >> combatants. It ended in 1975 for the paper pushers.
> >
> >Tell that to the Hmong and the Special Forces guys who stayed in
> >battle mode until after the papers were pushed.
> >
> >w3rv

You tell it to them. I'm sure it would be relatively safe for you to
finally go there now.

> Whew.....Lennie's an idiot who can't keep track of current events
> including the ending of one of the most bitter wars this nation has ever
> endured, and Brain, allegedly a combat veteran himself, insults and demeans
> those who DID fight in that war, even to the end.

>
> A PAIR of idiots.
>
> Sheesh.
>
> Steve

Seven (7) hostile actions meets noncombatant with real military
experience.

That's like tweedle dee and tweedle dee.

2071. Re: Plop-Plop Fizz Fizz Oh What A Relief It Is...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 01:41:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304071741.4ff50cce@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64308

Hopefully the interruptions of the CW coincide with the psychomotor skills.

"Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b6rrb7$892b0$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...
> No.... it would be FAST MORSE CODE, not FAST CW. CW is a method of
> transmission and morse code is the encoding/decoding stream sent over the
> transmission signal. There is a difference.
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0304041209.73cf33c4@posting.google.com...
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> news:<20030403173218.11311.00000006@mb-fd.aol.com>...
> >
> > > Remember, Real Hams work DX on HF with CW.
> >
> > Ahem, please make that "with FAST CW."

2072. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 02:14:15 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <CA7A7BCA1CB69BDA.4006380074E70FB7.90D81FCEFC018135@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64312

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.04.07.04.59.03.228521.32723@arrl.org...
> On Sun, 06 Apr 2003 22:21:39 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> >
news:94747B2B5A50BF12.DC06DC5B1570EDAC.15CD574D5721AB1B@lp.airnews.net...
> >
> > Exactly. And evil wins when honorable and honest people stand by and do
> > nothing when confronted by evil.
> >
> >> But I'm not so sure that the US gov't. or military needs to start
> >> marching in and changing things here and there.
> >
> > Sadly, you sound like too many of the anti-war groupies who believe that
> > because we do one thing in Iraq, we will or must do the same thing in
> > other places.
>
> But doesn't "evil [win] when honorable and honest people stand by and do
> nothing when confronted by evil"? If you truly belive that, why don't you
> think that the US should eliminate evil everywhere? Is there any reason
> other than practicalities that should check the US from attacking evil
> regimes wherever they exist? And what are the characteristics of a regime
> that make it evil?
>
> Those are the questions that makes a lot of people in the world nervous
> about the Bush administration's preemptive war doctrine.
>
> > The lesson to be learned
> > here is that we are not impotent nor unwilling to take needed action
> > when it warrants such.
>
> Ah, but the "when it warrants" is the problem. There is a fear outside the
> borders of the US that the present US government will pay no attention to
> what anyone outside the US thinks or to how US actions will affect them.
> And based on its behavior to date, that's not an unrealistic concern.
>
> Jon
>

Thanks, Jon. You said well what I would probably have fumbled around with.
Bill, my sentiments follow those expressed in Jon's post; however, please
understand they aren't stated to incite anger. They are stated as true
fears for what will happen next, *if* anything will. Note that I have
emphasized the "if" in order to dispel your fears that I sound so much like

the anti-war groupies. Not that I think that is a bad thing...I am, for the most part, an anti-war person and I don't think that is a bad thing. I think it is a bad thing to overreact on either side of the fence, though.

Kim W5TIT

2073. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 02:18:02 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <61D891F3EDA9D475.F374DD75F5AC4BF8.6756145A52648264@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64313

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAB6A7FC.15B8D%stewart@say.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >
> > Loyal American Crackpot who supports our
> > President, our Troops, and the War in Iraq
>
>
> The overriding question is whether one can be done without the other.
For
> example, can one not support the President yet still support the troops?
Or,
> can one support the troops yet not support the war?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

I absolutely support our troops, their efforts and their dedication.
However, I do not support the President's decision nor am I sure I support
the war or not. So in my opinion yes, one can be done without the other. I
have just seen a tidbit of news (didn't get the story yet--only got the
headline) about some possibility that chemical weapons capability was
discovered today. Thank goodness it was discovered and not used!

Kim W5TIT

2074. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 02:25:43 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.08.02.25.42.510174.8992@arrl.org>
Source record: 64309

On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 21:21:24 -0400, Brian wrote:

> Do you think that the Daschle Chicks are patriots? If so, why?

Do you think they are not? If so, why?

> I was a member of the military and most of us considered ourselves
> patriots. Was that bad?

Not at all. I consider myself a patriot, too. Is that bad?

Jon

2075. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 02:27:04 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <E05A95C55F028CC8.07D76E48702AE153.742F1CDA66ED547E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64311

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAB711F0.15C83%stewart@say.net...
> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" wrote:
> >
> > Dwight Stewart wrote...
> >>
> >> Or, can one support the troops yet not support the war?
> >
> > In this case, I'd say "no", Dwight. At least
> > not if you openly protest the war.
> >
> > Open protest of our government's actions when
> > we are already at war gives aid and comfort to
> > the enemy in as much as they can hope that if
> > they "tough it out" they can perhaps prevail.
>
>
> Well, I wasn't necessarily talking about protests. However, since you
> brought it up, when does one protest a war one feels is wrong? After the
war
> is over and the wrong is done? When does one protest an aspect of the war
> one disagrees with? For example, in the early stages of the Vietnam War
(the
> war often cited by those opposed to protests), most supported the war.
That
> support changed as that long war changed and expanded. Were people
supposed
> to sit back in silence as the situation changed simply because the war had
> already begun?
>
> I truly believe the best way to support our troops is to take our
> responsibilities under the Constitution seriously. That includes openly
> speaking out on the issues surrounding war - yes, even when that speech
> involves protest. I think it is irresponsible to elect people to extreme
> power with no challenge after that on the issues affecting us and our
> troops. Likewise, it is equally irresponsible to allow those people to
send
> our troops off to war to kill and be killed without challenging those
people
> on each and every aspect surrounding that war.
>
> Our soldiers in the foxhole have little freedoms. During wartime, they
> depend on the people back home to keep the government and military in
check.

> Their lives depend on it. I hope Americans never fail those soldiers by
just
> sitting back in silence as the government and military does whatever they
> want with our men and women in the military.
>
> If a healthy Democracy gives our opposition false hope, then so be it -
> they will eventually realize we are actually stronger because of it. That,
> not silence, is what makes America great, and powerful.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>

Ditto to your and Jon's posts!

Kim W5TIT

2076. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 02:37:01 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <677B0FD5B2E506F9.119100F173E05EA4.CB710EDCD698FD92@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64315

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030407204927.11628.00000030@mb-fz.aol.com...
>
> Or consider this thought experiment:
>
> Suppose President Bush announced that he wants to create a new $1/gallon
> federal tax on retail sales of gasoline. Suppose he says the money from
this
> new tax would go to pay for the war, fight terrorism, and reduce America's
> dependence on imported oil. Suppose he further announces that govt.
agencies
> and certain key industries would be exempt from the tax, but everyone else
> would have to pay it. $1 per gallon of gasoline - other fuels exempt.
>

Fer cryin' out loud, will someone shut him up??!!! (LOL) Jim!! Don't say
stuff like that out loud!

>
> Most of all, suppose he said "the country needs this tax as part of the
war
> effort".
>
> How do you think people would react?
>

Well, *IF* the poltiicians would even listen to their people (us), then I'd
tell them, "Not only no, but Hell no."

>
> Would anyone who spoke against this hypothetical new tax be giving aid and
> comfort to the enemy?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Nope, but I'd dang sure be drumming the "go to war" drum...<sarcastic grin>

Kim W5TIT

2077. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 02:47:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b6tdcvsvl1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64310

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.04.07.22.53.17.874763.9024@arrl.org...
> On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 13:57:57 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > news:pan.2003.04.07.04.59.03.228521.32723@arrl.org...
> >
> >> Is there any reason
> >> other than practicalities that should check the US from attacking evil
> >> regimes wherever they exist?
> >
> > Practicality is a very real limiting factor. Costs also are as measured
> > in terms of lives and dollars.
>
> So it's okay to NOT intervene against evil if it's going to cost you.

There's a financial limit to everything.

> But
> is that the ONLY limiting factor?

Financial costs and lives are at least two elements.

> Is it utterly unimportant if some people
> disagree that the attack is justified?

It is to me.

> How about if a LOT of people disagree?

As measured in what terms? 1% of USA population is 2 million
people at least. 1% is minimal in percentage terms...others
would say one million people is a lot.

> How about if everybody except Bill Sohl disagrees with you?

If everyone but me disagrees, I surely doubt my position
or opinion would win out.

> At what point do you begin to say to yourself, "hmmm,
> maybe I should take their views into account"?

I don't have to care at all as to other's opinions since I'm not
the one making the decisions.

> >> And what are the characteristics of a regime that make it evil?
> >
> > Jon, I'm disappointed you even have to ask. I have no doubt as to being
> > able to recognize evil for what it is and where it is.

>
> That's nice. What is the evil-versus-cost balancing point, Bill? How do
> you measure the evil of a regime and balance that against the costs of
> eliminating it to make the decision whether to attempt to destroy the
> regime by force or to destroy it by more peaceful, albeit slower, means?
> Is there a universal equation that answers all such questions? Or do you
> believe that the answers are necessarily going to be determined in part by
> one's experiences, values and culture?

So I guess you want a business case review of all
decisions for you to review?

> > If the judgement is in doubt, then discretion would indicate it isn't
> > bad enough. What is totally pathetic is the fact (IMHO) that some of
> > those that opposed us going to Iraq, opposed our engagement because they
> > didn't believe the SH Iraqi regime was evil enough to warrant
> > intervention.
>
> As did the Bush administration, or so they said. This was presented as a
> case of elimination of WMD, remember. The Administration said they would
> be satisifed if Iraq openly and completely complied with the UNSC demand
> to eliminate its weapons of mass destruction -- no elimination of the SH
> regime required. You're not suggesting that the Administration was lying,
> are you?

Iraq never openly and completely complied.

> As for those who opposed force, maybe they thought the costs were too
> high. One can disagree with that, but it's not a black-and-white issue.

It's pretty much a B & W issue in my book...which is an
opinion I'm entitled to.

> I find it troubling that people on both sides of this question quickly
> retreat to simplistic moralizing. If you're against the war you're in
> favor of an evil regime; if you're for the war you're willing to slaughter
> the innocent for oil. Neither position characterizes the opposing point of
> view at all. Both are attempts to win an argument rather than to reach
> consensus. (Well, duh, Jon, welcome to RRAP!)

There already is a consensus. Over 70% support the war.
I find it ironic that because the minority opinion (i.e. protestors)
say they are protesting because no one is listening. Well "duh"
if the protestors only represent a minority opinion, then it
seems to me the elected officials ARE following public
opinion.

> >> Those are the questions that makes a lot of people in the world nervous
> >> about the Bush administration's preemptive war doctrine.
> >
> > And isn't it wonderful that you live in this country and that you and
> > others can freely express your doubts and opinions.
>

> Yep. Sure is. I wish everyone could. What costs are you willing to bear to
> ensure that the folks in North Korea can, for example? (I'm guessing
> you're not in favor of attacking them.)

I haven't looked at the options. Does every cop ticket every
car s/he sees speeding?

> > Many of those outside the borders of the US sure don't have my respect
> > after their shameful behavior in the UN.
>
> Are you aware that many outside the US feel exactly the same way about the
> US?

So? I learned very early in the political game that
you can't please all the people all the time so you better
not waste time opining over every disident opinion.

> > As to considering other's
> > opinions, I trust that is certainly of major concern in evolving US
> > world policy.
>
> I wish I shared your trust. The present administration seems daily less
> interested in hearing the opinions of anyone.

And you base that statement on what?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2078. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 02:57:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB7B2C9.15CB1%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64314

"K7JEB" wrote:
>
> If you are carrying one, you will have to give
> the Inspection Officer the bird as you drive
> through.

LOL. There you go - the perfect answer to that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2079. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 03:27:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB7B9F7.15CB3%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64316

"Bill Sohl" wrote:
>
> Try a different news channel. Most of the
> Iraqi army were conscripted. Even those that
> may have volunteered probably did so as the
> better alternative to the plight of civilians
> in Iraq.

Does that make it any better, Bill? They joined the military, whether enlisted or drafted. Neither changes their understanding of why their country is being invaded, their knowledge of WMD, or their desire to defend their country. Nor does either change the fact that many are not out cheering our invading Army right now - they're home crying over the loss of a son, daughter, husband, wife, mother or father. War is ugly. The government, military, and press, are working hard to make sure Americans never see that ugliness. If we're going to scream for war, then we should also have the balls to honestly look at the results.

> The fact that any American doesn't understand why
> is simply an indication that whoever that person/
> persons are, they are either dumber than a rock or
> they have NO access to media coverage of the events
> leading to and the execution of the war itself
> over the last 20 days.

Or perhaps they're smart enough not to so easily be taken in by propaganda - smart enough to know our government and military has not always told the truth about war, with no reason to believe anything has changed today. I've watched the media over the last few weeks, and I've seen more accurate reporting coming out of the military's own public affairs personnel (which have a mandate to portray the military solely in a positive manner).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2080. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 03:36:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9243A1.F66483EF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64317

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>...
>
> > Apparently that doesn't mean anything.

> Most of what you say doesn't mean anything.

...not to a fellow with a reading comprehension problem it wouldn't.
You attempt to divine something from my replies which is not there and
you seem unable to understand what I have written.

In this case, you have no response to my comments at all except for a
final line which you use out of context. We could have discussed it at
Universal Radio on Saturday. I even had all the morse proficiency
charts and diagrams in my my car.

Dave K8MN

2081. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 03:50:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB7BF38.15CB5%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64318

"Jon Bloom" wrote:
>
> (snip) But the plain truth is, it's not in
> the best interests of the services to make
> it possible to receive all of the educational
> benefits you need by serving only one hitch.

Very true. Sadly, the reality often doesn't match what the young men and
women are led to believe when they join (like that is something new).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2082. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 04:27:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB7C805.15CB7%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64319

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> I disagree! Freedom of speech demands that those
> who oppose the war, on whatever grounds, be
> allowed to have their say, as long as they do not
> reveal military secrets, damage property, or
> restrict the rights of others (say, by illegally
> blocking traffic). Being against a government
> policy does not mean someone is against those
> who have to carry out that policy. For example,
> disagreement with the old 55 mph speed limit
> does not mean someone hates police officers.
>
> (snip) Just the opposite, Steve. Open expression
> of political opinion isn't just a right, it's a
> duty. It shows the other side that America lives
> by what it preaches.
>
> One doesn't have to go down the "don't protest
> during wartime" policy very far before the argument
> can be made to suspend national elections during
> wartime. After all, if someone runs against the
> incumbent president, they oppose his policies and
> disagree with his decisions - by definition. And
> "wartime" covers a lot of ground - how long did
> the Cold War last?

Very well said, Jim. It is amazing how many talk about how great America is, but so quickly seek to suspend what makes America great when it is inconvenient. A free and open society makes us stronger. In a oppressive society, people prudently tend to avoid the government and military as much as possible. That extends to scientists, engineers, technology specialists, backyard experimenters, and just plain old folks. Here, many complain instead of not having more involvement in government and the military. Everybody thinks they have a better way of doing things - and some certainly do (we have benefited from it many times). Oppression stifles innovation and free thinking. Once we head down that road, we lose the edge that has made this country great and powerful.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!

-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2083. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 04:42:47 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB7CB87.15CB9%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64320

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> (snip) Pacifists want to sit back and do nothing.
> That is "safe." They feel secure doing nothing. By
> doing nothing they will not be responsible for any
> nasty action.

It is not so simple or extreme - pacifists versus war hawks. Those who oppose the war do so for many reasons. Those who support the war do so for as many reasons. Some will never change their support or opposition to war (the pacifists and war hawks). Most will change support or opposition based on the realities of the situation.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2084. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 04:43:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030408004353.11311.00000117@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 64321

In article <BAB6A7FC.15B8D%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> Loyal American Crackpot who supports our
>> President, our Troops, and the War in Iraq
>
>
> The overriding question is whether one can be done without the other. For
>example, can one not support the President yet still support the troops? Or,
>can one support the troops yet not support the war?
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Dwight:

In this case, our cause is just. We seek to free an imprisoned nation from
the barbarism of a vicious, totalitarian despot who would have threatened
the rest of the free world unchecked had we not finally intervened. No, it
is categorically NOT possible for any loyal American to justify non-support
for this righteous campaign and the Commander-In-Chief who courageously
prosecuted it. To withhold support for the President and this war is to
choose the continuation of the evil of the Saddam Hussein regime. One
cannot say they support our Troops yet deny the President the support
he so richly deserves for having the courage to eliminate this plague from
the face of the earth. These Anti-War protesters are merely mindless
parrots of empty rhetoric which reflects nothing more than their own
intellectual laziness and physical cowardice.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2085. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 04:43:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030408004353.11311.00000118@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 64322

In article <BAB6AD3D.15B91%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>
> Considering the present educational benefits, I'm not so sure about that,
>Larry. The present system is a partial matching funds system that requires
>small withholdings over many years of service, or significant chunks of
>monthly paychecks for those leaving after one enlistment, to gather enough
>money for a college education today. Of course, her new found fame will ease
>that burden considerably.
>
>

Dwight:

PFC Lynch's new found fame has resulted in the offer of two complete
college scholarships. Then there will be the books, made-for-TV movie,
if not a full-blown Hollywood box-office feature, celebrity endorsements,
the list is endless. She is now a millionaire -- many times over. Her
name is known in every household in America and most of those in
the rest of the Western World. Of course, the men who rescued her
will continue to get their pay and benefits until they are either forced
to separate from the Army, or, if they're lucky, retire. And the rest
of the POW's and all those killed and injured will simply fade into the
background of America's memory, except for their own families and
friends. But Jessica will remember them -- and after all the glory soon
to be lavished on her fades, she will always know that the sacrifices
they made for her will live on in a place of highest honor. PFC Lynch
is a true, legitimate American Hero deserving of everything she receives.
It will also be her mission to make sure that the others are not forgotten.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2086. Re: Remote Weather Station Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 05:57:14 UTC
From: w.f.alexander@attbi.com
Message-ID: <4ae5eb22.0304072157.2e385361@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64323

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030407064614.01663.00000181@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Remote Weather Station Licensing
> >Date: 4/6/2003 11:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>
> Just FYI, Bill, but repeaters operate under the callsign of thier
> trustee...not a seperate license. That was once true, but not any longer.
>
> As long as your station is operating on frequencies authorized for
> auxiliary or remote base (222mHz and above) and identifies as it shoud (once
> every 10 minutes) and does not otherwise cause harmful interference to other
> stations, I doubt that you'd be in any violation of Part 97.

This sounds promising. I suppose I should print out the Part 97 rules
and just read them. The ARRL operator's manual didn't mention these
options.

> There's so little activity at 902mHz as far as Amateur Radio goes, that I
> still think that if yuo observe the basic rules-of-the-road, you'd not be in
> any violation.
>
> More FYI, but under current bandplanning for the 33cm band, 904 to 906Mhz
> and 915 to 918MHz is reserved for "data" modes...certainly your TAPR-based
> telemetry would meet this criteria.

Understood. I also need to see if there's any geolocation beacons
nearby (I think there's some in the 915 MHz band). Does anyone
actually use the geolocation allocations? They seem to be sprinkled
all over, but I've never actually heard of a service that uses them.

> And last but not least...you might consider an e-mail to Riley
> Hollingsworth, the FCC's "enforcement" guru, and ask him the same question
> directly.
>
> Please share your findings...I hang glide and would like to put a remote
> station at the launch site which is a considerable (read that as too far for
> Part 15!) distance from my home.

:) I'm a paraglider pilot and this is exactly why I want the wind
data. I'm going to hook it into a homebrew ultrasonic anemometer, so
I'll be able to measure gusts very accurately. My main problem is
getting permission from the city to plant this thing off on
unincorporated land. So many regulations!

Thanks for the tips...

- Bill KG6PNN

2087. Re: Remote Weather Station Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 06:19:15 UTC
From: w.f.alexander@attbi.com
Message-ID: <4ae5eb22.0304072219.3c217043@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64324
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dennis -

Thanks for the info. I wasn't aware of the hobbyist clauses in the type acceptance for Part 15. That makes it far more tempting. I especially like your advice to have it comply with both parts 97 and 15.

I'll be digging into the CFR 47-97, starting with 97.221, but my experience with other Parts is that often the meeting minutes are required in order to understand the intent of the regulations. Do you have any advice on where to go for pre-fabricated interpretations of the regs?

- Bill

dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) wrote in message news:<b6sn4d$2rp8$1@heap.juniper.net>...
> Fritz Wuehler <fritz@rodent.frell.eu.org> wrote:
> >What I want: an autonomous weather station that broadcasts wind data at
> >least every three minutes. Just to give you an idea of how much data
> >I'm talking about, a few 1200 baud APRS (e.g. with the TAPR APRS PIC-E
> >system) packets would be plenty - it's not much data.
>
> I think you are describing an "automatically controlled digital
> station". This is covered by 97.221. You are free to do this
> at VHF and higher frequencies, as well as in selected portions of
> the HF bands.
>
> >My concerns: this is not a backyard affair attached to my personal
> >station - it would be a standalone broadcast unit (or perhaps an
> >autoresponder?). I don't think my personal callsign is legal for use
> >here. It seems like a lot of people do what I'm talking about via APRS,
> >but I'm not so sure about the autonomous station issue. Repeaters get
> >their own licenses - what about weather stations?
>
> Your personal callsign is fine. Callsigns no longer identify the
> locations of stations or anything like that, but rather just tell
> the FCC who to talk to if the station screws up. I suspect an arrangement
> where you polled the data out of the station via an autoresponder
> might be slightly better than broadcasting, all other things being equal.
> You are responsible for having a way to shut down the station in a hurry
> if it bothers someone, and having the station stay silent until polled
> is an effective way to do that under normal circumstances.
>

> >I've thought about going to Part 18 ISM rules instead with a 902 MHz
> >line-of-sight link, but that's not a clear regulatory option, either.
> >Neither is Part 15 (I don't want to have to certify compliance). I
> >think it really is a HAM-related activity, but I don't understand the
> >operations portion.
>
> Part 18 really isn't applicable, but Part 15 would probably work okay
> if its constraints were compatible with your applicaton. Section 15.23
> says:
>
> 15.23 Home-built devices.
>
> (a) Equipment authorization is not required for devices that are not
> marketed, are not constructed from a kit, and are built in quantities of
> five or less for personal use.
>
> (b) It is recognized that the individual builder of home-built
> equipment may not possess the means to perform the measurements for
> determining compliance with the regulations. In this case, the builder
> is expected to employ good engineering practices to meet the specified
> technical standards to the greatest extent practicable. The provisions
> of Sec. 15.5 apply to this equipment.
>
> If you assembling the equipment yourself it need not be FCC-authorized,
> you just need to do your best to build the equipment in a way which
> complies with the technical constraints of some section in Part 15 (just
> the way you'll need to build it to conform to Part 97 if you operate under
> amateur regulations instead).
>
> Since some of the best Part 15 frequencies overlap amateur bands, however,
> and since the modes available under Part 15 are usually also legal under
> Part 97, it would probably still be appropriate to identify with your
> callsign regardless given that it might help someone find you if the
> station screws up. If the equipment technically complies with the
> requirements of both Parts, the somewhat academic discussion of which
> Part it was actually operating under can probably be left for the very
> unlikely event that you need to talk to the FCC about it.
>
> Dennis Ferguson

2088. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 10:29:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408062954.23756.00000072@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 64328

In article <pan.2003.04.07.16.34.56.685007.30182@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
>Date: Mon, 07 Apr 2003 12:34:56 -0400
>
>On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 12:15:21 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>>
>> Understood. So the answer to my question:
>>
>> 'Did Papa Bush really "fail"?'
>>
>> is a resounding "NO! - all of the GW1 coalition's goals were
>> accomplished."
>
>One can criticize Bush-I for not forseeing all of the consequences of the
>decision to stop the war.

Sure. One can also go back and criticize his predecessors for not seeing the
consequences of allowing SH to have such a big army.....

>Of course, once you start damning people for not
>being clairvoyant the list of the damned gets a bit lengthy.

True, true. However, consider that while the race is not always to the swift,
it's that's a pretty good way to bet. A dictator who built his power base on
murderous repression probably isn't going to be overthrown easily.

If there's any real MMQBing to be done, it should be against UNSCOM for putting
up with the regime's shenanigans for too long. Suppose that the very first time
the inspectors were denied access to a site, they simply packed up their bags
and left. And as soon as they were gone, air satrikes flattenened the denied
site.
>
>> Maybe - or maybe not. Point is, coalition troops are in Bagdad now, so
>> coulda/woulda/shoulda will soon become reality. What would be really
>> neat is if much of the occupation/rebuilding could be turned over to the
>> UN.
>
>I agree, as long as there is a specific plan for evolving control of the
>country to the Iraqis themselves as soon as the country can be
>de-Baath'ed.

What do you think of my gasoline surtax hypothesis?
>

>> Thanks for the quotes, Jon.
>
>My pleasure.
>
>> One thing none of the above folks really foresaw was that the presence
>> of "infidel" foreign troops in Saudi Arabia would be a prime recruitment
>> tool and motivator for anti-US terrorism. Even though the troops are
>> there at the express request of the Saudi royal family, to keep SH under
>> control.
>
>OBL and crowd aren't much happier with the Saudis than they are with the
>US.

Of course not - because they invited the "infidel" troops.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2089. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 10:29:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408062955.23756.00000073@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 64327

In article <BAB7C805.15CB7%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
>Date: Tue, 08 Apr 2003 00:27:50 -0400
>
>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> I disagree! Freedom of speech demands that those
>> who oppose the war, on whatever grounds, be
>> allowed to have their say, as long as they do not
>> reveal military secrets, damage property, or
>> restrict the rights of others (say, by illegally
>> blocking traffic). Being against a government
>> policy does not mean someone is against those
>> who have to carry out that policy. For example,
>> disagreement with the old 55 mph speed limit
>> does not mean someone hates police officers.
>>
>> (snip) Just the opposite, Steve. Open expression
>> of political opinion isn't just a right, it's a
>> duty. It shows the other side that America lives
>> by what it preaches.
>>
>> One doesn't have to go down the "don't protest
>> during wartime" policy very far before the argument
>> can be made to suspend national elections during
>> wartime. After all, if someone runs against the
>> incumbent president, they oppose his policies and
>> disagree with his decisions - by definition. And
>> "wartime" covers a lot of ground - how long did
>> the Cold War last?
>
>
> Very well said, Jim.

Thanks.

What do you think would happen with my thought experiment about a gasoline
surtax?

>It is amazing how many talk about how great America
>is, but so quickly seek to suspend what makes America great when it is
>inconvenient.

Not just incovenient, but sometimes downright ugly to look at.

> A free and open society makes us stronger.

Exactly!

>In a oppressive
>society, people prudently tend to avoid the government and military as much
>as possible.

Or they just up and leave.

>That extends to scientists, engineers, technology specialists,
>backyard experimenters, and just plain old folks. Here, many complain
>instead of not having more involvement in government and the military.
>Everybody thinks they have a better way of doing things - and some certainly
>do (we have benefited from it many times). Oppression stifles innovation and
>free thinking. Once we head down that road, we lose the edge that has made
>this country great and powerful.
>
'zactly. Which is why things like nonviolent anti-war protests are actually good for the USA in the long term, even if they don't stop the war in the short term. If nothing else, they are a real-life demonstration that free expression does exist in the USA.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2090. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 10:29:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408062956.23756.00000074@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 64325

In article <677B0FD5B2E506F9.119100F173E05EA4.CB710EDCD698FD92@lp.airnews.net>,
"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>Date: Mon, 7 Apr 2003 21:37:01 -0500
>
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030407204927.11628.00000030@mb-fz.aol.com...
>>
>> Or consider this thought experiment:
>>
>> Suppose President Bush announced that he wants to create a new $1/gallon
>> federal tax on retail sales of gasoline. Suppose he says the money from
>> this
>> new tax would go to pay for the war, fight terrorism, and reduce America's
>> dependence on imported oil. Suppose he further announces that govt.
>> agencies
>> and certain key industries would be exempt from the tax, but everyone else
>> would have to pay it. $1 per gallon of gasoline - other fuels exempt.
>>
>
>Fer cryin' out loud, will someone shut him up??!!! (LOL) Jim!! Don't say
>stuff like that out loud!

BWAAHAAHAAA!

Let's see - suppose the war winds up costing $100 billion ($100,000,000,000)
this year. Suppose the average retail gasoline user buys 500 gallons of
gasoline under the new tax. And suppose there are 200 million (200,000,000)
average retail gasoline users. End result is $100 billion in new tax revenue.

Hmm..only $100 billion....doesn't leave anything for fighting terrorism or
reducing dependency on imported oil....better make it $2/gallon.
>

>> Most of all, suppose he said "the country needs this tax as part of the
>> war effort".
>>
>> How do you think people would react?
>
>Well, *IF* the poltiicians would even listen to their people (us), then I'd
>tell them, "Not only no, but Hell no."

But Kim! It's the President (hypothetically) saying what we (hypothetically)
NEED! Aren't you a loyal American? How can you or anyone question him? He has

all the information, and in his judgement this is a hypothetical sacrifice we need to make.

(sardonic mode = OFF)

>> Would anyone who spoke against this hypothetical new tax be giving aid and
>> comfort to the enemy?
>>
>Nope, but I'd dang sure be drumming the "go to war" drum...<sarcastic grin>
>
I think you mean "stop the war" drum, don't you?

I think you've got the general public's reaction down perfectly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2091. Re: Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 10:29:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408062957.23756.00000075@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 64326

In article <3E8B8A7D.F848F6FB@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>You have to admit that this one would be difficult to forget.

I've been trying to forget it for five years...

>Masa's likely forgetten the whole thing by now and is likely sitting
>quietly at home--probabry sipping some Ripton Tea.

Ever think it was all an act? Like Hashafisti Scratchi?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2092. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 10:34:40 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.08.10.34.38.819114.5721@arrl.org>
Source record: 64329

On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 22:47:33 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:pan.2003.04.07.22.53.17.874763.9024@arrl.org...
>
>> Is it utterly unimportant if some people disagree that the attack is
>> justified?
>
> It is to me.

Okay, you know what you think and don't give a damn what anyone else
thinks. Understood.

>> I wish I shared your trust. The present administration seems daily less
>> interested in hearing the opinions of anyone.
>
> And you base that statement on what?

The fact that the Administration has, from the day it entered office,
expressed disdain for those -- domestically and internationally -- who
disagree with it. It's one thing to disagree about things, it's another to
belittle and demean those with whom you disagree. Why is it that countries
that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side of
the fence from us now? In significant part, it's because we've told them
in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.

Jon

2093. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 12:48:36 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.08.12.48.36.85734.22061@arrl.org>
Source record: 64330

On Tue, 08 Apr 2003 06:29:54 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>
> True, true. However, consider that while the race is not always to the
> swift, it's that's a pretty good way to bet. A dictator who built his
> power base on murderous repression probably isn't going to be overthrown
> easily.

One good aphorism deserves another: God is on the side of the heaviest battalions. Once the "heaviest battalions" were stopped, the possible outcomes changed dramatically.

> If there's any real MMQBing to be done, it should be against UNSCOM for
> putting up with the regime's shenanigans for too long. Suppose that the
> very first time the inspectors were denied access to a site, they simply
> packed up their bags and left. And as soon as they were gone, air
> satrikes flattenened the denied site.

To be fair, UNSCOM serves at the pleasure of the UNSC. Except for reasons of safety of personnel, UNSCOM's people couldn't just pick up and leave without direction from the SC. But I agree with your basic point. The principal failures were between 1991 and 1998.

> What do you think of my gasoline surtax hypothesis?

I'm having trouble picturing the President actually agreeing to tax anything to pay for this war. But if he did, yes, I think those who spoke out against it would be labelled unpatriotic by the Limbaugh-O'Reillyites and their mindless followers.

Jon

2094. Re: Lennie Just Can't Stand Being Ignored!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 13:51:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408095121.14478.00000197@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64331

>Subject: Re: Lennie Just Can't Stand Being Ignored!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/7/2003 8:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030407211509.06237.00000056@mb-ca.aol.com>

>Tsk, tsk, tsk. I do have a radio license.

You have a radio OPERATOR license. You do not hold a station license.
Your GROL specifically PROHIBITS you from transmitting a radio signal without
the benefit of a station license.

In otherwords...You're QRT.

>Robeson cannot admit ignorance of the wider field of radio beyond
> amateur radio.

My knowledge of the "wider field" is already wider than what you've
demonstrated herein. This thread included.

>> Where did I say there were, Your Scumminess? There is still maritime
>>Morse Code traffic in the MF bands. There is still maritime Morse Code
>>traffic throughout HF. It's there. It's real. Get over it.
>
> The maritime morse code use is almost extinct now. A listen
> over the maritime bands on LF to HF here in Southern California
> turns up very few...but much voice and data.

Thank-you for acknowledging that I was correct, and that Morse Code IS
still used in the maritime services.

>Pilots do NOT use it...unless they are morse-fanatic amateurs.

Oh? You base this upon WHAT experience as an Aviator, Your Winglessness?

>Pilots do NOT HAVE TO USE IT. It's that simple.

I never said they HAD to use it, Your Flailingness. I said it's there and
CAN be used.

>If they know
> their position within about 200 NM, they simply pull out their
> sectionals, consult the VOR frequencies on the map, dial it up
> and they will have the VOR. A quick eyeball of the sectional
> will let them know approximately where they are...triangulation
> of at least one other station via the OBS and they will be quite
> close.

And if they don't audibly verify that the VOR they are tracking is the one
they want, they jsut screwed up...potentially fatally.

Again, you are asked to please provide your background and experience in
aeronautical navigation. So far you have shown you would be a negligent pilot.
Perhaps that's why you are not in teh FAA database?

>NO morse code identification is used with ATC Transponders....(SNIP)

Nice try to divest yourself of an awkward position of futile stupidity,
but you've already dug yourself in, Your Putziness. A transponder is NOT a
navigational device. Stay focused.

>Watch your sentence structure.

Watch your own, Your Lyingness.

>TACAN ground stations are NOT morse code
> IDed and, like DME, operate solely in low L-band

Again, your ignorance shows.

>Watch your English sentence structure or you will be admonished
> for not being able to use English as a native language.

Again, Your Lyingness, watch your own.

>Robeson displays such an abysmal lack of modern (in the last 48
> years) civil aircraft radionavigation that a mini-tutorial on basic
> radionav had to be given by myself.

So far, you've only been half right. Your lack of situational awareness on
current aeronautical navigation would get you busted on the check ride.

You are incompetent, Leonard H...Just accept it. I have.

>>I never said "pilots use morse to navigate by". I said pilot's use
>Morse
>>Code to identify the beacons that they DO navigate by.
>
> Very, very few do. Pilots DO NOT HAVE TO LISTEN FOR ID in
> US general aviation flying-navigating.

Again, your ignorance and incompetence would get you busted on the
Private Pilot check ride.

>The "within 200 NM" unofficial rule is taught in ground schools
> and known (almost, but not quite, instinctively) to experienced
> general aviation pilots who've used sectionals and VORs for
> air navigation.

"Unoffical rule"...?!?! "...taught in ground schools"...?!?!

BBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !

Riiiiiiiiiight!

>> WHERE in the FAA database is YOUR name? Mine's there. Mine's also in
>>the FCC database. I see you are absent from both.
>
> No aviation license is required to learn, experience, and know air
> radionavigation...not even for celestial navigation.

You're right...No license is required to learn. However PRACTICAL
EXPERIENCE is required to know the difference between theory and application.

You know neither!

>I've had several years of experience in the design of civil and
> military avionics, especially so in regards to aircraft radio-
> navigation systems, methods, techniques, and standards.

But no experience using them. You are incompetent to navigate an aircraft
by any means othr than a road map.

>Does the acronym ARINC mean anything to Robeson?

Does it to Anderson?

(A)nother
(R)ant
(I)ndicating
(N)o
(C)ompetence

>Mid-VHF propagation characteristics were known...(SNIP)

Yes Lennie. And that's why student pilots are taught, to this day, to
verify the VOR they are tracking.

>Robeson is invited to peruse any group of sectionals or en-
> route charts to show the slightest possibility of his alleged
> "skip errors."

Sectional charts can be used to predict propagational anomalies..?!?!

>TACAN was developed...(SNIP)

Irrelevent historical tidbit, but not germane. Obfuscation.

>DME (Distance Measuring Equipment) uses the same essentials...(SNIP)

Irrelevent historical tidbit, but STILL not germane. Obfuscation.

>VOR is really an elegant system for a simple airborne receiver
> based on vacuum tubes (it was developed in the early 1950s).

Yes, Lennie...we know...just one more 50's-era historical tidbit taht is
the backbone of your rants.

>Robeson can look at any group of sectionals or en-route charts
> and note the ground station frequencies of VORs. He can then
> (with all those alleged years of navigation experience) note the
> range separation...far enough that "skip" (rare at VHF) will not

> be a factor in any "errors."

And once again Lennie the Lame demonstrates HIS incompetence and lack of PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE with VHF propagation. Almost any issue of CQ or QST's "VHF" related columns will provide tons of historical events of VHF propagation events that conducted signals of very low power over distances never anticipated by the stations involved.

These events are fact. They happened. Too bad for Lennie.

>If Robeson finds some anamoly, his DUTY to country and "fellow
> pilots" should be to contact the FAA immediately and report that
> badness.

Why, Lennie? The errors are already known.

>>An error avoided by ID'ing the right VOR...A point
>>made to me by both my CFI and the Examiner I rode with. Neither were
>>Amateurs,
>>but made certain I knew to cross check the VOR ID by listening to it and
>>making sure I had the right beacon.
>
> You were obviously noted to be an LPN at the time, therefore
> you were brought up to speed on basic basics...if we can
> believe you. [few of us can]

I was an LPN in 1974? I don't think so.

>I have much more technical knowledge on civil air avionics than
> Robeson.

Inside the box? No doubt. How to USE the box? Never. You've already demonstrated significant lack of skill in the alst two posts. I'd let you tweak my NAVCOM's, Lennie, but I'd rap your knuckles with a ruler if you tried to play with them in the air.

>The very first VOR receivers were manually-tuned. This gave way...(SNIP)

More historical tidbits to cover his error about present day VOR receivers being crystal controlled. "OBFUSCATION"

>FAA has many VORs arranged so that a local tower or TRACON
> can use the "mid-band" audio...(SNIP)

We've already discussed that, Lennie. I see you've been reading the FAA's Pilot handbook to bring you up to speed. Still no practical experience, however, and STILL not in the FAA database as a licensed Aviator....Not do I see you as an authorized repairman.

More of what you are NOT, and less of what you are, I see.

>I've not used TACAN in a civil aviation craft, only the VOR, DME,
> Localizer, Glideslope, Marker Beacon, and ATC Transponder.
> I've used TACAN on military aircraft along with the expanded
> (Mode 4) Transponder fully set for the IFF code of the day.

Oh..?!?! In what capacity did YOU use the NAVAIDS of an aircraft in
flight, Lennie?

>Get some mental help, Robeson. You need it badly

I am not the one who think's he's Sky King, Lennie. Nice try, but you are
still lacking in yet another field of expertise for which you have no PRACTICAL
EXPERIENCE. That lack is glaring.

>You are outclassed and outgunned on technical knowledge of
> the civil aircraft radionavigation systems you brag about as an
> alleged "expert" on them. Sad case.

As I said...Inside the box? Perhaps. USING the box? Never. You'd never
pass the PPASEL checkride, Lennie.

And I STILL don't see your name in the FAA database.

Steve

2095. Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 13:57:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408095702.14478.00000198@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64332

>Subject: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 4/7/2003 1:17 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <b6sfjfptl1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>

>We should all be encouraging this and commenting that manufacturers
>SHOULD be required to design and market products that have a
>specified resistance to interference (IMHO).

This isn't too surprising, Bill. NTIA already requires such as a result
of band sharing and increasingly narrow bandwidths for audio channels. Civil
Air Patrol has lost the use of dozens of otherwise frequency-stable/compliant
Amateur transceivers for it's use becasue the RECEIVERS were not IMD compliant.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2096. Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 14:00:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408100046.14478.00000199@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64333

>Subject: Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>Date: 4/7/2003 3:47 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304072044210.542@kd6lvw.ampr.org>

>I think that the first issue here is that we should stop that spammer...(SNIP)

Here we go again.

>Only when he does things correctly will it be worth anyone's time to listen.

Too late. Hundreds-of-thousands of folks around the world are already
"listening". If it bothers you that much, use your killfile to dump it.

>However, you should note on how many things he has reported on incorrectly in
>the past as well. Based on my knowledge of his stories, he's no better than
>the National Enquirer as compared against the New York Times.

Uh...yeeeeah...Right.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2097. Re: Remote Weather Station Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 14:07:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408100722.14478.00000200@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64334

>Subject: Re: Remote Weather Station Licensing
>From: w.f.alexander@attbi.com (Bill Alexander)
>Date: 4/8/2003 12:57 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <4ae5eb22.0304072157.2e385361@posting.google.com>

>:) I'm a paraglider pilot and this is exactly why I want the wind
>data.

If you ever find yourself in the eastern Tennessee or northern Georgia area, drop me an e mail. I don't PG, but would be glad to give you the grand tour of some sites. I used to live only a few miles from Henson's Gap launch, and it's phenomenal!

Blue Skies!

Steve

2098. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 14:18:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408101859.14478.00000201@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64335

>Subject: Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 4/7/2003 1:31 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <b6sgd1$k3t$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
>
>
>"Hambone the Magnificent" <921d2will@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:3e91c18e@snipnews.snip.net...
>>
>> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>> news:20030405013919.05767.00000131@mb-fz.aol.com...
>>
>> > A pregnant woman...?!?!?!
>> > Can there be anything more loathesome than how they used
>> > her like that? I guess those idiots don't realize that doing stuff
>> > like that only raises the hair on an American's neck more and
>> > really drives them to fight harder.
>>
>> We may find it loathesome with our Western morals and
>> values Steve, but the mere fact that a pregnant woman (!!)
>> would sacrifice herself as a "human guided bomb" for her
>> religion (Islam) *speaks volumes* of the will of belief and
>> extremes these people are willing to go thru and do!
>>
>> They are modern Kamakazie
>
>The reality, however, is that Saddam was/is a secular person
>rather than a religious supporter of any extent.
>Apparently even Bin Laden has no great love for SH
>in terms of any SH's non-commitment to Islam.
>
>Is it loathsome, of course it is. So is human sacrifice...
>or is that too just my narrow minded western upbringing.

The ironic part is that Islam is the only one of the Big Three
(Christianity, Judism and Islam) that actually teaches acceptance of the other
two as fraternal brothers.

I wish I spoke Arabic and understood the culture better to understand how
they warp it to be just the opposite.

Of course Christianity has/had Jerry Falwell, Jim Jones, Jim Bakker, the
Crusades, etc...and I can find nothing in the Bible that preaches the kind of
INtolerance that Christianity has spawned.

Maybe that's why I have about a zilch-point-squat tolerance for ANY organized "religion".

73

Steve, K4YZ

2099. Re: Remote Weather Station Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 14:37:27 UTC
From: w.f.alexander@attbi.com
Message-ID: <4ae5eb22.0304080637.4907973f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64336
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Hi Dennis -

I spent last night surveying Part97, and I have a followup question regarding the relative merits of an "auxiliary station" (AS, cfr47:97.201) vs. an "automatically controlled digital station" (ACDS, cfr47:97.221).

According to 97.201(b,d,e), an AS can be put into service on 1.25 meters and shorter wavelengths, with automatic control and one-way transmissions. However, this mode excludes the 2m band.

In 97.221(b,c-2) we learn that 6 meters or shorter is OK for an ACDS. But paragraph 97.221(a) specifically excludes AS from this category.

Furthermore, I see two possible interpretations due to the use of the word "other" in 97.221(c): "A station may be automatically controlled while transmitting a RTTY or data emission on any other frequency authorized for...".

Interpretation one: Does this imply operation as a two-carrier system with one for command and control and the other for traffic?

Interpretation two: Or is this sub-rule intended to extend the range of an ACDS to wavelengths above 6 meters but not specifically listed in 97.221(b)?

Seems like Interpretation #2's extension of the service to the really low frequencies fits the technical specifications of very low bandwidth and autoresponse found in 97.221(c). This would tend to improve the efficiency of utilization of the more-valueable spectrum down there.

Other than that, the only difference between an AS and an ACDS that I can see is the bands of operation (<=1.25m vs <=6m) and the explicit permission for one-way transmit (97.201(e)) from an AS (but not for an ACDS).

Does anyone have a good read on which interpretation applies to the ACDS rule?

Any other advice on which one (i.e. which of the AS or ACDS rules) is more appropriate for a low-data-rate weather station feed?

Thanks again,

- Bill KG6PNN

dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) wrote in message
news:<b6sn4d$2rp8$1@heap.juniper.net>...
> Fritz Wuehler <fritz@rodent.frell.eu.org> wrote:
> >What I want: an autonomous weather station that broadcasts wind data at
> >least every three minutes. Just to give you an idea of how much data
> >I'm talking about, a few 1200 baud APRS (e.g. with the TAPR APRS PIC-E
> >system) packets would be plenty - it's not much data.
>
> I think you are describing an "automatically controlled digital
> station". This is covered by 97.221. You are free to do this
> at VHF and higher frequencies, as well as in selected portions of
> the HF bands.
>

2100. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 15:33:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030408113357.13624.00000145@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 64337

In article <61D891F3EDA9D475.F374DD75F5AC4BF8.6756145A52648264@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>I absolutely support our troops, their efforts and their dedication.
>However, I do not support the President's decision nor am I sure I support
>the war or not. So in my opinion yes, one can be done without the other. I
>have just seen a tidbit of news (didn't get the story yet--only got the
>headline) about some possibility that chemical weapons capability was
>discovered today. Thank goodness it was discovered and not used!
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Your intellectual vacuity leaves my head swirling in disbelief. You say you
can't support our President or this war, yet you praise our forces for finding
the very thing that Saddam Hussein intended to use to prosecute the lethal
brutality of his terrorist regime. Why don't you do yourself a big favor and
just sit in the corner like a good little girl and play with your dolls, and
not interrupt while the adults are having a mature, cogent discussion of issues
you obviously lack the intellectual development and maturity to understand? I
could say that I'm embarrassed for you, but I've stopped caring about that
years ago.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2101. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 15:52:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030408115200.13624.00000146@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 64338

In article <pan.2003.04.08.10.34.38.819114.5721@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>
>The fact that the Administration has, from the day it entered office,
>expressed disdain for those -- domestically and internationally -- who
>disagree with it.

Naturally, the Clinton Administration had no disdain for conservative
Republicans.

>It's one thing to disagree about things, it's another to
>belittle and demean those with whom you disagree.

Naturally, liberal Democrats don't do this.

>Why is it that countries
>that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side of
>the fence from us now?

It's obviously all President Bush's fault.

>In significant part, it's because we've told them
>in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.

The problem is, in order to give a damn about what anyone thinks, they
have to be saying something that makes sense. Jon, I don't give a
damn about anything you think.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2102. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 16:18:14 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304080818.242ffaa4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64340

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030407211514.06237.00000059@mb-ca.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0304070857.1ccaa986@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030406234143.25340.00000089@mb-fe.aol.com>...
> >> In article <20030406122618.00629.00000025@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (N2EY)
> >> writes:
> >> >--
> >> >
> >> >Here's two simple questions for you, Len, N0IMD, and anybody else who
> wants
> >> >to answer it:
> >> >
> >> >Currently there are more than 250,000 US amateur radio licensees shown in
> the
> >> >database as "Technician". Have any of them passed code tests? Do any of
> them
> >> >have HF amateur privileges?
> >>
> >> Here's a simple request for you:
> >
> >Just answer the questions, Len. They're not a trap. Just simple,
> >direct questions about FCC rules and the database.
>
> Fulfill my request and I will give you the answer.

Just answer the questions, Len. They're not a trap. Just simple,
direct questions about FCC rules and the database.

> >> Fund a personal DSL line or send me a CD-ROM with the full FCC
> >> amateur radio database on it and I might write a search program
> >> and totalization for any field of data...then present the totals in here
> >> free of charge.
> >
> >Why on earth should I do any of that? You won't even answer the two
> >simple questions posed above.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Doesn't explain why I should do what you request.

> In order to "answer" your pre-biased "questions,"

How are the questions "prebiased"?

> the request must be honored.

Why?

> >Let's see - you want ME to present the FCC database to you, on my own
> >time and expense. When said database is provided, you might - just
> >might - put together some software and present your results. Or you
> >might not. The software, presuming it is actually written, might
> >function correctly, or it might not. The results might be correct, or
> >they might not.
>
> >And we're supposed to trust YOU on all of this. Right.
>
> Why not?

Because you're not trustworthy. Your behavior here has demonstrated
that fact over and over again.

> >> I'm NOT going to limit searches to some pre-biased conclusion
> >> reaching. I'm NOT going to bias anything.
> >
> >Uh huh. Sure. We're supposed to just take your word on that, right?
> >We're all supposed to ASSUME you're going to be completely impartial,
> >fair, and error-free, even though you don't admit errors pointed out
> >by those who don't agree with you.
>
> I won't admit to "errors" that are not errors.

Nor will you admit to errors that *are* errors, if the person pointing
out the errors disagrees with you.
>
> Why do you pre-bias questions in favor of morse code?

Where do you see any bias in these questions:

Currently there are more than 250,000 US amateur radio licensees shown
in
the database as "Technician". Have any of them passed code tests? Do
any of
them have HF amateur privileges?

Where's the alleged 'bias'? Explain how those questions are biased.
>
> Are you the ARRL?

Yep - about 1/175,000 of the ARRL.

> Just honor the request I made and I might answer your question.

Hmm - previously you wrote:

"Fulfill my request and I will give you the answer."

"Will" just became "might".
>
> If you don't honor it then you are considered dishonorable.

By whom?
>
> >Why should anyone trust you when you won't even answer two simple
> >questions?
>
> I don't beat my wife.

Doesn't answer the questions.

> Ask an unbiased question and you might get an answer.

Where's the bias?
>
> >Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor baby - doesn't "the radio-electronics
> >professional" have access to a broadband connection?
>
> No.

You mean after all those years as a PROFESSIONAL, and all your
experience, connections and acquaintances in the "radio-electronics"
field, you have to come hat-in-hand like Oliver Twist, to someone like
me for a simple download? "Please, sir, I need some data.."

Answer the questions I asked and I might supply your request.
>
> >Here's a hint: Start the download just before bedtime and let it run
> >while you sleep.
>
> Here's a hint: Supply my request and you might get an answer.

Why should I do what you ask?

> >> DSL service makes it reasonable.
> >
> >So sign up. Do you want a welfare handout from me?
>
> Don't need it.

Then don't ask me. Do your own work.

> >The charade is that you won't answer them. Why not? Afraid of the
> >answers? Afraid of the truth?
>
> Not at all.

Then why not answer them?

> You won't accept the truth on morse code. You are
> afraid.

Not me.
>
> >> You continue to insist on biased
> >> sorting and statistical interpretations to fit your agenda.
> >
> >More nonsense from Len Anderson. Just no other word for it.

Actually, there IS another word.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...your questions are still biased.
>
> No other word for it.

Where's the bias?
>
> >Why not just answer the questions. Or are you too afraid of the
> >answers?
> >>
> >> No problem. Your requests are denied.
> >
> >As expected. You're afraid of the answers to those two simple, direct
> >questions. Can't handle them.

> >Here are some truths you obviously can't handle:
>
> You've never admitted that the NO-CODE Technician class
> licenses kept the total US ARS license numbers from shrinking.

There is no "NO-CODE Technician class" of license in the USA. No US
ham license specifies that code cannot be used by any ham. The FCC
does not issue amateur radio licenses that say "NO-CODE".

You ASSUME that if the code test for the Technician had not been
dropped in early 1991, none of the hams who got Technician class
licenses after the change would have been licensed. Very poor
reasoning. Illogical.

The FACT is that the total growth in US amateur licenses after the
1991 change but before the 2000 restructuring was only slightly more
than the growth in an equal time period previous to the change.
>
> >Just answer the questions, Len. Don't be afraid. The truth won't hurt
> >you.
>
> I've lost interest in this farcical "debate" over morse code.
>
> Mr. N2EY is a PCTA and a member of the Gang of Four.

Ah, the old ad-hominem attack when you run out of arguments. Which
happens frequently here.

There is, however, one thing you never seem to run out of, Len.

2103. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 17:10:54 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.08.17.10.54.523588.24805@arrl.org>
Source record: 64341

On Tue, 08 Apr 2003 11:52:00 -0400, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Jon, I don't give a damn
> about anything you think.

That makes me feel much better! Thanks, Larry!

Jon

2104. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 19:02:29 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3E931CC5.C1B1313E@crosslink.net>
Source record: 64339

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> The ironic part is that Islam is the only one of the Big Three
> (Christianity, Judism and Islam) that actually teaches acceptance of the other
> two as fraternal brothers.
>
> I wish I spoke Arabic and understood the culture better to understand how
> they warp it to be just the opposite. ...

All three worship the God of Abraham and there is much less difference
between Judiasm and Islam than between them and Christianity. Fact is,
other than having a Jew (Jesus) as its figurehead, Christianity has much
more in common with Greek mythology than with the other two. Consider,
if you will, the similarity of Jesus to Hercules: both fathered by God,
both went to heaven, ...

2105. Re: Remote Weather Station Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 19:44:16 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <b6v8qg$ru1$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 64342
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Bill,

Bill Alexander <w.f.alexander@attbi.com> wrote:
>Interpretation two: Or is this sub-rule intended to extend the range
>of an ACDS to wavelengths above 6 meters but not specifically listed
>in 97.221(b)?

I think this is correct. You can put an autoresponder on any
HF frequency, but an automatic station which initiates its own
transmissions needs to keep to the narrow HF bands listed in (b).
VHF and above is always okay.

>Any other advice on which one (i.e. which of the AS or ACDS rules) is
>more appropriate for a low-data-rate weather station feed?

I think the differences between an auxilliary station and an automatically
controlled digital station are these:

- An AS can use any mode, including a voice mode, while an ACDS is limited
to digital modes. Since your application seems to need a digital mode
in any case this distinction doesn't matter to you.

- An AS is specifically allowed to make one-way transmissions of anything,
while an ACDS is limited to one-way transmissions only for the generally
permissible purposes listed in 97.111. Since your goal is to transmit
"telemetry", 97.111 allows this type of one-way transmission and this
distinction doesn't matter to you either.

An ACDS is hence more limited in function than an AS, but has a broader
range of permissible frequencies available. Since your application
seems to meet the limitations of an ACDS you are free to call the
station that if you want to use frequencies where an AS is not permitted.
If you use a frequency where an AS is permitted, however, it doesn't
matter what you call it.

Dennis Ferguson

2106. Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 22:08:50 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304082134240.843@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 64343

On Tue, 8 Apr 2003, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >Subject: Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.
> >From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
> >Date: 4/7/2003 3:47 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304072044210.542@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
>
> >I think that the first issue here is that we should stop that spammer...(SNIP)
>
> Here we go again.

I see you offered nothing to contradict my statement. BP knows that the appropriate place for his "Newsline" post is "rec.radio.info" because that group is a limited-post-access group just for information bulletins that he received permission to post there back in 1996. He also knows that it's not appropriate here, but does it anyway. The charter for "rec.radio.amateur.misc" will permit it to be crossposted there.

> >Only when he does things correctly will it be worth anyone's time to listen.
>
> Too late. Hundreds-of-thousands of folks around the world are already
> "listening". If it bothers you that much, use your killfile to dump it.
>
> >However, you should note on how many things he has reported on incorrectly in
> >the past as well. Based on my knowledge of his stories, he's no better than
> >the National Enquirer as compared against the New York Times.
>
> Uh...yeeeeah...Right.

Fine: You need an example:

About two years ago (and for some time before), BP reported on an incident in the Southern California area regarding a repeater operated on 145.460- MHz and alleged interference with a repeater on the same frequency near Tijuana, BC, Mexico. What he didn't say is:

1) The mexicans were intentionally interfering with the machine in Los Angeles that was causing them problems by placing a signal on the INPUT frequency and using a 1,200 watt amplifier and yagi antenna. So they could get into their own machine, the mexicans used an auxillary input, which was repeated via the transmitter on the input frequency just described as well as the repeater's output frequency. That constitutes "malicious interference" but there was no mention of their actions. BP described the mexicans as the "good guys" when they were not.

2) He further reported that there had been no attempt to coordinate the repeater in Los Angeles. As it turns out, an UNACTED request for coordination

application had been delivered to the appropriate repeater coordination body (TASMA) a few years before. TASMA lied to the FCC when Riley Hollingsworth asked if an application had been filed (in addition to his question of whether or not coordination had been granted). Mysteriously, the application was eventually returned to Scott Swanson, K6PYP (the trustee of the Los Angeles machine) FIVE years later with no action taken. Where was this mentioned in the story reported by BP? [It wasn't.]

3) Don't you have to wonder why BP never asked K6PYP, or Angos Winke, KC6OKA, the alternate control operator, for their side of this story despite the fact that both lived in Los Angeles, yet he did talk to the mexicans and get their side of the story? The reason is simple: He's not even a responsible amateur journalist. Because of this, he left out of his story the harrassment that these two individuals, plus others who talked on the Los Angeles machine, received courtesy of the mexicans, including jamming on other repeaters, phone calls (for those with listed numbers), etc., ...

Then, there's also the matter that "Newsline" claims that it costs $1,000.00 per month in expenses to collect and report the news. Considering that its rival, "This Week in Amateur Radio" does the exact same function for only $100/month, then just what is this additional $900/month going to? Out of that amount, only about $50/month is explainable by "Newsline" maintaining their "instant update telephone number." Where's the rest going? There's only one possibility: Mr. Pasternak is paying himself a SALARY for collecting the amateur radio news. Although not using amateur radio itself to collect the news (I'll give him the benefit of the doubt on this), his pecuniary interest is still a violation of 47 CFR 97.113(a) and/or (b) - indirect compensation, which with the wording in (a), could also mean that any system repeating his news bulletin could also be in violation (because it facilitates the commercial affairs of BP since he takes a salary). This is different from the situation around "TWIAR," where Community Video Associates, Inc., the entity which produces "TWIAR," has non-profit status under 26 USC 501(c)(3) [and under the laws of the State of New York.] "Newsline's" producers have no such status, because if they did, they would have to disclose this fact of paying BP a salary (per the non-profit public inspection statute - 26 USC 6104), because it would appear on their IRS Form 990 or 990PF.

You asked.

2107. Re: Lennie Just Can't Stand Being Ignored!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 22:11:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408181157.11494.00000073@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 64350

In article <20030408095121.14478.00000197@mb-fy.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Sky King Robeson) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Lennie Just Can't Stand Being Ignored!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/7/2003 8:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030407211509.06237.00000056@mb-ca.aol.com>
>
>>Tsk, tsk, tsk. I do have a radio license.
>
> You have a radio OPERATOR license. You do not hold a station license.

Used to have a station license, but not in amateur radio.
Partnership with others. PLMRS.

Hmmm...I've had that commercial license for 47 years. :-)

>Your GROL specifically PROHIBITS you from transmitting a radio signal without
>the benefit of a station license.

Better look over Part 1 again...

> In otherwords...You're QRT.

Hardly. :-) Look at Part 95, Part 15, Title 47 CFR, just for
starters.

>>Robeson cannot admit ignorance of the wider field of radio beyond
>> amateur radio.
>
> My knowledge of the "wider field" is already wider than what you've
>demonstrated herein. This thread included.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

The LPN doesn't know military communications despite an
alleged "career" in the military.

The LPN doesn't know civil aeronautical radio or radionavigation.

The LPN doesn't know mass media radio services (used to be
called "broadcasting").

The LPN doesn't know Private Land Mobile Radio Service (PLMRS).

The LPN has never participated directly in radio or electronics
engineering. A half year as a purchasing agent is hardly IN
electronics.

>> The maritime morse code use is almost extinct now. A listen
>> over the maritime bands on LF to HF here in Southern California
>> turns up very few...but much voice and data.
>
> Thank-you for acknowledging that I was correct, and that Morse Code IS
>still used in the maritime services.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...that's like saying stage coaches are still USED for
transportation despite their only use now is in the entertainment
industry for movies and TV or as amusements at state fairs. :-)

The very best, safest stage coaches ever was are built today
with centers in Arizona and Southern California.

>>Pilots do NOT use it...unless they are morse-fanatic amateurs.
>
> Oh? You base this upon WHAT experience as an Aviator, Your
>Winglessness?

Based on knowledge of FAA regulations and direct experience with
ATC and radionavigation electronics, including design.

>>Pilots do NOT HAVE TO USE IT. It's that simple.
>
> I never said they HAD to use it, Your Flailingness. I said it's there
>and CAN be used.

Oh wow, the slightest little hint of the possibility of morse code use
for any reason and the LPN goes berserk on the subject. :-)

Get mental help, boy. You need it.

> And if they don't audibly verify that the VOR they are tracking is the
>one they want, they jsut screwed up...potentially fatally.

Bullshit. If a general aviation pilot doesn't know where he/she is
in a 200 NM radius, they are GENERALLY screwed up and
should never have been there above the ground and posing a
general threat to anyone below.

I have NO idea of where you've been in the last 40 years in aviation
but I do NOT want to be on the ground under your flight path. You
seem to "know" only the dire warnings of your instructors and some
by-the-book ops rules of the CAP. You DO mouth-off incessantly
about your prowess in the air and use of CW on navaids, yet
haven't been written up in NOTAMS or Flying magazine. :-)

> Again, you are asked to please provide your background and experience in
>aeronautical navigation. So far you have shown you would be a negligent
>pilot.

Oh, more bullshit. I passed my private pilot written 40 years ago
(want a scan of the punch card reply? as if you care?) and
stopped that only for LACK OF MONEY AT THE TIME. My late
first wife wanted a house to live in, not an airplane.

There were no taxpayers writing off flying lessons for other tax-
payers 40 years ago. Dual time (that's with an instructor) was
$17 an hour, solo time was $12 an hour 40 years ago.

> Perhaps that's why you are not in teh FAA database?

Not now. I doubt their records go back 40 years.

>>NO morse code identification is used with ATC Transponders....(SNIP)
>
> Nice try to divest yourself of an awkward position of futile stupidity,
>but you've already dug yourself in, Your Putziness. A transponder is NOT a
>navigational device. Stay focused.

"Not?" Care to argue with the FAA and the Air Traffic Control people
on that? You would lose big time.

>>Watch your sentence structure.
>
> Watch your own, Your Lyingness.

I do. Now you keep on watching your bad sentence structure
and the rage-induced typos you are still making..."that is
something up with which I will not put." (W. Churchill? quote)

>>TACAN ground stations are NOT morse code
>> IDed and, like DME, operate solely in low L-band
>
> Again, your ignorance shows.

TACAN ground stations still don't do morse IDs.

TACAN operates in the same low L-band as DME.

> So far, you've only been half right. Your lack of situational awareness
>on current aeronautical navigation would get you busted on the check ride.

This isn't a flying newsgroup, dumas.

No "check rides" are "required" to explain principles of civil aviation
radionavigation to the ignorant.

> Again, your ignorance and incompetence would get you busted on the
>Private Pilot check ride.

Is that required in US amateur radio? :-)

> You're right...No license is required to learn. However PRACTICAL
>EXPERIENCE is required to know the difference between theory and application.
>
> You know neither!

Just another insult claim. Sigh.

>> I've had several years of experience in the design of civil and
>> military avionics, especially so in regards to aircraft radio-
>> navigation systems, methods, techniques, and standards.

>
> But no experience using them. You are incompetent to navigate an
>aircraft by any means othr than a road map.

I've used sectional charts from the US Government Printing Office
for air navigation. Cheaper than Jeppesson charts and "Jeps"
originated with US government charts. :-)

I did use an en-route chart once on a trip to McCarran Field in NV.

Didn't go backseat in a T-6, though. :-)

>>Does the acronym ARINC mean anything to Robeson?
>
> Does it to Anderson?

Aeronautical Radio INCorporated. An industry group that set
the aviation electronics standards for radio communication and
radionavigation and the electrical-electronic interfaces for same
since the early 1950s until today. FAA adopted nearly all of the
AIRINC standards for civil aviation electronics and the FCC
adopted the frequency arrangement for VOR/LOC-DME-GS so
that a single frequency control can select all of them.

Aeronautical Radio was a private communications service before
WW2 and became the nucleus of the US Air Traffic Control
System during that war. After the war they split off the
communications portion (it was decreasing in need) and the
aviation industry standards group known as ARINC of today
(and 50 years ago) was formed.

The various ICAO member nation civil aviation regulatory
agencies have adopted the ARINC specifications and mention
them by name and number just as the FAA does.

> Yes Lennie. And that's why student pilots are taught, to this day, to
>verify the VOR they are tracking.

No doubt in Robeson's impovrished part of the USA. :-)

>>VOR is really an elegant system for a simple airborne receiver
>> based on vacuum tubes (it was developed in the early 1950s).
>
> Yes, Lennie...we know...just one more 50's-era historical tidbit taht is
>the backbone of your rants.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...Those "tidbit tahts" (practical experience in design
and use) extend into the 80s. :-)

Pity you've not seen the excellent RCA Corporation (Aviation
Systems Division) complete commnav package in a single
3 1/2" instrument case only 10" long. Contains a VOR, the
VOR OBS, Localizer, Glideslope, LOC and GS indicators,
Marker Beacon receiver and MB indicator...plus a full comm

transceiver and frequency controls. All solid state, only a few ICs. Designed and built in Santa Monica, CA, beginning in 1973. I didn't do any of that commercial design but did adapt it for military use with military specifications at Electromagnetic and Aviation Systems Division.

Do you want to get into L-band transponders and Teledyne Electronics (Newbury Park, CA) in the early 1980s? :-)
Do you know what "KIRs" and "KITs" are? "Mode 4?"

Does CAP piloting excellence require the extension of one finger to push a single button on a transponder to "Squawk Ident?" Wow, must be a LOT of ground school and "check rides" for that one-pinky exercise! :-)

>>Robeson can look at any group of sectionals or en-route charts
>> and note the ground station frequencies of VORs. He can then
>> (with all those alleged years of navigation experience) note the
>> range separation...far enough that "skip" (rare at VHF) will not
>> be a factor in any "errors."
>
> And once again Lennie the Lame demonstrates HIS incompetence and lack of
>PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE with VHF propagation. Almost any issue of CQ or QST's
>"VHF" related columns will provide tons of historical events of VHF
>propagation
>events that conducted signals of very low power over distances never
>anticipated by the stations involved.

"CQ" and "QST" are not required reading by civil pilots. :-)

NOTAMs are. [NOTices to AirMen]

I don't recall any pilot acquaintence mention "CQ" or "QST" references in any NOTAMs. Perhaps you can mention them?

> I was an LPN in 1974? I don't think so.

Robeson was BORN an "LPN." [Low Power Nitwit]

> Inside the box? No doubt. How to USE the box? Never. You've already
>demonstrated significant lack of skill in the alst two posts. I'd let you
>tweak my NAVCOM's, Lennie, but I'd rap your knuckles with a ruler if you
>tried to play with them in the air.

Keep wearing your parachute, ace. You would NEED it after.
:-)

> More historical tidbits to cover his error about present day VOR
>receivers being crystal controlled. "OBFUSCATION"

Tsk, tsk, tsk...Robeson claimed VOR receivers were "NOT crystal controlled." He hasn't pointed out what DOES control their frequency...but I imagine he would say has fingers on the selector knobs. :-)

>>I've not used TACAN in a civil aviation craft, only the VOR, DME,
>> Localizer, Glideslope, Marker Beacon, and ATC Transponder.
>> I've used TACAN on military aircraft along with the expanded
>> (Mode 4) Transponder fully set for the IFF code of the day.
>
> Oh..?!?! In what capacity did YOU use the NAVAIDS of an aircraft in
>flight, Lennie?

You don't have a "need to know." :-)

>>Get some mental help, Robeson. You need it badly
>
> I am not the one who think's he's Sky King, Lennie.

Yes you are. All you are capable of in here is to insult, demean,
and try to humiliate anyone who opposes you. That's a form of
sociopathy. You don't "play well with others," can't take the
slightest correction without going berserk in here and generally
act like a grade-A asshole with oak leaf clusters.

You DO need mental help. QED.

> And I STILL don't see your name in the FAA database.

True enough. Now, what has that to do with US amateur radio
or morse code testing?

2108. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 22:12:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408181200.11494.00000075@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 64345

In article <20030408115200.13624.00000146@mb-fh.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>>In significant part, it's because we've told them
>>in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.
>
>The problem is, in order to give a damn about what anyone thinks, they
>have to be saying something that makes sense. Jon, I don't give a
>damn about anything you think.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Yep, an amazing parallel to the PCTA position... :-)

2109. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 22:12:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408181200.11494.00000074@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 64349

In article <c2356669.0304080818.242ffaa4@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030407211514.06237.00000059@mb-ca.aol.com>...
>> In article <c2356669.0304070857.1ccaa986@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>> (N2EY) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20030406234143.25340.00000089@mb-fe.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <20030406122618.00629.00000025@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>> (N2EY)
>> >> writes:
>> >> >--
>> >> >
>> >> >Here's two simple questions for you, Len, N0IMD, and anybody else who
>> wants
>> >> >to answer it:
>> >> >
>> >> >Currently there are more than 250,000 US amateur radio licensees shown
>in
>> the
>> >> >database as "Technician". Have any of them passed code tests? Do any of
>> them
>> >> >have HF amateur privileges?
>> >>
>> >> Here's a simple request for you:
>> >
>> >Just answer the questions, Len. They're not a trap. Just simple,
>> >direct questions about FCC rules and the database.
>>
>> Fulfill my request and I will give you the answer.
>
>Just answer the questions, Len. They're not a trap. Just simple,
>direct questions about FCC rules and the database.

Fulfill my request and I might give you an answer.

>> >> Fund a personal DSL line or send me a CD-ROM with the full FCC
>> >> amateur radio database on it and I might write a search program
>> >> and totalization for any field of data...then present the totals in
>here
>> >> free of charge.
>> >
>> >Why on earth should I do any of that? You won't even answer the two

>> >simple questions posed above.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
>Doesn't explain why I should do what you request.

You don't explain why we MUST give you an answer. :-)

>> In order to "answer" your pre-biased "questions,"
>
>How are the questions "prebiased"?

They have to be by all of Jimmie's past message content. :-)

>> the request must be honored.
>
>Why?

If you won't honor it you are considered dishonorable.

>> >Let's see - you want ME to present the FCC database to you, on my own
>> >time and expense. When said database is provided, you might - just
>> >might - put together some software and present your results. Or you
>> >might not. The software, presuming it is actually written, might
>> >function correctly, or it might not. The results might be correct, or
>> >they might not.
>>
>> >And we're supposed to trust YOU on all of this. Right.
>>
>> Why not?
>
>Because you're not trustworthy. Your behavior here has demonstrated
>that fact over and over again.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, I don't side with the PCTA...therefore Jimmie
wants to portray me as "not trustworthy!" :-)

Sounds suspiciously like the output of the Iraqi Ministry of
Information... :-)

>> >> I'm NOT going to limit searches to some pre-biased conclusion
>> >> reaching. I'm NOT going to bias anything.
>> >
>> >Uh huh. Sure. We're supposed to just take your word on that, right?
>> >We're all supposed to ASSUME you're going to be completely impartial,
>> >fair, and error-free, even though you don't admit errors pointed out
>> >by those who don't agree with you.
>>
>> I won't admit to "errors" that are not errors.
>
>Nor will you admit to errors that *are* errors, if the person pointing
>out the errors disagrees with you.

You are in error. :-)

>> If you don't honor it then you are considered dishonorable.
>
>By whom?

Failure to honor something is cause for a label of dishonorable.

Dictionaries say so. :-)

>> >Why should anyone trust you when you won't even answer two simple
>> >questions?
>>
>> I don't beat my wife.
>
>Doesn't answer the questions.

There's no imperative to answer them.

You won't honor simple, reasonable requests...

>> Ask an unbiased question and you might get an answer.
>
>Where's the bias?

Tsk, tsk, tsk, you are in self-bias relative to morse code.

>> >Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor baby - doesn't "the radio-electronics
>> >professional" have access to a broadband connection?
>>
>> No.
>
>You mean after all those years as a PROFESSIONAL, and all your
>experience, connections and acquaintances in the "radio-electronics"
>field, you have to come hat-in-hand like Oliver Twist, to someone like
>me for a simple download? "Please, sir, I need some data.."

Oliver, don't twist the subject.

I meant that we (my wife and I) don't have a DSL at our residence.

You seem to be a little dickens.

>Answer the questions I asked and I might supply your request.

You don't "ask questions," you demand answers. :-)

>> >Here's a hint: Start the download just before bedtime and let it run
>> >while you sleep.
>>
>> Here's a hint: Supply my request and you might get an answer.
>
>Why should I do what you ask?

You don't have to. You can remain in the Gang of Four and
act argumentative, aggressive, and antagonistic about

morse code and its alleged virtues. You have been consistent
in here in that regard.

>> >> DSL service makes it reasonable.
>> >
>> >So sign up. Do you want a welfare handout from me?
>>
>> Don't need it.
>
>Then don't ask me. Do your own work.

Quit asking questions, then. You don't have authority to demand
answers. :-)

>> >The charade is that you won't answer them. Why not? Afraid of the
>> >answers? Afraid of the truth?
>>
>> Not at all.
>
>Then why not answer them?

You ARE a little dickens. You have too many Great
Expectations. :-)

>> You won't accept the truth on morse code. You are
>> afraid.
>
>Not me.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...bravado. :-)

>There is no "NO-CODE Technician class" of license in the USA. No US
>ham license specifies that code cannot be used by any ham. The FCC
>does not issue amateur radio licenses that say "NO-CODE".

Tsk, tsk, tsk...read the regulations again. :-)

You, like all the members of the Gang of Four, are Title happy.

You want to make the Title of the license grant certificate as the
prime definition. It isn't.

The amateur radio license is for BOTH operator and "station"
(regulations define that as "control point").

Amateur radio licensees are directly responsible for the
technical regulations of their station, the same as operating
regulations.

>You ASSUME that if the code test for the Technician had not been
>dropped in early 1991, none of the hams who got Technician class
>licenses after the change would have been licensed. Very poor
>reasoning. Illogical.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...there's that pro-code bias again, Jimmie. :-)

Ooooo..."very poor reasoning. illogical." :-)

>The FACT is that the total growth in US amateur licenses after the
>1991 change but before the 2000 restructuring was only slightly more
>than the growth in an equal time period previous to the change.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...we've been around and around on that for
years and you still want to practice denial about morse code.

You aren't strictly dishonorable. You are so wrapped up in
the morse mystique that you can't think straight on that
subject.

>> I've lost interest in this farcical "debate" over morse code.
>>
>> Mr. N2EY is a PCTA and a member of the Gang of Four.
>
>Ah, the old ad-hominem attack when you run out of arguments. Which
>happens frequently here.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...forgetting the charges you laid about "very poor
reasoning?" "Illogical?" :-)

Whatever is remarked less-than-positive about morse code,
Jimmie will consistently charge "error," "faulty," "mistaken,"
"very poor reasoning," or "illogical." :-)

If there is such a thing, Jimmie seems to be acting as a "morse
code fedayin," a death commando in the fight for morse code
testing, use, and nobility. He keeps making those suicide
runs and hasn't realized his ideology died some time ago. :-)

>There is, however, one thing you never seem to run out of, Len.

I came close to running out of gas the other day until I found
a Shell station with working pumps. Had a discount coupon
valid at six local Shell stations. No problem. Found a nearby
Shell station with working pumps. Local anamoly.

I DO run out of patience with some of you morsemen on the
code test retention forever-and-ever. You guys keep living in
the past too much...and can't get a working time machine...
so you try to keep the future looking just like the past.

2110. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 22:12:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408181201.11494.00000076@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 64346

In article <pan.2003.04.08.10.34.38.819114.5721@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>>> I wish I shared your trust. The present administration seems daily less
>>> interested in hearing the opinions of anyone.
>>
>> And you base that statement on what?
>
>The fact that the Administration has, from the day it entered office,
>expressed disdain for those -- domestically and internationally -- who
>disagree with it. It's one thing to disagree about things, it's another to
>belittle and demean those with whom you disagree. Why is it that countries
>that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side of
>the fence from us now? In significant part, it's because we've told them
>in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...that sounds vaguely like ARRL's position on
morse code testing... :-)

The parallel is remarkable.

2111. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 22:12:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408181203.11494.00000078@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 64344

In article <f45722ac.0304071725.1f7d3d21@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> >Tell that to the Hmong and the Special Forces guys who stayed in
>> >battle mode until after the papers were pushed.
>> >
>> >w3rv
>
>You tell it to them. I'm sure it would be relatively safe for you to
>finally go there now.
>
>> Whew.....Lennie's an idiot who can't keep track of current events
>> including the ending of one of the most bitter wars this nation has ever
>> endured, and Brain, allegedly a combat veteran himself, insults and demeans
>> those who DID fight in that war, even to the end.
>>
>> A PAIR of idiots.
>>
>> Sheesh.
>>
>> Steve
>
>Seven (7) hostile actions meets noncombatant with real military
>experience.
>
>That's like tweedle dee and tweedle dee.

A pair of tweedle dumbs.

Perfect spokesmen/role-models for US amateur radio...Iraqi
Ministry of Information style. :-)

2112. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 22:12:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408181203.11494.00000077@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 64348

In article <BAB7CB87.15CB9%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) Pacifists want to sit back and do nothing.
>> That is "safe." They feel secure doing nothing. By
>> doing nothing they will not be responsible for any
>> nasty action.
>
> It is not so simple or extreme - pacifists versus war hawks.

I was only remarking on PACIFISTS, Dwight. I wasn't
"comparing" one extremist group with another.

Do-nothing pacifism avoids responsibility. That applies to
those who "didn't see anything" in regards to any sort of
danger that lies ahead.

Isolationism is a form of pacifism...retreating behind
supposedly isolating borders...national borders to decisions
made by others that are perceived to be impassable.

Isolationism was popular in the USA in 1940. Nobody could
possibly invade the USA back then, could they? It was
emotionally wonderful to aid others in far-off lands in that
beginning of WW2. But, why should the USA go to any war
on distant shores? The USA wasn't threatened directly, was
it? Well, not until late 1941...

Isolationism was still around in mid-summer of 1950. A small
half of a country in Asia invaded the other half. The USA wasn't
directly attacked, was it? The USA was safe, wasn't it? It was
someone else's problem, wasn't it?

Isolationism and pacifism grew about a decade later to heroic
proportions about another country (or two halves of a country)
in southeast Asia (as opposed to northeast Asia). It wasn't a
concern of the USA in such a faraway place, was it? The USA
was safe and isolated in North America...it shouldn't bother
with other people's problems. Don't get involved was the cry.

Of course by that time a very large union of socialized republics
had nuclear capability and a delivery system for same and DID
threaten the USA and a number of other free "western" countries.
That particular republic DID take over a number of countries
through their particular ideology.

The USA has gotten rather involved in a number of other, later countries that didn't have IRBMs or ICBMs pointed directly at us. Panama was one (the USA built their famous canal). Grenada was another. Haiti is a good example where the USA should have stayed home, right? Haiti wasn't a military threat place, had no real strategic value nor oil, wasn't even settled by English-speaking colonists. The USA shouldn't have gotten involved according to the pacifist-isolationists.

In 1990 a large dictatorial-government Middle Eastern nation invaded a small neighbor. That nation's goal was rather transparent: Expansion by conquest. Kuwait was far from USA shores. Neither Kuwaitis nor Iraqis spoke English and their religions weren't based on Christianity. It wasn't any of the USA's concern was the cry of the pacifist-isolationists. The USA should not have gotten involved, should it? Iraq didn't directly threaten the USA, did it?

Meanwhile, the USSR had begun military support for the communist government in a place called Afghanistan in 1979. The USSR spent nine years there and didn't achieve any success. There were reports of as many as 15,000 Soviet military dead from that fighting. The USA wasn't directly involved in Afghanistan when the USSR was fighting there. The USSR pulled out in 1988. The USSR collapsed of its own accord (and economic-social failure) in 1991 and became separate republics. Pacifist-isolationists often point to the Soviet involvement in Afghanistan as the "cause" and that their military should have stayed home. The real reasons had begun long before the communist coup of Aghanistan. The original coup there had been orchestrated by communists playing their socialist ideology.

So, on up to 2001 the USA was very safe and secure in North America, no one had invaded our shores, no ICBMs fell on US targets, no weapons of mass destruction had devastated any part of the USA. Sure, there was a bombing of the parking area at the World Trade Center in the 90s but that was by a small bunch of Islamic crazies, wasn't it? Nothing to be concerned about. Let's all stay home, feel secure behind our borders, nobody will bother us said the pacifist-isolationists.

Problem is, we were NOT safe. That was proven on the 11th day of September in 2001. An organized Islamic fundamentalist group of terrorists had already invaded us and turned our own peaceful civilian carrier aircraft into flying bombs which slaughtered over a thousand civilians alone in New York City. Those terrorists were traced to Afghanistan as their base of operations.

Accordingly, the USA military went into Afghanistan and cleaned house, deposing the communist infrastructure and restoring their government into something representative of the Afghanis. The USA was successful where the USSR had not been successful. Afghanistan was not claimed as any conquest of the USA.

Haiti has not been claimed as any conquest of the USA. Grenada hasn't been claimed as a conquest of the USA. Panama hasn't been claimed as a conquest of the USA. Kuwait hasn't been claimed as a conquest of the USA. The USA hasn't claimed any of the countries it fought in over the last century as conquests. The USA gave the Philippines back its independence in 1946.

You and other forty- to fifty-somethings can point to Vietnam as some kind of "failure" from "getting involved." Vietnam finally became an independent nation in 1976 under communist rule. But, South Korea remains free and prosperous even though the Korean War hasn't yet ended while North Korea is essentially impovrished under dictatorial-military rule. Korea remains a danger point. According to the pacifist-isolationists, we shouldn't be involved there, it is no business of ours, it is far away and won't bother us. We still have large ports and buildings and relatively free access, don't we? Do we need another WTC-like event, such as a low-yield nuclear weapon going off on our shores? A spread of virulent disease among our population?

Iraq never directly threatened the USA in 2003 or 2002 or 2001. No Iraqi military action disturbed our isolated North American or Pacific states. Nobody would dare strike the USA, would they? Pacifist-isolationists are supremely involved in denial.

2113. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 22:12:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408181204.11494.00000079@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 64347

In article <f45722ac.0304071721.22779ed7@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
>news:<pan.2003.04.07.12.19.31.119577.27440@arrl.org>...
>> On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 06:24:56 -0400, Brian wrote:
>> >
>> >> The problem is not a lack of patriots, it's that many think only those
>> >> with whom they agree are patriots.
>> >
>> > Such as?
>>
>> Where have you been? Spend 5 minutes on Google. You'll find plenty of
>> examples. (Helpful search terms: Daschle, Dixie Chicks)
>>
>> >> When, exactly, was being a patriot a bad thing?
>> >
>> > When it was commonly used as slang for militia.
>>
>> Commonly? By anyone other than the members of the so-called militias?
>>
>> Jon
>
>Do you think that the Daschle Chicks are patriots? If so, why?
>
>I was a member of the military and most of us considered ourselves
>patriots. Was that bad?

Judging by some of the past comments in here, you must have
been "bad" (probably unpatriotic) for not publishing your
written permission to operate from "T5 land" on ham bands.

"Patriotism" in regards to amateur radio seems to be an
infinite variable judged solely on morsemanship... :-)

2114. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 22:19:31 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <TVHka.112642$OV.211828@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 64251

I seem to remember that this woman ran from the car screaming just before detonation ...I wonder how she was duped into this act ???? BTW ever notice that these human bombs are young people. It seems to me that a geriatric bomber should be easy to recruit. Also how about some unfortunate with a terminal disease??? Haven't even heard of the above. It is amazing what religious brainwashing can accomplish. Just bring God into the mix and as the little guy in the ARRL cartoon said "Hold on to your hats". Satan sure has a good laugh and God cries when man kills his brother.

God Bless 73 Tom KI3R Port Vue PA nr Pittsburgh
"Hambone the Magnificent" <921d2will@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:3e91c18e@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030405013919.05767.00000131@mb-fz.aol.com...
>
> > A pregnant woman...?!?!?! Can there be anything more loathesome than
> how
> > they used her like that? I guess those idiots don't realize that doing
> stuff
> > like that only raises the hair on an American's neck more and really
> drives
> > them to fight harder.
>
> We may find it loathesome with our Western morals and
> values Steve, but the mere fact that a pregnant woman (!!)
> would sacrifice herself as a "human guided bomb" for her
> religion (Islam) *speaks volumes* of the will of belief and
> extremes these people are willing to go thru and do!
>
> They are modern Kamakazie
>
>

2115. Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 23:02:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408190200.01771.00000150@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64252

>Subject: Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>Date: 4/8/2003 5:08 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304082134240.843@kd6lvw.ampr.org>

>> >I think that the first issue here is that we should stop that
>spammer...(SNIP)
>>
>> Here we go again.
>
>I see you offered nothing to contradict my statement.

What's to offer, DS? You think Bill is a spammer. I don't. His items ARE relative to Amateur Radio specifically, and policy more often than not. When one condisers that MOST of the "posts" here are personality conflicts and mindless rants of unlicensed or inexperienced persons, Bill's posts are, at worst, a wholly germane diversion.

>1) The mexicans were intentionally interfering with the machine in Los
>Angeles...(SNIP)

So...You cite ONE incident that was over two years ago. There's usually at least five or six "items" per report, so assuming one release a week and (104 posts), that comes out to 520 seperate topics.

I'm am so not impressed. CNN should be so right all the time.

>2) He further reported that there had been no attempt to coordinate the
>repeater in Los Angeles.

I am futher unimpressed with the coordinating and political processes in Southern California. I am reminded of a situation involving a Costa Mesa Amateur who decided to set up his own "remote base" on busy 2M simplex frequencies and began operating an uncooridinated, out-of-band repeater. These were the days before Riley, mind you.

Despite being handed over 100 seperate signatures on formal written complaints, nothing was ever done beccause when the offender was contacted, "he swore and threatened" the "officials" of the coordinating organizations.

>) Don't you have to wonder why BP never asked K6PYP, or Angos Winke, KC6OKA,
>the alternate control operator, for their side of this story despite the fact
>that both lived in Los Angeles, yet he did talk to the mexicans and get their
>side of the story?

Mexicans are under no obligation to observe United States regulations. I was IN California and know for a fact that there were numerous occassions when

US Amateurs turned a blind eye to requests from Mexican Amateurs to help avoid problems THEY were experiencing.

I can't condone "tit-for-tat" harmful interference, but I understand where the motivation comes from.

>Then, there's also the matter that "Newsline" claims that it costs $1,000.00
>per month in expenses to collect and report the news. Considering that its
>rival, "This Week in Amateur Radio" does the exact same function for only
>$100/month, then just what is this additional $900/month going to?

Who cares?

W5YI and WB6NOA have been wringing money out of Amateurs for decades for performing what the FCC will do for free yet people still send them money every month. At least with Newsline, Mr Pasternak still makes his wares available to ALL Amateurs regardless of whether they "donate" or not.

>Mr. Pasternak is paying himself a SALARY for collecting the
>amateur radio news.

So...Some people may call him a charlatan, others an entreprenuer. This is NOT snake oil he's peddling. You are free to read/listen to the stuff or not. Again, you can QSY if you hear it on the air and put him in your killfile on-line.

>Although not using amateur radio itself to collect the
>news (I'll give him the benefit of the doubt on this), his pecuniary interest
>is still a violation of 47 CFR 97.113(a) and/or (b) - indirect compensation,
>which with the wording in (a), could also mean that any system repeating his
>news bulletin could also be in violation (because it facilitates the
>commercial
>affairs of BP since he takes a salary).

Well then, the next time you hear one ON THE AIR, write a letter to Riley. Otherwise, anything that transpires on this forum is NOT subject to any interpretation of Part 97.

>You asked.

Yep. But you've not given me one bit of reason other than your dislike for the man as to why his "Newsline" posts should or shouldn't appear here, DS. Again, in MY opinion (with absolutely no more or no less weight than yours, of course...) his posts are far more appropriate for this forum than MOST of the ones generated by "the regulars", and yes, that includes mine.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2116. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 23:39:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408193957.12142.00000050@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 64253

In article <20030408181200.11494.00000074@mb-fa.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>>> Fulfill my request and I will give you the answer.

> Fulfill my request and I might give you an answer.
>
>>> >> Fund a personal DSL line or send me a CD-ROM with the full FCC
>>> >> amateur radio database on it

>>> the request must be honored.
>
> Quit asking questions, then.

N2EY wrote:

>>There is, however, one thing you never seem to run out of, Len.
>
> I came close to running out of gas the other day

It's not gasoline that you never seem to run out of.

2117. Re: Lennie Just Can't Stand Being Ignored!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 23:45:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408194542.01771.00000151@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64254

>Subject: Re: Lennie Just Can't Stand Being Ignored!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/8/2003 5:11 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030408181157.11494.00000073@mb-fa.aol.com>

>>Your GROL specifically PROHIBITS you from transmitting a radio signal
>without
>>the benefit of a station license.
>
> Better look over Part 1 again..

Better read the back of your permit again, Lennie.

>> In otherwords...You're QRT.
>
> Hardly. :-) Look at Part 95, Part 15, Title 47 CFR, just for
> starters

Oh wow! CB radio! I am sooooooooooo impressed!

>I have NO idea of where you've been in the last 40 years in aviation...(SNIP)

Well, for almost 30 years of it I have been a licensed Aviator. With
HUNDREDS of hours as pilot-in-command and crosscountry experience.

And YOU have how many hours of flight time..?!?!

>Oh, more bullshit. I passed my private pilot written 40 years ago...(SNIP)

FORTY YEARS AGO...?!?!

BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! !

> (want a scan of the punch card reply? as if you care?)

What? Yet another chance for you to claim a "mistake" and send yet
another picture of someone exposing themselves? No thanks.

>and
> stopped that only for LACK OF MONEY AT THE TIME. My late
> first wife wanted a house to live in, not an airplane.

And since Mrs Lennie the First has since passed away and you are now so
richly esconed in your retirement, what has prevented you finishing up?
Certainly, someone as financially secure as you claim to be can pony-up the $3
to 4K it takes to successfully complete the Private Pilot tasks and get a
license, Lennie!

Other than my hang glider, I don't own an aircraft either, but I still manage to get to fly on a regular basis.

Of course, YOU are King of Excuses when it comes to not finishing what you start, aren't you? You can't even pony up the $10 and the hour of time it would take to get an Amateur license.

>There were no taxpayers writing off flying lessons for other tax-
> payers 40 years ago. Dual time (that's with an instructor) was
> $17 an hour, solo time was $12 an hour 40 years ago.

And that's about what it was when I got my license in 74. I started two years earlier, doing the usual "kid jobs", etc, to earn money to fly with.

So....Now that you are sooooooooo financially secure and have soooooo much knowledge, WHAT is your excuse for not pursuning THIS license...?!?!

>Not now. I doubt their records go back 40 years.

Oh...yes...A student pilot "license" which is part and parcel of the Third Class medical. THAT will impress them in the pilot's lounge!

>> Nice try to divest yourself of an awkward position of futile stupidity,
>>but you've already dug yourself in, Your Putziness. A transponder is NOT a
>>navigational device. Stay focused.
>
> "Not?" Care to argue with the FAA and the Air Traffic Control people
> on that? You would lose big time.

Transponders are NOT "navigational" devices. While one is required when operating in certain controlled airspace and when filed IFR, it does NOT provide the pilot with ANY navigational information. It's purpose is identification and collision avoidance.

>> So far, you've only been half right. Your lack of situational awareness
>>on current aeronautical navigation would get you busted on the check ride.
>
> This isn't a flying newsgroup, dumas.

Well, Your Spitefulness, so far you've spent three days trying to gain Newsgroup Supremacy by trying to impress us with your (narrow) prowess in things aeronautical.

More usual lying, twofaced Andersonian "Do As I Say, Not Do As I Do" rhetoric.

>No "check rides" are "required" to explain principles of civil aviation
> radionavigation to the ignorant.

Good...when the ignorant arrive, we'll send them your way...they'll be in good company.

>> You're right...No license is required to learn. However PRACTICAL
>>EXPERIENCE is required to know the difference between theory and
>application.
>>

>> You know neither!
>
> Just another insult claim. Sigh.

It's not an insult if it's true, Lennie.

>I did use an en-route chart once on a trip to McCarran Field in NV.

OOOOOIE! Did you play "I Spy" while you were at it, Lennie...?!?!

HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! !

>>>Does the acronym ARINC mean anything to Robeson?
>>
>> Does it to Anderson?
>
> Aeronautical Radio INCorporated. An industry group that set
> the aviation electronics standards...(SNIP)

Yes Lennie, I know. Since you asked (in the very post that I am responding to) what anything about civil aviation had to do with Amateur Radio, allow me to ask what ARINC, or any of your technical dissertaions on VOR-vs-TACAN has to do with it, other than to give you a chance to grandstand...????

>Aeronautical Radio was a private communications service before
> WW2...(SNIP)

Here we go with Lennie regressing several decades while he simultaneously lambasts any Amateur who dares to discuss anything historical as "stagnant", etc, etc.

>> Yes, Lennie...we know...just one more 50's-era historical tidbit taht is
>>the backbone of your rants.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...Those "tidbit tahts" (practical experience in design
> and use) extend into the 80s.

Then why, in 2003, were you asserting that VOR receivers are crystal controlled? THAT was OVER 20 years ago, Lennie. Actually closer to 30.

>Do you want to get into L-band transponders and Teledyne
> Electronics (Newbury Park, CA) in the early 1980s?

Twenty-plus year old technology, Lennie? Why? Is it germane to Amateur Radio? Is there ANYTHING remotely germane to the current subject of Morse Code identification of aeronautical navaids in the United States?

>> Inside the box? No doubt. How to USE the box? Never. You've already
>>demonstrated significant lack of skill in the alst two posts. I'd let you
>>tweak my NAVCOM's, Lennie, but I'd rap your knuckles with a ruler if you
>>tried to play with them in the air.
>
> Keep wearing your parachute, ace. You would NEED it after.

Oooooh! A THREAT from the Lying One!

>> Oh..?!?! In what capacity did YOU use the NAVAIDS of an aircraft in
>>flight, Lennie?
>
> You don't have a "need to know."

That's alright Lennie. I ALREADY know...you DIDN'T!

>>>Get some mental help, Robeson. You need it badly
>>
>> I am not the one who think's he's Sky King, Lennie.
>
> Yes you are. All you are capable of in here is to insult, demean,
> and try to humiliate anyone who opposes you.

"Opposes" me, Lennie? So far all you've done is dig yourself into yet another "why I didn't get a license" quagmire, and demonstrated your lack of practical skills in aeronautical navigation.

It's not "insult(ing)", "demaen(ing)" or "humiliat(ing)" to expose YOUR mistruths and inadequacies. You make it rather easy, acutally.

>That's a form of
> sociopathy. You don't "play well with others," can't take the
> slightest correction without going berserk in here and generally
> act like a grade-A asshole with oak leaf clusters.

Hmmmmm....profanity, demeaning insults and failure to "play well with others" noted of the person who just accuswed someone else of the same traits.

>> And I STILL don't see your name in the FAA database.
>
> True enough. Now, what has that to do with US amateur radio
> or morse code testing?

You brought up the subject, Lennie. I am simply pointing out that this is yet another area knowledge that you are both deficient and unlicensed in, despite YOUR assertions that you are oh-so qualified in.

Loser. (That's English for PUTZ!)

Steve

2118. Re: Lennie Just Can't Stand Being Ignored!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-08 23:57:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408195707.01771.00000152@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64255

>Subject: Re: Lennie Just Can't Stand Being Ignored!
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 4/8/2003 6:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030408194542.01771.00000151@mb-cb.aol.com>

>>Subject: Re: Lennie Just Can't Stand Being Ignored!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/8/2003 5:11 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030408181157.11494.00000073@mb-fa.aol.com>

HOW COULD I HAVE MISSED THIS...?!?!

>>There were no taxpayers writing off flying lessons for other tax-
>> payers 40 years ago. Dual time (that's with an instructor) was
>> $17 an hour, solo time was $12 an hour 40 years ago.

Yes, Lennie, there WERE! At that time you were eligible for the WW2 Era
GI-Bill, and at THAT time could have completed ALL your airman ratings THROUGH
Airline Transport Pilot (incuding CFI/CFII).

The program was LATER ammended to only provide ADVANCED flight training to
those already holding a Private Pilot certificate.

I must be getting slow! Whew! But still threw a wrench into yet another
LennieRant!

Steve

2119. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 00:26:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408202636.23238.00000033@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64256

In article <pan.2003.04.08.12.48.36.85734.22061@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
>Date: Tue, 08 Apr 2003 08:48:36 -0400
>
>On Tue, 08 Apr 2003 06:29:54 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>>
>> True, true. However, consider that while the race is not always to the
>> swift, it's that's a pretty good way to bet. A dictator who built his
>> power base on murderous repression probably isn't going to be overthrown
>> easily.
>
>One good aphorism deserves another: God is on the side of the heaviest
>battalions.

Not always. Battle of Midway, June 1942.

USN submarine Albacore against IJN aircraft carrier Taiho.

>Once the "heaviest battalions" were stopped, the possible
>outcomes changed dramatically.

Yup.
>
>> If there's any real MMQBing to be done, it should be against UNSCOM for
>> putting up with the regime's shenanigans for too long. Suppose that the
>> very first time the inspectors were denied access to a site, they simply
>> packed up their bags and left. And as soon as they were gone, air
>> satrikes flattenened the denied site.
>
>To be fair, UNSCOM serves at the pleasure of the UNSC.

OK then, the MMQBing should be against the UNSC. They were derelict in their
duty.

>Except for reasons
>of safety of personnel, UNSCOM's people couldn't just pick up and leave
>without direction from the SC. But I agree with your basic point. The
>principal failures were between 1991 and 1998.

Exactly.
>
>> What do you think of my gasoline surtax hypothesis?
>
>I'm having trouble picturing the President actually agreeing to tax

>anything to pay for this war.

Me too, but that's not the point of the thought experiment.

>But if he did, yes, I think those who spoke
>out against it would be labelled unpatriotic by the Limbaugh-O'Reillyites
>and their mindless followers.

Scary, that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2120. Why the spew today Steve

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 02:02:10 UTC
From: Myself <Me@onthenet.net>
Message-ID: <gmv69v4q7q385d108blsqdt5bc0g298rri@4ax.com>
Source record: 64259

Why the spew this morning, Steve lose another job?
Len isn't your worst enemy you are.

2121. Steve al-Sahhaf at the Ministry (was:Lennie Just Can't Stand Being Ignored!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 02:04:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408220419.13308.00000096@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 64257

In article <20030408194542.01771.00000151@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Ministry of Information's al-Sahhaf) writes:

>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/8/2003 5:11 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030408181157.11494.00000073@mb-fa.aol.com>
>
>>>Your GROL specifically PROHIBITS you from transmitting a radio signal
>>without
>>>the benefit of a station license.
>>
>> Better look over Part 1 again..
>
> Better read the back of your permit again, Lennie.

Not a "permit" dumas. It is a LICENSE.

>>> In otherwords...You're QRT.
>>
>> Hardly. :-) Look at Part 95, Part 15, Title 47 CFR, just for
>> starters
>
> Oh wow! CB radio! I am sooooooooooo impressed!
>
>>I have NO idea of where you've been in the last 40 years in
>aviation...(SNIP)
>
> Well, for almost 30 years of it I have been a licensed Aviator. With
>HUNDREDS of hours as pilot-in-command and crosscountry experience.

So...you've done your "twenty" in the USMC...and "30 years" as
a licensed aviator ("pilot-in-command")...and had at least 10
years as a nurse. That adds up to, roughly 60 years.

You were born in 1955 (plus/minus one).

Either you have a time machine or you LIE, sweetums.

EXAGGERATION OF THE TRUTH TO THE POINT OF LYING.

>> (want a scan of the punch card reply? as if you care?)
>
> What? Yet another chance for you to claim a "mistake" and send yet
>another picture of someone exposing themselves? No thanks.

You don't want the truth.

You can't handle the truth.

> Other than my hang glider, I don't own an aircraft either, but I still
>manage to get to fly on a regular basis.

Wow. "Pilot in command" of a T-6! You are a "left-seater?"

> Of course, YOU are King of Excuses when it comes to not finishing what
you
>start, aren't you? You can't even pony up the $10 and the hour of time it
>would take to get an Amateur license.

Poor baby. Still delusional as well as sociopathic.

I finished a career in commercial and military electronics, making
a nice living. I still work in electronics when and where I feel like
working.

> And that's about what it was when I got my license in 74. I started two
>years earlier, doing the usual "kid jobs", etc, to earn money to fly with.

Isn't that so wonderful! You did "kid jobs" at age 19.

But...wait...wasn't "Sgt Putz" in the USMC then? ?

Did they have sergeant pilots in the USMC then? ?

In 1974 I was a senior staff engineer at RCA Corporation and
was granted my first patent.

>> "Not?" Care to argue with the FAA and the Air Traffic Control people
>> on that? You would lose big time.
>
> Transponders are NOT "navigational" devices. While one is required when
>operating in certain controlled airspace and when filed IFR, it does NOT
>provide the pilot with ANY navigational information. It's purpose is
>identification and collision avoidance.

Poor baby. Probably hasn't been in a TRACON or done anything
but curse at ATC personnel. :-)

Nearly all of the Los Angeles Center is controlled airspace. It isn't
like the remote wilderness of TN. Busy place here. Radar vectoring
all around.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...Robeson thinks he knows collision avoidance. :-)

> Well, Your Spitefulness, so far you've spent three days trying to gain
>Newsgroup Supremacy by trying to impress us with your (narrow) prowess in
>things aeronautical.

What is this "supremacy" gig, dumas?

You don't have the slightest conception of what goes on inside those
avionics boxes. I offered a little insight. You NEED insight, boy.

> More usual lying, twofaced Andersonian "Do As I Say, Not Do As I Do"
>rhetoric.

Minister al-Sahhaf doesn't want information? Poor baby. Lives in
an alternate reality then. Too bad the minister can't learn anything.
Learning is a scary thought to him?

>> Just another insult claim. Sigh.
>
> It's not an insult if it's true, Lennie.

Robeson LIES. Robeson CURSES. Robeson INSULTS.
Robeson has B.O.

> OOOOOIE! Did you play "I Spy" while you were at it, Lennie...?!?!

The location filming company that contracted to the TV show
"I Spy" was then located in an industrial park just west of
BUR (Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport). That TV show
may have done a few locations around Las Vegas but most of
the shows were shot off-shore.

Why is that important, dumas?

>> Aeronautical Radio INCorporated. An industry group that set
>> the aviation electronics standards...(SNIP)
>
> Yes Lennie, I know. Since you asked (in the very post that I am
responding
>to) what anything about civil aviation had to do with Amateur Radio, allow me
>to ask what ARINC, or any of your technical dissertaions on VOR-vs-TACAN has
>to do with it, other than to give you a chance to grandstand...????

Anyone engaged in civil avionics design SHOULD be familiar
with ARINC. It is obvious that Robeson doesn't know snit from
shoeshine.

> Here we go with Lennie regressing several decades while he simultaneously
>lambasts any Amateur who dares to discuss anything historical as "stagnant",
>etc, etc.

ARINC still exists. They have a website.

> Then why, in 2003, were you asserting that VOR receivers are crystal
>controlled? THAT was OVER 20 years ago, Lennie. Actually closer to 30.

Civil avionics VOR receivers are still crystal controlled.

> Twenty-plus year old technology, Lennie? Why? Is it germane to Amateur
>Radio? Is there ANYTHING remotely germane to the current subject of Morse
>Code identification of aeronautical navaids in the United States?

Tsk, tsk, tsk...the Minister brought up the automatic morse code
ID on civil airways radionavigation ground stations. Civil aviation
has nothing to do with amateur radio or morse code testing.

Steve Robeson, aka Steve al-Sahhaf of the Ministry of Information,
has constantly brought up invalid examples of the alleged necessity
or alleged aid of morse code seemingly in everyday life. He has
become delusional as well as sociopathic.

> Hmmmmm....profanity, demeaning insults and failure to "play well with
>others" noted of the person who just accuswed someone else of the same
>traits.

"Accuswed?!?" Rage and message typing do not go together. ;-)

> You brought up the subject, Lennie. I am simply pointing out that this
>is yet another area knowledge that you are both deficient and unlicensed in,
>despite YOUR assertions that you are oh-so qualified in.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...Robeson brought up the "morse code necessity on
radionav IDs" to Vipul Shah.

That was nonsense as to "necessity" then, is still nonsense now.

> Loser. (That's English for PUTZ!)

Tsk, tsk, tsk...more attempts at insults from al-Sahhaf the amateur.

Get help, Steamy. You are in sore need of it.

Polish.

2122. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 02:04:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408220419.13308.00000097@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 64258

In article <20030408193957.12142.00000050@mb-fr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030408181200.11494.00000074@mb-fa.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>
>>>> Fulfill my request and I will give you the answer.
>
>> Fulfill my request and I might give you an answer.
>>
>>>> >> Fund a personal DSL line or send me a CD-ROM with the full FCC
>>>> >> amateur radio database on it
>
>>>> the request must be honored.
>>
>> Quit asking questions, then.
>
>N2EY wrote:
>
>>>There is, however, one thing you never seem to run out of, Len.
>>
>> I came close to running out of gas the other day
>
>It's not gasoline that you never seem to run out of.

Poor baby. Nobody answering your demands? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

2123. Re: Steve al-Sahhaf at the Ministry (was:Lennie Just Can't Stand Being Ignored!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 02:37:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408223731.01698.00000172@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64260

>Subject: Steve al-Sahhaf at the Ministry (was:Lennie Just Can't Stand Being
>Ignored!)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/8/2003 9:04 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030408220419.13308.00000096@mb-cj.aol.com>

>So...you've done your "twenty" in the USMC...and "30 years" as
> a licensed aviator ("pilot-in-command")...and had at least 10
> years as a nurse. That adds up to, roughly 60 years.
>
> You were born in 1955 (plus/minus one).
>
> Either you have a time machine or you LIE, sweetums.
>
> EXAGGERATION OF THE TRUTH TO THE POINT OF LYING.

Unlike yourself, Your Scumminess, I am capable of multi-tasking.

I notice both you and Vippy seem to have a problem with that concept, and
that both of you are allegedly "engineers". What's that say about the
occupational field...???

>> What? Yet another chance for you to claim a "mistake" and send yet
>>another picture of someone exposing themselves? No thanks.
>
> You don't want the truth.
>
> You can't handle the truth.

Oh, I accept that you may have had a student pilots permit at one time.
Lots of people start flying then never finish. You were just one of them.

>> Other than my hang glider, I don't own an aircraft either, but I still
>>manage to get to fly on a regular basis.
>
> Wow. "Pilot in command" of a T-6! You are a "left-seater?"

First of all, I'd LOVE to have PIC time in a T-6. But what I'd REALLY
like to know is where YOU are coming up with this...?!?! I have never
indicated ANY experience in the T-6.

>> Of course, YOU are King of Excuses when it comes to not finishing what
>you
>>start, aren't you? You can't even pony up the $10 and the hour of time it
>>would take to get an Amateur license.

>
> Poor baby. Still delusional as well as sociopathic.
>
> I finished a career in commercial and military electronics, making
> a nice living. I still work in electronics when and where I feel like
> working.

"Delusional"...?!?! "Sociopath"...?!?! I said you have numerous excuses
as to why you don't finish your licenses and you relate it to your
"career"...?!?! Someone's "delusional" here, Your Putziness, but it ain't me.

And since you once again bring up that "nice living", why haven't you been
able to pony up the $10 and hour of your time to get that Extra Lite?

And since you brought up your "expert knowledge" in aeronautics, how come
you've not finsihed up THAT license...?!?!

>> And that's about what it was when I got my license in 74. I started
>two
>>years earlier, doing the usual "kid jobs", etc, to earn money to fly with.
>
> Isn't that so wonderful! You did "kid jobs" at age 19.

Up until I went to boot camp...Yup.

>But...wait...wasn't "Sgt Putz" in the USMC then?

Not until September 1974. Wanna refigure the math, Your Putziness?

>In 1974 I was a senior staff engineer at RCA Corporation and
> was granted my first patent.

And now look where you are...generating hundreds of bits of hate-mail in a
newsgroup dedicated to a field of radiocommunications in which you have
expressed no real interest in being part of .

I am impressed. Not.

>> Transponders are NOT "navigational" devices. While one is required
>when
>>operating in certain controlled airspace and when filed IFR, it does NOT
>>provide the pilot with ANY navigational information. It's purpose is
>>identification and collision avoidance.
>
> Poor baby. Probably hasn't been in a TRACON or done anything
> but curse at ATC personnel.

Why do you persist in humiliating yourself, Lennie?

>Nearly all of the Los Angeles Center is controlled airspace. It isn't
> like the remote wilderness of TN. Busy place here. Radar vectoring
> all around.

Yep. And not one approach or airway that can be executed using a
transponder to navigate it by.

>Tsk, tsk, tsk...Robeson thinks he knows collision avoidance.

Ever see my name in an NTSB report vis-a-vis a midair?

Guess I DO know something about collision avoidance.

>You don't have the slightest conception of what goes on inside those
> avionics boxes. I offered a little insight. You NEED insight, boy.

Not really. That's your self deluded ideation of what I MUST need in
order to make YOURSELF happy. If that's what it takes, indulge yourself.

>> More usual lying, twofaced Andersonian "Do As I Say, Not Do As I Do"
>>rhetoric.
>
> Minister al-Sahhaf doesn't want information? Poor baby. Lives in
> an alternate reality then. Too bad the minister can't learn anything.
> Learning is a scary thought to him?

Hmmmm...that's funny. Seems I remember trying to coax the Licenseless One
into doing some tutorials on microwave principles...NOW you find it appropriate
to "lecture" me..?!?!

BBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !

Funny how your willingness to "impart knowledge" seems to be tentative on
your desire to be Newsgroup Hero.

It doesn't work.

>>> Just another insult claim. Sigh.
>>
>> It's not an insult if it's true, Lennie.
>
> Robeson LIES. Robeson CURSES. Robeson INSULTS.
> Robeson has B.O.

One out of four, Lennie. I do take great sport in insulting you. Of
course it's all possible by the fuel you provide.

>> Twenty-plus year old technology, Lennie? Why? Is it germane to
>Amateur
>>Radio? Is there ANYTHING remotely germane to the current subject of Morse
>>Code identification of aeronautical navaids in the United States?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...the Minister brought up the automatic morse code
> ID on civil airways radionavigation ground stations. Civil aviation
> has nothing to do with amateur radio or morse code testing.

Morse Code testing was not the topic. It may be in YOUR singular mind,
but there are others in this forum who can discuss more than one topic
simultaneously.

>> Hmmmmm....profanity, demeaning insults and failure to "play well with
>>others" noted of the person who just accuswed someone else of the same
>>traits.

>
> "Accuswed?!?" Rage and message typing do not go together.

Rage...?!?! Naw! I spend more time smiling and laughing as I poke yet another hole in your silly ramblings...You DO make it easy.

Yet another LennieRant rolls to a meaningless and unproductive stop.

As if we doubted it would end any other way.

Steve

2124. Re: Why the spew today Steve

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 02:38:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030408223852.01698.00000173@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64261

>Subject: Why the spew today Steve
>From: Myself Me@onthenet.net
>Date: 4/8/2003 9:02 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <gmv69v4q7q385d108blsqdt5bc0g298rri@4ax.com>
>
>
>Why the spew this morning, Steve lose another job?
>Len isn't your worst enemy you are.

BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! !

OK, Lennie! OK!

Steve

2125. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 02:53:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E938AFA.F41FCF0A@att.net>
Source record: 64262

Jon Bloom wrote:

> Why is it that countries
> that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side of
> the fence from us now? In significant part, it's because we've told them
> in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.

Why Jon, I'm surprised you haven't heard. Don't you read the news?
France, Germany and Russia hold over half the Iraqi debt, which is quite large
since the sanctions of '91.
. Who you suppose will pay off if Saddam goes?

Dick

2126. Re: Lennie Just Can't Stand Being Ignored!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 03:08:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E938E7C.A347AEA1@att.net>
Source record: 64263

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>
>
> I STILL don't see your name in the FAA database.

So what else is new?? theony database he is in these days , theGROL, is one
so obsolete that it's only maintained because of an international treaty that
requires it.

Hey, that's just like the Morse code test! Lennie the Putz and Morse code equal
in worth in the eyes of the FCC! whatta concept!

2127. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 03:11:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E938F48.E9919FB4@att.net>
Source record: 64264

N2EY wrote:

>
> There is, however, one thing you never seem to run out of, Len.

Yep Offal de Bull.

2128. Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 03:37:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hd1ssn7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 64265

On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 15:48:15 -0400, Robert Casey wrote:

>>
>>
>> RADIO RULES: FCC CONSIDERS INTERFERENCE IMMUNITY FOR RECIEVERS
>>
>
>About f---in' time!

The working (field enforcement) staff begged for this fifteen years ago, and the then-Commish' in its infinite wisdom declared that it would be "better" to let industry develop its own voluntary standards -- the "less work for Washington" approach. We see how well that worked.

Part of this inquiry is because the EU has had susceptability standards for several years and the manufacturers are expected to push for standards which are no stricter than those of the EU. Fortunately, they are pretty strict.

We will see what happens - money talks and big money talks the loudest.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2129. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 03:37:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hd1vz18.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 64266

On 4 Apr 2003 10:06:53 -0800, N2EY wrote:

>Does Israel have the right to exist as a sovereign nation?

Israel is the Jewish homeland - it has an absolute right to
exist.

>Does "Palestine" have the right to exist as a sovereign nation?

There already is a country that is the "Palestinian" homelanmd.
It lies east of the Jordan River and the Arava and it's misnamed
as a "Hashemite Kingdom" although the Palestinian Arabs outnumber
the Hashemite Arabs two to one.

>> Since the Palestinians cannot
>> do anything about their situation while Israel controls their fate, the
>> burden of that ultimately falls on Israel. Perhaps in my lifetime.
>
>WHOA! "Can't do anything about their situation"??? Sounds like
>"learned helplessness" to me.

Taught to them by a corrupt and evil leadership.

>Have they tried nonviolent resistance? Not sporadically, mind you, but
>as a widespread grassroots movement?

Any "leader" that advocates that would be deposed in short
order.

>How about legal challenges through the justice system?

Try it.... <ggg>

>How about simply emigrating and starting a new life somewhere else?

See my comment above.

>I've never been to Israel, so perhaps the following questions seem
>naive. But I'll ask them anyway:
>
>- Can anyone who applies become an Israeli citizen, and get full
>voting rights?

Yes.

Anyone who is born in the country (or is born to an Israeli
parent temporarily out of the country) is a citizen unless the
parents' visa conditions preculde this ("guest workers" and
foreign diplomats inside Israel).

Anyone who has at least one Jewish grandparent or who converts
to Judaism outside the country and then immigrates into the
country is automatically granted citizenship on request after
arrival.

Anyone who converts to Judaism under the auspices of the
Israeli Rabbinate inside the country is automatically eligible to
request citizenship.

For anyone else not in the above categories, it's about as
complicated a process as we have here in the US but it is
doable. My (non-Jewish) sister-in-law is going through that
process now.

>- What was Palestine like before 1948 in terms of agriculture,
>industry, education, civil rights?

It was under a British mandate, and the Brits were as nasty to
the Jewish community as they were/are to the Irish Catholic
community in Northern Ireland. The Jewish settled areas were
in the process of development of agriculture, industry and
education which flourished. The Arab settled areas were far
less developed in spite of being occupied for a much longer
time.

>- Why have all of the proposals for a Palestinian state been rejected?

The "Oslo Peace Process" would have given the Arabs 92% of the
disputed territories and provided for establishment of a
separate state. The radicals among the Arab political leaders had
their own agenda and wrecked those chances.

> What was missing in those proposals?

What was missing in the eyes of the Arab leadership was
pushing the Jews into the sea.....

>Perhaps his worst fault was taking bad advice from the likes of Henry
>Kissinger, who advised him to admit the Shah of Iran to the USA.

Doktor Heintz has his own agenda for doing things. Best not
to try to discern what it is.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2130. Re: Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 04:12:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E939E32.3EFB5D30@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64268

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3E8B8A7D.F848F6FB@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >You have to admit that this one would be difficult to forget.
>
> I've been trying to forget it for five years...
>
> >Masa's likely forgetten the whole thing by now and is likely sitting
> >quietly at home--probabry sipping some Ripton Tea.
>
> Ever think it was all an act? Like Hashafisti Scratchi?

I don't believe that any more than I believe Vipul's routine is an act.
Now Baghdad Barney from the Information Ministry--THAT'S an act.

Dave K8MN

2131. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 04:12:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E939DB3.28C419E@att.net>
Source record: 64267

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> > Why is it that countries
> > that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side of
> > the fence from us now? In significant part, it's because we've told them
> > in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.
>
> Why Jon, I'm surprised you haven't heard. Don't you read the news?
> France, Germany and Russia hold over half the Iraqi debt, which is quite large
> since the sanctions of '91.
> . Who you suppose will pay off if Saddam goes?
>
> Dick

Oh, by the way, we DON'T give a damn what they think. And that happens
to be a *very* widely held opinion. They sell weapons and war technology to
Saddam and Al Queda and don't give a damn what WE think about that, so why should
we ever again care what they think? All they're good for is stymieing anything and
everything constructive in the UN. And protecting *their* interests regardless of
any others.

2132. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 04:35:59 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@att.net>
Message-ID: <PqNka.51934$ja4.3336784@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 64269

Dear Larry,
Trying to muddy the issue about justification for this war by interjecting labels like "liberal democrats" vs. "conservative republicans" is not making sense. There many conservatives, patriots, republicans, clergymen, etc, who are questioning where this administration is going with this manifest destiny stuff ("Pax Americana"), such as Pat Buchanan, Bob Knovak, William Saffire, etc. Do we no longer agree with our founding fathers who recommended "avoiding foreign entanglements"?...and that is not to preach isolationism, by the way. I am concerned that the U.S. has, perhaps needlessly, just grabbed the tiger by the tail. Someone tell me how this plays out and we get back to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and, of course, manditory testing for morse efficiency.

Is OBL winning or losing? Has capitalism so failed us internationally that we have to resort to force of arms? Could we not take the same $10E9 and convert our economy from hydrocarbon based to nuclear/hydrogen based and let our current oil fed foes starve or sell them the technology for the price of laying down their arms?

Dear "UNK",
As to easily recognizing "evil", there are a few million readers of the Koran who honestly discern YOU as evil. And the U.S. recent and apparently future planned incursions, campaigns, etc. will reinforce their feelings. Going back in history, the Ottomans thought the Armenians were "evil". Many germans, at one time, thought the Poles, Jews, Czechs, Slavs, and/or Gypsies were "evil" (I kind of agree about the Gypsies by the way after my problem in Rome). We humans need to be very careful about easily discerning evil as an obvious attribute, as it seems to escape our capacity to do so correctly from time to time.

Was Iraq a direct threat to the U.S. with WMD? I don't think so.
We have "owned" Iraq for the last 11 years. We have bombed and missiled the s**t of of them from the air with satellite and on-ground covert work (Mossaud) assist during that period. I am disgusted with "reason de jour" justification of this campaign. I finally heard one of the CNN/MSNBC/FOX chief propagandists say this morning "It is fortunate that we reporters do not have to adhere to a fixed set of principles". The U.S. foreign policy needs to be a clear, fixed set of principles that our friends and foes cannot mistake. Oh... and please something other than "Might makes right.".

Lastly, I never thought I would stand with Jon Bloom on any issue, but I do on this one. Having said that, I prefer to not respond any further as this subject should be (OT) on this newsgroup. There are multitudinous suitable groups carrying on this thread. And, TRADITIONALLY, hams are supposed to avoid political discussions in the interest of

brotherhood and international good will.

73,
Clay N4AOX

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030408115200.13624.00000146@mb-fh.aol.com...
> In article <pan.2003.04.08.10.34.38.819114.5721@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>
> >
> >The fact that the Administration has, from the day it entered office,
> >expressed disdain for those -- domestically and internationally -- who
> >disagree with it.
>
> Naturally, the Clinton Administration had no disdain for conservative
> Republicans.
>
> >It's one thing to disagree about things, it's another to
> >belittle and demean those with whom you disagree.
>
> Naturally, liberal Democrats don't do this.
>
> >Why is it that countries
> >that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side of
> >the fence from us now?
>
> It's obviously all President Bush's fault.
>
> >In significant part, it's because we've told them
> >in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.
>
> The problem is, in order to give a damn about what anyone thinks, they
> have to be saying something that makes sense. Jon, I don't give a
> damn about anything you think.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

2133. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 05:52:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E93B4F4.8AC48D5E@att.net>
Source record: 64270

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <pan.2003.04.08.10.34.38.819114.5721@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>
> >>> I wish I shared your trust. The present administration seems daily less
> >>> interested in hearing the opinions of anyone.
> >>
> >> And you base that statement on what?
> >
> >The fact that the Administration has, from the day it entered office,
> >expressed disdain for those -- domestically and internationally -- who
> >disagree with it. It's one thing to disagree about things, it's another to
> >belittle and demean those with whom you disagree. Why is it that countries
> >that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side of
> >the fence from us now? In significant part, it's because we've told them
> >in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...that sounds vaguely like ARRL's position on
> morse code testing... :-)
>
> The parallel is remarkable.

What is remarkable is your absolute ignorance.

2134. Re: Steve al-Sahhaf at the Ministry (was:Lennie Just Can't Stand Being Ignored!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 06:02:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030409020226.15625.00000095@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 64271

In article <20030408223731.01698.00000172@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Canyon of the Cartoons) writes:

>>Subject: Steve al-Sahhaf at the Ministry (was:Lennie Just Can't Stand Being
>>Ignored!)
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/8/2003 9:04 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030408220419.13308.00000096@mb-cj.aol.com>
>
>>So...you've done your "twenty" in the USMC...and "30 years" as
>> a licensed aviator ("pilot-in-command")...and had at least 10
>> years as a nurse. That adds up to, roughly 60 years.
>>
>> You were born in 1955 (plus/minus one).
>>
>> Either you have a time machine or you LIE, sweetums.
>>
>> EXAGGERATION OF THE TRUTH TO THE POINT OF LYING.
>
> Unlike yourself, Your Scumminess, I am capable of multi-tasking.

Of course...you never sleep either. That may explain things.

> I notice both you and Vippy seem to have a problem with that concept, and
>that both of you are allegedly "engineers". What's that say about the
>occupational field...???

Rather good, I'd say. I'm now a Life Member of the IEEE, don't pay dues anymore. Nothing extra to reach that.

Electronic engineering is an interesting, rewarding, and (often) a creative professional occupation. I've enjoyed the career and continue to do so in part-time work.

> Oh, I accept that you may have had a student pilots permit at one time.
>Lots of people start flying then never finish. You were just one of them.

Private flying is not a requirement for electronics engineering.

>>> Other than my hang glider, I don't own an aircraft either, but I still
>>>manage to get to fly on a regular basis.
>>
>> Wow. "Pilot in command" of a T-6! You are a "left-seater?"
>
> First of all, I'd LOVE to have PIC time in a T-6. But what I'd REALLY

>like to know is where YOU are coming up with this...?!?! I have never
>indicated ANY experience in the T-6.

Tennessee CAP doesn't have any T-6s? Tsk, tsk, tsk, its a
standard aircraft around here for CAP. Old aircraft, went out of
production decades ago.

What do you "fly?" Aeronca C-3s? :-)

Maybe rebuilt or replica Wright Flyers?

> "Delusional"...?!?! "Sociopath"...?!?! I said you have numerous excuses
>as to why you don't finish your licenses and you relate it to your
>"career"...?!?! Someone's "delusional" here, Your Putziness, but it ain't
>me.

Since when did a pilot's license pertain to anything in radio?

Steam Robeson has gone off on the deeper end again.

> And since you brought up your "expert knowledge" in aeronautics, how come
>you've not finsihed up THAT license...?!?!

No such license was required for my work. No pilot's license is
required to design, produce, or work on civil or military avionics.

I don't claim to be any "expert" on avionics. However, in comparison
to Steam's ignorance, I appear to be an "expert." :-)

>>> And that's about what it was when I got my license in 74. I started
two
>>>years earlier, doing the usual "kid jobs", etc, to earn money to fly with.
>>
>> Isn't that so wonderful! You did "kid jobs" at age 19.
>
> Up until I went to boot camp...Yup.
>
>>But...wait...wasn't "Sgt Putz" in the USMC then?
>
> Not until September 1974. Wanna refigure the math, Your Putziness?

Why? Are you busy with your "CV" in here? :-)

Does the USMC have sergeant pilots? If so, what aircraft?

You seem to think having a pilot's license is Very Important to
radio knowledge. How come Steamy wasn't a USMC pilot if
he had a private pilot license two years before joining?

Inconsistency. Tsk, tsk, tsk. That's getting to be another
"seven hostile actions" thing, isn't it?

>>In 1974 I was a senior staff engineer at RCA Corporation and
>> was granted my first patent.
>

> And now look where you are...generating hundreds of bits of hate-mail in
>a newsgroup dedicated to a field of radiocommunications in which you have
>expressed no real interest in being part of .

Tsk, tsk, tsk...still with the bad sentence structure. Did you
enlist in the marines to hide the shame of failing high school
English? :-)

This newsgroup is about AMATEUR RADIO. Do you understand
radio? I don't think so. You seem to think a pilot's license is
needed to operate a radio. That's bizarre.

>> Poor baby. Probably hasn't been in a TRACON or done anything
>> but curse at ATC personnel.
>
> Why do you persist in humiliating yourself, Lennie?

Humiliating? Nope. I've been to a TRACON. I've talked to ATC
personnel away from one. No problems, no badness, no
humiliation.

Steamy is imagining things again, poor guy.

>>Tsk, tsk, tsk...Robeson thinks he knows collision avoidance.
>
> Ever see my name in an NTSB report vis-a-vis a midair?
>
> Guess I DO know something about collision avoidance.

Sorry. By Robesian logic, one has to be IN something to "know
about it." Since you claim to have never been in a mid-air,
you know NOTHING about it. :-)

> Not really. That's your self deluded ideation of what I MUST need in
>order to make YOURSELF happy. If that's what it takes, indulge yourself.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...you need mental counseling. Medical science
must have some new drug that would help you.

> Hmmmm...that's funny. Seems I remember trying to coax the Licenseless
One
>into doing some tutorials on microwave principles...NOW you find it
appropriate
>to "lecture" me..?!?!

Someone has to. Steamy knows less about microwave technology than
operating the knobs on his OBS...but NOTHING about the circuitry or
systems behind the front panel.

> Funny how your willingness to "impart knowledge" seems to be tentative
>on your desire to be Newsgroup Hero.

Steamy is still imagining things. This is just discussion in a newsgroup.

Steamy thinks it is all about "fighting." Bizarre. Must be paranoia
or some form of sociopathy. Certainly unbalanced.

> It doesn't work.

Steamy doesn't work IN electronics. The closest he's been is as a
purchasing agent in a small firm for less than a year.

> One out of four, Lennie. I do take great sport in insulting you. Of
>course it's all possible by the fuel you provide.

Sociopathy for sure, Steamy, you've become infected with it.

You cannot play well with others. You need counseling and
therapy...possibly a drug prescription.

> Morse Code testing was not the topic. It may be in YOUR singular mind,
>but there are others in this forum who can discuss more than one topic
>simultaneously.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Steamy hasn't been able to discuss ONE topic without
insulting others.

>>> Hmmmmm....profanity, demeaning insults and failure to "play well with
>>>others" noted of the person who just accuswed someone else of the same
>>>traits.
>>
>> "Accuswed?!?" Rage and message typing do not go together.
>
> Rage...?!?! Naw! I spend more time smiling and laughing as I poke yet
>another hole in your silly ramblings...You DO make it easy.

What is this word "accuswed?" It's not in my dictionary.

Does it mean you are married to cursing? That's a possibility...

Get help, Steamy. You will be better for it.

2135. Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 06:36:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB93796.15D96%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64272

"Bill Sohl" wrote:

> We should all be encouraging this and commenting
> that manufacturers SHOULD be required to design
> and market products that have a specified
> resistance to interference (IMHO).

Will this legislation have a negative impact on the receivers in our ham radio equipment? Has anyone seen the standards manufacturers will be made to follow when designing receivers? Will these standards reduce the receiver's sensitivity or receive capability in any manner?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2136. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 07:02:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB93DB2.15D98%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64273

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> In this case, our cause is just. We seek to free an
> imprisoned nation from the barbarism of a vicious,
> totalitarian despot who would have threatened the
> rest of the free world unchecked had we not finally
> intervened. (snip)

Lets keep the discussion within the realm of reality, Larry. Saddam didn't threaten the "rest of the free world" even prior to the last Iraq war. He was a two-bit dictator of a third world country with a third world military. He could not even defeat Iran, much less the rest of the free world. And, after the reduction of his military during and after the last war, he was even less of a threat to the free world leading into this war.

As for WMD (if he actually had them leading up to this war), he did not use them even to save his country from a direct attack or to save his own life - not exactly what one would expect from a person intending to use them on the "rest of the free world."

> No, it is categorically NOT possible for any loyal
> American to justify non-support for this righteous
> campaign and the Commander-In-Chief who courageously
> prosecuted it. (snip)

Nonsense.

> To withhold support for the President and this war
> is to choose the continuation of the evil of the
> Saddam Hussein regime. (snip)

Nonsense.

> (snip) These Anti-War protesters are merely mindless
> parrots of empty rhetoric which reflects nothing more
> than their own intellectual laziness and physical
> cowardice.

Nonsense.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2137. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 07:23:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAB942BF.15D9A%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64274

"Len Over 21" wrote:

> Do-nothing pacifism avoids responsibility.

I disagree. While I'm not a pacifist, I do come from a religious background that advocates pacifism. As I see it, instead of your rather bleak outlook, pacifism requires the ultimate in responsibility for one's actions - the idea that one is not going to lower oneself to the same violence of another unless absolutely necessary, combined with the restraint to hold one's own violent tendencies in check. In a violent world, that requires far more control, and bravery, then the ease of just striking out at anything one objects to.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2138. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 12:40:29 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.09.12.40.28.774793.11986@arrl.org>
Source record: 64275

On Tue, 08 Apr 2003 22:53:02 -0400, Dick Carroll wrote:
> Why Jon, I'm surprised you haven't heard. Don't you read the news?
> France, Germany and Russia hold over half the Iraqi debt, which is quite large
> since the sanctions of '91.
> . Who you suppose will pay off if Saddam goes?

Looks like we'll be finding out!

Jon

2139. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 13:02:19 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.09.13.02.16.611269.11986@arrl.org>
Source record: 64276

On Wed, 09 Apr 2003 00:12:57 -0400, Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Oh, by the way, we DON'T give a damn what they think. And that happens
> to be a *very* widely held opinion. They sell weapons and war technology
> to Saddam

As did the US in the 1980s, including materials for WMD. See:
http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename=article&contentId=A52241-2002Dec29

> and Al Queda and don't give a damn what WE think about that, so why
> should we ever again care what they think? All they're good for is
> stymieing anything and everything constructive in the UN. And protecting
> *their* interests regardless of any others.

So we should fight selfishness with selfishness, is that it? My
second-grader thinks that way, too, but I'm trying to teach him to do the
right thing even when others don't.

Jon

2140. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 13:09:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304090509.6c9a4d25@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64277

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.08.02.25.42.510174.8992@arrl.org>...
> On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 21:21:24 -0400, Brian wrote:
>
> > Do you think that the Daschle Chicks are patriots? If so, why?
>
> Do you think they are not? If so, why?

I think it's important for every American to have the right to voice
their displeasure with their government, -at no risk to themselves-,
while other Americans are dying on the battlefield to protect that
right.

The Constitution doesn't mandate patriotism, and I think the Dixie
Chick merely exercised her right to be unpatriotic and stupid.

Brian

2141. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 13:22:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304090522.33ca1c74@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64278

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9243A1.F66483EF@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > Apparently that doesn't mean anything.
>
> > Most of what you say doesn't mean anything.
>
> ...not to a fellow with a reading comprehension problem it wouldn't.
> You attempt to divine something from my replies which is not there and
> you seem unable to understand what I have written.
>
> In this case, you have no response to my comments at all except for a
> final line which you use out of context. We could have discussed it at
> Universal Radio on Saturday. I even had all the morse proficiency
> charts and diagrams in my my car.

Dave, damn! Next time you're this way let me know and I'll buy you
lunch at Alice's Resturaunt, or maybe even Mark Pi's. Put a belt clip
on that Ten-Tec radio, get your knee-key, charts, diagrams, and 8x10
glossies with circles and arrows.

We just might get through this thing if you're ready to open up a
little.

Brian

2142. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 13:23:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304090523.4fec6f36@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64279

"Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b6rrb6$892b0$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...
> Even if someone who never used morse code before, they could do better than
> that speed even if they were looking it up on a chart!

Faster would have made the world's record unlikely. Brian

2143. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 13:38:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E942224.724E1463@att.net>
Source record: 64280

Jon Bloom wrote:

> On Wed, 09 Apr 2003 00:12:57 -0400, Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Oh, by the way, we DON'T give a damn what they think. And that happens
> > to be a *very* widely held opinion. They sell weapons and war technology
> > to Saddam
>
> As did the US in the 1980s, including materials for WMD. See:
> http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename=article&contentId=A52241-2002Dec29
>
> > and Al Queda and don't give a damn what WE think about that, so why
> > should we ever again care what they think? All they're good for is
> > stymieing anything and everything constructive in the UN. And protecting
> > *their* interests regardless of any others.
>
> So we should fight selfishness with selfishness, is that it? My
> second-grader thinks that way, too, but I'm trying to teach him to do the
> right thing even when others don't.
>
> Jon

Make sure to teach him that he should never protect himself. That message
is consistant with your views expressed here.

2144. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 14:28:23 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.09.14.28.22.926718.25899@arrl.org>
Source record: 64281

On Wed, 09 Apr 2003 09:38:03 -0400, Dick Carroll wrote:
> Make sure to teach him that he should never protect himself. That
> message is consistant with your views expressed here.

No, it's not. It's utterly inconsistent, in fact. Not giving a damn about what anyone else thinks is much more likely to endanger you than at least trying to reach common ground with them. The effort to reach common ground doesn't require giving up your own vital interests, such as self defense, but not making that effort makes it more likely that you WILL have to defend yourself.

Jon

2145. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 16:32:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030409123219.00629.00000045@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 64282

In article <d5mka.4773$Xp3.2935953@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>In academia, it is "publish or perish". The professors will NOT use any
>material outside that written by colleagues unless that is the only choice.
>The quality or ease of understanding the material is irrelevant to the
>professors. They are contributing to each other's financial welfare and
>that is the basis on which they select text books. This has been going on
>ever since there were universities. To think otherwise is incredibly naive.
>
>I've many reference books that I bought in my field because the college
>texts were next to impossible to understand. Why didn't the professors use
>these better books? They knew about them and they also knew that neither
>they nor other college professors authored them.

Right on the money, Dee!

In my experience, sometimes the books were pretty good, in other cases they were almost useless. Cost was not an indicator of quality, either. There were also cases where we were expected to buy a high-priced book and wound up using only a chapter or two.

Some universities dealt in used books and buy-back programs, but they were rare.

Most amateur radio publications are not meant to be university textbooks. Most EE courses are not about radio.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2146. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 17:30:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304090930.36f37eaa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64283

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BAB942BF.15D9A%stewart@say.net>...
> "Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> > Do-nothing pacifism avoids responsibility.
>
>
> I disagree. While I'm not a pacifist, I do come from a religious
> background that advocates pacifism. As I see it, instead of your rather
> bleak outlook, pacifism requires the ultimate in responsibility for one's
> actions - the idea that one is not going to lower oneself to the same
> violence of another unless absolutely necessary, combined with the restraint
> to hold one's own violent tendencies in check. In a violent world, that
> requires far more control, and bravery, then the ease of just striking out
> at anything one objects to.

Kindly note the reaction of the average Iraqui to the coming of our
armor & troops. There are 26 million of them, we've lost 100 or so of
ours so far. As ill-founded (YMMV) as the rationale is for getting
into this quagmire is it not coming up a worthwhile endeavor anyway?

>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

w3rv

Quaker.

2147. Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 17:34:02 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304090934.7b06e5be@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64284

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BAB93796.15D96%stewart@say.net>...
> "Bill Sohl" wrote:
>
> > We should all be encouraging this and commenting
> > that manufacturers SHOULD be required to design
> > and market products that have a specified
> > resistance to interference (IMHO).
>
>
> Will this legislation have a negative impact on the receivers in our ham
> radio equipment? Has anyone seen the standards manufacturers will be made to
> follow when designing receivers? Will these standards reduce the receiver's
> sensitivity or receive capability in any manner?

The max allowable bandwidth will be 500 Hz.

>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

w3rv

2148. Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 20:52:18 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304092030000.980@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 64285

On Tue, 8 Apr 2003, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >Subject: Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.
> >From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
> >Date: 4/8/2003 5:08 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304082134240.843@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
>
> >> >I think that the first issue here is that we should stop that
> >spammer...(SNIP)
> >>
> >> Here we go again.
> >
> >I see you offered nothing to contradict my statement.
>
> What's to offer, DS? You think Bill is a spammer. I don't. His items
> ARE relative to Amateur Radio specifically, and policy more often than not.
> When one condisers that MOST of the "posts" here are personality conflicts and
> mindless rants of unlicensed or inexperienced persons, Bill's posts are, at
> worst, a wholly germane diversion.

He is a spammer because his posts, per the newsgroup FAQ and charter for the "rec.radio" hierarchy, are specifically NOT appropriate here and are supposed to go to a different newsgroup - and HE KNOWS THAT because he had to apply for permission to post on that other newsgroup and was granted it. Many of his stories are NOT policy issues. Granted, there's alot of ranting by the participants here that are also off topic, but their error doesn't justify his.

You will note that I don't contest his posting on "rec.radio.amateur.MISC". That's because the FAQ and charter DO permit it there (but technically, it should be CROSS-POSTED, not separately posted, to "rec.radio.info", which he isn't doing).

> >1) The mexicans were intentionally interfering with the machine in Los
> >Angeles...(SNIP)
>
> So...You cite ONE incident that was over two years ago. There's usually
> at least five or six "items" per report, so assuming one release a week and
> (104 posts), that comes out to 520 seperate topics.
>
> I'm am so not impressed. CNN should be so right all the time.

You asked for an example. I only had to present one. It may not be the only one, but it was the one that came to mind first.

> >2) He further reported that there had been no attempt to coordinate the
> >repeater in Los Angeles.
>

> I am futher unimpressed with the coordinating and political processes in
> Southern California. I am reminded of a situation involving a Costa Mesa
> Amateur who decided to set up his own "remote base" on busy 2M simplex
> frequencies and began operating an uncooridinated, out-of-band repeater. These
> were the days before Riley, mind you.

Before Riley or after Riley: In Southern California, NO DIFFERENCE.

> Despite being handed over 100 seperate signatures on formal written
> complaints, nothing was ever done beccause when the offender was contacted, "he
> swore and threatened" the "officials" of the coordinating organizations.
>
> >) Don't you have to wonder why BP never asked K6PYP, or Angos Winke, KC6OKA,
> >the alternate control operator, for their side of this story despite the fact
> >that both lived in Los Angeles, yet he did talk to the mexicans and get their
> >side of the story?
>
> Mexicans are under no obligation to observe United States regulations. I
> was IN California and know for a fact that there were numerous occassions when
> US Amateurs turned a blind eye to requests from Mexican Amateurs to help avoid
> problems THEY were experiencing.

Well, I see that my point went completely over your head on this one: Why
didn't BP contact K6PYP or KC6OKA to get the other side of the story? Here's
why: BP wasn't interested in TRUTHFUL reporting but would rather smear the
reputation of individuals he didn't personally like. They probably should have
sued him for defamation of character (which is one of the things that can
breach the "CA Shield Law" for the press).

In the truth of this situation, you will find that the repeaters in question
were so far apart (~150 miles) that one could not interfere with the other in
their respective counties, especially considering the FM capture effect - and
that the real issue here was the Mexican's malicious interference for wanting a
"clear channel" (i.e. no one else on it) vs. a "usable channel" (which is what
the capture effect would give them up to the northern border of San Diego
County).

> I can't condone "tit-for-tat" harmful interference, but I understand where
> the motivation comes from.
>
> >Then, there's also the matter that "Newsline" claims that it costs $1,000.00
> >per month in expenses to collect and report the news. Considering that its
> >rival, "This Week in Amateur Radio" does the exact same function for only
> >$100/month, then just what is this additional $900/month going to?
>
> Who cares?

Fraud is everyone's problem.

> W5YI and WB6NOA have been wringing money out of Amateurs for decades for
> performing what the FCC will do for free yet people still send them money every
> month. At least with Newsline, Mr Pasternak still makes his wares available to

> ALL Amateurs regardless of whether they "donate" or not.

Fred's actions, although absolutely disgusting, are not illegal in any way. I don't know what actions you refer to by Gordon that "the FCC will do for free" because the only action I am aware of him doing is his teaching activity which the FCC doesn't do at all.

> >Mr. Pasternak is paying himself a SALARY for collecting the
> >amateur radio news.
>
> So...Some people may call him a charlatan, others an entreprenuer. This is
> NOT snake oil he's peddling. You are free to read/listen to the stuff or not.
> Again, you can QSY if you hear it on the air and put him in your killfile
> on-line.

But it reduces to a pecuniary interest that IS banned by the rules because he is accepting compensation to write and make a transmission (which is then re-transmitted as noted below). There is a rule that does forbid this.

> >Although not using amateur radio itself to collect the
> >news (I'll give him the benefit of the doubt on this), his pecuniary interest
> >is still a violation of 47 CFR 97.113(a) and/or (b) - indirect compensation,
> >which with the wording in (a), could also mean that any system repeating his
> >news bulletin could also be in violation (because it facilitates the
> >commercial
> >affairs of BP since he takes a salary).
>
> Well then, the next time you hear one ON THE AIR, write a letter to Riley.
> Otherwise, anything that transpires on this forum is NOT subject to any
> interpretation of Part 97.
>
> >You asked.
>
> Yep. But you've not given me one bit of reason other than your dislike for
> the man as to why his "Newsline" posts should or shouldn't appear here, DS.
> Again, in MY opinion (with absolutely no more or no less weight than yours, of
> course...) his posts are far more appropriate for this forum than MOST of the
> ones generated by "the regulars", and yes, that includes mine.

Read the unified newsgroup FAQ for all of "rec.radio" and that should make it clear to you that his posts on this group are inappropriate.

As I have said before, just because others have gone off-topic doesn't justify more off-topic posts.

2149. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 21:09:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030409170937.13737.00000052@mb-fs.aol.com>
Source record: 64286

In article <BAB942BF.15D9A%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
>> Do-nothing pacifism avoids responsibility.
>
> I disagree. While I'm not a pacifist, I do come from a religious
>background that advocates pacifism.

Nothing wrong with that...

>As I see it, instead of your rather
>bleak outlook, pacifism requires the ultimate in responsibility for one's
>actions - the idea that one is not going to lower oneself to the same
>violence of another unless absolutely necessary, combined with the restraint
>to hold one's own violent tendencies in check.

There IS something wrong with that.

Embedded in that long sentence is the self-enobling "lower oneself
to the same violence of another" only slight modified by the
appended "...unless absolutely necessary." That means some
implicit enoblement which is no defense of anything, just a
refined form of braggadoccio.

There is NO courage in martyrdom or of letting others walk all over
you in symbolic conquest. Being a martyr is only "glory" as
perceived by others believing the same thing...all of which becomes
null and void when the martyr and the believers are dead, destroyed.

>In a violent world, that
>requires far more control, and bravery, then the ease of just striking out
>at anything one objects to.

While martyrdom and combat-for-what-one-believes-in can both
result in death, the combatant at least DOES something.
Martyrs resign themselves to death without doing anything at
all. That's a violation of the basic, built-in imperative in the
human race: Survival.

Aiding and abetting martyrdom might give emotional comfort to
those living in some intellectual fantasy world, but it is totally
unrealistic. All the intellectual fantasies put together are a
very meager sustenance, insufficient to keep a martyr alive.

Pacifism is often motivated by personal fear. That is not a redeeming attribute. It isn't noble or on some "higher plane" when the motivation is purely personal. Is selfishness a noble attribute? I don't think so.

I too come from a religious background, a religion begun by a Catholic priest of long ago named Martin Luther. One might say it began when Luther nailed a document to his church door (a simplistic viewpoint, perhaps, but illustrative). Many centuries ago that took considerable courage when the Catholic church considered themselves "higher" than ordinary folk and didn't want to "lower" themselves to their level by having Bibles only in Latin rather than in the native language. The Catholic church reformed itself after Lutheranism spread. That was good for all. It was NOT an easy task. History shows that.

Pacifism is a form of denial, an avoidance of responsibility, emotional selfishness. Such grows into "noble thoughts higher than the common emotional level" when sheltered from harm...sheltered by the very "lower level" common folk the pacifists declare they "rise above." Nonsense.

2150. Re: Lennie Just Can't Stand Being Ignored!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 22:02:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030409180251.29540.00000282@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64287

>Subject: Re: Steve al-Sahhaf at the Ministry (was:Lennie Just Can't Stand
>Being Ignored!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/9/2003 1:02 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030409020226.15625.00000095@mb-ch.aol.com>

>> Oh, I accept that you may have had a student pilots permit at one time.
>
>>Lots of people start flying then never finish. You were just one of them.
>
> Private flying is not a requirement for electronics engineering.

I didn't say it was. Just (correctly) pointed out that this was yet
another thing you've NOT accomplished.

>> First of all, I'd LOVE to have PIC time in a T-6. But what I'd REALLY
>>like to know is where YOU are coming up with this...?!?! I have never
>>indicated ANY experience in the T-6.
>
> Tennessee CAP doesn't have any T-6s? Tsk, tsk, tsk, its a
> standard aircraft around here for CAP. Old aircraft, went out of
> production decades ago.

Unless someone has a T-6 in private ownership in CAP colors, there are NO
T-6's being flown by Civil Air Patrol...In California Wing or any other. There
were none when I was a member of CAWG in the late 80's, and I see none on the
current roster.

>What do you "fly?" Aeronca C-3s?

Currently? The Cessna 172, 182, 172RG, 210 and the American
Aviation/Grumman AA1A/TR-2.

You?

>Since when did a pilot's license pertain to anything in radio?

Since you once again assert "expertise" in something but cannot
demonstrate practical experience in it. A pilot's license would be prima facie
evidence that you accomplished SOMETHING.

>Steam Robeson has gone off on the deeper end again.

At least I have the steam to go in deep, Lennie. You're just petered out!

>> And since you brought up your "expert knowledge" in aeronautics, how
>come
>>you've not finsihed up THAT license...?!?!

>
> No such license was required for my work. No pilot's license is
> required to design, produce, or work on civil or military avionics.

No...Only to prove practical experience in APPLYING your work. Again, you
may know what goes on INSIDE the box, but you have zero-point-squat experience
IN the air using it.

>I don't claim to be any "expert" on avionics. However, in comparison
> to Steam's ignorance, I appear to be an "expert."

You "appear" to be expert in several things...none of which includes
practical radio communications or aeronautical navigation.

>You seem to think having a pilot's license is Very Important to
> radio knowledge. How come Steamy wasn't a USMC pilot if
> he had a private pilot license two years before joining?

Having a pilot's license is important to being able to substantiate
practical experience in aerial navigation.

And you seem to not be able to keep the math straight on when I joined the
Marine Corps and when I got my license.

>Inconsistency. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

My thoughts exactly. Wanna go back throught the last couple days
exchanges in this thread alone and see why YOU are once again in error?

>This newsgroup is about AMATEUR RADIO. Do you understand
> radio? I don't think so. You seem to think a pilot's license is
> needed to operate a radio.

Where did you see me say that?

I think making such silly conclusions without supporting evidence is...

>bizarre.

Thanks...just the word I was looking for...

>>>Tsk, tsk, tsk...Robeson thinks he knows collision avoidance.
>>
>> Ever see my name in an NTSB report vis-a-vis a midair?
>>
>> Guess I DO know something about collision avoidance.
>
> Sorry. By Robesian logic, one has to be IN something to "know
> about it." Since you claim to have never been in a mid-air,
> you know NOTHING about it.

I know enough about it to have never had one.

>> Hmmmm...that's funny. Seems I remember trying to coax the Licenseless
>One

>>into doing some tutorials on microwave principles...NOW you find it
>appropriate
>>to "lecture" me..?!?!
>
> Someone has to. Steamy knows less about microwave technology than
> operating the knobs on his OBS...but NOTHING about the circuitry or
> systems behind the front panel.

But...but...but...LENNIE! This is a newsgroup on Amateur Radio...NOT civil Avionics!

And I know more than you allow yourself to assume I know. But that's YOUR fantasy, and I'll let you enjoy it.

>> Funny how your willingness to "impart knowledge" seems to be tentative
>>on your desire to be Newsgroup Hero.
>
> Steamy is still imagining things. This is just discussion in a newsgroup.

No it's not. It's all about a ner-do-well ex radio technician's desire to prove himself "better" than mere mortals because he is too cowardly or too proud to sit for the same civil radio exams they had to sit for.

>Steamy thinks it is all about "fighting." Bizarre. Must be paranoia
> or some form of sociopathy. Certainly unbalanced.

Another diagnosis from your correspondence course trained psychology major missus, Lennie? You've still not reconcilled us with how you at once stated she was a licensed therapist, then turned around an said she's NOT a psychologist or psychiatrist.

In your words..."bizarre".

>You cannot play well with others. You need counseling and
> therapy...possibly a drug prescription.

You certainly take great pleasure is talking about psychotropic drugs all the time, Lennie. Wonder if I make a couple calls to ER's in your area if I'd find out if you were a frequent flier for drugs yourself?

>Get help, Steamy. You will be better for it.

Check the mirror, Your Confusedness. Must be terrible to be at your age and have so many things un-done.

Whew.

Steve

2151. Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 22:25:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030409182552.29540.00000283@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64288

>Subject: Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>Date: 4/9/2003 3:52 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304092030000.980@kd6lvw.ampr.org>

>He is a spammer...(SNIP)

Only because you do not like him. I do not see you protesting the "buy
Viagra" and other equally rediculous items that pop-up from time to time.

>> So...You cite ONE incident that was over two years ago. There's
>usually
>> at least five or six "items" per report, so assuming one release a week and
>> (104 posts), that comes out to 520 seperate topics.
>>
>> I'm am so not impressed. CNN should be so right all the time.
>
>You asked for an example. I only had to present one. It may not be the only
>one, but it was the one that came to mind first.

And I still refer to the general news media...they are 100% right and
completely unbiased 100% of the time, DS?

>> Mexicans are under no obligation to observe United States regulations.
>I
>> was IN California and know for a fact that there were numerous occassions
>when
>> US Amateurs turned a blind eye to requests from Mexican Amateurs to help
>avoid
>> problems THEY were experiencing.
>
>Well, I see that my point went completely over your head on this one: Why
>didn't BP contact K6PYP or KC6OKA to get the other side of the story? Here's
>why: BP wasn't interested in TRUTHFUL reporting but would rather smear the
>reputation of individuals he didn't personally like. They probably should
>have
>sued him for defamation of character (which is one of the things that can
>breach the "CA Shield Law" for the press).

I got your point. I repeat my question...The general news media is ALWAYS
100% right or 100% unbiased...?!?!

>Fraud is everyone's problem.

You can prove fraud? You can prove that Mr. Pasternak's expenses are NOT
the +/- $1000 he claims?

>Fred's actions, although absolutely disgusting, are not illegal in any way.
>I
>don't know what actions you refer to by Gordon that "the FCC will do for
>free"
>because the only action I am aware of him doing is his teaching activity
>which
>the FCC doesn't do at all.

Then I guess he's "withdrawn" for the renew-for-fee scheme that W5YI, and
now the ARRL seem to find lucrative.

>But it reduces to a pecuniary interest that IS banned by the rules because he
>is accepting compensation to write and make a transmission (which is then
>re-transmitted as noted below). There is a rule that does forbid this.

Then, Dieter, may I suggest you write an appropriate letter of concern to
Mr. Hollingsworth and voice your concerns? I know he's an active Amateur
himself and must be aware of Mr. Paternak's service, yet he's not taken any
action nor made any effort. Perhaps if you prodded him a bit?

>Read the unified newsgroup FAQ for all of "rec.radio" and that should make it
>clear to you that his posts on this group are inappropriate.

Then if we strictly enforce the FAQ's we can expect a reduction of, say,
95% of all the posts here? Including yours vis-a-vis what is
appropriate/inappropriate?

>As I have said before, just because others have gone off-topic doesn't
>justify
>more off-topic posts.

Well....nuff said, I suppose. If you are THAT concerned about the
potential violations of Part 97, then I'd expect you to write the FCC as
suggested. Otherwise I don't forsee any resolution to the situation. I for
one enjoy being able to see and then comment on the pertinent parts of his
posts here as it applies to them.
73

Steve, K4YZ

2152. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 22:27:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030409182714.00629.00000046@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 64289

In article <PqNka.51934$ja4.3336784@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Clay N4AOX" <wyn@att.net> writes:

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: "Clay N4AOX" <wyn@att.net>
>Date: Wed, 09 Apr 2003 04:35:59 GMT
>
>Dear Larry,
> Trying to muddy the issue about justification for this war by
>interjecting labels like "liberal democrats" vs. "conservative republicans"
>is not making sense. There many conservatives, patriots, republicans,
>clergymen, etc, who are questioning where this administration is going with
>this manifest destiny stuff ("Pax Americana"), such as Pat Buchanan, Bob
>Knovak, William Saffire, etc.

Good point, Clay. There are also large numbers of "liberal democrats" who have not opposed the war at all.

>Do we no longer agree with our founding
>fathers who recommended "avoiding foreign entanglements"?...and that is not
>to preach isolationism, by the way. I am concerned that the U.S. has,
>perhaps needlessly, just grabbed the tiger by the tail. Someone tell me
>how this plays out and we get back to life, liberty, and the pursuit of
>happiness and, of course, manditory testing for morse efficiency.

It all basically comes down to the White House feeling that we are threatened enough, and the chances of success high enough, to make military action worthwhile.
>
> Is OBL winning or losing?

We'll know in a few decades.

Remember who trained OBL (a murderous bastard) in the use of weapons and the organization of a covert anti-government movement. The CIA was willing to turn a blind idea to "resistance" atrocities against the Soviets back then.

Then the Soviets finally left, and the Moscow-tied Kabul govt. collapsed, Afghanistan erupted in civil war which finally ended when the Taliban took over. Were the Taliban better than the Moscow-tied govt. the USA helped topple?

>Has capitalism so failed us
>internationally that we have to resort to force of arms? Could we not take
>the same $10E9 and convert our economy from hydrocarbon based to
>nuclear/hydrogen based and let our current oil fed foes starve or sell them
>the technology for the price of laying down their arms?

That sort of thing is "boring" to many people, Clay.

There's also the fact that, as Jon Bloom's link points out, the USA had a role in empowering him and selling him weapons and weapons technology.
>
> Dear "UNK",
> As to easily recognizing "evil", there are a few million readers of
>the Koran who honestly discern YOU as evil. And the U.S. recent and
>apparently future planned incursions, campaigns, etc. will reinforce their
>feelings. Going back in history, the Ottomans thought the Armenians were
>"evil". Many germans, at one time, thought the Poles, Jews, Czechs,
>Slavs, and/or Gypsies were "evil" (I kind of agree about the Gypsies by the
>way after my problem in Rome). We humans need to be very careful about
>easily discerning evil as an obvious attribute, as it seems to escape our
>capacity to do so correctly from time to time.

Well said!

> Was Iraq a direct threat to the U.S. with WMD? I don't think so.

I think Mr. Bush's concern is that they were an indirect threat.

>We have "owned" Iraq for the last 11 years. We have bombed and missiled the
>s**t of of them from the air with satellite and on-ground covert work
>(Mossaud) assist during that period. I am disgusted with "reason de jour"
>justification of this campaign. I finally heard one of the CNN/MSNBC/FOX
>chief propagandists say this morning "It is fortunate that we reporters do
>not have to adhere to a fixed set of principles". The U.S. foreign policy
>needs to be a clear, fixed set of principles that our friends and foes
>cannot mistake. Oh... and please something other than "Might makes right.".

A lot of this really boils down to the tendency of American foreign policy to be willing to partner with all sorts of murderous bastards simply because they are suupposedly not as bad as some other murderous bastards. Then the mess created has to be cleaned up by another war.

For example, the USA backed the Shah of Iran (a murderous bastard) because he was anti-USSR and would sell us oil cheap. A blind eye was turned to the Shah's domestic atrocities. It took a radical group to overthrow him because moderate groups were exterminated. Then Iran went from being a friend to a foe, so the USA helped Iraq, and turned a blind eye to SH's atrocities for a while.
>
> Lastly, I never thought I would stand with Jon Bloom on any issue,
>but I do on this one. Having said that, I prefer to not respond any
>further as this subject should be (OT) on this newsgroup. There are
>multitudinous suitable groups carrying on this thread. And, TRADITIONALLY,
>hams are supposed to avoid political discussions in the interest of
>brotherhood and international good will.

Which will take a lot of rebuilding.

Thanks, Clay.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2153. Re: Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 22:39:59 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304091439.206c40e8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64290

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030408062957.23756.00000075@mb-fj.aol.com>...
> In article <3E8B8A7D.F848F6FB@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >You have to admit that this one would be difficult to forget.
>
> I've been trying to forget it for five years...
>
> >Masa's likely forgetten the whole thing by now and is likely sitting
> >quietly at home--probabry sipping some Ripton Tea.
>
> Ever think it was all an act? Like Hashafisti Scratchi?

He was for real, somebody in that flamefest knew him personally. As I
recall he was either a student or a faculty member or both at McGill
and had a bunch of commercial radio licenses and worked professionally
in the BC field. He reportedly bailed away from ham radio in a snit
later to the extent that he sold all his gear. I still dunno what a
Japanese Canadian was doing spouting off in a U.S. ham policy forum.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2154. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 23:14:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E94A944.F59C6946@att.net>
Source record: 64291

Jon Bloom wrote:

> On Wed, 09 Apr 2003 09:38:03 -0400, Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Make sure to teach him that he should never protect himself. That
> > message is consistant with your views expressed here.
>
> No, it's not. It's utterly inconsistent, in fact. Not giving a damn about
> what anyone else thinks is much more likely to endanger you than at least
> trying to reach common ground with them.

You still don't get it Jon. After 12 years of them waffling over the Iraq problem
I couldn't care less what France Germany Russia nor the UN thinks about it. Obviously their views are contaminated beyond recovery by their financial interest
in keeping Saddam in power. I agree with the administration, we must not wait for
the next version of 9/11.
I doubt you'd have done so, but I, for one, wondered following the 1993 WTC attack, how they'd do it next time, in a better effort to do it right. We learned the answer on 9/11. Allowing Saddam to arm the Islamic terrorists by allowing our European "friends" to stonwall and delay until nothing *can* be done is futile folly.

> The effort to reach common
> ground doesn't require giving up your own vital interests, such as self
> defense, but not making that effort makes it more likely that you WILL
> have to defend yourself.

Evidently you're another who didn't understand what took place on 9/11/01, and evidently still do not.

>
>
> Jon

2155. Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-09 23:37:09 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304092311210.1110@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 64292

On Wed, 9 Apr 2003, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >Subject: Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.
> >From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
> >Date: 4/9/2003 3:52 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304092030000.980@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
>
> >He is a spammer...(SNIP)
>
> Only because you do not like him. I do not see you protesting the "buy
> Viagra" and other equally rediculous items that pop-up from time to time.

If you look back on this newsgroup to December 2002 or so, you will find that I am NOT the only one who has said so. There are others who have called the posting of "Newsline" here as spam.

> >> So...You cite ONE incident that was over two years ago. There's
> >usually
> >> at least five or six "items" per report, so assuming one release a week and
> >> (104 posts), that comes out to 520 seperate topics.
> >>
> >> I'm am so not impressed. CNN should be so right all the time.
> >
> >You asked for an example. I only had to present one. It may not be the only
> >one, but it was the one that came to mind first.
>
> And I still refer to the general news media...they are 100% right and
> completely unbiased 100% of the time, DS?

It's not a matter of being 100% correct. It's a matter of DUE DILLIGENCE, which was lacking here. Had BP tried to contact those on the other side of the story and was refused an interview, that would be different. I have been informed by those two individuals I mentioned in an earlier response that no contact attempt was made that they know of - despite the fact that one of them had a listed telephone number.

> >> Mexicans are under no obligation to observe United States regulations.
> >I
> >> was IN California and know for a fact that there were numerous occassions
> >when
> >> US Amateurs turned a blind eye to requests from Mexican Amateurs to help
> >avoid
> >> problems THEY were experiencing.
> >
> >Well, I see that my point went completely over your head on this one: Why
> >didn't BP contact K6PYP or KC6OKA to get the other side of the story? Here's

> >why: BP wasn't interested in TRUTHFUL reporting but would rather smear the
> >reputation of individuals he didn't personally like. They probably should
> >have
> >sued him for defamation of character (which is one of the things that can
> >breach the "CA Shield Law" for the press).
>
> I got your point. I repeat my question...The general news media is ALWAYS
> 100% right or 100% unbiased...?!?!

See due dilligence above.

> >Fraud is everyone's problem.
>
> You can prove fraud? You can prove that Mr. Pasternak's expenses are NOT
> the +/- $1000 he claims?

Circumstantially, YES:
1) His competitor, Community Video Associates Inc., does the same thing as "Newsline" when they put together "This Week in Amateur Radio" yet TWIAR's expense is 10% of what Newsline's claimed expense is. CVA is a non-profit organization and thus subject to public inspection per 26 USC 6104, so you can verify their expenses for yourself. After eliminating the maintenance cost for the "instant update" phone line ($50/month - and that's generous; it's probably cheaper since it doesn't call out), that leaves an 85% greater cost incurred by "Newsline" (as compared to its competitor). Granted, if the difference in cost were less, such as 10%, this wouldn't be an issue, but with such disparity, one has to wonder.....

2) Via a request of one of the member clubs, the Los Angeles Area Council of Amateur Radio Clubs asked in response to one of "Newsline's" requests for funding to identify the extent of the expenses. "Newsline" turned down the request. The only reason NOT to disclose, especially to a group which may potentially fund the activity, is if something illegal, illicit, or unethical is going on and the person performing that activity does not want to be discovered as having done it.

For six years (1988-1994), I worked as a U.S. Government auditor (for a certain Treasury Department agency that everyone hates this time of year), and based on that training, experience, and the several tax fraud cases that I uncovered during that career, I can tell you that in my professional opinion that these two factors above are STRONG indicators of fraud and/or fraudulent behavior. His lack of ethics in his reporting is a weaker but additional indication. Furthermore, I know of no counterindications that would otherwise explain the situation in a non-fraudulent way.

If you don't believe me, ask him to explain his expenses and see what kind of response you get.

> >Fred's actions, although absolutely disgusting, are not illegal in any way.
> >I
> >don't know what actions you refer to by Gordon that "the FCC will do for
> >free"

> >because the only action I am aware of him doing is his teaching activity
> >which
> >the FCC doesn't do at all.
>
> Then I guess he's "withdrawn" for the renew-for-fee scheme that W5YI, and
> now the ARRL seem to find lucrative.
>
> >But it reduces to a pecuniary interest that IS banned by the rules because he
> >is accepting compensation to write and make a transmission (which is then
> >re-transmitted as noted below). There is a rule that does forbid this.
>
> Then, Dieter, may I suggest you write an appropriate letter of concern to
> Mr. Hollingsworth and voice your concerns? I know he's an active Amateur
> himself and must be aware of Mr. Paternak's service, yet he's not taken any
> action nor made any effort. Perhaps if you prodded him a bit?

I wouldn't have a problem with that. RH may be unaware that BP is paying himself a salary, but I'm certain he's aware of the rest of it (i.e. the reporting activity). Unfortunately, it's this one fact that changes everything.

> >Read the unified newsgroup FAQ for all of "rec.radio" and that should make it
> >clear to you that his posts on this group are inappropriate.
>
> Then if we strictly enforce the FAQ's we can expect a reduction of, say,
> 95% of all the posts here? Including yours vis-a-vis what is
> appropriate/inappropriate?

Definently 80%. I'm not certain that it would reduce by 95%; I haven't actually counted the posts. :-)

> >As I have said before, just because others have gone off-topic doesn't
> >justify
> >more off-topic posts.
>
> Well....nuff said, I suppose. If you are THAT concerned about the
> potential violations of Part 97, then I'd expect you to write the FCC as
> suggested. Otherwise I don't forsee any resolution to the situation. I for
> one enjoy being able to see and then comment on the pertinent parts of his
> posts here as it applies to them.

The only reason I haven't done so yet is because I don't have sufficient PROOF. I have only the indications.

However, you will find that for each post he has made here with the "Newsline" script, a complaint has gone to his ISP for violating the newsgroup charter - and NOT ALL of those complaints over the past 6 months have come from me. If he would simply post his stuff where it belongs ("rec.radio.info") and not here, there'd be nothing to complain about as far as his ISP is concerned

2156. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 00:26:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030409202655.18459.00000027@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 64293

In article <BAB942BF.15D9A%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>While I'm not a pacifist, I do come from a religious
>background that advocates pacifism.

Of course "pacifism" covers a wide spectrum. At one extreme are folks who would rather be killed than kill, no matter what the circumstances. At the other extreme are those who will fight, but won't *start* a fight.

In addition, there's the whole dimension of conflict resolution and not empowering those who are likely to become violent. Selling SH's Iraq weapons and the technology to make them empowered him. Guess who sold his regime things like anthrax and botulinum toxins.

>As I see it, instead of your rather
>bleak outlook, pacifism requires the ultimate in responsibility for one's
>actions - the idea that one is not going to lower oneself to the same
>violence of another unless absolutely necessary, combined with the restraint
>to hold one's own violent tendencies in check.

Yup. Some folks, however, cannot see beyond the old ideas of violence.

>In a violent world, that
>requires far more control, and bravery, then the ease of just striking out
>at anything one objects to.
>
Which brings up the point of who started the fight.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2157. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 01:29:04 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.10.01.29.03.763898.13428@arrl.org>
Source record: 64294

On Wed, 09 Apr 2003 19:14:39 -0400, Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Evidently you're another who didn't understand what took place on
> 9/11/01,
> and evidently still do not.

I understand it quite well, Dick. I also understand that there are two sides to the story. That's a concept you have repeatedly failed to get on a variety of issues discussed in this NG over the years, and it doesn't surprise me a bit that you don't get it now. It's so much simpler and comforting to pick a side and demonize all who don't agree with you.

Jon

2158. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 01:37:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030409213752.24176.00000111@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 64295

In article <pan.2003.04.08.17.10.54.523588.24805@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>
>> Jon, I don't give a damn
>> about anything you think.
>
>That makes me feel much better! Thanks, Larry!
>
>Jon

Don't mention it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2159. Re: Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 01:46:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304091746.7b7c0819@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64296

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304091439.206c40e8@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030408062957.23756.00000075@mb-fj.aol.com>...
> > In article <3E8B8A7D.F848F6FB@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >You have to admit that this one would be difficult to forget.
> >
> > I've been trying to forget it for five years...
> >
> > >Masa's likely forgetten the whole thing by now and is likely sitting
> > >quietly at home--probabry sipping some Ripton Tea.
> >
> > Ever think it was all an act? Like Hashafisti Scratchi?
>
> He was for real, somebody in that flamefest knew him personally. As I
> recall he was either a student or a faculty member or both at McGill
> and had a bunch of commercial radio licenses and worked professionally
> in the BC field. He reportedly bailed away from ham radio in a snit
> later to the extent that he sold all his gear. I still dunno what a
> Japanese Canadian was doing spouting off in a U.S. ham policy forum.

Perhaps he had real military experience.

You can cut a pretty wide swath once you have real military experience, you know.

Or do you?

2160. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 02:27:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030409222705.11628.00000045@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64297

In article <20030408101859.14478.00000201@mb-fy.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>Subject: Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 08 Apr 2003 14:18:59 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)
>>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>>Date: 4/7/2003 1:31 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <b6sgd1$k3t$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
>>
>>"Hambone the Magnificent" <921d2will@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>news:3e91c18e@snipnews.snip.net...
>>>
>>> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>>> news:20030405013919.05767.00000131@mb-fz.aol.com...
>>>
>>> > A pregnant woman...?!?!?!
>>> > Can there be anything more loathesome than how they used
>>> > her like that? I guess those idiots don't realize that doing stuff
>>> > like that only raises the hair on an American's neck more and
>>> > really drives them to fight harder.
>>>
>>> We may find it loathesome with our Western morals and
>>> values Steve, but the mere fact that a pregnant woman (!!)
>>> would sacrifice herself as a "human guided bomb" for her
>>> religion (Islam) *speaks volumes* of the will of belief and
>>> extremes these people are willing to go thru and do!

We don't know what motivated them to do it. One of the reported motivational methods used by SH's regime was to torture and threaten small children in front of their parents. The people in the van may have been doing it to save their loved ones.
>>>
>>> They are modern Kamakazie

Japanese for "divine wind".
>>
>>The reality, however, is that Saddam was/is a secular person
>>rather than a religious supporter of any extent.
>>Apparently even Bin Laden has no great love for SH
>>in terms of any SH's non-commitment to Islam.

'zactly. But SH is closer to OBL's idea of Utopia.
>>
>>Is it loathsome, of course it is. So is human sacrifice...
>>or is that too just my narrow minded western upbringing.

Early Western civilization involved human sacrifice. Fortunately it was outgrown.

> The ironic part is that Islam is the only one of the Big Three
>(Christianity, Judism and Islam) that actually teaches acceptance of the
>other two as fraternal brothers.

I disagree! The Christianity I know teaches acceptance of Judaism and Islam as well as almost all other religions.
>
> I wish I spoke Arabic and understood the culture better to understand
>how they warp it to be just the opposite.

Couple of things:

- Islam isn't a monolithic religion any more than Christianity is. Sunnis, Shiities, lots of varieties, just like there are Catholics and Presbyterians and Jehovah's Witnesses.
>
- It is my understanding that the writings which form the basis of Islam can be categorized into roughly three types:

1) Things which are core beliefs, directly attributable to the Prophet and must be accepted because they are central to the religion (monotheism, for example).

2) Things which are generally accepted to be true and attributable to the Prophet and are accepted by most

3) Things which may be true and may be attributable.

The trouble is that the dividing lines and classification are not precise. Something that most consider as 3) may be considered as 1) by a few radicals. Christianity has a similar thing - some folks think every word of the Bible must be literally true, even though contradictions clearly exist if the stories are taken literally. (Example - the two creation stories in Genesis).

One major difference betwen Islam and Judeo-Christianity has to do with how those religions spread. Judaism existed long before its people had a homeland, and survived millenia of persecution and existence as a minority religion. Christianity was an underground movement for centuries before being adopted by Constantine.

But Islam spread like wildfire from its beginning, and achieved widespread dominance of much of the known world within the lifetime of its founder.

> Of course Christianity has/had Jerry Falwell, Jim Jones, Jim Bakker, the
>Crusades, etc...

The KKK, witch burnings, religious wars, and of course the Spanish Inquisition.

>and I can find nothing in the Bible that preaches the kind of
>INtolerance that Christianity has spawned.

Oddly enough, most of the war and violent actions occur in the "Old" Testament. The "New" Testament is full of "love thy neighbor as thyself", "turn the other cheek" and such. I seem to recall that Jesus and His disciples were pretty much all pacifists in the extreme.

> Maybe that's why I have about a zilch-point-squat tolerance for ANY
>organized "religion".
>
How about those that reject all forms of outward violence?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2161. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 02:42:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E94D9DA.B16883CD@att.net>
Source record: 64298

Jon Bloom wrote:

> On Wed, 09 Apr 2003 19:14:39 -0400, Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Evidently you're another who didn't understand what took place on
> > 9/11/01,
> > and evidently still do not.
>
> I understand it quite well, Dick. I also understand that there are two
> sides to the story.

So since there are two sides to the story you're obligated to ride the fence.
Still,
and forever, never ever take a stand. Careful. Some fences are sharp.
With friends like you freedom need look out for its enemies. The Pogo
principle applies.

> That's a concept you have repeatedly failed to get on
> a variety of issues discussed in this NG over the years, and it doesn't
> surprise me a bit that you don't get it now. It's so much simpler and
> comforting to pick a side and demonize all who don't agree with you.

Do be careful on that fence, Jon. And please pass that concept on to
the rest of the Newington crew. Might save a few emergency room calls.

2162. Re: Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 02:43:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E94DA3D.CD9A661E@att.net>
Source record: 64299

Brian wrote:

> You can cut a pretty wide swath once you have real military experience, you know.

So what was it that happened to you?

2163. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 02:46:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E94DAEC.AF0957FC@att.net>
Source record: 64300

N2EY wrote:

> >>The reality, however, is that Saddam was/is a secular person
> >>rather than a religious supporter of any extent.
> >>Apparently even Bin Laden has no great love for SH
> >>in terms of any SH's non-commitment to Islam.
>
> 'zactly. But SH is closer to OBL's idea of Utopia.

You guys need to read up on Islam. Any Muslim is always worth more than any number of Infidels, or non-Islamics. Take that concept far enough and you soon begin to see what our real threat is.

2164. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 02:53:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E94DC70.DBDE5C57@att.net>
Source record: 64351

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> > Do-nothing pacifism avoids responsibility.
>
> I disagree. While I'm not a pacifist, I do come from a religious
> background that advocates pacifism. As I see it, instead of your rather
> bleak outlook, pacifism requires the ultimate in responsibility for one's
> actions - the idea that one is not going to lower oneself to the same
> violence of another unless absolutely necessary, combined with the restraint
> to hold one's own violent tendencies in check. In a violent world, that
> requires far more control, and bravery, then the ease of just striking out
> at anything one objects to.

So we object to Saddam so we just struck out at him.

Dwight you need to get on Ebay and bid on a clue.

2165. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 03:33:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E94E690.28EA89A3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64352

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9243A1.F66483EF@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > Apparently that doesn't mean anything.
> >
> > > Most of what you say doesn't mean anything.
> >
> > ...not to a fellow with a reading comprehension problem it wouldn't.
> > You attempt to divine something from my replies which is not there and
> > you seem unable to understand what I have written.
> >
> > In this case, you have no response to my comments at all except for a
> > final line which you use out of context. We could have discussed it at
> > Universal Radio on Saturday. I even had all the morse proficiency
> > charts and diagrams in my my car.
>
> Dave, damn! Next time you're this way let me know and I'll buy you
> lunch at Alice's Resturaunt, or maybe even Mark Pi's. Put a belt clip
> on that Ten-Tec radio, get your knee-key, charts, diagrams, and 8x10
> glossies with circles and arrows.

It was just a brief stop for a 2m mag mount antenna. My cheapy Pro-Am
1/4 wave had some mashed coaxial cable. The coax had a silly molded
fitting at the antenna end which precluded repair. I selected a Hustler
5/8 wave antenna and went on my way. There are lots of repeaters
between Columbus and Cincinnati but I made only four QSOs during the
drive. The longest and most pleasant was with a YL on the Cambridge
machine. I don't know where the abundance of Technician Class ops are
spending their time but it doesn't appear to be on 2m FM.

> We just might get through this thing if you're ready to open up a
> little.

I'm not really in the mood to "open up" on morse proficiency if opening
up means I need to declare that someone whose maximum morse speed is
five words per minute is proficient in the use of morse. That'd be
dishonest.

Dave K8MN

2166. Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 07:50:31 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b737nk$1od$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64353

They have no future except their own graves. Even today these codeless stooges are impaling themselves by the thousands upon the gates of true ham radio. Their blood flows like a filthy torrent into 27MHz. All non-CW activity is a despicable lie, promoted by these congenital gangsters who have no sense of true communication. They should be hit with shoes. God will grill their bellies in hell, where they will fry in their own fat as their souls wail in lamentation.

I'm sorry I must have blacked out there for a minute. Did I say anything?

73 Corry K4DOH

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/

"Here I am, the CEO of a multibillion-dollar company, and I'm having to answer about what some weirdo has said on a message board." - Richard Scrushy

2167. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 08:18:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABAA0FB.166A6%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64354

"Len Over 21" wrote:

> (snip) There is NO courage in martyrdom or of letting
> others walk all over you in symbolic conquest. Being
> a martyr is only "glory" as perceived by others
> believing the same thing... all of which becomes null
> and void when the martyr and the believers are dead,
> destroyed.

Very few pacifists are talking about martyrdom, Len. Most instead believe violence should be a very last resort - far beyond the use of force when it is just more convenient than an alternative.

> (snip) Pacifism is often motivated by personal fear.
> That is not a redeeming attribute. (snip)

Is is also inaccurate. Pacifist all over the world have placed themselves in danger while acting on their views. Indeed, many have faced public ridicule and harassment just for speaking out against violence (just look at your own messages for an example of that - you don't see them in this newsgroup talking about you). Others have faced much more serious consequences.

In reality, hiding in the majority, especially when violence is involved, is the truly safe route - it takes no effort and offers no personal risk. Which is more brave, the punk riding the shirttails of the bully or the person who stands up to the bully to say he is wrong? Which were more brave, the ones who went along with Saddam or those who stood up to say he was wrong?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2168. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 09:02:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABAAB81.166A8%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64355

"N2EY" wrote:

> (snip) In addition, there's the whole dimension of
> conflict resolution and not empowering those who are
> likely to become violent. Selling SH's Iraq weapons
> and the technology to make them empowered him. Guess
> who sold his regime things like anthrax and botulinum
> toxins.

It is amazing, isn't it? We spent years building up governments like Saddam's solely because they were willing to do violence for us, only to scream bloody murder when it no longer fits our agenda. Are we doing the same thing again - placing another violent government in Iraq to control the Iraqi people (control as defined by our political, military, or business interests). I truly hope Bush's words are much more than just rhetoric - that a government truly concerned for the Iraqi people, not just the political, military, or business interests of us and our friends, will be offered. Sadly, I think the temptation of this opportunity will be simply too much to resist - the Iraqi people will be screwed again and will continue to hate us for it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2169. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 09:27:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABAB131.166AA%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64356

"Dick Carroll" wrote:

> So we object to Saddam so we just struck out at him.

We now object to Saddam. As you well know, our government and military didn't do so for many years. Instead, we spend years building up his government with both political support and military aid. Perhaps if we not done so, our young men and women would not be over there today and the Iraqi people would have had freedom years ago.

But all that is in the past. The question now is what will happen next. Will we insert a government that is truly concerned with the interests of the Iraqi people or will it be a government more concerned with the political, military, and business interests of us and our friends? The rhetoric from Bush sounds good, but our actions (ignoring our allies and the UN) already suggests the worst.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2170. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 10:27:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030410062750.11012.00000064@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 64357

In article <3E94DAEC.AF0957FC@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>
>> >>The reality, however, is that Saddam was/is a secular person
>> >>rather than a religious supporter of any extent.
>> >>Apparently even Bin Laden has no great love for SH
>> >>in terms of any SH's non-commitment to Islam.
>>
>> 'zactly. But SH is closer to OBL's idea of Utopia.
>
> You guys need to read up on Islam.

Which kind?

>Any Muslim is always worth more than
>any number of Infidels, or non-Islamics.

There are, and were, Christians who believe the same thing.

>Take that concept far enough and
>you soon begin to see what our real threat is.
>
The real threat, as I see it, is that millions and millions of people see the West in general and the USA in particular as empire builders who want to conquer and control anyone with anything valuable - like oil. I'm NOT saying that's an accurate perception!

Maybe the scenes of joyful Iraqis tearing down the statues of SH will help change that perception. Maybe Iraq can be rebuilt and reorganized into a free country whose govt. doesn't invade and threaten its neighbors. And maybe the rest of the UN can take some responsibility in the rebuilding process.

Or maybe the country will be torn by civil war and ethnic rivalry, while the world's focus is elsewhere. How much attention does Afghanistan get these days?

The real solutions lie in the follow-up work.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2171. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 10:27:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030410062750.11012.00000063@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 64358

In article <20030409170937.13737.00000052@mb-fs.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <BAB942BF.15D9A%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
>writes:
>
>>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>>> Do-nothing pacifism avoids responsibility.

What about pacifism that does something?
>>
>> I disagree. While I'm not a pacifist, I do come from a religious
>>background that advocates pacifism.
>
> Nothing wrong with that...
>
>>As I see it, instead of your rather
>>bleak outlook, pacifism requires the ultimate in responsibility for one's
>>actions - the idea that one is not going to lower oneself to the same
>>violence of another unless absolutely necessary, combined with the restraint
>>to hold one's own violent tendencies in check.
>
> There IS something wrong with that.
>
> Embedded in that long sentence is the self-enobling "lower oneself
> to the same violence of another" only slight modified by the
> appended "...unless absolutely necessary." That means some
> implicit enoblement which is no defense of anything, just a
> refined form of braggadoccio.

So nonviolence is no more noble than violence?
>
> There is NO courage in martyrdom or of letting others walk all over
> you in symbolic conquest. Being a martyr is only "glory" as
> perceived by others believing the same thing...all of which becomes
> null and void when the martyr and the believers are dead, destroyed.

You're saying that all those Christian martyrs like Peter and Paul had no
courage. Most of them could have saved themselves by simply acknowledging the
deity of the Roman emperor. But they would not acknowledge the deity of
anything but their one God. Nor would they fight over it.
>
>>In a violent world, that
>>requires far more control, and bravery, then the ease of just striking out

>>at anything one objects to.
>
> While martyrdom and combat-for-what-one-believes-in can both
> result in death, the combatant at least DOES something.

Something which may or may not be justified.

> Martyrs resign themselves to death without doing anything at
> all.

Wrong.

> That's a violation of the basic, built-in imperative in the
> human race: Survival.

Good Friday is the 18th. Think about what that day is about.

> Aiding and abetting martyrdom might give emotional comfort to
> those living in some intellectual fantasy world, but it is totally
> unrealistic. All the intellectual fantasies put together are a
> very meager sustenance, insufficient to keep a martyr alive.

Uh huh.
>
> Pacifism is often motivated by personal fear.

So is violence. It's obvious that Saddam was motivated by personal fear.

> That is not a
> redeeming attribute.

True.

> It isn't noble or on some "higher plane"
> when the motivation is purely personal.

What about when it's not?

> Is selfishness a noble attribute?

If it is logical selfishness, yes. It means that the person takes
responsibility for their own life. Martyrdom can be very selfish, because it
says that a person values their ideals more than their life.

> I don't think so.
>
Well, there you have it.

> Pacifism is a form of denial, an avoidance of responsibility,
> emotional selfishness.

Not at all. It's a different set of values. Ultimately, peace must prevail or
we will all be destroyed.

> Such grows into "noble thoughts
> higher than the common emotional level" when sheltered from

> harm...sheltered by the very "lower level" common folk the
> pacifists declare they "rise above." Nonsense.
>
Not at all. At one time it was common for disputes of all types to be settled violently. Then came pacifist ideas such as the rule of law and control of one's behavior. Once it was common and acceptable for parents to do physical violence to their children, husbands to do physical violence to their wives, employers to do physical violence to their workers, etc. Much of that has been eliminated from civilization. The same principles apply on a larger scale.

2172. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 11:32:44 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0304100332.6f5a359c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64359

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304021735.56e4cdc1@posting.google.com>...
> The last numbers I saw
> stated that Israel is kept economically afloat by annual four billion
> dollar handouts from us.
>
> w3rv

Did you say four BILLION?! While we have homeless right here who
freeze to death each winter for lack of shelter!

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2173. Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 11:45:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030410074510.05732.00000320@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64360

>Subject: Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>Date: 4/9/2003 6:37 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304092311210.1110@kd6lvw.ampr.org>

>If you look back on this newsgroup to December 2002 or so, you will find that
>I
>am NOT the only one who has said so. There are others who have called the
>posting of "Newsline" here as spam.

Then write to them, coordinate an effort and be done with it. You've
spent more time making an issue out of it than spending time discussing
anything that was in the "news release" itself.

>It's not a matter of being 100% correct. It's a matter of DUE
DILLIGENCE...(SNIP)

I reiterate my previous question: "I refer to the general news media...are
they 100% right and completely unbiased 100% of the time?"

>Had BP tried to contact those on the other side of the
>story and was refused an interview, that would be different. I have been
>informed by those two individuals I mentioned in an earlier response that no
>contact attempt was made that they know of - despite the fact that one of
>them
>had a listed telephone number.

Making phone calls, travelling for interviews, etc, cost money. Even one
trip of one day's journey can rack up $100 of legitimate expenses, especially
in Southern California. One day's work can put him 1/10th of the way to that
$1K he is claiming.

>> I got your point. I repeat my question...The general news media is
>ALWAYS
>> 100% right or 100% unbiased...?!?!
>
>See due dilligence above.

You've not answered MY question, Dieter. When the "professional"
newscasters can't even gt it 100% right 100% of the time for the great amounts
of expenditures (and resources!) they have, why should a guy doing it part time
?

Yes...I agree that everyone should strive to get it right 100% of the time,
but I am NOT swayed by your argument that Mr. Pastrnak has made any great
imposition here. Certainly far more bandwidth has been expended here with your
arguing about where it rightfully belongs than if you'd said nothing and just

killfilled him.

>Circumstantially, YES:
>1) His competitor, Community Video Associates Inc., does the same thing as
>"Newsline" when they put together "This Week in Amateur Radio" yet TWIAR's
>expense is 10% of what Newsline's claimed expense is.

Wal-mart sells a great generic cola that sells for about .17$ a can...Do you think I should stop drinking Pepsi or Coke at .75$ just because someone does it cheaper?

>After eliminating the maintenance cost for
>the "instant update" phone line ($50/month - and that's generous;...(SNIP)

Unless he's having to pay for the phone as a business...Even 501(c)3 organizations have to pay "business rates" in many areas.

>2) Via a request of one of the member clubs, the Los Angeles Area Council of
>Amateur Radio Clubs asked in response to one of "Newsline's" requests for
>funding to identify the extent of the expenses. "Newsline" turned down the
>request. The only reason NOT to disclose, especially to a group which may
>potentially fund the activity, is if something illegal, illicit, or unethical
>is going on and the person performing that activity does not want to be
>discovered as having done it.

Does he have a legal obligaton to respond?

>Furthermore, I know of no counterindications that would otherwise explain the
>situation in a non-fraudulent way.

Well, Dieter, he's been doing this for a great many years now, and I KNOW his service is widely known by FCC staffers and the public in general. So tell me...WHY is it that no one of any consiquence has called into question his "service" before?

>If you don't believe me, ask him to explain his expenses and see what kind of
>response you get.

Does he have a legal obligation to respond?

>I wouldn't have a problem with that. RH may be unaware that BP is paying
>himself a salary, but I'm certain he's aware of the rest of it (i.e. the
>reporting activity). Unfortunately, it's this one fact that changes
>everything.

Other than making some kitchen table calculations on what you THINK he should be claiming as legitimate expenses, you've not said or demonstrated in any substantial way any fraud, Dieter.

>Definently 80%. I'm not certain that it would reduce by 95%; I haven't
>actually counted the posts. :-)

OK...I'll buy your 80%!

>The only reason I haven't done so yet is because I don't have sufficient
>PROOF.
>I have only the indications.

Well then...There we are.

>However, you will find that for each post he has made here with the
>"Newsline"
>script, a complaint has gone to his ISP for violating the newsgroup charter -
>and NOT ALL of those complaints over the past 6 months have come from me. If
>he would simply post his stuff where it belongs ("rec.radio.info") and not
>here, there'd be nothing to complain about as far as his ISP is concerned.

Then perhaps THEY are not as concerned about it either. Just KF
him...Then we won't go through this again?

73

Steve, K4YZ

2174. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 12:17:56 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304100417.abea89e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64361

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030409202655.18459.00000027@mb-cc.aol.com>...

> In addition, there's the whole dimension of conflict resolution and not
> empowering those who are likely to become violent. Selling SH's Iraq weapons
> and the technology to make them empowered him. Guess who sold his regime things
> like anthrax and botulinum toxins.
>

Guess who sold Saddam the AA missles which knocked down the Warthog
and possibly the F-15. (Hint: Their capital is Paris . .)

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2175. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 12:20:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304100420.11ea8ede@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64362

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E94E690.28EA89A3@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9243A1.F66483EF@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>...
> > > >
> > > > > Apparently that doesn't mean anything.
> >
> > > > Most of what you say doesn't mean anything.
> > >
> > > ...not to a fellow with a reading comprehension problem it wouldn't.
> > > You attempt to divine something from my replies which is not there and
> > > you seem unable to understand what I have written.
> > >
> > > In this case, you have no response to my comments at all except for a
> > > final line which you use out of context. We could have discussed it at
> > > Universal Radio on Saturday. I even had all the morse proficiency
> > > charts and diagrams in my my car.
> >
> > Dave, damn! Next time you're this way let me know and I'll buy you
> > lunch at Alice's Resturaunt, or maybe even Mark Pi's. Put a belt clip
> > on that Ten-Tec radio, get your knee-key, charts, diagrams, and 8x10
> > glossies with circles and arrows.
>
> It was just a brief stop for a 2m mag mount antenna. My cheapy Pro-Am
> 1/4 wave had some mashed coaxial cable. The coax had a silly molded
> fitting at the antenna end which precluded repair. I selected a Hustler
> 5/8 wave antenna and went on my way. There are lots of repeaters
> between Columbus and Cincinnati but I made only four QSOs during the
> drive. The longest and most pleasant was with a YL on the Cambridge
> machine. I don't know where the abundance of Technician Class ops are
> spending their time but it doesn't appear to be on 2m FM.

We're going to lose some frequencies if the only thing going on are
the repeaters automatically IDing every hour. Perhaps Len is right.
Pretty soon amateur radio will be only about HF.

ARES on 147.06 in Lancaster had a nice net last night. Lots of public
service events coming up.

> > We just might get through this thing if you're ready to open up a
> > little.
>
> I'm not really in the mood to "open up" on morse proficiency if opening
> up means I need to declare that someone whose maximum morse speed is
> five words per minute is proficient in the use of morse. That'd be
> dishonest.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, I wouldn't want you to be dishonest. Here's what I can do for you. I recall that you stated that "20wpm is more proficient than 13wpm." I'll tabulate all the wpm rates between 13 and 20wpm and you can select the lowest one at which proficiency is achieved. We won't even bother with 5wpm.

OK. Here goes:

14wpm
15wpm
16wpm
17wpm
18wpm
19wpm

OK, which one is where proficiency begins?

Brian

2176. Re: Time To Make Good, Masa!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 12:24:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304100424.3b9305af@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64363

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E94DA3D.CD9A661E@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
>
> > You can cut a pretty wide swath once you have real military experience, you know.
>
> So what was it that happened to you?

I don't try to cut a wide swath. I'm basically a whittler.

2177. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 12:58:14 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@citlink.net>
Message-ID: <GTdla.874$Bx6.600@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 64364

Sounds like it all came direct from the horses butt
end.....

"Unclaimed Mysteries" <k4doh@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b737nk$1od$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> They have no future except their own graves. Even today these codeless
> stooges are impaling themselves by the thousands upon the gates of true
> ham radio. Their blood flows like a filthy torrent into 27MHz. All
> non-CW activity is a despicable lie, promoted by these congenital
> gangsters who have no sense of true communication. They should be hit
> with shoes. God will grill their bellies in hell, where they will fry in
> their own fat as their souls wail in lamentation.
>
> I'm sorry I must have blacked out there for a minute. Did I say anything?
>
> 73 Corry K4DOH
>
> --
> It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
> http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/
>
> "Here I am, the CEO of a multibillion-dollar company, and I'm having to
> answer about what some weirdo has said on a message board." - Richard
> Scrushy
>

2178. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 13:33:06 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.10.13.33.06.241296.8870@arrl.org>
Source record: 64365

On Wed, 09 Apr 2003 22:42:00 -0400, Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> So since there are two sides to the story you're obligated to ride the
> fence. Still,
> and forever, never ever take a stand.

What irks you is that my stand is not the one prepackaged by Murdoch's
spinners to appeal to your prejudices.

> Careful. Some fences are sharp.
> With friends like you freedom need look out for its enemies. The Pogo
> principle applies.

With friends like you, freedom won't be around much longer to worry about.

Jon

2179. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 13:50:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E95768E.2090303@psu.edu>
Source record: 64366

N2EY wrote:

> The KKK, witch burnings, religious wars, and of course the Spanish Inquisition.

Wow, Jim! Caught me by surprise with that one. I wasn't expecting the
Spanish Inquisition......

- Mike KB3EIA -

2180. Finest No-Coder to key up a handie talkie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 15:59:53 UTC
From: L L O Y D D A V I E S <firebottle@n0vfp.cm>
Message-ID: <3e959119_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 64367

That would be me!

--
Lloyd/N0VFP
"Finest No-Coder to key up a handie talkie"
Ft-817, ATS 909

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2181. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 16:31:40 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304100831.5d5745f2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64368

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BABAAB81.166A8%stewart@say.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
>
> > (snip) In addition, there's the whole dimension of
> > conflict resolution and not empowering those who are
> > likely to become violent. Selling SH's Iraq weapons
> > and the technology to make them empowered him. Guess
> > who sold his regime things like anthrax and botulinum
> > toxins.
>
>
> It is amazing, isn't it?

Not at all. Totally predictable. It's like selling a psychotic a gun
and then being shocked when he turns it on you. Long history of that
sort of thing - the USA sold Japan all sorts of technology and raw
materials in the '20s and '30s.

> We spent years building up governments like
> Saddam's solely because they were willing to do violence for us, only to
> scream bloody murder when it no longer fits our agenda.

The basic policy has been something like "we have to support these
people in order to counter the Soviets, who are even worse". Plus
America "needs" cheap oil. End justifies the means, all that sort of
rot. Not much thought was given to exactly who was being empowered.
And it turns out that the Soviets were as scared of us as we were of
them.

What really needs to change is the policy of Western republics blind
acceptance of repressive regimes based on convenience or a perceived
bigger threat.

Not dealing with some repressive regimes might mean things like
more-expensive gasoline. Are Americans willing to make that sacrifice?

> Are we doing the
> same thing again - placing another violent government in Iraq to control the
> Iraqi people (control as defined by our political, military, or business
> interests).

Hopefully not. But look at Afghanistan today.....

> I truly hope Bush's words are much more than just rhetoric -
> that a government truly concerned for the Iraqi people, not just the
> political, military, or business interests of us and our friends, will be
> offered. Sadly, I think the temptation of this opportunity will be simply

> too much to resist - the Iraqi people will be screwed again and will
> continue to hate us for it.

There's actually a whole bunch of issues to muddy up the situation. Who are "the Iraqi people" - Kurds, who have little loyalty to any Bagdad govt.? Shiites? Sunnis? The concept of nation-states is a very Western one.

And of course there's big money at stake. With SH gone, who owns Iraq's oil? How will the new oil money be spent, since the sanctions will finally be lifted? Will the Iraqi people get a piece of the action, or will it be like the breakup of the Soviet union?

Don't be surprised if France, Germany and Russia wind up getting all their investment back (with interest) without having sent one soldier or any money to support the war or the rebuilding.

Reaction in the Arab world seems to be mixed. Some are jubilant that the tyrant is gone, and Iraq has a much brighter future. Others are angry and even sad that the allegedly "elite" Iraqi army and Republican Guard crumbled so fast. Did the USA make more friends or enemies by this war? Too soon to tell.

Most of all, it's not over yet. Parts of Iraq are still not under coalition control, and there are non-Iraqi fighters (a la the Afghan mujahadeen of the '80s) engaging coalition forces. No WMDs have been found yet, which raises some scenarios:

1) There never were any WMDs (not very likely)

2) There were WMDs, but SH destroyed them all (only a little more likely than 1)

3) There are WMDs, they just haven't been found yet (we all hope this is true, but wishing doesn't make it so)

4) The WMDs are now in someone else's hands, somewhere else. This is the scariest scenario, because they may turn up where we really don't want them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2182. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 16:34:59 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304100834.7b551cac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64369

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304090509.6c9a4d25@posting.google.com>...
> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.08.02.25.42.510174.8992@arrl.org>...
> > On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 21:21:24 -0400, Brian wrote:
> >
> > > Do you think that the Daschle Chicks are patriots? If so, why?
> >
> > Do you think they are not? If so, why?
>
> I think it's important for every American to have the right to voice
> their displeasure with their government, -at no risk to themselves-,
> while other Americans are dying on the battlefield to protect that
> right.
>
> The Constitution doesn't mandate patriotism, and I think the Dixie
> Chick merely exercised her right to be unpatriotic and stupid.

Stupid, maybe. Unpatriotic? Not at all. Unless free speech has become unpatriotic.

2183. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 16:44:57 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304100844.553f129b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64370

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hd1vz18.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 4 Apr 2003 10:06:53 -0800, N2EY wrote:
>
> >Does Israel have the right to exist as a sovereign nation?
>
> Israel is the Jewish homeland - it has an absolute right to
> exist.

Sounds right to me - but I wonder what others think.
>
> >Does "Palestine" have the right to exist as a sovereign nation?
>
> There already is a country that is the "Palestinian" homelanmd.
> It lies east of the Jordan River and the Arava and it's misnamed
> as a "Hashemite Kingdom" although the Palestinian Arabs outnumber
> the Hashemite Arabs two to one.

Some would say that country "doesn't count".
>
> >> Since the Palestinians cannot
> >> do anything about their situation while Israel controls their fate, the
> >> burden of that ultimately falls on Israel. Perhaps in my lifetime.
> >
> >WHOA! "Can't do anything about their situation"??? Sounds like
> >"learned helplessness" to me.
>
> Taught to them by a corrupt and evil leadership.

(comedic interlude)

Didja ever notice how the most famous of those leaders always has a
three-day beard? How does he DO it? If somebody shaves every three
days, then there's a 33% chance they'll have a 3 day beard, a 33%
chance of a 2 day beard, and a 33% chance of being clean-shaven. But
that guy ALWAYS has a 3 day beard!

(end comedic interlude)
>
> >Have they tried nonviolent resistance? Not sporadically, mind you, but
> >as a widespread grassroots movement?
>
> Any "leader" that advocates that would be deposed in short
> order.

Worked for India.
>
> >How about legal challenges through the justice system?
>
> Try it.... <ggg>
>
> >How about simply emigrating and starting a new life somewhere else?
>
> See my comment above.

Sounds to me like the Palestinians *can* do something about their
situation, and Israel does not totally control their fate. But they
don't want to try those options.
>
> >I've never been to Israel, so perhaps the following questions seem
> >naive. But I'll ask them anyway:
> >
> >- Can anyone who applies become an Israeli citizen, and get full
> >voting rights?
>
> Yes.
>
> Anyone who is born in the country (or is born to an Israeli
> parent temporarily out of the country) is a citizen unless the
> parents' visa conditions preculde this ("guest workers" and
> foreign diplomats inside Israel).
>
> Anyone who has at least one Jewish grandparent or who converts
> to Judaism outside the country and then immigrates into the
> country is automatically granted citizenship on request after
> arrival.
>
> Anyone who converts to Judaism under the auspices of the
> Israeli Rabbinate inside the country is automatically eligible to
> request citizenship.
>
> For anyone else not in the above categories, it's about as
> complicated a process as we have here in the US but it is
> doable. My (non-Jewish) sister-in-law is going through that
> process now.

So I could move there and get citizenship if I were willing to fill
out the forms, learn the information required on the citizenship
tests, and pledge allegiance to the republic.

Which means that if enough Palestinians did the same thing, they could
eventually take over. But that would take some time.
>
> >- What was Palestine like before 1948 in terms of agriculture,
> >industry, education, civil rights?
>
> It was under a British mandate, and the Brits were as nasty to

> the Jewish community as they were/are to the Irish Catholic
> community in Northern Ireland. The Jewish settled areas were
> in the process of development of agriculture, industry and
> education which flourished. The Arab settled areas were far
> less developed in spite of being occupied for a much longer
> time.
>
> >- Why have all of the proposals for a Palestinian state been rejected?
>
> The "Oslo Peace Process" would have given the Arabs 92% of the
> disputed territories and provided for establishment of a
> separate state. The radicals among the Arab political leaders had
> their own agenda and wrecked those chances.
>
> > What was missing in those proposals?
>
> What was missing in the eyes of the Arab leadership was
> pushing the Jews into the sea.....

Thanks for the info, Phil. Answers a lot of questions.

>
> >Perhaps his worst fault was taking bad advice from the likes of Henry
> >Kissinger, who advised him to admit the Shah of Iran to the USA.
>
> Doktor Heintz has his own agenda for doing things. Best not
> to try to discern what it is.

'Doktor Heintz'??

73 de Jim, N2EY

2184. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 18:12:29 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b74c5p$4df$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64371

Steve Fleckenstein wrote:
> Sounds like it all came direct from the horses butt
> end.....................
>

Your newsreader is broked. HTH.

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/

"Here I am, the CEO of a multibillion-dollar company, and I'm having to answer about what some weirdo has said on a message board." - Richard Scrushy

2185. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 19:23:50 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.10.19.23.49.933154.17889@arrl.org>
Source record: 64372

On Thu, 10 Apr 2003 12:31:40 -0400, N2EY wrote:
> Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> news:<BABAAB81.166A8%stewart@say.net>...
>> Are we doing the
>> same thing again - placing another violent government in Iraq to
>> control the Iraqi people (control as defined by our political,
>> military, or business interests).
>
> Hopefully not. But look at Afghanistan today.....

Indeed:
http://www.ctnow.com/news/opinion/op_ed/hc-afghan0410.artapr10,0,1275296.story

Key quote:

"To make matters worse, Afghanistan's politics and stability are beholden
to warlords who were in power before the rise of the Taliban. These
warlords are despised as the main cause of corruption and tyranny.
Democracy and free markets will never take root in an environment
dominated by them. Unfortunately, the re-emergence of these warlords is
directly related to U.S. financial and military support, which is the sole
source of their power."

Of course, that's probably just a lot of liberal whining, eh?

>> I truly hope Bush's words are much more than just rhetoric - that a
>> government truly concerned for the Iraqi people, not just the
>> political, military, or business interests of us and our friends, will
>> be offered. Sadly, I think the temptation of this opportunity will be
>> simply too much to resist - the Iraqi people will be screwed again and
>> will continue to hate us for it.

More likely is that, as in Afghanistan, we'll get tired of nation building
(which before 9/11 Bush said repeatedly was something he didn't think we
should be doing) and leave Iraq to find its own way. The result won't be
pretty.

> There's actually a whole bunch of issues to muddy up the situation. Who
> are "the Iraqi people" - Kurds, who have little loyalty to any Bagdad
> govt.? Shiites? Sunnis? The concept of nation-states is a very Western
> one.

True, but it's one that the powerful in the Middle East are committed to
because, well, they're in power.

> Don't be surprised if France, Germany and Russia wind up getting all
> their investment back (with interest) without having sent one soldier or

> any money to support the war or the rebuilding.

And as a bonus, "Tommy points" from the Arabs and the profitable business relationships that go with them. (If you're not a Celts fan you may not know what Tommy points are. Closest equivalent: attaboys.)

> 4) The WMDs are now in someone else's hands, somewhere else. This is the
> scariest scenario, because they may turn up where we really don't want
> them.

You're missing the beauty of it, Jim. No WMD in Iraq? That's because they got moved to Syria. We'll have to go get them. (Three weeks later...) Ooops! No WMD in Syria? That's because they got moved to Yemen. Better go get them... rinse, repeat, ad infinitum.

Jon

2186. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 19:44:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030410154430.04182.00000116@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 64373

In article <BABAA0FB.166A6%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
>> (snip) There is NO courage in martyrdom or of letting
>> others walk all over you in symbolic conquest. Being
>> a martyr is only "glory" as perceived by others
>> believing the same thing... all of which becomes null
>> and void when the martyr and the believers are dead,
>> destroyed.
>
> Very few pacifists are talking about martyrdom, Len. Most instead believe
>violence should be a very last resort - far beyond the use of force when it
>is just more convenient than an alternative.

Pacifists aren't doing any martyrdom in this country. They
don't have to worry about long-term imprisonment or death.
Only the violent pacifists will have to worry about an over-
nighter in the pokey.

It is very easy to be a pacifist in the USA. Pacifists can feel
safe and protected by the guarantees of the First Amendment.
No problem. Trouble is, those pacifists haven't thought further
about how come we still have those guarantees after almost
227 years of national existance.

Those guarantees didn't happen by magic or divine inter-
vention. They haven't remained in place, guaranteed, because
a group of self-righteous noble-thinking "we are the moral
superior" pacifists refused to participate in keeping those
guarantees in place.

>> (snip) Pacifism is often motivated by personal fear.
>> That is not a redeeming attribute. (snip)
>
>Is is also inaccurate. Pacifist all over the world have placed themselves
>in danger while acting on their views.

Okay, give them a medal and a pretty certificate, broadcast the
ceremony on international television.

Dwight, there's a difference between the oxymoronic "active
pacifists" fomenting a revolution in order to be free of oppression
and the pacifists I'm describing. Real Pacifists won't fight for
anything. They absolve themselves of responsibility, lay back,

refuse to take action. Not to worry in the USA. Some editor in journalism will pick up on that, toss in some "noble" adjectives and "moralism" titles and they are given publicity.

You may have forgotten the "hell no, we won't go!" shouting and hollering of the 1960s. Most of that shouting was done by young people who faced conscription into military service. They feared "dying in Vietnam." They felt they were "too good for lower-class military service." They were moral superiors. As a more noble group they felt entitled to enjoy the guarantees of a better life. Those guarantees had been kept in place by "lower class, less morally superior" citizens in a very large world war and a smaller one in northeast Asia and the beginnings of the MAD standoff between the USSR and USA, held in place by the resolve and work of non-pacifists.

>Indeed, many have faced public
>ridicule and harassment just for speaking out against violence (just look at
>your own messages for an example of that - you don't see them in this
>newsgroup talking about you). Others have faced much more serious
>consequences.

You have forgotten the returnees from Vietnam being spat upon and ridiculed by the morally-superior peaceniks in the 60s and 70s. You have forgotten the rash of anti-war motion pictures of that time and the media portraying the military and government as instruments of evil. The peaceniks and media felt safe doing all that...the guarantees of the US Constitution permitted them free speech. They felt morally superior. They felt safe to express themselves. Guarantees of safety were the responsibility of the lower-class, less superior people. It wasn't the nobles' task. They were owed it, they felt. Noble people feel like that.

There hasn't been any conscription in the USA since 1973. For a few months longer than 30 years the USA military has been all-volunteer. In those three decades a few things happened that threatened our guarantees and the fates of several nations besides our own. Pacifists didn't help keep our guarantees or take action.

The USSR dissolved, not from any actions of pacifists, but from the inherent socio-economic faults of communism. The Germanys united and "the wall" fell from action, not a result of pacifism. No pacifists stopped the nation of Iraq from invading their tiny neighbor. Pacifists didn't deter the hijacked airliners crashing into the WTC and Pentagon. Activists in the fourth plane took over before it could strike any target. Pacifists didn't remove the Taliban from Afghanistan...activists are removing the last vestiges even now.

> In reality, hiding in the majority, especially when violence is involved,
>is the truly safe route - it takes no effort and offers no personal risk.

"Safe?" In a perverse way, death is "safety." In an environment where one may be killed for opposing a regime by not worshiping it, there is an infinite amount of risk.

>Which is more brave, the punk riding the shirttails of the bully or the
>person who stands up to the bully to say he is wrong?

[mental picture of a single Chinese male "opposing" a tank in Tienanmen Square] "Standing up" against the bullies is sometimes idiotic. That Chinese individual could have become a bloody mass of protoplasm in a few seconds, trying to "stop" 30-odd tons of tank. Very emotional TV moment...and also almost a videobite of martyrdom.

>Which were more brave,
>the ones who went along with Saddam or those who stood up to say he was
>wrong?

The USA and UK for standing up against the do-nothing world opinion is the most brave, especially all those volunteers of the US military. That's my answer. It isn't an answer for your loaded question.

Most of those who thought Saddam Hussein was wrong were either silent or dead. There was no guarantee of free speech in Iraq. There was no glorifying videobites of pacifists on Iraqi TV protesting the invasion of Kuwait a dozen or so years ago. Perhaps some Kurds in northern Iraq were pacifists...we don't know...several hundred were gassed to death. Pacifists didn't stop the 8-year Iraq-Iran war...the UN took some action because world oil supplies were being affected. Iraq and Iran got hand-slaps. Iran had a revolution and revolutionaries took over the US Embassy in Iran, imprisoned the staff. USA didn't take enough action. About two years after the end of the Iraq-Iran War, Iraq invaded Kuwait. A coalition led by the USA kicked out Iraq. Pacifists didn't do it but their nobility rose to the top and demanded "go no further!" Pacifists don't want to do anything. They are above such things as actually doing something. They are morally superior.

Here, have a flower...

2187. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 19:44:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030410154430.04182.00000117@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 64374

In article <d22b54c3.0304100417.abea89e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030409202655.18459.00000027@mb-cc.aol.com>...
>
>> In addition, there's the whole dimension of conflict resolution and not
>> empowering those who are likely to become violent. Selling SH's Iraq
>weapons
>> and the technology to make them empowered him. Guess who sold his regime
>things
>> like anthrax and botulinum toxins.
>
>Guess who sold Saddam the AA missles which knocked down the Warthog
>and possibly the F-15. (Hint: Their capital is Paris . .)
>
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>w3rv

Don't forget all that scrap metal that used to be T-55 and T-72
tanks that weren't made in Michigan. :-)

2188. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 20:25:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E95D3BD.C17A360E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64375

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E94E690.28EA89A3@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9243A1.F66483EF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>...

> > It was just a brief stop for a 2m mag mount antenna. My cheapy Pro-Am
> > 1/4 wave had some mashed coaxial cable. The coax had a silly molded
> > fitting at the antenna end which precluded repair. I selected a Hustler
> > 5/8 wave antenna and went on my way. There are lots of repeaters
> > between Columbus and Cincinnati but I made only four QSOs during the
> > drive. The longest and most pleasant was with a YL on the Cambridge
> > machine. I don't know where the abundance of Technician Class ops are
> > spending their time but it doesn't appear to be on 2m FM.
>
> We're going to lose some frequencies if the only thing going on are
> the repeaters automatically IDing every hour. Perhaps Len is right.
> Pretty soon amateur radio will be only about HF.

But where are all of those new Technicians if not on 2m FM? They're
certainly not on 2m SSB or CW. Len wouldn't know those things. He
isn't even a ham.

> ARES on 147.06 in Lancaster had a nice net last night. Lots of public
> service events coming up.
>
> > > We just might get through this thing if you're ready to open up a
> > > little.
> > >
> > I'm not really in the mood to "open up" on morse proficiency if opening
> > up means I need to declare that someone whose maximum morse speed is
> > five words per minute is proficient in the use of morse. That'd be
> > dishonest.

> Dave, I wouldn't want you to be dishonest. Here's what I can do for
> you. I recall that you stated that "20wpm is more proficient than
> 13wpm." I'll tabulate all the wpm rates between 13 and 20wpm and you
> can select the lowest one at which proficiency is achieved. We won't

> even bother with 5wpm.

I've also stated that 25 wpm is more proficient than 20, 30 wpm is more proficient than 25, 35 wpm is more proficient than 30 and 40 wpm is more proficient than 35.

> OK. Here goes:
>
> 14wpm
> 15wpm
> 16wpm
> 17wpm
> 18wpm
> 19wpm
>
> OK, which one is where proficiency begins?

To further add to your confusion, I've stated that I believe morse proficiency begins at a point somewhat higher than 10 wpm. You'll need to begin typing numbers from 11 through 40. The answer will be in there somewhere.

2189. Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 21:56:13 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304102117060.1269@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 64376

On Thu, 10 Apr 2003, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >Subject: Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.
> >From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
> >Date: 4/9/2003 6:37 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304092311210.1110@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
>
> >If you look back on this newsgroup to December 2002 or so, you will find that
> >I
> >am NOT the only one who has said so. There are others who have called the
> >posting of "Newsline" here as spam.
>
> Then write to them, coordinate an effort and be done with it. You've
> spent more time making an issue out of it than spending time discussing
> anything that was in the "news release" itself.
>
> >It's not a matter of being 100% correct. It's a matter of DUE
> DILLIGENCE...(SNIP)
>
> I reiterate my previous question: "I refer to the general news media...are
> they 100% right and completely unbiased 100% of the time?"

Excluding the "tabloids," they may not be 100% correct, but they TRY, and when possible, confirm a situation from multiple sources and attempt to solicit the other party's side - that's due dilligence - lacking here.

> >Had BP tried to contact those on the other side of the
> >story and was refused an interview, that would be different. I have been
> >informed by those two individuals I mentioned in an earlier response that no
> >contact attempt was made that they know of - despite the fact that one of
> >them
> >had a listed telephone number.
>
> Making phone calls, travelling for interviews, etc, cost money. Even one
> trip of one day's journey can rack up $100 of legitimate expenses, especially
> in Southern California. One day's work can put him 1/10th of the way to that
> $1K he is claiming.

Yes, and his competitors do it for $100/MONTH, not $100/day. It's obvious that his expenses are overinflated.

> >> I got your point. I repeat my question...The general news media is
> >ALWAYS
> >> 100% right or 100% unbiased...?!?!
> >
> >See due dilligence above.

>
> You've not answered MY question, Dieter. When the "professional"
> newscasters can't even gt it 100% right 100% of the time for the great amounts
> of expenditures (and resources!) they have, why should a guy doing it part time
> ?
>
> Yes...I agree that everyone should strive to get it right 100% of the time,
> but I am NOT swayed by your argument that Mr. Pastrnak has made any great
> imposition here. Certainly far more bandwidth has been expended here with your
> arguing about where it rightfully belongs than if you'd said nothing and just
> killfilled him.

Killfiling someone (i.e. filtering) is a LAST resort in fighting spam. Getting
the spammer to stop and/or closing him down is always an earlier step.

> >Circumstantially, YES:
> >1) His competitor, Community Video Associates Inc., does the same thing as
> >"Newsline" when they put together "This Week in Amateur Radio" yet TWIAR's
> >expense is 10% of what Newsline's claimed expense is.
>
> Wal-mart sells a great generic cola that sells for about .17$ a can...Do
> you think I should stop drinking Pepsi or Coke at .75$ just because someone
> does it cheaper?
>
> >After eliminating the maintenance cost for
> >the "instant update" phone line ($50/month - and that's generous;...(SNIP)
>
> Unless he's having to pay for the phone as a business...Even 501(c)3
> organizations have to pay "business rates" in many areas.

I am aware of that - and even if the "instant update" line is on the business
measured rate, most if not all of the calls are INCOMING, which means the cost
isn't charged to that line. My local phone book indicates that this rate is
$19.22/month for single-line business measured rate customers (plus $0.04 for
the first minute and $0.01/min for additional minutes under the measured rate
for OUTGOING calls - which from this line should be none). Add the $6.00 FCC
Long distance access fee and local taxes, and one arrives at a cost per month
in the neighborhood of $30.00. Out of the other $20.00 (since I said $50), I'm
assuming the cost of calling to upload the new message each week. All other
calls are assumed to be in the $100/month overhead that the competitor also
incurs.

> >2) Via a request of one of the member clubs, the Los Angeles Area Council of
> >Amateur Radio Clubs asked in response to one of "Newsline's" requests for
> >funding to identify the extent of the expenses. "Newsline" turned down the
> >request. The only reason NOT to disclose, especially to a group which may
> >potentially fund the activity, is if something illegal, illicit, or unethical
> >is going on and the person performing that activity does not want to be
> >discovered as having done it.
>
> Does he have a legal obligaton to respond?

If "Newsline" is a non-profit organization, YES, he is required to respond else face losing the organization's non-profit status. He can choose to make the inquiring party file a request for the form 990 or form 990PF to the IRS to get the information (26 USC 6104(b) or (d), the latter for "private foundations") but may not fight such a request. The application (IRS form 1023 or 1024) for non-profit status is also subject to inspection (26 USC 6104(a)). If "Newsline" isn't a non-profit organization, then under the Internal Revenue Code, it is by default a FOR PROFIT business, and thus the violation under 47 CFR 97.113 has occurred (specification: Preparing the content of an amateur radio transmission for profit - thus being indirect compensation for a transmission).

> >Furthermore, I know of no counterindications that would otherwise explain the
> >situation in a non-fraudulent way.
>
> Well, Dieter, he's been doing this for a great many years now, and I KNOW
> his service is widely known by FCC staffers and the public in general. So tell
> me...WHY is it that no one of any consiquence has called into question his
> "service" before?

Some people have. They just haven't stayed with it like I have. Just because he's gotten away with a violation of law doesn't mean that what he did is legal because he hasn't been prosecuted (civilly or criminally), nor with the continuation of the activity does the period of limitations close.

> >If you don't believe me, ask him to explain his expenses and see what kind of
> >response you get.
>
> Does he have a legal obligation to respond?

If he doesn't, file an IRS form 4506-A and get the information from them. If there's no application for exempt status (form 1023 or 1024) on file, then the organization isn't exempt and my case is proven.

I actually did do this exact thing with regard to one of our area repeater coordination groups about 7 years ago. This was during a period of time where that particular group wasn't even mailing acknowledgements for "request for coordination" applications (nor acting on them). After finding out that the group didn't have non-profit status (via a request to the IRS on form 4506-A), I filed a complaint to the NFCC challenging their legitimacy as a repeater coordinator. About 6 months after that, this group all of a sudden started having regular meetings and started acting on RFC applications (granting some of them). Considering that at least one, if not both of the other repeater coordinators for "socal" does have IRC 501(c)(7) non-profit status, you should be able to figure out which group I'm talking about. :-)

> >I wouldn't have a problem with that. RH may be unaware that BP is paying
> >himself a salary, but I'm certain he's aware of the rest of it (i.e. the
> >reporting activity). Unfortunately, it's this one fact that changes
> >everything.
>
> Other than making some kitchen table calculations on what you THINK he
> should be claiming as legitimate expenses, you've not said or demonstrated in

> any substantial way any fraud, Dieter.

I agree that I haven't absolutely demonstrated it. I have demonstrated strong indications of fraud that this organization refuses to produce any evidence to counter. Based on what I know, I have no reason to believe that my assertion is false and I have those indications which point ONLY to the assertion being true.

> >Definently 80%. I'm not certain that it would reduce by 95%; I haven't
> >actually counted the posts. :-)
>
> OK...I'll buy your 80%!
>
> >The only reason I haven't done so yet is because I don't have sufficient
> >PROOF.
> >I have only the indications.
>
> Well then...There we are.

Note however, who controls the proof. If the indications are false, the organization has been challenged on it (not in a way that accuses them; just a request for justification of expense) and has failed to produce anything that may counter the indications. Also, this is not the first time I have indicated this on this group, and the organization's members do supposedly scan this newsgroup - so where is their rebuttal?

> >However, you will find that for each post he has made here with the
> >"Newsline"
> >script, a complaint has gone to his ISP for violating the newsgroup charter -
> >and NOT ALL of those complaints over the past 6 months have come from me. If
> >he would simply post his stuff where it belongs ("rec.radio.info") and not
> >here, there'd be nothing to complain about as far as his ISP is concerned.
>
> Then perhaps THEY are not as concerned about it either. Just KF
> him...Then we won't go through this again?

As I said before, filtering is not the optimal solution to fighting spam. The best solution is elimination at the source.

2190. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 22:26:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030410182651.08544.00000038@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64377

In article <d22b54c3.0304100417.abea89e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030409202655.18459.00000027@mb-cc.aol.com>...
>
>> In addition, there's the whole dimension of conflict resolution and not
>> empowering those who are likely to become violent. Selling SH's Iraq
>weapons
>> and the technology to make them empowered him. Guess who sold his regime
>things
>> like anthrax and botulinum toxins.
>>
>
>Guess who sold Saddam the AA missles which knocked down the Warthog
>and possibly the F-15. (Hint: Their capital is Paris . .)
>
Were they the same folks who had to install speed bumps on the Champs Elysees to slow down incoming Panzers?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2191. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 22:26:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030410182652.08544.00000039@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64378

In article <3E95768E.2090303@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> The KKK, witch burnings, religious wars, and of course the Spanish
>Inquisition.
>
>
> Wow, Jim! Caught me by surprise with that one. I wasn't expecting the
>Spanish Inquisition......

You have a lot of company, Mike. Nobody expects the Spanish Inquisition.

--

And the Inquisition was not limited to Spain. The horrors of it were barbaric
in the extreme. All because some folks disagreed about religion.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2192. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 23:18:05 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030410191805.20747.00000269@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 64381

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>> Why do people misinterpret what I say? I agreed Morse code is a growth
>> industry, EE is not.

>Because you say it in such a manner that it can easily be misinterpreted.

I try to be as clear as possible.

>Pointing out the increased numbers is merely stating a fact. In and of
>itself that is NOT advocating anything.

Thats true, its just stating statistics. However, chosing how you look at the numbers is another story.

>However the fact can then be used
>to support advocating Morse.

Thats what I mean. Chosing to look at the numbers that way is advocating Morse code.

N2EY claimed more Morse code sales indicates Morse code is growing, which means more poeple are interested in it, which means Morse code is more useful (according to N2EY's logic).

2193. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 23:36:57 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030410193657.20747.00000270@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 64382

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>But where are all of those new Technicians if not on 2m FM? They're
>certainly not on 2m SSB or CW. Len wouldn't know those things. He
>isn't even a ham.

Just because one is not a Ham doesn't mean one wouldn't know that. For example, some radio techs may chose not to be a Ham.

>I've also stated that 25 wpm is more proficient than 20, 30 wpm is more
>proficient than 25, 35 wpm is more proficient than 30 and 40 wpm is more
>proficient than 35.

Thats common sense. What is the lowest rate of proficiency?

It could depend on reflex, then its 10 wpm. It could also depend on "pleasant" sounding word rate. Channel capacity, as someone pointed out.

What's your definition of proficiency, and whats the number?

>To further add to your confusion, I've stated that I believe morse
>proficiency begins at a point somewhat higher than 10 wpm.

The studies show 10 wpm is the speed of proficiency.

After having 10 wpm, you lose your ability to do 5wpm. Therefore, 10 wpm is not more proficient than 5 wpm - they are two different skills.

In some real-time encoding schemes, both reflex and non-relex real-time encoding is desired. (Imagine having 10 wpm, but not losing your 5 wpm real-time encoding skill).

As Morse code is finite, and used for communication, this is not the case here. The goal for Morse coders is to get 10 wpm or higher <real-time encoding> speed.

2194. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 23:48:29 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <hpnla.1428$DM5.971597@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64379

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030406105812.00320.00000367@mb-fs.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
> >And now Vipul manages to interpret the response as to mean exactly the
> >opposite of what the poster actually said. Where do you get your data ??
>
> Why do people misinterpret what I say? I agreed Morse code is a growth
> industry, EE is not.

Because you say it in such a manner that it can easily be misinterpreted.

>
> Pointing out the increased numbers is advocating Morse code. N2EY (an
> Electrical Engineer) advocates Morse code, not Electrical Engineering.

Pointing out the increased numbers is merely stating a fact. In and of
itself that is NOT advocating anything. However the fact can then be used
to support advocating Morse.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2195. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-10 23:51:22 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <_rnla.1431$DM5.972676@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64380

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E94E690.28EA89A3@earthlink.net...
>
> It was just a brief stop for a 2m mag mount antenna. My cheapy Pro-Am
> 1/4 wave had some mashed coaxial cable. The coax had a silly molded
> fitting at the antenna end which precluded repair. I selected a Hustler
> 5/8 wave antenna and went on my way. There are lots of repeaters
> between Columbus and Cincinnati but I made only four QSOs during the
> drive. The longest and most pleasant was with a YL on the Cambridge
> machine. I don't know where the abundance of Technician Class ops are
> spending their time but it doesn't appear to be on 2m FM.
>

Between Columbus and Cincinnati, there aren't very many people. I've been
there. Once outside the cities, it's downright sparse!

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2196. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 00:13:38 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030410201338.20747.00000271@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 64384

>From: Unclaimed Mysteries k4doh@mindspring.com

>They have no future except their own graves.
>Even today these codeless
>stooges are impaling themselves by the thousands upon the gates of true
>ham radio. Their blood flows like a filthy torrent into 27MHz

Your ignorance leads you to believe that. Some no-coders know alot more than some Extras. Its better to be lean (without code) and mean than fat and sluggish.

Only an appliance operator would refer to 27MHz as a bad segment, which shows you bought into the cult and have a limited view of amateur radio (appliance operator group).

>All
>non-CW activity is a despicable lie, promoted by these congenital
>gangsters who have no sense of true communication.

That's what the Church of CW would like you to believe. If all non-CW activity is a lie, would you like broadcast radios to have only CW broadcasts? Of course not.

Its actually the CW "gangsters" that tries to recruit with Morse code and pressure amateurs to learn Morse code. Their recruitment of amateurs comes with the heavy recommendation (or pressure) of Morse code.

They use deceptive media tactics, such as claiming accomplishments where there are none, using the best to represent the whole, claiming to participate in technical aspects (such as homebrewing), while really hating it, and other methods to spread their lies. The methods and lies told by the Morsers are what's "despicable".

Dots and dashed, abbreviations and codewords are not true communication.

>They should be hit
>with shoes.

No, free choice is the answer. Unfortunately, they may recruit through Morse, but drive away quality. Unfortunately, that does not look good to regulators.

>God will grill their bellies in hell, where they will fry in
>their own fat as their souls wail in lamentation.

God is not in hell - the Devil is. Long-time Morsers tend to have more fat. Less physical activity does that, you know.

>I'm sorry I must have blacked out there for a minute. Did I say anything?

You must have been possessed. Once you see the truth, you will be outraged.
Lets just hope its not too late.

2197. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 00:27:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030410202708.11012.00000073@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 64385

In article <b7d1465c.0304100332.6f5a359c@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) writes:

>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0304021735.56e4cdc1@posting.google.com>...
>> The last numbers I saw
>> stated that Israel is kept economically afloat by annual four billion
>> dollar handouts from us.
>>
>> w3rv
>
>Did you say four BILLION?!

Peanuts compared to the cost of, say, a couple of B2 bombers.

>While we have homeless right here who
>freeze to death each winter for lack of shelter!
>
Those homeless don't share vital intel data.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2198. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 00:48:01 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <5hola.1451$DM5.992828@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64383

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030410191805.20747.00000269@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
> >"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> Why do people misinterpret what I say? I agreed Morse code is a growth
> >> industry, EE is not.
>
> >Because you say it in such a manner that it can easily be misinterpreted.
>
> I try to be as clear as possible.
>
> >Pointing out the increased numbers is merely stating a fact. In and of
> >itself that is NOT advocating anything.
>
> Thats true, its just stating statistics. However, chosing how you look at
the
> numbers is another story.
>
> >However the fact can then be used
> >to support advocating Morse.
>
> Thats what I mean. Chosing to look at the numbers that way is advocating
Morse
> code.
>
> N2EY claimed more Morse code sales indicates Morse code is growing, which
means
> more poeple are interested in it, which means Morse code is more useful
> (according to N2EY's logic).

That is not quire a correct statement. You imputed a deduction sequence
toN2EY that went one step too far. It does not mean that it is more useful
merely that it is useful.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2199. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 01:14:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304101714.5982e678@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64386

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0304100834.7b551cac@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304090509.6c9a4d25@posting.google.com>...
> > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.08.02.25.42.510174.8992@arrl.org>...
> > > On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 21:21:24 -0400, Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > Do you think that the Daschle Chicks are patriots? If so, why?
> > >
> > > Do you think they are not? If so, why?
> >
> > I think it's important for every American to have the right to voice
> > their displeasure with their government, -at no risk to themselves-,
> > while other Americans are dying on the battlefield to protect that
> > right.
> >
> > The Constitution doesn't mandate patriotism, and I think the Dixie
> > Chick merely exercised her right to be unpatriotic and stupid.
>
> Stupid, maybe. Unpatriotic? Not at all. Unless free speech has become unpatriotic.

Is all free speech patriotic?

2200. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 01:16:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9617F6.2383C36E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64387

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > The KKK, witch burnings, religious wars, and of course the Spanish Inquisition.
>
> Wow, Jim! Caught me by surprise with that one. I wasn't expecting the
> Spanish Inquisition......

NOBODY expects the Spanish Inquisition!

Keep it up and it's the comfy chair for you.

Dave K8MN

2201. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 01:33:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E961BE1.AF6AFC06@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64388

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >But where are all of those new Technicians if not on 2m FM? They're
> >certainly not on 2m SSB or CW. Len wouldn't know those things. He
> >isn't even a ham.

> Just because one is not a Ham doesn't mean one wouldn't know that. For example,
> some radio techs may chose not to be a Ham.

Uhhh....Mr. Shah, What non-ham radio techs sit around scanning 2m FM all
day?

> >I've also stated that 25 wpm is more proficient than 20, 30 wpm is more
> >proficient than 25, 35 wpm is more proficient than 30 and 40 wpm is more
> >proficient than 35.
>
> Thats common sense. What is the lowest rate of proficiency?

Somewhat higher than ten words per minute.

> It could depend on reflex, then its 10 wpm.

You mean according to your one and only source?

> It could also depend on "pleasant" sounding word rate.

There's an interesting answer from one who is not proficient in morse.
Maybe what you wrote means something to you. It doesn't having any
meaning for me.

> Channel capacity, as someone pointed out.

Maybe you found some meaning in that term. Perhaps you can explain it
to us.

> What's your definition of proficiency, and whats the number?

Look back in the thread to find the definition. The number I've given
is somewhat higher than ten words per minute.

> >To further add to your confusion, I've stated that I believe morse
> >proficiency begins at a point somewhat higher than 10 wpm.
>
> The studies show 10 wpm is the speed of proficiency.

The "studies"? Your one source is the final authority?

> After having 10 wpm, you lose your ability to do 5wpm. Therefore, 10 wpm is not more proficient than 5 wpm - they are two different skills.

That'd be true if it actually happened. Someone who is proficient in morse at 35 wpm does not lose his ability to copy 5 wpm. Why don't you attempt to argue something about which you are knowledgeable?

> In some real-time encoding schemes, both reflex and non-relex real-time encoding is desired. (Imagine having 10 wpm, but not losing your 5 wpm real-time encoding skill).

I can imagine that at any time.

> As Morse code is finite, and used for communication, this is not the case here.
> The goal for Morse coders is to get 10 wpm or higher <real-time encoding>
> speed.

It is quite obvious that you have no understanding of the subject.

Dave K8MN

2202. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 01:40:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E961D89.D40E1A4E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64389

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E94E690.28EA89A3@earthlink.net...
> >
> > It was just a brief stop for a 2m mag mount antenna. My cheapy Pro-Am
> > 1/4 wave had some mashed coaxial cable. The coax had a silly molded
> > fitting at the antenna end which precluded repair. I selected a Hustler
> > 5/8 wave antenna and went on my way. There are lots of repeaters
> > between Columbus and Cincinnati but I made only four QSOs during the
> > drive. The longest and most pleasant was with a YL on the Cambridge
> > machine. I don't know where the abundance of Technician Class ops are
> > spending their time but it doesn't appear to be on 2m FM.
> >
>
> Between Columbus and Cincinnati, there aren't very many people. I've been
> there. Once outside the cities, it's downright sparse!

Dee,

I was hitting numerous repeaters from my mobile. I know that if I can
hit them from the car, it'd be quite easy for someone operating from any
little burg to hit them. Ohio has a large number of hams.

Dave K8MN

2203. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 01:44:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E961E77.8999034F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64390

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <b7d1465c.0304100332.6f5a359c@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net
> (Bert Craig) writes:
>
> >kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
> >news:<d22b54c3.0304021735.56e4cdc1@posting.google.com>...
> >> The last numbers I saw
> >> stated that Israel is kept economically afloat by annual four billion
> >> dollar handouts from us.
> >>
> >> w3rv
> >
> >Did you say four BILLION?!
>
> Peanuts compared to the cost of, say, a couple of B2 bombers.
>
> >While we have homeless right here who
> >freeze to death each winter for lack of shelter!
> >
> Those homeless don't share vital intel data.

Don't forget that Egypt receives a similar sum and most folks there
don't even like us.

Dave K8MN

"How can I be anti-Semitic? I am a Semite!"
--Anwar Sadat

2204. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 01:46:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E961F0A.5A1CF86@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64391

Brian wrote:

> Is all free speech patriotic?

Having witnessed an interview with Scott Ridder on CNN this evening, I'd have to say, "No".

Dave K8MN

2205. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 01:56:45 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304101756.77e882b8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64392

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BABAB131.166AA%stewart@say.net>...
> "Dick Carroll" wrote:
>
> > So we object to Saddam so we just struck out at him.
>
>
> We now object to Saddam. As you well know, our government and military
> didn't do so for many years. Instead, we spend years building up his
> government with both political support and military aid. Perhaps if we not
> done so, our young men and women would not be over there today and the Iraqi
> people would have had freedom years ago.

Yeah, yeah. And we could have taken out the Soviet Union in 1945 if
only Patton had gotten his way. You can spend your life doing
pointless circular "what-ifs".

> But all that is in the past. The question now is what will happen next.
> Will we insert a government that is truly concerned with the interests of
> the Iraqi people or will it be a government more concerned with the
> political, military, and business interests of us and our friends? The
> rhetoric from Bush sounds good, but our actions (ignoring our allies and the
> UN) already suggests the worst.

Did you notice that we didn't get much if any help from the UN when we
almost single-handedly rebuilt Europe after WW2? What shred of
evidence do you have which indicates that history will not repeat
itself in the case of Iraq?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

w3rv

2206. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 02:26:43 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7594i$5o1$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64393

Make my funk the P-Funk, Vshah101 wrote:
>>From: Unclaimed Mysteries k4doh@mindspring.com
>
>
>>They have no future except their own graves.
>>Even today these codeless
>>stooges are impaling themselves by the thousands upon the gates of true
>>ham radio. Their blood flows like a filthy torrent into 27MHz
>
>
> Your ignorance leads you to believe that. Some no-coders know alot more than
> some Extras. Its better to be lean (without code) and mean than fat and
> sluggish.
>
> Only an appliance operator would refer to 27MHz as a bad segment, which shows
> you bought into the cult and have a limited view of amateur radio (appliance
> operator group).
>
>
>>All
>>non-CW activity is a despicable lie, promoted by these congenital
>>gangsters who have no sense of true communication.
>
>
> That's what the Church of CW would like you to believe. If all non-CW activity
> is a lie, would you like broadcast radios to have only CW broadcasts? Of course
> not.
>
> Its actually the CW "gangsters" that tries to recruit with Morse code and
> pressure amateurs to learn Morse code. Their recruitment of amateurs comes with
> the heavy recommendation (or pressure) of Morse code.
>
> They use deceptive media tactics, such as claiming accomplishments where there
> are none, using the best to represent the whole, claiming to participate in
> technical aspects (such as homebrewing), while really hating it, and other
> methods to spread their lies. The methods and lies told by the Morsers are
> what's "despicable".
>
> Dots and dashed, abbreviations and codewords are not true communication.
>
>
>>They should be hit
>>with shoes.
>

>
> No, free choice is the answer. Unfortunately, they may recruit through Morse,
> but drive away quality. Unfortunately, that does not look good to regulators.
>
>
>>God will grill their bellies in hell, where they will fry in
>>their own fat as their souls wail in lamentation.
>
>
> God is not in hell - the Devil is. Long-time Morsers tend to have more fat.
> Less physical activity does that, you know.
>
>
>>I'm sorry I must have blacked out there for a minute. Did I say anything?
>
>
> You must have been possessed. Once you see the truth, you will be outraged.
> Lets just hope its not too late.

I continue to be amazed just how well-stocked this particular pond is.

73 Corry K4DOH

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/

"Here I am, the CEO of a multibillion-dollar company, and I'm having to
answer about what some weirdo has said on a message board." - Richard
Scrushy

2207. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 02:49:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030410224926.01589.00000167@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64395

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/10/2003 2:44 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030410154430.04182.00000116@mb-fg.aol.com>

>Only the violent pacifists will have to worry about an over-
> nighter in the pokey.

"violent pacifists"...?!?!

>It is very easy to be a pacifist in the USA. Pacifists can feel
> safe and protected by the guarantees of the First Amendment.
> No problem. Trouble is, those pacifists haven't thought further
> about how come we still have those guarantees after almost
> 227 years of national existance.

For once, Len, something we can agree on wholeheartedly.

>Those guarantees didn't happen by magic or divine inter-
> vention. They haven't remained in place, guaranteed, because
> a group of self-righteous noble-thinking "we are the moral
> superior" pacifists refused to participate in keeping those
> guarantees in place.

Absolutely.

>>Is is also inaccurate. Pacifist all over the world have placed themselves
>>in danger while acting on their views.
>
> Okay, give them a medal and a pretty certificate, broadcast the
> ceremony on international television.

Everyone loves a parade. Personally, I'd like to see the 174th, the 101st
and the USMC march up to those silly crossed swords in Baghdad and pull them
down.

>Dwight, there's a difference between the oxymoronic "active
> pacifists" fomenting a revolution in order to be free of oppression
> and the pacifists I'm describing. Real Pacifists won't fight for
> anything. They absolve themselves of responsibility, lay back,
> refuse to take action. Not to worry in the USA. Some editor in
> journalism will pick up on that, toss in some "noble" adjectives
> and "moralism" titles and they are given publicity

Absolutely again. Everyone loves the lazy mutt laying on the porch.
Soaks up the sun, eats your food, then won't even bark when the house is being
broke into.

>You may have forgotten the "hell no, we won't go!" shouting and
> hollering of the 1960s. Most of that shouting was done by
> young people who faced conscription into military service. They
> feared "dying in Vietnam." They felt they were "too good for
> lower-class military service." They were moral superiors.

I'd disagree on the "moral superiors", Len...They were just cowards.

>You have forgotten the returnees from Vietnam being spat upon
> and ridiculed by the morally-superior peaceniks in the 60s and
> 70s.

I make it a point to shake the hand of every Veteran that comes through my
ER and say "thank-you".

>The USSR dissolved, not from any actions of pacifists, but
> from the inherent socio-economic faults of communism.

Hmmmmmm.....if you include the fact that we outspent them on defense and
thier economic system failed aas a result of that misguided prioritizinf of
thier already limited assets, I also agree.

>Germanys united and "the wall" fell from action, not a result
> of pacifism. No pacifists stopped the nation of Iraq from
> invading their tiny neighbor. Pacifists didn't deter the hijacked
> airliners crashing into the WTC and Pentagon. Activists in
> the fourth plane took over before it could strike any target.
> Pacifists didn't remove the Taliban from Afghanistan...activists
> are removing the last vestiges even now.

Here here!

>[mental picture of a single Chinese male "opposing" a tank
> in Tienanmen Square] "Standing up" against the bullies
> is sometimes idiotic. That Chinese individual could have
> become a bloody mass of protoplasm in a few seconds,
> trying to "stop" 30-odd tons of tank. Very emotional TV
> moment...and also almost a videobite of martyrdom.

But I wonder where Red China would be today if that tank HAD run that kid
over and the tape made it out to the world...?!?! Maybe just the "videobyte"
you sugest, but I can't help but believe that the world would have brought
great pressure to bear on Beijing.

>>Which were more brave,
>>the ones who went along with Saddam or those who stood up to say he was
>>wrong?
>
> The USA and UK for standing up against the do-nothing world
> opinion is the most brave, especially all those volunteers of the
> US military. That's my answer. It isn't an answer for your loaded
> question.

Yep!

>Most of those who thought Saddam Hussein was wrong were
> either silent or dead.

Better to live in a world where you have the right to remain silent, than
to live in a world where tyrants have the right to MAKE you silent!

>Here, have a flower...

This was scary! Len and I on the exact same wavelength... ! !

73

Steve

2208. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 02:57:04 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030410225704.20674.00000228@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 64396

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>What is the lowest rate of proficiency?
>
>Somewhat higher than ten words per minute.

"Somewhat" is not a number. Whats the number?

>> It could depend on reflex, then its 10 wpm.
>
>You mean according to your one and only source?

Yes, from a source that advocates Morse code. Do you have a better source?

>> Channel capacity, as someone pointed out.
>
>Maybe you found some meaning in that term. Perhaps you can explain it
>to us.

I'm not surprised that a Morser would not know about channel capacity.

>Someone who is proficient in
>morse at 35 wpm does not lose his ability to copy 5 wpm.

Maybe not for you. After not using at 5wpm, others may forget.

2209. Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 02:59:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030410225903.01589.00000168@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64397

>Subject: Re: FCC considers interference immunity for recievers.
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>Date: 4/10/2003 4:56 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304102117060.1269@kd6lvw.ampr.org>

>Excluding the "tabloids," they may not be 100% correct, but they TRY, and
>when
>possible, confirm a situation from multiple sources and attempt to solicit
>the
>other party's side - that's due dilligence - lacking here.

And lacking the expense acount that CNN reporters have, you can say that
Bill Pasternak DOESN'T try...?!?! Even remotely?

>Yes, and his competitors do it for $100/MONTH, not $100/day. It's obvious
>that
>his expenses are overinflated.

That's $3000. How can it be "obvious" whn you don't have a statement of
his expenses...?!?! And I hear Bill's report on far more systems than I do any
other.

>Killfiling someone (i.e. filtering) is a LAST resort in fighting spam.
>Getting
>the spammer to stop and/or closing him down is always an earlier step.

If it's spam, it's spam. Kill it. If it's not worth killfilling, then
it's just annoyiong, SO WHAT?

>If "Newsline" is a non-profit organization, YES, he is required to respond
>else
>face losing the organization's non-profit status.

You say "if" it's an non-profit. Is it even an "organization"...???
Does it have a charter or other instument of organization?

>Some people have. They just haven't stayed with it like I have. Just
>because
>he's gotten away with a violation of law doesn't mean that what he did is
>legal
>because he hasn't been prosecuted (civilly or criminally), nor with the
>continuation of the activity does the period of limitations close.

Point taken...but it could also be that they have already looked into it
and decided that it was either NOT a violation or there wasn't enough evidence
to support even an investigation.

>I agree that I haven't absolutely demonstrated it. I have demonstrated
>strong
>indications of fraud that this organization refuses to produce any evidence
>to
>counter. Based on what I know, I have no reason to believe that my assertion
>is false and I have those indications which point ONLY to the assertion being
>true.

Again...point taken.

>As I said before, filtering is not the optimal solution to fighting spam.
>The
>best solution is elimination at the source.

It's a target rich enviroment, that's for sure!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2210. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 03:04:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030410230404.00177.00000099@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 64398

In article <pan.2003.04.09.14.28.22.926718.25899@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>No, it's not. It's utterly inconsistent, in fact. Not giving a damn about
>what anyone else thinks is much more likely to endanger you than at least
>trying to reach common ground with them. The effort to reach common
>ground doesn't require giving up your own vital interests, such as self
>defense, but not making that effort makes it more likely that you WILL
>have to defend yourself.
>
>Jon

Jon:

As long as Americans desire to remain a free and independent nation, we
will always have to defend ourselves. We didn't become free and
independent by negotiation and diplomacy. We struggled, fought, and
sacrificed in order to earn our freedom. We then rose to become the most
powerful nation on the planet, and we use our power to export the freedom,
justice, and democracy which we have come to take for granted. We are
not exporting misery, as the (hopefully) late Saddam Hussein and his
regime had been doing. I think it's about time that Americans stopped
"giving a damn about what other people think" in a much bigger way.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2211. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 03:04:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030410230405.00177.00000100@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 64400

In article <pan.2003.04.10.01.29.03.763898.13428@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>On Wed, 09 Apr 2003 19:14:39 -0400, Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>> Evidently you're another who didn't understand what took place on
>> 9/11/01,
>> and evidently still do not.
>
>I understand it quite well, Dick. I also understand that there are two
>sides to the story. That's a concept you have repeatedly failed to get on
>a variety of issues discussed in this NG over the years, and it doesn't
>surprise me a bit that you don't get it now. It's so much simpler and
>comforting to pick a side and demonize all who don't agree with you.
>
>Jon

Jon:

I won't presume to speak for Dick, but I, for one, will spend the rest of
my life "disagreeing" with vicious despots who impose brutal regimes of
torture, rape, starvation, extortion, and death upon their innocent citizens.
Forgive me if this politically-incorrect point of view offends you personally.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2212. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 03:04:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030410230406.00177.00000101@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 64399

In article <BAB93DB2.15D98%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> In this case, our cause is just. We seek to free an
>> imprisoned nation from the barbarism of a vicious,
>> totalitarian despot who would have threatened the
>> rest of the free world unchecked had we not finally
>> intervened. (snip)
>
>
> Lets keep the discussion within the realm of reality, Larry. Saddam didn't
>threaten the "rest of the free world" even prior to the last Iraq war. He
>was a two-bit dictator of a third world country with a third world military.
>He could not even defeat Iran, much less the rest of the free world. And,
>after the reduction of his military during and after the last war, he was
>even less of a threat to the free world leading into this war.
>
> As for WMD (if he actually had them leading up to this war), he did not
>use them even to save his country from a direct attack or to save his own
>life - not exactly what one would expect from a person intending to use them
>on the "rest of the free world."
>
>
>> No, it is categorically NOT possible for any loyal
>> American to justify non-support for this righteous
>> campaign and the Commander-In-Chief who courageously
>> prosecuted it. (snip)
>
>
> Nonsense.
>
>
>
>> To withhold support for the President and this war
>> is to choose the continuation of the evil of the
>> Saddam Hussein regime. (snip)
>
>
> Nonsense.
>
>

>> (snip) These Anti-War protesters are merely mindless
>> parrots of empty rhetoric which reflects nothing more
>> than their own intellectual laziness and physical
>> cowardice.
>
>
> Nonsense.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Dwight:

So you're opposed to the war. Fine, be that way. Just thank God you're an American, and you won't be thrown feet first into an industrial plastic shredder for disagreeing with the government. You will simply be dismissed as a hopelessly misinformed, intellectually lazy, physical coward -- as your response would indicate.

BTW, the newly free people of the city of Baghdad have spent the day rejoicing and tearing down statues of Saddam Hussein. A curiously odd response for people who were victimized by us nasty old Americans trying to impose our will upon them!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2213. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 03:33:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABBAFAD.1684D%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64452

"N2EY" wrote:

> (snip) What do you think would happen with my
> thought experiment about a gasoline surtax?

I don't think it is much of a thought experiment. We will eventually have to pay for these conflicts and our government loves to hide taxes in consumer goods and services. By doing so, people never fully realize how much taxes they're actually paying to the government. Therefore, I expect gas taxes to increase just like the many other hidden federal taxes will. And, for those who do realize it and complain, there will be people out there saying it is necessary for defense (defense = war - today's wars are never described as war). Heck, as you probably well remember, this was routine stuff during the cold war.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2214. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 03:39:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <yNqla.1498$DM5.1060106@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64394

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E961D89.D40E1A4E@earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > Between Columbus and Cincinnati, there aren't very many people. I've
been
> > there. Once outside the cities, it's downright sparse!
>
> Dee,
>
> I was hitting numerous repeaters from my mobile. I know that if I can
> hit them from the car, it'd be quite easy for someone operating from any
> little burg to hit them. Ohio has a large number of hams.
>
> Dave K8MN

Yes any one in any little burg can hit them but some of those little burgs are so small that the one or two hams in them aren't listening all day. In Columbus, no problem, plenty of people to talk to. In Cincinnati, no problem, again plenty of people to talk to. But in between is a very different story. That stretch between these two cities is very low in population density.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2215. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 03:56:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E963D60.C8AC7A7A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64453

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >What is the lowest rate of proficiency?
> >
> >Somewhat higher than ten words per minute.
>
> "Somewhat" is not a number. Whats the number?

I haven't provided a number.

> >> It could depend on reflex, then its 10 wpm.
> >
> >You mean according to your one and only source?
>
> Yes, from a source that advocates Morse code. Do you have a better source?

Not only better, I have more than one. Maybe if you do some research,
you can find more and better sources. Try not to rely too much on the
internet.

In future, you might run across this quote:

"A large number of those attempting to increase their morse code copying
ability seemed to hit a wall at a speed of about ten words per minute.
It proved difficult to move beyond the ten word per minute level no
matter how often or how long the practice sessions. After a long period
with little evident increase in copying speed, a breakthrough would be
achieved. A student would find that his speed had suddenly gone from
ten words per minute to thirteen or even fifteen."

"One way to limit the effect of the 'wall' is to always practice with
code five or ten words per minute faster than you can comfortably copy.
Make no effort to write down the characters. Just copy along in your
head. Don't worry about missing a few letters or even an entire word
here and there. You'll find that with each practice session, you are
able to copy more and more of the text. In a very short time, your code
speed will increase markedly." --Dave Heil K8MN

Good luck in finding other source material.

> >> Channel capacity, as someone pointed out.
> >
> >Maybe you found some meaning in that term. Perhaps you can explain it
> >to us.
>

> I'm not surprised that a Morser would not know about channel capacity.

What's a "morser"? My neighbors had a cat which was a pretty good mouser.

Channel capacity isn't a factor in morse proficiency. You can either copy a particular speed or you can't copy it. We don't even need a channel. Just sit in a room with me and copy code. You're trying to make this too difficult, Vipul.

> >Someone who is proficient in
> >morse at 35 wpm does not lose his ability to copy 5 wpm.
>
> Maybe not for you. After not using at 5wpm, others may forget.

Not "maybe". Not for me and not for any good morse op known to me. Again, why not discuss something with which you are familiar instead of trying to impress me with your tap dancing?

Dave K8MN

2216. Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 04:02:38 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b76f1k$be9jq$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 64478

I personally have not seen the exact text, but recently in the magazine World Radio there was an article by James Wades, WB8SIW referencing amateur radio and public service. In this article from my understanding he makes a comment in regards to the idea that only 2% of hams participate in public service activities and the rest are "freeloaders."

I hope to locate the text to get a better "read" on the article, but was wondering what your comments are? I see some of the point of this article possibly, in reference to the public service/emergency service communications are the "justification" of our vast allocations that we are afforded.

Knowing Jim personally from a meeting before, my read on his personality is that he is one that is "never wrong, no matter what," so the comment is not much surprise. He however is a EXTREMELY intelligent person who also is extremely active in NTS and other traffic activities, and has published a wonderful text regarding nets and traffic handling etc.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2217. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 04:03:57 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <N8rla.1513$DM5.1070142@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64451

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030410225704.20674.00000228@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >Someone who is proficient in
> >morse at 35 wpm does not lose his ability to copy 5 wpm.
>
> Maybe not for you. After not using at 5wpm, others may forget.

I don't know of any one who has lost their ability to copy at 5wpm after advancing to the higher levels. It just doesn't happen. Generally the problem is they get so bored at that slow speed, they fall asleep! Figuratively speaking that is. When I was that slow, people on the air did slow down for me and chatted with me a while, but did bail out after a short QSO simply because the slow speed was boring.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2218. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 04:07:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E96400F.E074D3C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64454

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E961D89.D40E1A4E@earthlink.net...
> > "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> > >
> > > Between Columbus and Cincinnati, there aren't very many people. I've
> been
> > > there. Once outside the cities, it's downright sparse!
> >
> > Dee,
> >
> > I was hitting numerous repeaters from my mobile. I know that if I can
> > hit them from the car, it'd be quite easy for someone operating from any
> > little burg to hit them. Ohio has a large number of hams.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Yes any one in any little burg can hit them but some of those little burgs
> are so small that the one or two hams in them aren't listening all day. In
> Columbus, no problem, plenty of people to talk to. In Cincinnati, no
> problem, again plenty of people to talk to. But in between is a very
> different story. That stretch between these two cities is very low in
> population density.
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE

Dee,

I don't think we have a connect here. There are lots of little burgs
with a few hams in them. You'd think at least some of them would be
listening to the repeaters they can hit. Also, I wasn't limiting my
discussion of the areas *between* Columbus and Cincinnati--I was
including those two large metro areas. There are few folks to be found
on 2m FM, even at "drive time". Maybe they're all night owls. I wasn't
on during the evenings. I make this particular drive on different days
of the week and about six times per year. The day of the week or time
of day don't seem to make much difference.

I listen to repeaters in my local area both earlier and later in the day
and I find little activity outside of specific net times. I was in
Pittsburgh all day yesterday and found activity on two of the
metropolitan Pittsburgh machines for short periods during the hours
between 8:30 AM and 6 PM. Total operators involved--perhaps six.

Again, where have all the 2m FM ops gone? Where are all the new Techs?

Dave K8MN

2219. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 04:28:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304102028.634938b1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64455

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<_rnla.1431$DM5.972676@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E94E690.28EA89A3@earthlink.net...
> >
> > It was just a brief stop for a 2m mag mount antenna. My cheapy Pro-Am
> > 1/4 wave had some mashed coaxial cable. The coax had a silly molded
> > fitting at the antenna end which precluded repair. I selected a Hustler
> > 5/8 wave antenna and went on my way. There are lots of repeaters
> > between Columbus and Cincinnati but I made only four QSOs during the
> > drive. The longest and most pleasant was with a YL on the Cambridge
> > machine. I don't know where the abundance of Technician Class ops are
> > spending their time but it doesn't appear to be on 2m FM.
> >
>
> Between Columbus and Cincinnati, there aren't very many people. I've been
> there. Once outside the cities, it's downright sparse!
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE

It ain't Nebraska.

2220. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 04:37:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304102037.3c646027@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64456

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E95D3BD.C17A360E@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E94E690.28EA89A3@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9243A1.F66483EF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > It was just a brief stop for a 2m mag mount antenna. My cheapy Pro-Am
> > > 1/4 wave had some mashed coaxial cable. The coax had a silly molded
> > > fitting at the antenna end which precluded repair. I selected a Hustler
> > > 5/8 wave antenna and went on my way. There are lots of repeaters
> > > between Columbus and Cincinnati but I made only four QSOs during the
> > > drive. The longest and most pleasant was with a YL on the Cambridge
> > > machine. I don't know where the abundance of Technician Class ops are
> > > spending their time but it doesn't appear to be on 2m FM.
> >
> > We're going to lose some frequencies if the only thing going on are
> > the repeaters automatically IDing every hour. Perhaps Len is right.
> > Pretty soon amateur radio will be only about HF.
>
> But where are all of those new Technicians if not on 2m FM?

They're on the web. Where are you?

They're
> certainly not on 2m SSB or CW. Len wouldn't know those things. He
> isn't even a ham.

He's on the web, just like yew.

> > ARES on 147.06 in Lancaster had a nice net last night. Lots of public
> > service events coming up.
> >
> > > > We just might get through this thing if you're ready to open up a
> > > > little.
> > >
> > > I'm not really in the mood to "open up" on morse proficiency if opening
> > > up means I need to declare that someone whose maximum morse speed is

> > > five words per minute is proficient in the use of morse. That'd be
> > > dishonest.
>
> > Dave, I wouldn't want you to be dishonest. Here's what I can do for
> > you. I recall that you stated that "20wpm is more proficient than
> > 13wpm." I'll tabulate all the wpm rates between 13 and 20wpm and you
> > can select the lowest one at which proficiency is achieved. We won't
> > even bother with 5wpm.
>
> I've also stated that 25 wpm is more proficient than 20, 30 wpm is more
> proficient than 25, 35 wpm is more proficient than 30 and 40 wpm is more
> proficient than 35.

Really? I don't remember. When did you state that?

> > OK. Here goes:
> >
> > 14wpm
> > 15wpm
> > 16wpm
> > 17wpm
> > 18wpm
> > 19wpm
> >
> > OK, which one is where proficiency begins?
>
> To further add to your confusion, I've stated that I believe morse
> proficiency begins at a point somewhat higher than 10 wpm. You'll need
> to begin typing numbers from 11 through 40. The answer will be in there
> somewhere.

Welp, I don't think so. You said that "20wpm is more proficient than
13wpm." And above, you -claim- to have stated that "40 is more
proficient than 35 which ismore proficient than 30 which is more
proficient than 25 which is more proficient than 20."

Why do you want me to restart the list at 11?

Do you think proficiency begins at 11wpm?

If so, why do you think it?

2221. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 04:37:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hd5nl69.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 64457

On Sun, 06 Apr 2003 03:12:25 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:

>> - Can anyone who applies become an Israeli citizen,
>> and get full voting rights?
>
>
> I don't know the answer to that myself. I have not been able to find much
>independent information about Israel and the few Israeli I've tried to talk
>to seem evasive and even defensive.

For the life of me, I don't see why. I posted the info in
clear and certain terms from personal study and knowledge.
It's no secret. Or maybe it's just like few Amwricans know
what the naturalization process here is all about. I certainly
learned a lot when I took a course in Immigration Law in law
school in spite of the fact that I am descended from an
immigrant father and grandparents (all became US citizens).

>I've heard some jobs are now limited to
>just Jews - police, military, and so on. But I don't know that to be a fact
>- it could be just anti-Israeli propaganda.

It is a fact.

>> - What was Palestine like before 1948 in terms of
>> agriculture, industry, education, civil rights?

> Did Palestine exist as a separate entity prior to 1948? I honestly
>don't know.

It was part of the Ottoman Empire until the end of WW-I and
then part of the British Mandate territory until the War of
Independence (1948) which followed the end of the Mandate.

The name "Palestina" was "bestowed" upon the land by the
Romans after their conquest about 2000 years ago, but we Jews
always referred to it as Eretz Yisrael (The Land of Israel).

What are now referred to as "Palestinian territories" were
occupied and administered by Jordan (the West Bank, which we
refer to as Judea and Samaria) and Egypt (Gaza) at the end of
the British Mandate and were never independent. They were
liberated from those countries' control during the Six Day War
(1967) and their disposition has been in dispute ever since. In
the Oslo Accords (1992), Israel agreed to give 92% of the area
to the Arabs for a separate state upon lasting peace guarantees,
which were not forthcoming, so the territory remains in dispute.

Does it exist as a separate entity today? There are lots of
us who say no.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2222. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 04:37:35 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hd5ntwa.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 64458

On Sun, 06 Apr 2003 11:20:23 -0400, Jon Bloom wrote:

>It's the Israelis saying that:
>http://www.haaretzdaily.com/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo=278925
>Seems petty light on details, however.

The :"Hevre" are always light on public details....but they do
get it right. Haaretz is no better than the NY Times.....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2223. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 05:11:38 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hd5q1bb.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 64459

On 10 Apr 2003 09:44:57 -0700, N2EY wrote:

>(comedic interlude)
>
>Didja ever notice how the most famous of those leaders always has a
>three-day beard? How does he DO it? If somebody shaves every three
>days, then there's a 33% chance they'll have a 3 day beard, a 33%
>chance of a 2 day beard, and a 33% chance of being clean-shaven. But
>that guy ALWAYS has a 3 day beard!
>
>(end comedic interlude)

Number Two blade on the electric clippers. That's what my
barber uses to trim my beard..... <ggg>

>So I could move there and get citizenship if I were willing to fill
>out the forms, learn the information required on the citizenship
>tests, and pledge allegiance to the republic.

And endure mind-numbing bureaucracy, a souvenir of the British
who were past masters at erecting bureaucratic roadblocks for
the annoyance of the inhabitants of their colonies and mandate
areas.

>Which means that if enough Palestinians did the same thing, they could
>eventually take over. But that would take some time.

That's why the agreement to release control over the 92% - to
prevent just that. At present, the Arabs in those territories
are not eligible to acquire citizenship because of the disputed
status.

>Thanks for the info, Phil. Answers a lot of questions.

You're very welcome. I know more about my "second country"
than most Americans know about the one that they were born
into.

>> Doktor Heintz has his own agenda for doing things. Best not
>> to try to discern what it is.
>
>'Doktor Heintz'??

"Heintz" is the original German name for "Henry".

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2224. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 05:26:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABBCA47.1684F%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64460

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> (snip) Dwight, there's a difference between
> the oxymoronic "active pacifists" fomenting a
> revolution in order to be free of oppression
> and the pacifists I'm describing. (snip)
>
> You may have forgotten the "hell no, we won't
> go!" shouting and hollering of the 1960s. (snip)
> Most of that shouting was done by young people
> who faced conscription into military service.
> They feared "dying in Vietnam." (snip)

Ah, now I get it. You're confusing pacifists with those opposed to a particular war. Millions of Americans opposed the Vietnam war, including many millions who were certainly not pacifists and were far too old to be drafted. This included college professors opposed for intellectual reasons, religious people, parents afraid of losing children, grandparents afraid of losing grandchildren, wives afraid of losing husbands, people who didn't like the reality they saw on television every night, people shocked at seeing unarmed students being shot on American college campuses by soldiers, active duty military personnel who were tired of that seemingly endless war, veterans who remembered well what was really happening over there, and, in the end, the vast majority of Americans at the time.

And, yes, that certainly included some young men who were afraid to die and didn't feel the government had a right to force them to do so (using the draft). And, even though I enlisted into the Army at the time, I didn't then, and I don't now, support a military draft.

> (snip) The USSR dissolved, not from any actions
> of pacifists, but from the inherent socio-economic
> faults of communism. The Germanys united and
> "the wall" fell from action, not a result of
> pacifism.

Actually, the wall fell mainly because of changing attitudes in Europe. Germany had recently opened up new trade with Russia, Margaret Thatcher was openly talking about the same, France and Germany were helping to build an oil pipeline into Europe from Russia, polls showed most in Europe were more afraid of the US under Regan than the USSR under Gorbachov, and so on. Mikhail Gorbachov quickly realized Russia was better off doing business with Europe than continuing an endless cold war. It was only at that point the wall came down.

Regan had no idea what was happening at the time. The White House was still talking about no confirmation while CNN was showing East German soldiers rolling up barricade wire and using cranes to lift sections away (with Germans breaking off pieces of the wall for souvenirs). In spite of that, Regan held a press conference days later to claim credit for the situation.

By the way, my wife and I were living in Germany, and both working for the military, up to about a year before the wall came down. Even at that point, it was clear things were changing between Europe and Russia - that the wall was coming down soon. I even told friends here about it at the time. Therefore, we were not at all surprised to see the wall come down - only sorry we were not still there to see it ourselves.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2225. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 05:39:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABBCD5D.16851%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64461

"Brian Kelly" wrote:
>
> (snip) Did you notice that we didn't get much if
> any help from the UN when we almost single-handedly
> rebuilt Europe after WW2? What shred of evidence
> do you have which indicates that history will not
> repeat itself in the case of Iraq?

That was not the UN mandate at the time. The original purpose of the organization was to "preserve peace, advance justice and constitute a permanent structure for international cooperation." The UN Charter at the time said nothing about rebuilding nations after a conflict.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2226. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 06:18:36 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABBD67B.16853%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64462

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> You will simply be dismissed as a hopelessly
> misinformed, intellectually lazy, physical
> coward -- as your response would indicate.

Larry, I dismissed you as an idiot long ago. Yet you continue to amaze me at how foolish you've become in your old age.

> BTW, the newly free people of the city of Baghdad
> have spent the day rejoicing and tearing down
> statues of Saddam Hussein. A curiously odd
> response for people who were victimized by us
> nasty old Americans trying to impose our will
> upon them!

Perhaps if this country had not imposed its will upon them twenty years by backing Saddam Hussein, those people would have been dancing long ago and a few hundred thousand Iraqis would not have died in two wars. Of course, the cameras will never show the Iraqi families who lost love ones crying, will they? Yes, I do oppose this war - I find it very distasteful to kill that many people to fix the mess this country helped to create. I clearly would have preferred a more peaceful solution.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2227. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 06:25:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABBD7FC.16855%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64463

"Bert Craig" wrote:

> Did you say four BILLION?! While we have homeless
> right here who freeze to death each winter for
> lack of shelter!

That doesn't include the money sent by organizations, supporters, and
religious groups in this country.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2228. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 06:37:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABBDAF4.16857%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64464

"N2EY" wrote:

> Not at all. Totally predictable. It's like
> selling a psychotic a gun and then being
> shocked when he turns it on you. Long
> history of that sort of thing - the USA
> sold Japan all sorts of technology and raw
> materials in the '20s and '30s. (snip)

Are we ever going to learn, Jim? Is there any hope? I simply don't see it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2229. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 09:23:22 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.11.09.23.22.142615.31793@arrl.org>
Source record: 64465

On Thu, 10 Apr 2003 23:04:05 -0400, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> I won't presume to speak for Dick, but I, for one, will spend the rest
> of my life "disagreeing" with vicious despots who impose brutal regimes
> of torture, rape, starvation, extortion, and death upon their innocent
> citizens.

If you've been reading the thread you should realize that's not germane.
The topic is whether we should care at all what NON-despotic governments
and their peoples think.

Jon

2230. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 09:31:09 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.11.09.31.09.683823.31793@arrl.org>
Source record: 64466

On Thu, 10 Apr 2003 23:04:04 -0400, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> As long as Americans desire to remain a free and independent nation, we
> will always have to defend ourselves. We didn't become free and
> independent by negotiation and diplomacy. We struggled, fought, and
> sacrificed in order to earn our freedom. We then rose to become the
> most powerful nation on the planet, and we use our power to export the
> freedom, justice, and democracy which we have come to take for granted.

We have done much of that, to our everlasting credit.

> We are
> not exporting misery,

Unfortunately, we HAVE caused a lot of misery, usually by propping up dictators who we think serve our interests. Remember, Saddam received substantial assistance from the US during the Iran-Iraq war of the 1980s. He was no less brtual then, and we were well aware of it. But we saw him as a counterweight to the mullahs in Iran, so we helped him retain power.

> as the (hopefully) late Saddam Hussein and his regime had been doing. I
> think it's about time that Americans stopped "giving a damn about what
> other people think" in a much bigger way.

It depends who the other people are. The Saddams, Hizbollahs and Islamic Jihads need to be defeated. But why make enemies of those who agree that they need to be defeated but have different views of how to do it?

Jon

2231. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 09:56:14 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.11.09.56.13.866901.31793@arrl.org>
Source record: 64467

On Thu, 10 Apr 2003 21:56:45 -0400, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Did you notice that we didn't get much if any help from the UN when we
> almost single-handedly rebuilt Europe after WW2?

While it's certainly true that American assistance was critical, the Europeans themselves did most of the heavy lifting -- literally as well as financially.

And it's not like the Marshall Plan was altruism. Its purpose was to promote free-market economies and to prevent the spread of communism in Western Europe by repairing the social fabric of that region. (Eeek! Social work! Must have been a bunch of damn liberals!) It was done, in short, to serve our own interests as well as those of the Europeans. There's absolutely nothing wrong with that, and we have a right to a certain amount of pride, but we should remember as we polish our halo that we, too, benefited.

> What shred of
> evidence do you have which indicates that history will not repeat itself
> in the case of Iraq?

For one thing, there are others who CAN help now. In 1948, who besides the US was in a position to supply significant financial help? Also, both the UN leadership and the leaders of some of the key UN member countries have expressed a willingness to help rebuild Iraq. That said, the bulk of the money will probably come from the US. If things go well, however, that money, like that of the Marshall Plan, will have been well spent.

Jon

2232. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 10:01:45 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.11.10.01.41.941075.31793@arrl.org>
Source record: 64468

On Thu, 10 Apr 2003 09:50:06 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
> N2EY wrote:
>
>> The KKK, witch burnings, religious wars, and of course the Spanish Inquisition.
>
>
> Wow, Jim! Caught me by surprise with that one. I wasn't expecting the
> Spanish Inquisition......

How about those nice red uniforms?

Jon

2233. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 11:10:59 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030411071059.11494.00000116@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 64469

In article <b7594i$5o1$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, Unclaimed Mysteries
<k4doh@mindspring.com> writes:

>I continue to be amazed just how well-stocked this particular pond is.
>
>73 Corry K4DOH

Why be surprised? :-)

2234. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 11:57:55 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@citlink.net>
Message-ID: <75yla.358$D_1.146@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 64470

Simple. They want you to share in their pain.

"No CW Test" <nocwtest@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030411071059.11494.00000116@mb-fa.aol.com...
> In article <b7594i$5o1$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, Unclaimed Mysteries
> <k4doh@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >I continue to be amazed just how well-stocked this particular pond is.
> >
> >73 Corry K4DOH
>
> Why be surprised? :-)

2235. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 12:25:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304110425.24cb1df9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64471

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E96400F.E074D3C@earthlink.net>...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3E961D89.D40E1A4E@earthlink.net...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Between Columbus and Cincinnati, there aren't very many people. I've
> been
> > > > there. Once outside the cities, it's downright sparse!
> > >
> > > Dee,
> > >
> > > I was hitting numerous repeaters from my mobile. I know that if I can
> > > hit them from the car, it'd be quite easy for someone operating from any
> > > little burg to hit them. Ohio has a large number of hams.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Yes any one in any little burg can hit them but some of those little burgs
> > are so small that the one or two hams in them aren't listening all day. In
> > Columbus, no problem, plenty of people to talk to. In Cincinnati, no
> > problem, again plenty of people to talk to. But in between is a very
> > different story. That stretch between these two cities is very low in
> > population density.
> >
> > Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
> Dee,
>
> I don't think we have a connect here. There are lots of little burgs
> with a few hams in them. You'd think at least some of them would be
> listening to the repeaters they can hit. Also, I wasn't limiting my
> discussion of the areas *between* Columbus and Cincinnati--I was
> including those two large metro areas. There are few folks to be found
> on 2m FM, even at "drive time". Maybe they're all night owls. I wasn't
> on during the evenings. I make this particular drive on different days
> of the week and about six times per year. The day of the week or time
> of day don't seem to make much difference.
>
> I listen to repeaters in my local area both earlier and later in the day
> and I find little activity outside of specific net times. I was in
> Pittsburgh all day yesterday and found activity on two of the
> metropolitan Pittsburgh machines for short periods during the hours

> between 8:30 AM and 6 PM. Total operators involved--perhaps six.
>
> Again, where have all the 2m FM ops gone? Where are all the new Techs?
>
> Dave K8MN

To further your claims, several central and southern Ohio repeaters are linked throughout the state, and even across several states. If anyone is listening, they're listening for specific people, not your average traveler.

I've programmed in every possible 2M repeater pair, and every 2M FM simplex frequency, with 146.52 my "priority" frequency. I put my radio on scan when I'm in my car. It's generally a waste of electricity. Very few times do I hear anyone talking outside of drive time and then only on a couple of repeaters.

Where have all the hams gone?

2236. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 12:26:28 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304110426.7f1f23e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64472

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BABBDAF4.16857%stewart@say.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
>
> > Not at all. Totally predictable. It's like
> > selling a psychotic a gun and then being
> > shocked when he turns it on you. Long
> > history of that sort of thing - the USA
> > sold Japan all sorts of technology and raw
> > materials in the '20s and '30s. (snip)
>
>
> Are we ever going to learn, Jim?

Some of us learned long ago. Others are still learning. Some will
never learn.

>Is there any hope?

Definitely yes!

>I simply don't see it.

Consider how acceptable violence and repression used to be, even in
civilized Western republics like the USA.

Husbands beat their wives, parents beat their children, employers beat
their workers and the workers rioted in return.

Slavery - the actual treatment of human beings as property - was
legal and protected (by force) in much of this country until only 160
years ago. A country that promised "all men are created equal" and
"freedom and justice for all".

Except for a few land purchases here in the East and some remaining
"reservations", most of the USA's land area was obtained from its
original inhabitants by force of arms.

But today almost all of that sort of behavior is considered
unacceptable, and forbidden by law. Long slow progress, but progress
nonetheless.

Or consider this: Women got the right to vote in the USA in 1920 -
almost 150 years after the nation's founding on the principle of "all
MEN are created equal". Did they have to use violence to get it?

Weapons of mass destruction are a relatively new thing, compared to
the long sorry history of warfare. Fortunately the people who make the
decisions are pacifist enough not to have used them since 1945.

Coalition air forces could have turned Bagdad into another 1945 Dresden or Tokyo, but they chose not to, and used precision rather than brute force. Not perfect but better.

The mission of pacifism in the 21st century is to oppose the policies that lead to wars, and go after them long before the shooting starts. It's clear that support of SH and the Afghan mujahadeen in the 1980s were mistakes. The challenge is to not make those mistakes again.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2237. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 12:31:24 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304110211.2be02a00@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64473

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BABBCD5D.16851%stewart@say.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) Did you notice that we didn't get much if
> > any help from the UN when we almost single-handedly
> > rebuilt Europe after WW2? What shred of evidence
> > do you have which indicates that history will not
> > repeat itself in the case of Iraq?
>
>
> That was not the UN mandate at the time. The original purpose of the
> organization was to "preserve peace, advance justice and constitute a
> permanent structure for international cooperation."

You didn't respond to my question, I'll try again but with a different
spin: What makes you think we won't approach the reconstruction of
Iraq differently from the way we handled the same problem in Europe?

> The UN Charter at the
> time said nothing about rebuilding nations after a conflict.

Right. The bottom line then is the same as it is now. We didn't need
the UN then to get the job done and we don't need the UN again to get
the job done. As in history does tend to repeat itself doesn't it?

Historically I've been a rather strong supporter of the UN but after
this debacle to hell with it. WHO and UNICEF work. The rest is all
about a bunch of niggling socialist non-entities who pick our pockets
then kick us in the ass.

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

w3rv

2238. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 12:42:20 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304110126.4dcadcd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64474

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030410182651.08544.00000038@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0304100417.abea89e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20030409202655.18459.00000027@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> >
> >> In addition, there's the whole dimension of conflict resolution and not
> >> empowering those who are likely to become violent. Selling SH's Iraq
> weapons
> >> and the technology to make them empowered him. Guess who sold his regime
> things
> >> like anthrax and botulinum toxins.
> >>
> >
> >Guess who sold Saddam the AA missles which knocked down the Warthog
> >and possibly the F-15. (Hint: Their capital is Paris . .)
> >
> Were they the same folks who had to install speed bumps on the Champs Elysees
> to slow down incoming Panzers?

I think so. But I forget who it was who floated 3,000 miles in massive
force on their own dime into that neighborhood and "urged" what was
left of the Panzers to go back over those speed bumps the other way
and head north in high gear. Help me here, you know how it is with us
Old Farts, memory problems and all that . . .

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

w3rv

2239. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 12:45:47 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304110138.5b6caedc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64475

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030410154430.04182.00000117@mb-fg.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0304100417.abea89e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20030409202655.18459.00000027@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> >
> >> In addition, there's the whole dimension of conflict resolution and not
> >> empowering those who are likely to become violent. Selling SH's Iraq
> weapons
> >> and the technology to make them empowered him. Guess who sold his regime
> things
> >> like anthrax and botulinum toxins.
> >
> >Guess who sold Saddam the AA missles which knocked down the Warthog
> >and possibly the F-15. (Hint: Their capital is Paris . .)
> >
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >w3rv
>
> Don't forget all that scrap metal that used to be T-55 and T-72
> tanks that weren't made in Michigan. :-)

Weren't they made by the same clods we bailed out via how many seamen
we lost on the runs to Murmansk? The same clods who now find their oyl
in the hands of M1A1s instead of their T-55s and T-72s? Tsk-tsk.

2240. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 12:48:40 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304110414.1674d136@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64476

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E961F0A.5A1CF86@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Is all free speech patriotic?
>
> Having witnessed an interview with Scott Ridder on CNN this evening, I'd
> have to say, "No".
>
> Dave K8MN

Well there you have it.

2241. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 12:57:34 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.11.12.57.33.625935.25998@arrl.org>
Source record: 64477

On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 08:26:28 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>
> Slavery - the actual treatment of human beings as property - was legal
> and protected (by force) in much of this country until only 160 years
> ago.

138 years. But who's counting? :-)

> Weapons of mass destruction are a relatively new thing, compared to the
> long sorry history of warfare.

Yes, but not as recent as people may think. The Greeks tossed infected bodies into besieged cities in a crude form of biological warfare. In the French and Indian War, British general Amherst distributed blankets infected with smallpox to aid in exterminating the Indians.

> Fortunately the people who make the
> decisions are pacifist enough not to have used them since 1945.

Pacifist enough, or not desperate enough?

> Coalition air forces could have turned Bagdad into another 1945 Dresden
> or Tokyo, but they chose not to, and used precision rather than brute
> force. Not perfect but better.

Vastly better for the residents of Baghdad.

> It's clear that support of SH and the Afghan mujahadeen in the 1980s
> were mistakes. The challenge is to not make those mistakes again.

SH, yes. In the case of the mujahadeen, it's not so clear. They, at least, were acting in legitimate self defense. The error in Afghanistan came after the Soviets left when we abandoned the progressive elements of Afghan society, allowing the warloads and eventually the Taliban to take control and set the country back hundreds of years. Had we engaged in that nasty ol' nation building then, 9/11 probably would never have happened. 9/11 happened not because of a lack of warmaking but because of a lack of peacemaking.

What IS hopeful is that the Administration is saying it's committed to rebuilding Iraq. I hope that's true, because if we don't it will turn into Afghanistan squared. But when it comes to this Administration, I'm from Missouri.

Jon

2242. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 13:27:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E96C2E0.CA11EF28@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64479

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E95D3BD.C17A360E@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E94E690.28EA89A3@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9243A1.F66483EF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > > > It was just a brief stop for a 2m mag mount antenna. My cheapy Pro-Am
> > > > > > 1/4 wave had some mashed coaxial cable. The coax had a silly molded
> > > > > > fitting at the antenna end which precluded repair. I selected a Hustler
> > > > > > 5/8 wave antenna and went on my way. There are lots of repeaters
> > > > > > between Columbus and Cincinnati but I made only four QSOs during the
> > > > > > drive. The longest and most pleasant was with a YL on the Cambridge
> > > > > > machine. I don't know where the abundance of Technician Class ops are
> > > > > > spending their time but it doesn't appear to be on 2m FM.
> > > > >
> > > > > We're going to lose some frequencies if the only thing going on are
> > > > > the repeaters automatically IDing every hour. Perhaps Len is right.
> > > > > Pretty soon amateur radio will be only about HF.
> > >
> > > But where are all of those new Technicians if not on 2m FM?
> >
> > They're on the web. Where are you?

No amateur radio license is needed for internet access. I'm on 2m. I'm
on the internet. I'm on 160m through 70cm.

> They're
> > certainly not on 2m SSB or CW. Len wouldn't know those things. He
> > isn't even a ham.
> >
> > He's on the web, just like yew.

That has nothing to do with amateur radio.

> > > ARES on 147.06 in Lancaster had a nice net last night. Lots of public
> > > service events coming up.
> > >
> > > > > We just might get through this thing if you're ready to open up a
> > > > > little.
> > > >
> > > > I'm not really in the mood to "open up" on morse proficiency if opening
> > > > up means I need to declare that someone whose maximum morse speed is
> > > > five words per minute is proficient in the use of morse. That'd be
> > > > dishonest.
> > >
> > > Dave, I wouldn't want you to be dishonest. Here's what I can do for
> > > you. I recall that you stated that "20wpm is more proficient than
> > > 13wpm." I'll tabulate all the wpm rates between 13 and 20wpm and you
> > > can select the lowest one at which proficiency is achieved. We won't
> > > even bother with 5wpm.
> >
> > I've also stated that 25 wpm is more proficient than 20, 30 wpm is more
> > proficient than 25, 35 wpm is more proficient than 30 and 40 wpm is more
> > proficient than 35.
>
> Really? I don't remember. When did you state that?

Look it up.

> > > OK. Here goes:
> > >
> > > 14wpm
> > > 15wpm
> > > 16wpm
> > > 17wpm
> > > 18wpm
> > > 19wpm
> > >
> > > OK, which one is where proficiency begins?
> >
> > To further add to your confusion, I've stated that I believe morse
> > proficiency begins at a point somewhat higher than 10 wpm. You'll need
> > to begin typing numbers from 11 through 40. The answer will be in there
> > somewhere.
>
> Welp, I don't think so. You said that "20wpm is more proficient than
> 13wpm." And above, you -claim- to have stated that "40 is more
> proficient than 35 which ismore proficient than 30 which is more
> proficient than 25 which is more proficient than 20."
>
> Why do you want me to restart the list at 11?

You really have to take some steps to deal with that reading
comprehension problem of yours. Since I've stated that I believe that
morse proficiency is somewhat higher than ten words per minute, any list
would have to begin with a number higher than ten. The number "11"

qualifies.

> Do you think proficiency begins at 11wpm?

No.

> If so, why do you think it?

I don't "think it".

Dave K8MN

2243. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 13:54:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E96C906.EAA3D44C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64480

N2EY wrote:

> Except for a few land purchases here in the East and some remaining
> "reservations", most of the USA's land area was obtained from its
> original inhabitants by force of arms.
>
> But today almost all of that sort of behavior is considered
> unacceptable, and forbidden by law. Long slow progress, but progress
> nonetheless.

I should hope that it is unacceptable. I certainly don't want the descendants of the original inhabitants showing up around here attempting to regain their land by force of arms. After all, I paid for it.

> Or consider this: Women got the right to vote in the USA in 1920 -
> almost 150 years after the nation's founding on the principle of "all
> MEN are created equal". Did they have to use violence to get it?

Not as long as there were men willing to do almost anything to avoid the sharp-tongued nagging of a spouse or who were interested in having meals prepared or saw the benefit of sex on a regular basis. Voting rights for women was the easy hurdle compared to the very real crisis now before us: Do women have a right to membership in an all male, private golf club? The Great Cincinnati ARA Stag Hamfest name was changed a couple of decades back and it has been all down hill from that point.

> Weapons of mass destruction are a relatively new thing, compared to
> the long sorry history of warfare. Fortunately the people who make the
> decisions are pacifist enough not to have used them since 1945.

Way back when I was a kid living in this area in the 1950's, a chemical plant a short distance down the Ohio had two huge storage tanks full of mustard gas, a World War I-era relic. The tanks were poorly secured and in poor physical condition as evidenced by their rusty surface. I shudder to think what would have happened should a tank rupture have taken place. Those tanks are long gone but a number of chemical plants in the area still produce or use some vile stuff like phosgene. If a large enough quantity of that stuff ever gets loose in the narrow Ohio Valley, the descendants of the original inhabitants won't even need to use force to reclaim their land.

Dave K8MN

2244. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 15:53:12 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304110753.6113effa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64481

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.11.09.56.13.866901.31793@arrl.org>...
> On Thu, 10 Apr 2003 21:56:45 -0400, Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > Did you notice that we didn't get much if any help from the UN when we
> > almost single-handedly rebuilt Europe after WW2?
>
> While it's certainly true that American assistance was critical, the
> Europeans themselves did most of the heavy lifting -- literally as well as
> financially.

In the final analysis we did more, much more than anybody else even
thought about doing or were able to do for their friends & allies.
Would the French have done what we did if they were able to do so? As
if.

> And it's not like the Marshall Plan was altruism. Its purpose was to
> promote free-market economies and to prevent the spread of communism in
> Western Europe by repairing the social fabric of that region. (Eeek!
> Social work! Must have been a bunch of damn liberals!)

Yeah, it was quite a tussle . . Joe Stalin being the prototype far end
Socialist and all that . .

> It was done, in
> short, to serve our own interests as well as those of the Europeans.
> There's absolutely nothing wrong with that, and we have a right to a
> certain amount of pride, but we should remember as we polish our halo that
> we, too, benefited.

The indisputable bottom line is that we saved hundreds of millions of
Western Europeans from living like the Poles, Hungarians and the
Czechs did for 45 or so years. Considerations of altruism or not aside
who benefitted most, the citizens of France and Italy for instance or
us who are at least 3,000 miles away from all of them? I think you
agree with me in this respect.

>
> > What shred of
> > evidence do you have which indicates that history will not repeat itself
> > in the case of Iraq?
>
> For one thing, there are others who CAN help now. In 1948, who besides the
> US was in a position to supply significant financial help?

Nobody. Which is my point.

> Also, both the
> UN leadership

Pffft! WHAT "UN leadership"? I still don't have qsl cards from some of those "leader's" non-entities.

> and the leaders of some of the key UN member countries have
> expressed a willingness to help rebuild Iraq.

Those turkeys spent twelve years locked in debate and doing nothing while Saddam Huessein spit in their faces and now they suddenly want to do something "useful" in Iraq? After 100+ Yanks gave their all to depose the swine after "The UN" postulated even more aimless endless debate about whether somebody should go in and get the job done or not?

> That said, the bulk of the
> money will probably come from the US. If things go well, however, that
> money, like that of the Marshall Plan, will have been well spent.

I basically agree with that WRT to the current situation. What I do not agree with however is the notion that the UN as a body has some inherent right to tell us how much patience we need to develop for that organization's impotence. While they do nothing and we fund it.

> Jon

w3rv

2245. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 15:59:27 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304110759.39fe98ad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64482

wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote in message
news:<b7d1465c.0304100332.6f5a359c@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304021735.56e4cdc1@posting.google.com>...
> > The last numbers I saw
> > stated that Israel is kept economically afloat by annual four billion
> > dollar handouts from us.
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Did you say four BILLION?! While we have homeless right here who
> freeze to death each winter for lack of shelter!

You got it . .

>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

w3rv

2246. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 16:28:58 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.11.16.28.58.178387.18686@arrl.org>
Source record: 64483

On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 11:53:12 -0400, Brian Kelly wrote:
> The indisputable bottom line is that we saved hundreds of millions of
> Western Europeans from living like the Poles, Hungarians and the Czechs
> did for 45 or so years. Considerations of altruism or not aside who
> benefitted most, the citizens of France and Italy for instance or us who
> are at least 3,000 miles away from all of them? I think you agree with
> me in this respect.

I do, but I don't look down on those we helped just because we helped
them, or because they haven't prostrated themselves at our feet in
gratitude.

>> For one thing, there are others who CAN help now. In 1948, who besides
>> the US was in a position to supply significant financial help?
>
> Nobody. Which is my point.

But others are in a position to supply help in this case. You asked for
evidence that history won't repeat itself. One element of that is that it
is at least POSSIBLE that others will help now. It was IMPOSSIBLE after
WW2.

>> Also, both the
>> UN leadership
>
> Pffft! WHAT "UN leadership"? I still don't have qsl cards from some of
> those "leader's" non-entities.

Funny, I never thought of QSLing as the metric of UN leadership!

>> and the leaders of some of the key UN member countries have expressed a
>> willingness to help rebuild Iraq.
>
> Those turkeys spent twelve years locked in debate and doing nothing
> while Saddam Huessein spit in their faces

Doesn't that also describe the behavior of the US until last year? Do you
think the US would have attacked SH had it not been for 9/11?

> and now they suddenly want
> to do something "useful" in Iraq? After 100+ Yanks gave their all to
> depose the swine after "The UN" postulated even more aimless endless
> debate about whether somebody should go in and get the job done or not?

Why not find out whether they truly want to be useful? Why prejudge what
their behavior will be? After all, if the UN process looks like it's going
to become fruitless, we can always go ahead and do what needs to be done

ourselves. If we blow off the UN we're letting them off the hook. They can say they were never given a chance to help. Instead, hold their feet to the fire.

>> That said, the bulk of the
>> money will probably come from the US. If things go well, however, that
>> money, like that of the Marshall Plan, will have been well spent.
>
> I basically agree with that WRT to the current situation. What I do not
> agree with however is the notion that the UN as a body has some inherent
> right to tell us how much patience we need to develop for that
> organization's impotence. While they do nothing and we fund it.

Who said they could TELL us to do anything? I'm saying let's see if we can get agreement on what will be done.

You know, my neighbor doesn't have the right to tell me what to do, nor I him, but if I'm doing something that disturbs him or he's doing something that disturbs me, I certainly want to talk to him about it. The bottom line is that if you don't like the way other UN member states are behaving, you're still better off talking to them than ignoring them. Talk costs nothing.

Besides, Tony Blair wants to try to have the UN involved, and don't you think we owe him at least a shot at it? He's certainly been a stand-up guy. Why would you want to throw him under the wheels of the bus, politically speaking?

Jon

2247. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 16:54:13 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304110854.7bc15ef2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64484

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BABBD7FC.16855%stewart@say.net>...
> "Bert Craig" wrote:
>
> > Did you say four BILLION?! While we have homeless
> > right here who freeze to death each winter for
> > lack of shelter!
>
>
> That doesn't include the money sent by organizations, supporters, and
> religious groups in this country.

Specifically the lobbying and threats of witheld minority bloc votes .
. Ain't democracy a bunch of fun?

>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
w3rv

2248. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 17:09:00 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304110909.5684f766@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64485

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030410154430.04182.00000116@mb-fg.aol.com>...
> You may have forgotten the "hell no, we won't go!" shouting and
> hollering of the 1960s. Most of that shouting was done by
> young people who faced conscription into military service. They
> feared "dying in Vietnam."

Considering how many young people died in Vietnam, that was a pretty
rational fear.

> They felt they were "too good for
> lower-class military service."

All of them? How many did you interview?

> They were moral superiors. As
> a more noble group they felt entitled to enjoy the guarantees
> of a better life. Those guarantees had been kept in place by
> "lower class, less morally superior" citizens in a very large
> world war and a smaller one in northeast Asia and the beginnings
> of the MAD standoff between the USSR and USA, held in place
> by the resolve and work of non-pacifists.

Did you know that some young people left the country rather than be
forced to fight in Vietnam? Sweden was a popular destination.

From what I saw in the Vietnam era, most of the anti-war protest was
an expression of conscience that the war was not morally justified and
was not necessary for the defense of the USA. I remember a group
called "Vietnam Veterans Against The War", composed of servicemen who
had done tours of duty in Vietnam.

Vietnam was a French colony that was under Japanese control during
WW2. After WW2, some Vietnamese wanted their country to be
independent, and asked the USA for help in breaking away from France.
But the USA and other Western nations would not help out, so the
Vietnamese turned to the USSR for help - and got it. Just like some
colonies who wanted independence from Britain 227 years ago, and
turned to France for help.....

I remember a

> >Indeed, many have faced public
> >ridicule and harassment just for speaking out against violence (just look at
> >your own messages for an example of that - you don't see them in this
> >newsgroup talking about you). Others have faced much more serious
> >consequences.

>
> You have forgotten the returnees from Vietnam being spat upon
> and ridiculed by the morally-superior peaceniks in the 60s and
> 70s.

A few did that. Not many. They were wrong. The people to blame for
Vietnam were the politicians who gave the orders, not those who
carried them out.

Anti-war protestors were beaten, jailed, some even killed.

> You have forgotten the rash of anti-war motion pictures of
> that time and the media portraying the military and government
> as instruments of evil.

Were those anti-war movies inaccurate?

> The peaceniks and media felt safe doing
> all that...the guarantees of the US Constitution permitted them
> free speech.

Guess they shouldn't have actually USED it, huh, Len?

> They felt morally superior. They felt safe to
> express themselves. Guarantees of safety were the responsibility
> of the lower-class, less superior people. It wasn't the nobles'
> task. They were owed it, they felt. Noble people feel like that.

Where DO you get such mixed-up ideas? Were there no "upper class"
people fighting in Vietnam?

I recall a man who was heavyweight champion of the world. They wanted
to draft him, but he said no, he didn't think the war was justified
and he would not go. Spent five years in jail, lost his title, the
prime of his carrer and a whole lot of money.

The reality was that the Army almost certainly would not have put him
in a combat situation, and he would have done his service in some rear
area. But his conscience would not allow him to accept such a deal.
Principle of the thing.

I also remember how Richard Nixon campaigned for President in 1968,
saying he had a secret plan to end the war in Vietnam. Took over five
years but he made good on his promise.
>
> There hasn't been any conscription in the USA since 1973.

That's when you say the Vietnam war ENDED, right?

> For
> a few months longer than 30 years the USA military has been
> all-volunteer. In those three decades a few things happened
> that threatened our guarantees and the fates of several nations
> besides our own.

Like what?

> Pacifists didn't help keep our guarantees or
> take action.

There are actions other than military ones, Len.
>
> The USSR dissolved, not from any actions of pacifists, but
> from the inherent socio-economic faults of communism.

It also did not dissolve because of any war.

> The
> Germanys united and "the wall" fell from action, not a result
> of pacifism.

Not because of any war, either.

> No pacifists stopped the nation of Iraq from
> invading their tiny neighbor.

Which one - Iran or Kuwait?

It wasn't pacifists who sold weapons and weapons technology to Iraq,
either.

> Pacifists didn't deter the hijacked
> airliners crashing into the WTC and Pentagon. Activists in
> the fourth plane took over before it could strike any target.
> Pacifists didn't remove the Taliban from Afghanistan...activists
> are removing the last vestiges even now.

Pacifists didn't train or fund the people who became terrorists,
either. Nor did pacifists put the Taliban into power.
>
> > In reality, hiding in the majority, especially when violence is involved,
> >is the truly safe route - it takes no effort and offers no personal risk.
>
> "Safe?" In a perverse way, death is "safety." In an environment
> where one may be killed for opposing a regime by not worshiping
> it, there is an infinite amount of risk.

That's true.
>
> >Which is more brave, the punk riding the shirttails of the bully or the
> >person who stands up to the bully to say he is wrong?
>
> [mental picture of a single Chinese male "opposing" a tank
> in Tienanmen Square] "Standing up" against the bullies
> is sometimes idiotic. That Chinese individual could have
> become a bloody mass of protoplasm in a few seconds,
> trying to "stop" 30-odd tons of tank. Very emotional TV
> moment...and also almost a videobite of martyrdom.

Speaking of martyrs - we're coming up on the 91st anniversary of the sinking of the Titanic. Not one of the engineering officers of the Titanic survived, because they were all below decks to the very end. They were keeping steam up and the dynamos turning so that there would be lights and power for the radio.

At least some of them could have escaped if they had left their posts. But they did not, even after the abandon ship order was given. Were they martyrs?

> >Which were more brave,
> >the ones who went along with Saddam or those who stood up to say he was
> >wrong?
>
> The USA and UK for standing up against the do-nothing world
> opinion is the most brave, especially all those volunteers of the
> US military. That's my answer. It isn't an answer for your loaded
> question.

Not a loaded question at all. No rational persondisoputes the bravery of the troops fighting to free Iraq. The question is why does the USA support such regimes in the first place?

> Most of those who thought Saddam Hussein was wrong were
> either silent or dead. There was no guarantee of free speech in
> Iraq. There was no glorifying videobites of pacifists on Iraqi TV
> protesting the invasion of Kuwait a dozen or so years ago.
> Perhaps some Kurds in northern Iraq were pacifists...we don't
> know...several hundred were gassed to death.

Pacifists didn't sell weapons or weapons technology to Iraq. Nor the techniques of how to make chemical weapons.

> Pacifists didn't
> stop the 8-year Iraq-Iran war...the UN took some action because
> world oil supplies were being affected. Iraq and Iran got hand-
> slaps.

Not because of pacifists. Because of the perceived need for cheap oil.

> Iran had a revolution and revolutionaries took over the
> US Embassy in Iran, imprisoned the staff. USA didn't take
> enough action.

USA installed the repressive regime that was overthrown by those revolutionaries, who then installed a different repressive regime. Neither was the work of pacifists.

What action should the USA have taken to free the hostages?

> About two years after the end of the Iraq-Iran
> War, Iraq invaded Kuwait. A coalition led by the USA kicked
> out Iraq. Pacifists didn't do it but their nobility rose to the top
> and demanded "go no further!"

INCORRECT. The first Gulf war was stopped because the goals had been achieved.

Here are some direct quotes from the "pacifists" who decided to stop that war short of kicking out SH's regime.

(thanks, Jon):

"The ending wasn't quite as clean as it might have been if Saddam Hussein had come to that tent [at Safwan on March 3, 1991], laid down his thing and maybe left office ... I miscalculated. I thought he'd be gone ... We might have handled the flying of helicopters differently. So I think there's room for some ex post facto criticism here ... [But] I think history will say we did the right thing."

--Former President George Bush, PBS interview with David Frost, aired January 1996 (taped Dec. 12, 1995).

"We had a crucial but limited objective in the Gulf War: to reverse Iraqi aggression, and to cripple Saddam's offensive military capabilities ... Occupying Iraq with thousands of American troops for the indefinite future and creating a gaping power vacuum in the Persian Gulf for Iran to fill [is what would have happened] if we had pressed on to Baghdad in 1991."

--Brent Scowcroft, national security adviser, 1991. "Why We Stopped the Gulf War," Newsweek, Sept. 23, 1996, p. 3.

"I was just damned glad to have the victory in our hands with the minimum loss of casualties, and I was willing to settle for that because that's a hell of a lot more than anybody's had in a war as long as I can remember."

--Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf, commander, U.S. Central Command, "The Gulf War," Frontline, Jan. 9-10, 1996.

"So of all the criticism of Bush Administration decision-making during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, it is this marching-to-Baghdad canard that has the least merit. As a diplomatic, political or even military matter, marching to Baghdad would have been a disaster in the making. Iraq might have fragmented in unpredictable ways, which would have played into the hands of

the mullahs in Iran. The mullahs could have
exported their brand of Islamic
fundamentalism with the help of Iraq's
hiites and quickly transformed themselves
into the dominant regional power."

(Past tense added.)

--James A. Baker, III, secretary of state,
1989-92. "Why U.S. Did Not March on to
Baghdad," Washington Times, Sept. 11, 1996.

Yup, those "pacifists" Bush/Scowcroft/Schwarzkopf/Baker....

--

If an American believes that a particular war is wrong, do they not
have a responsibility to protest against that war? Or should they
simply accept whatever the President says?

2249. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 17:40:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E96FE04.8060705@psu.edu>
Source record: 64486

This is good! A Troll catching a Troll.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2250. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 17:46:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E96FF8A.1090302@psu.edu>
Source record: 64487

Unclaimed Mysteries wrote:

>
> I continue to be amazed just how well-stocked this particular pond is.
>
> 73 Corry K4DOH

Yes Cory, the fishies hardly need any bait either!

2251. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 18:18:50 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns935A916697109elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 64488

Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com> wrote in
news:b7594i$5o1$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net:

> Make my funk the P-Funk, Vshah101 wrote:
>>>From: Unclaimed Mysteries k4doh@mindspring.com
>>
>>
>>>They have no future except their own graves.
>>>Even today these codeless
>>>stooges are impaling themselves by the thousands upon the gates of
>>>true ham radio. Their blood flows like a filthy torrent into 27MHz
>>
>>
>> Your ignorance leads you to believe that. Some no-coders know alot
>> more than some Extras. Its better to be lean (without code) and mean
>> than fat and sluggish.
>>
>> Only an appliance operator would refer to 27MHz as a bad segment,
>> which shows you bought into the cult and have a limited view of
>> amateur radio (appliance operator group).
>>
>>
>>>All
>>>non-CW activity is a despicable lie, promoted by these congenital
>>>gangsters who have no sense of true communication.
>>
>>
>> That's what the Church of CW would like you to believe. If all non-CW
>> activity is a lie, would you like broadcast radios to have only CW
>> broadcasts? Of course not.
>>
>> Its actually the CW "gangsters" that tries to recruit with Morse code
>> and pressure amateurs to learn Morse code. Their recruitment of
>> amateurs comes with the heavy recommendation (or pressure) of Morse
>> code.
>>
>> They use deceptive media tactics, such as claiming accomplishments
>> where there are none, using the best to represent the whole, claiming
>> to participate in technical aspects (such as homebrewing), while
>> really hating it, and other methods to spread their lies. The methods
>> and lies told by the Morsers are what's "despicable".
>>
>> Dots and dashed, abbreviations and codewords are not true
>> communication.

>>
>>
>>>They should be hit with shoes.
>>
>>
>> No, free choice is the answer. Unfortunately, they may recruit through
>> Morse, but drive away quality. Unfortunately, that does not look good
>> to regulators.
>>
>>
>>>God will grill their bellies in hell, where they will fry in their
>>>own fat as their souls wail in lamentation.
>>
>>
>> God is not in hell - the Devil is. Long-time Morsers tend to have more
>> fat. Less physical activity does that, you know.
>>
>>
>>>I'm sorry I must have blacked out there for a minute. Did I say
>>>anything?
>>
>>
>> You must have been possessed. Once you see the truth, you will be
>> outraged. Lets just hope its not too late.
>
>
> I continue to be amazed just how well-stocked this particular pond is.
>
> 73 Corry K4DOH
>

Yeah, they really didn't realise you had your trolling motor on, did they?
N3KIP

2252. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 19:02:19 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABC897A.169A4%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64489

"Phil Kane" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> I don't know the answer to that myself. I have
>> not been able to find much independent information
>> about Israel and the few Israeli I've tried to talk
>> to seem evasive and even defensive.
>
> For the life of me, I don't see why. I posted the
> info in clear and certain terms from personal study
> and knowledge. It's no secret. (snip)

Don't be fooled by how slowly my messages appear in the newsgroup, Phil. I posted the message above before you responded to Jim. Therefore that comment didn't apply to your answer to Jim, but to questions in general.

However, since you seem open to questions, perhaps you can answer a few of mine. Continuing with question about citizenship, could I, a non-Jew, immigrate to Israel and participate fully in the system there - vote, seek political office, work for the government, serve in the military, attend any state financed school, and so on? If not, why not?

>> I've heard some jobs are now limited to just
>> Jews - police, military, and so on. But I
>> don't know that to be a fact - it could be just
>> anti-Israeli propaganda.
>
> It is a fact.

Well, I've heard others say that, but didn't know for sure. Anyway, I guess that answers part of my question above. So, why is that the case, Phil? The concept of equal rights for all and separation of church/state are fundamental to the American way of thinking. As such, the exclusion of others, based on religion or anything else, just doesn't feel right to me.

I believe you once said you hold dual citizenship. If so, how do you reconcile the two political systems? They seem totally at odds with each other. Do you believe in the equal rights for all and separation of church/state like we have here or do you believe in the exclusion of others from full participation within a religious state? I truly hope this country is never controlled by any religion, though some religions are almost certainly seeking exactly that.

> (snip) In the Oslo Accords (1992), Israel agreed to
> give 92% of the area to the Arabs for a separate
> state upon lasting peace guarantees, which were not

> forthcoming, so the territory remains in dispute.

So, what is it going to take to end the dispute? I'm just as uncomfortable with the images of Israeli tanks shooting up Arab neighborhoods as I am with the Arab car bombings and so forth. Is there some sane way to end this madness or do we just accept an endless cycle of violence?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2253. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 19:54:01 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E971D59.1080500@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 64500

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> I read it, and I agree with him. Most 'hams' today are not only freeloaders
> on the work and sweat of those before, they have no concept at all that this
> is not a hobby. Its a service.
>
> We exist because of our demonstrated capabilities in providing emergency
> communications. For little to NO COST to the public.
>
> Thats why were here. Not to chat on 20 about uncle arthur paying you a
> visit last night.
>

If you want to limit it to just a service and take the hobby
aspect away, then there should be nothing on the air that does not
have anything to do with public service. Therefore the bands would
be unused 99% of the time and the amateur "service" would only
need a fraction of the frequencies it now has.
It is the chat about uncle arthur and other non-public service
things that keep the bands in use so that all the frequency space
allocated to amateur radio is there when public service is needed.
I see nothing in the regulations that state that everyone who
obtains an amateur radio operator's license is required to
participate in public service.

2254. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 20:19:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b777vqrnb1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64490

The reality of the VN war is that is has NOT ended for those that actually were involved.

Dan/W4NTI

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030407065725.01663.00000183@mb-cb.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
> >From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
> >Date: 4/7/2003 4:21 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <d22b54c3.0304070121.4cd76396@posting.google.com>
>
> >brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
> >news:<f45722ac.0304061345.7e2a86b6@posting.google.com>...
> >> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
> >news:<d22b54c3.0304061023.ef5df7e@posting.google.com>...
> >> > averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman) wrote in message
> >news:<20030405212529.04143.00000018@mb-fb.aol.com>...
> >> > > In article <b6nnrt$215$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> >> > > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
> >> > >
> >> > > >Len Over 21...we all have your number. Stir up the crap. Dont need
> >it.
> >> > > >And DONT CARE WHAT YOU THINK...I put you on the dumbass list a long
> >time
> >> > > >ago.
> >> > >
> >> > > You seem to want to FIGHT. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
> >> > >
> >> > > The Vietnam War ended on January 27, 1973.
> >> >
> >> > WRONG! Again. 1975. You're a disgrace to the rest of the putzes.
> >> >
> >> > w3rv
> >>
> >> It ended in 1973 for the people with "real military experience," i.e.,
> >> combatants. It ended in 1975 for the paper pushers.
> >
> >Tell that to the Hmong and the Special Forces guys who stayed in
> >battle mode until after the papers were pushed.
> >
> >w3rv
>

> Whew.....Lennie's an idiot who can't keep track of current events
> including the ending of one of the most bitter wars this nation has ever
> endured, and Brain, allegedly a combat veteran himself, insults and
demeans
> those who DID fight in that war, even to the end.
>
> A PAIR of idiots.
>
> Sheesh.
>
> Steve

2255. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 20:24:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7789j$v63$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64491

From aproximately 1967 to 1973. About the time that the alleged 'flower children' crawled out from under their rocks.

Dan/W4NTI

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message news:pan.2003.04.07.04.14.38.840562.32723@arrl.org...

>
> When, exactly, was being a patriot a bad thing?
>
> Jon

2256. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 20:33:53 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b778q8qbn1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64492

Syria is next. That will save you from 'thinking' about it. And guess what? I doubt the military gives two hoots about your opinion on the subject of US self defense. And thank goodness for that.

Dan/W4NTI

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message news:94747B2B5A50BF12.DC06DC5B1570EDAC.15CD574D5721AB1B@lp.airnews.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b6qf42jur1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> >
news:DB8F8D62FBA3227C.A80D1F5907B3342B.2CD38C1E834FCC63@lp.airnews.net...
> > > Dan, what proof do you have of this? "We" the people were told that
> they
> > > were in Iraq. Now, we were told this by our President who,
presumably,
> > has
> > > the entire resources of our spying capabilities available to him.
While
> > > "we're" not done in Iraq yet, have *YOU* noticed that there's been
> nothing
> > > in the way of WMD or biological or chemical weapons found?
> >
> > Who cares, so what?
> >
> > Even if no WMD are found, the Iraqi regime was so inherently
> > evil that the ending of that regime is of far more value towards
> > global and regional stabilization than any WMD aspect.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
> >
> >
> >
>
> Bill, I understand your sentiment. I also agree that evil is a bad thing.
> But I'm not so sure that the US gov't. or military needs to start marching
> in and changing things here and there. So far, we're only talking about
> Iraq. My fear is what next? I don't know...I just don't think it's
right.
> I really don't. I think getting into messes like that is biting off much
> more than we can chew, militarily, politically, etc.
>

> Kim W5TIT
>
>

2257. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 20:36:44 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b778vk$6nl$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64493

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b6qngd$jo8$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:94747B2B5A50BF12.DC06DC5B1570EDAC.15CD574D5721AB1B@lp.airnews.net...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:b6qf42jur1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > >
> news:DB8F8D62FBA3227C.A80D1F5907B3342B.2CD38C1E834FCC63@lp.airnews.net...
> > > > Dan, what proof do you have of this? "We" the people were told that
> > they
> > > > were in Iraq. Now, we were told this by our President who,
> presumably,
> > > has
> > > > the entire resources of our spying capabilities available to him.
> While
> > > > "we're" not done in Iraq yet, have *YOU* noticed that there's been
> > nothing
> > > > in the way of WMD or biological or chemical weapons found?
> > >
> > > Who cares, so what?
> > >
> > > Even if no WMD are found, the Iraqi regime was so inherently
> > > evil that the ending of that regime is of far more value towards
> > > global and regional stabilization than any WMD aspect.
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> >
> > Bill, I understand your sentiment. I also agree that evil is a bad
thing.
>
> Exactly. And evil wins when honorable and honest people
> stand by and do nothing when confronted by evil.
>
> > But I'm not so sure that the US gov't. or military needs to start
marching
> > in and changing things here and there.
>
> Sadly, you sound like too many of the anti-war groupies
> who believe that because we do one thing in Iraq, we will or
> must do the same thing in other places. The lesson to be learned

> here is that we are not impotent nor unwilling to take needed
> action when it warrants such.
>
> > So far, we're only talking about
> > Iraq. My fear is what next? I don't know...I just don't think it's
> right.
> > I really don't. I think getting into messes like that is biting off
much
> > more than we can chew, militarily, politically, etc.
>
> I strongly disagree with your sentiments. We enjoy a democratic
> system and the fruits of that system's 200+ years of success.
> We have (IMHO) a moral obligation to confront extreme
> evil when it threatens us in the long run.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>
Correct in all aspects Bill. Syria is next. Or let me ammend that. It
should be, since were already there and geared up to go.

Didn't George Patton want to do that with 'our friends the Russians' ?? Boy
did we miss a chance there.

Dan/W4NTI

2258. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 20:50:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b779oo$v29$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64494

I read it, and I agree with him. Most 'hams' today are not only freeloaders on the work and sweat of those before, they have no concept at all that this is not a hobby. Its a service.

We exist because of our demonstrated capabilities in providing emergency communications. For little to NO COST to the public.

Thats why were here. Not to chat on 20 about uncle arthur paying you a visit last night.

Dan/W4NTI

"Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message news:b76f1k$be9jq$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> I personally have not seen the exact text, but recently in the magazine
> World Radio there was an article by James Wades, WB8SIW referencing amateur
> radio and public service. In this article from my understanding he makes a
> comment in regards to the idea that only 2% of hams participate in public
> service activities and the rest are "freeloaders."
>
> I hope to locate the text to get a better "read" on the article, but was
> wondering what your comments are? I see some of the point of this article
> possibly, in reference to the public service/emergency service
> communications are the "justification" of our vast allocations that we are
> afforded.
>
>
> Knowing Jim personally from a meeting before, my read on his personality is
> that he is one that is "never wrong, no matter what," so the comment is not
> much surprise. He however is a EXTREMELY intelligent person who also is
> extremely active in NTS and other traffic activities, and has published a
> wonderful text regarding nets and traffic handling etc.
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>

>

2259. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 20:52:20 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b779ss$6m4$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64495

AND DONT FORGET.....MAY THE FLEAS OF A THOUSAND CAMELS NEST IN THEIR ARMPITS.

Dan/W4NTI

"Unclaimed Mysteries" <k4doh@mindspring.com> wrote in message news:b737nk$1od$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> They have no future except their own graves. Even today these codeless
> stooges are impaling themselves by the thousands upon the gates of true
> ham radio. Their blood flows like a filthy torrent into 27MHz. All
> non-CW activity is a despicable lie, promoted by these congenital
> gangsters who have no sense of true communication. They should be hit
> with shoes. God will grill their bellies in hell, where they will fry in
> their own fat as their souls wail in lamentation.
>
> I'm sorry I must have blacked out there for a minute. Did I say anything?
>
> 73 Corry K4DOH
>
> --
> It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
> http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/
>
> "Here I am, the CEO of a multibillion-dollar company, and I'm having to
> answer about what some weirdo has said on a message board." - Richard
> Scrushy
>

2260. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 21:07:19 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.11.21.07.19.63909.25509@arrl.org>
Source record: 64496

On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 16:24:59 -0400, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:pan.2003.04.07.04.14.38.840562.32723@arrl.org...
>>
>> When, exactly, was being a patriot a bad thing?
>
> From aproximately 1967 to 1973. About the time that the alleged 'flower
> children' crawled out from under their rocks.

That's your opinion. Others would say that those who protested the
Vietnam war were patriotic.

Jon

2261. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 21:23:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030411172311.11494.00000125@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 64497

In article <c2356669.0304110909.5684f766@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030410154430.04182.00000116@mb-fg.aol.com>...
>> You may have forgotten the "hell no, we won't go!" shouting and
>> hollering of the 1960s. Most of that shouting was done by
>> young people who faced conscription into military service. They
>> feared "dying in Vietnam."
>
>Considering how many young people died in Vietnam, that was a pretty
>rational fear.

Most of those protesters survived to this day and some are the "leaders" of present-day USA.

Research the casualty figures of WW2. The USA "had no business going to Asia or Europe to fight a war" was a common thought November 1941 and earlier. Prove it was a correct philosophy.

>> They felt they were "too good for
>> lower-class military service."
>
>All of them? How many did you interview?

Several hundred, mostly as a civilian. I'd already completed my 8-year US military service, had received an Honorable Discharge.

How was your military service for the United States?

>> They were moral superiors. As
>> a more noble group they felt entitled to enjoy the guarantees
>> of a better life. Those guarantees had been kept in place by
>> "lower class, less morally superior" citizens in a very large
>> world war and a smaller one in northeast Asia and the beginnings
>> of the MAD standoff between the USSR and USA, held in place
>> by the resolve and work of non-pacifists.
>
>Did you know that some young people left the country rather than be
>forced to fight in Vietnam? Sweden was a popular destination.

Canada was much more popular than Sweden. Most Canadians can speak English. I can speak Swedish and have visited there three times. Sweden is a European neutral, was so throughout the last century. Sweden still has compulsory military service, has had such throughout the last century. In the USA the draft ended in 1973, 30 years ago.

>From what I saw in the Vietnam era, most of the anti-war protest was
>an expression of conscience that the war was not morally justified and
>was not necessary for the defense of the USA. I remember a group
>called "Vietnam Veterans Against The War", composed of servicemen who
>had done tours of duty in Vietnam.

Most of them had ONE tour. How many tours have you done?

Let's cry great big crocodile tears and wail forever about Vietnam
and awful WAR!

Let's bring out minor examples and highlight them to "prove" that
war is terrible, ghastly, brutal, and SHOULD NEVER BE.

Fight for peace.

>Vietnam was a French colony that was under Japanese control during
>WW2. After WW2, some Vietnamese wanted their country to be
>independent, and asked the USA for help in breaking away from France.
>But the USA and other Western nations would not help out, so the
>Vietnamese turned to the USSR for help - and got it. Just like some
>colonies who wanted independence from Britain 227 years ago, and
>turned to France for help.....

Of course..."similarities!"

France struggled through EIGHT YEARS of fighting the Vietminh
during the French Indo-China War...1944 through 1952, just 59
to 51 years ago...NOT 227 years ago. That French colonial
country, taken (by force of arms, really) long ago, had been
fractioned and conquered by others before. Research the
distance from France to Vietnam and compare from the UK to
North America. Did the French speak any form of Vietnamese
when they took over than colony? Were they of the same
racial background? Did they share a common history?

Segue to 1775 and the "English Colony" of the Americas.
English for the most part through ancestry, language, and a
shared history of roots IN Europe. The Revolution of 1776
was more of a civil war with a direct resentment of rule by
royalty. The colonialists resented rule by royalty and wanted
independence. You may have read about it.

Hop back to 2003. Guess who were PARTNERS in the Iraqi
Liberation...USA and United Kingdom!

Where was France? Have the French ever had any victory
of their own in two centuries? They couldn't hold Vietnam,
even with lots of aid from the USA. They folded. It was a
"dien-ben-phooey" for them.

>> You have forgotten the returnees from Vietnam being spat upon
>> and ridiculed by the morally-superior peaceniks in the 60s and
>> 70s.
>

>A few did that. Not many. They were wrong.

They were all over the press and TV at the time. I was a working adult back then, had received my Honorable Discharge from US Army service. Peace and flower-power and free love for everybody. Wonderful, widespread exposure in the media.

They felt "better red than dead." Communism was a wonderful thing they thought, everyone retreat to a commune and commune with nature. No worries, no problems. They could do so in safety, protected by non-peaceniks.

Meanwhile, away from the applause for "Dr. Strangelove," a quiet majority kept to MAD, loitered the B-52s just short of the USSR, practiced on "oil burner routes" just in case, installed the BMEWS and those advanced electronics in Alaska. They kept on volunteering for military service even though the draft was on until 1973, kept watch in NATO in places like Berlin. Boomers and sharks were active in the oceans, aided by things like SOSUS and advanced sonar, resolve and responsibility of their crews. Oh yes, some of us evil, code-hating professionals even helped on making precision munitions that minimized collateral damage while improving targeting accuracy.

>The people to blame for
>Vietnam were the politicians who gave the orders, not those who
>carried them out.

Well, then, speaking as a moral superior, your experience in such order-giving should be a model for all politicians.

>Anti-war protestors were beaten, jailed, some even killed.

Better get some media involved on such "gangster" tactics and bring the "ciminals" to trial!

>> You have forgotten the rash of anti-war motion pictures of
>> that time and the media portraying the military and government
>> as instruments of evil.
>
>Were those anti-war movies inaccurate?

Yes. Hunt the radio surplus stores for a "Gold Code Receiver."

You won't find any. It existed only in movie.

Did the USA suffer any nuclear bombardment during the Cold War? Was MAD successful in preventing wholesale slaughter of the "western" world? Did the USSR survive past 1991?

>> The peaceniks and media felt safe doing
>> all that...the guarantees of the US Constitution permitted them

>> free speech.
>
>Guess they shouldn't have actually USED it, huh, Len?

Not only did they USE all of it, the media made them a glorious
example of a "superior moral" group.

You evidently weren't aware of what was happening then, young
as you were.

>> They felt morally superior. They felt safe to
>> express themselves. Guarantees of safety were the responsibility
>> of the lower-class, less superior people. It wasn't the nobles'
>> task. They were owed it, they felt. Noble people feel like that.
>
>Where DO you get such mixed-up ideas? Were there no "upper class"
>people fighting in Vietnam?

The "moral superiority class," the peaceniks thought they WERE
the "upper class." They felt they could accomplish things by
NOT doing things.

Did you fight in Vietnam?

>I recall a man who was heavyweight champion of the world. They wanted
>to draft him, but he said no, he didn't think the war was justified
>and he would not go. Spent five years in jail, lost his title, the
>prime of his carrer and a whole lot of money.

TS. Cassius Marcellus Clay changed his name to Mohammed
Ali after turning professional in boxing. I fail to see any
redeeming qualities for human society in professional boxing
other than as entertainment.

>The reality was that the Army almost certainly would not have put him
>in a combat situation, and he would have done his service in some rear
>area. But his conscience would not allow him to accept such a deal.
>Principle of the thing.

FEAR not "principle." Let's not kid anyone, mighty moral superior.

Elvis Presley served in the US Army. BFD.

How have Ali and Presley fared since then?

>> There hasn't been any conscription in the USA since 1973.
>
>That's when you say the Vietnam war ENDED, right?

The end of US military conscription happened on 27 Jan 73.

>> For
>> a few months longer than 30 years the USA military has been
>> all-volunteer. In those three decades a few things happened
>> that threatened our guarantees and the fates of several nations

>> besides our own.
>
>Like what?

Almanacs are full of such information. I can't be your history
teacher all the time. DO YOUR OWN WORK.

You may begin with MAD, try the Sinai (twice), Lebanon, both
places for peacekeeping forces. There's the Philippines, at least
two countries in the middle of Africa, an island in the
Carribbean called Cuba that once had IRBMs from the USSR
pointed at us (but while the draft was going on), Haiti, Grenada,
Panama (USA built their canal). There's the DMZ in Korea, the
Korean War still technically going on (its a sort of perpetual
truce). "Checkpoint Charlie" is gone in Berlin now that the
USSR dissolved and the Germanys reunited.

>> Pacifists didn't help keep our guarantees or
>> take action.
>
>There are actions other than military ones, Len.

Of course...lie down and "stop" a tank sometime.

>> The USSR dissolved, not from any actions of pacifists, but
>> from the inherent socio-economic faults of communism.
>
>It also did not dissolve because of any war.

Ah...so a place called Afghanistan "meant nothing" to the
soviet republics? Better check the years the USSR was in
there and the body counts they accumulated. Better check
out a few places in middle Europe (Hungary is an example
that comes to mind) where force of arms aided and abetted
communist ideology as a ruling party.

>> The
>> Germanys united and "the wall" fell from action, not a result
>> of pacifism.
>
>Not because of any war, either.

The Germanys were DIVIDED by post-WW2 "peace negotiations"
so that eastern Germany could be taken over by communists.
That was in all the papers and recorded fact.

>> No pacifists stopped the nation of Iraq from
>> invading their tiny neighbor.
>
>Which one - Iran or Kuwait?

Iran is almost the size of Iraq. Kuwait is much smaller in area.
Try a recent history book of the last decade for help.

>It wasn't pacifists who sold weapons and weapons technology to Iraq,
>either.

USSR/Russia, France, Germany were the biggest sellers.

Did any of them help the Iraqi people? Were any of them involved
in the second Gulf War?

No to all the above.

>Pacifists didn't train or fund the people who became terrorists,
>either. Nor did pacifists put the Taliban into power.

Ah, you are finally seeing the light of dawn! Amazing!

Tell us how pacifists, peaceniks, and flower-power love children
stopped those groups. At any time.

>Speaking of martyrs - we're coming up on the 91st anniversary of the
>sinking of the Titanic. Not one of the engineering officers of the
>Titanic survived, because they were all below decks to the very end.
>They were keeping steam up and the dynamos turning so that there would
>be lights and power for the radio.

How many passengers did they "save?"

>Not a loaded question at all. No rational persondisoputes the bravery
>of the troops fighting to free Iraq. The question is why does the USA
>support such regimes in the first place?

Another Gang of Four member exhibits typos in the "heat" of
message battle... :-)

How in the world did you get the idea that the USA "supported"
Iraq since 1980?!?!? Iraq is oil-rich and has sold petroleum on
the world market...is that "support?!?"

"Support" isn't defined as largely keeping a hands-off policy due
to a touchy Middle Eastern sociopolitical situation in the 1980s.

"Support" ENDED - in no uncertain terms - when Iraq invaded
Kuwait in 1990.

>> Most of those who thought Saddam Hussein was wrong were
>> either silent or dead. There was no guarantee of free speech in
>> Iraq. There was no glorifying videobites of pacifists on Iraqi TV
>> protesting the invasion of Kuwait a dozen or so years ago.
>> Perhaps some Kurds in northern Iraq were pacifists...we don't
>> know...several hundred were gassed to death.
>
>Pacifists didn't sell weapons or weapons technology to Iraq. Nor the
>techniques of how to make chemical weapons.

Pacifists didn't STOP all that military hardware from Russia, France,
or chemical, civil engineering services from Germany.

>What action should the USA have taken to free the hostages?

Teach the Iranians morse code and love for the most effective
mode in ancient amateur radio, of course.

>> About two years after the end of the Iraq-Iran
>> War, Iraq invaded Kuwait. A coalition led by the USA kicked
>> out Iraq. Pacifists didn't do it but their nobility rose to the top
>> and demanded "go no further!"
>
>INCORRECT. The first Gulf war was stopped because the goals had been
>achieved.

Kiss my yes, Jimmie. Peaceniks were all over DC and glorified in
the media before and after the first Gulf War. Plus the Middle
Easterners themselves didn't want to cause any more trouble with
Iraq...Iraqis are mostly Arab in case you haven't noted..

>Here are some direct quotes from the "pacifists" who decided to stop
>that war short of kicking out SH's regime.

Jimmie boy, I've already heard and seen those quoted individuals.

You sum up the Gulf War(s) in the ultra-simplistic "it's all about
oil!" and won't be corrected on it. It's far more complex than
that...but it's nice for you in trying to win message points. :-)

Have your years of experience in government affairs made you
an "expert" in What To Do and What Is Correct? I don't think so.

Have your years of military service made you an expert on
warfare? I don't think so.

How have you been doing on 97.3.(e) to improve world opinion...
Peacefully?

2262. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 21:23:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030411172313.11494.00000126@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 64499

In article <pan.2003.04.11.12.57.33.625935.25998@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 08:26:28 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>>
>> Slavery - the actual treatment of human beings as property - was legal
>> and protected (by force) in much of this country until only 160 years
>> ago.
>
>138 years. But who's counting? :-)
>
>> Weapons of mass destruction are a relatively new thing, compared to the
>> long sorry history of warfare.
>
>Yes, but not as recent as people may think. The Greeks tossed infected
>bodies into besieged cities in a crude form of biological warfare. In the
>French and Indian War, British general Amherst distributed blankets
>infected with smallpox to aid in exterminating the Indians.

Research "grapeshot" and "throatshot" such as at the Battle
of Culludden...deliberate point-blank range firing of cannons
loaded with scrap metal into advancing ranks. Research the
deliberate bayonetting of wounded found on a battlefield as a
"humanitarian" gesture.. Research some places such as the
Andersonville POW camp during the American Civil War.
Research the deliberate firebombing of cities such as the
northeastern section of Tokyo in 1945. Research 1988 and
a certain air force, now non-existant, dropping poison gas on
its countrymen to quell a political uprising.

Warfare is NOT a game. It is brutal. It isn't a spectator sport
enjoyed sitting in front of a television on Saturday afternoons.

Sometimes war is necessary.

>> Fortunately the people who make the
>> decisions are pacifist enough not to have used them since 1945.
>
>Pacifist enough, or not desperate enough?

Not suicidal. Research the acronym "MAD" and find out if it
worked.

Try 1988 and the southeastern part of Iraq for "pacifism" in
action. Bye-bye a few hundred Kurds.

>> Coalition air forces could have turned Bagdad into another 1945 Dresden
>> or Tokyo, but they chose not to, and used precision rather than brute
>> force. Not perfect but better.
>
>Vastly better for the residents of Baghdad.

...and Kirkuk, Mosul, Najaf, and Tikrit for similar cities.

Those who don't like "collateral damage" are welcome to research
Coventry or parts of London as well as Hamburg and Berlin.

>> It's clear that support of SH and the Afghan mujahadeen in the 1980s
>> were mistakes. The challenge is to not make those mistakes again.
>
>SH, yes. In the case of the mujahadeen, it's not so clear. They, at least,
>were acting in legitimate self defense. The error in Afghanistan came
>after the Soviets left when we abandoned the progressive elements of
>Afghan society, allowing the warloads and eventually the Taliban to take
>control and set the country back hundreds of years. Had we engaged in that
>nasty ol' nation building then, 9/11 probably would never have happened.
>9/11 happened not because of a lack of warmaking but because of a lack of
>peacemaking.

Research "League of Nations" and the aftermath of 1918 and what
happened to a certain Weimar Republic. Research what happened
to a certain Russian Revolution of 1917 and its aftermath. Research
what happened in Indonesia and their Civil Wars which killed about
as many as were victims in those German and Polish camps having
their entrance gates marked "Arbeit Macht Frei."

Nasty old USA is "to blame" for all of those, isn't it?

Clearly, 97.1.(e) hasn't been used effectively. The "international
language" of morse code hasn't been effective in all that for a
half century. So much for the "public service" of morse code
and peaceful coexistance. :-)

>What IS hopeful is that the Administration is saying it's committed to
>rebuilding Iraq. I hope that's true, because if we don't it will turn into
>Afghanistan squared. But when it comes to this Administration, I'm from
>Missouri.

Best not to be. The "representative" from Missouri appears in here
from time to time. Everyone has seen his "feelings." Null-making.

2263. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 21:23:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030411172314.11494.00000127@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 64498

In article <c2356669.0304110426.7f1f23e6@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
>news:<BABBDAF4.16857%stewart@say.net>...
>> "N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> > Not at all. Totally predictable. It's like
>> > selling a psychotic a gun and then being
>> > shocked when he turns it on you. Long
>> > history of that sort of thing - the USA
>> > sold Japan all sorts of technology and raw
>> > materials in the '20s and '30s. (snip)
>>
>> Are we ever going to learn, Jim?
>
>Some of us learned long ago. Others are still learning. Some will
>never learn.

The "20s and 30s" was 80 to 70 years ago.

Back then there WAS a case to be made for morse code.

Tell us all about the "sorts of technology 'sold'" to Japan
80 to 70 years ago.

Tell us where Hallicrafters, National Radio, and RME have
gone.

Bad form, OM. You dwell on the past too much without
thinking of the present-day and the future.

>>Is there any hope?
>
>Definitely yes!

There IS a chance that all of S25 will be rewritten at WRC-03.

>>I simply don't see it.
>
>Consider how acceptable violence and repression used to be, even in
>civilized Western republics like the USA.

You were there. Tell us about it.

>Husbands beat their wives, parents beat their children, employers beat
>their workers and the workers rioted in return.

Tell us about being a victim. First-person stories have nice
visceral quality about them.

>Slavery - the actual treatment of human beings as property - was
>legal and protected (by force) in much of this country until only 160
>years ago. A country that promised "all men are created equal" and
>"freedom and justice for all".

160 years is roughly 8 generations. Morse code and the telegraph
were new then, "high-tech" for its time.

159 years and approximately 8 generations later, some amateurs
are adamant about knowing morse code for a radio license.

Radio as a communications medium is only 107 years old.

>Except for a few land purchases here in the East and some remaining
>"reservations", most of the USA's land area was obtained from its
>original inhabitants by force of arms.

Eastern thinking may consider the Louisiana Purchase a garage
sale or Alaska picked up at some auction.

The center of population of the USA has long since been WEST
of the Mississippi River.

>But today almost all of that sort of behavior is considered
>unacceptable, and forbidden by law. Long slow progress, but progress
>nonetheless.

159 years after the first commercial use of telegraphy and 107
years after the start of radio as a communications medium,
some amateurs insist, some adamantly, that morse code testing
is required for an amateur radio license.

No real progress in the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society.

Perhaps in using transistors and discarded tuna cans, yes.

>Or consider this: Women got the right to vote in the USA in 1920 -
>almost 150 years after the nation's founding on the principle of "all
>MEN are created equal". Did they have to use violence to get it?

Consider this: In US amateur radio, the predominant demographic
group of licensees is composed of WHITE MALES.

>Weapons of mass destruction are a relatively new thing, compared to
>the long sorry history of warfare. Fortunately the people who make the
>decisions are pacifist enough not to have used them since 1945.

The year 1988 will mark that as untrue.

>Coalition air forces could have turned Bagdad into another 1945
>Dresden or Tokyo, but they chose not to, and used precision rather
>than brute force. Not perfect but better.

The "brute force" technique is apparantly what this renowned
historian (and military NON-veteran) considers the charging
across an open field in formation by rank and file during the
American Civil War...which ended in most world armies about
the turn of the last century.

The year now is 2003 and it is NOT 1944 and pipe-dreaming
about the 8th Air Force flying B-17s by day (10 crew per plane)
and RAF flying Lancasters by night over the same target. It
is NOT 1945 and B-29s dropping thousands of incendiaries on
Tokyo, setting fires so great that the last flight (of 4) could not
hold position due to updrafts and diverted to a secondary.

Neither is this 159 years ago and the commercial birth of
wired telegraphy. Neither is it 107 years ago and the birth of
radio as a communications medium. Spark as an RF
generation source is outlawed.

>The mission of pacifism in the 21st century is to oppose the policies
>that lead to wars, and go after them long before the shooting starts.

"Hell no, you won't go!" You didn't. Feel proud.

>It's clear that support of SH and the Afghan mujahadeen in the 1980s
>were mistakes. The challenge is to not make those mistakes again.

It's clear that the support of ARRL and the olde-tyme morsemen
of the 1930s to 1950s for morsemanship as king was a mistake.
The challenge is not to keep repeating it for an avocation.

Recall 97.1.(e) and compare that to ALL the warfare that has
engulfed the world since the end of WW2. Where has all that
"goodwill" gone, what did it do?

2264. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 22:47:15 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.11.22.47.14.716872.1240@arrl.org>
Source record: 64401

On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 17:23:13 -0400, Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <pan.2003.04.11.12.57.33.625935.25998@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>
>>On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 08:26:28 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>> Weapons of mass destruction are a relatively new thing, compared to
>>> the long sorry history of warfare.
>>
>>Yes, but not as recent as people may think. The Greeks tossed infected
>>bodies into besieged cities in a crude form of biological warfare. In
>>the French and Indian War, British general Amherst distributed blankets
>>infected with smallpox to aid in exterminating the Indians.
>
> Research "grapeshot" and "throatshot" such as at the Battle of
> Culludden...deliberate point-blank range firing of cannons loaded
> with scrap metal into advancing ranks. Research the deliberate
> bayonetting of wounded found on a battlefield as a "humanitarian"
> gesture.. Research some places such as the Andersonville POW camp
> during the American Civil War. Research the deliberate firebombing of
> cities such as the northeastern section of Tokyo in 1945.

None of which are WMD as the term is now defined. WMD are generally
defined as chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. It's certainly true
that many things that have been done in warfare are brutal. And to the
victim, dead is dead whether killed by WMD or by a pointed stick. But the
term WMD doesn't refer to all those other weapons.

> Warfare is NOT a game. It is brutal. It isn't a spectator sport
> enjoyed sitting in front of a television on Saturday afternoons.

Gosh, really, Professor Len? Just who, in your fevered imagination, do you
think believes that war isn't brutal?

> Sometimes war is necessary.

Yes, particularly in defense against aggression. Of course, which side is
the aggressor and which the defender tends to be determined by the victor.

>>> Fortunately the people who make the
>>> decisions are pacifist enough not to have used them since 1945.
>>
>>Pacifist enough, or not desperate enough?
>
> Not suicidal. Research the acronym "MAD" and find out if it worked.

Was MAD a deterrent to the use of CW or BW? Didn't seem to be in
Iran/Iraq.

> Try 1988 and the southeastern part of Iraq for "pacifism" in action.

Don't you mean northeastern Iraq, Prof? Anyway, I take it that in 1988 you
were arguing that we should be attacking Iraq, right? Or were you a
"pacifist" with regard to that conflict at the time?

> Bye-bye a few hundred Kurds.

A few thousand, actually. But who's counting?

> Research "League of Nations" and the aftermath of 1918 and what
> happened to a certain Weimar Republic. Research what happened to a
> certain Russian Revolution of 1917 and its aftermath. Research what
> happened in Indonesia and their Civil Wars which killed about as many
> as were victims in those German and Polish camps having their
> entrance gates marked "Arbeit Macht Frei."
>
> Nasty old USA is "to blame" for all of those, isn't it?

Eh? Of course not. Your point being what?

> Clearly, 97.1.(e) hasn't been used effectively. The "international
> language" of morse code hasn't been effective in all that for a half
> century. So much for the "public service" of morse code and peaceful
> coexistance. :-)

Still obsessing over Morse, Len? Some day you really must get a life!

Jon

2265. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 23:18:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030411191849.18459.00000039@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 64403

In article <20030410191805.20747.00000269@mb-cv.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
>>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>>> Why do people misinterpret what I say? I agreed Morse code is a growth
>>> industry, EE is not.

EE isn't a growth industry? Then why did you go into it?

>>Because you say it in such a manner that it can easily be misinterpreted.
>
>I try to be as clear as possible.

You're usually vry unclear. PArt of the problem is that you attach your own definitions to words, rather than use the definitions everyone else uses. For example, you talk about "ham radio" as if it is not the same thing as "amateur radio". To everyone else, the two terms mean the same thing.
>
>>Pointing out the increased numbers is merely stating a fact. In and of
>>itself that is NOT advocating anything.
>
>Thats true, its just stating statistics. However, chosing how you look at the
>numbers is another story.

Are any of the facts presented incorrect?
>
>>However the fact can then be used
>>to support advocating Morse.

Is that a bad thing?
>
>Thats what I mean. Chosing to look at the numbers that way is advocating
>Morse code.

Is that a bad thing?
>
>N2EY claimed more Morse code sales indicates Morse code is growing,

Morse code USE. Is that not a logical conclusion?

>which means more poeple are interested in it,

Is that not a logical conclusion? I don't think many people are buying new keys, paddles, keyers, software, filters, rigs and other Morse-code-related equipment and then not using it.

>which means Morse code is more useful
>(according to N2EY's logic).

If something is used more, is it not more useful?

Why does it bother you if someone proves that Morse code is useful?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2266. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 23:19:04 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030411191904.18459.00000040@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 64402

In article <3E95D3BD.C17A360E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>But where are all of those new Technicians if not on 2m FM? They're
>certainly not on 2m SSB or CW. Len wouldn't know those things.

Of course he would. Len knows everything. ;-)

2267. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 23:48:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b77kdd$t99$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64405

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.04.08.10.34.38.819114.5721@arrl.org...
> On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 22:47:33 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > news:pan.2003.04.07.22.53.17.874763.9024@arrl.org...
> >
> >> Is it utterly unimportant if some people disagree that the attack is
> >> justified?
> >
> > It is to me.
>
> Okay, you know what you think and don't give a damn what anyone else
> thinks. Understood.

You asked about "some people". Depending on who it is, I base my
decision as to the value I place on their opinion. Most of the anti-war
types
I've seen interviewed are patently uninformed...hence I value little
as to their opinion.

> >> I wish I shared your trust. The present administration seems daily less
> >> interested in hearing the opinions of anyone.
> >
> > And you base that statement on what?
>
> The fact that the Administration has, from the day it entered office,
> expressed disdain for those -- domestically and internationally -- who
> disagree with it.

So?

> It's one thing to disagree about things, it's another to
> belittle and demean those with whom you disagree.

Examples please of the administrations "belittling and demeaning".

> Why is it that countries
> that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side of
> the fence from us now?

Follow the money. Every day now we learn more about the back door
cozy financial relationships between Saddam's regime and some of
our "close allies."

> In significant part, it's because we've told them
> in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.

Not that they have essentially said/done the same thing
to us.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2268. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-11 23:48:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030411194833.05202.00000068@mb-cl.aol.com>
Source record: 64404

In article <pan.2003.04.11.22.47.14.716872.1240@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 17:23:13 -0400, Len Over 21 wrote:
>> In article <pan.2003.04.11.12.57.33.625935.25998@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
>> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>>
>>>On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 08:26:28 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>>>>
>>>> Weapons of mass destruction are a relatively new thing, compared to
>>>> the long sorry history of warfare.
>>>
>>>Yes, but not as recent as people may think. The Greeks tossed infected
>>>bodies into besieged cities in a crude form of biological warfare. In
>>>the French and Indian War, British general Amherst distributed blankets
>>>infected with smallpox to aid in exterminating the Indians.
>>
>> Research "grapeshot" and "throatshot" such as at the Battle of
>> Culludden...deliberate point-blank range firing of cannons loaded
>> with scrap metal into advancing ranks. Research the deliberate
>> bayonetting of wounded found on a battlefield as a "humanitarian"
>> gesture.. Research some places such as the Andersonville POW camp
>> during the American Civil War. Research the deliberate firebombing of
>> cities such as the northeastern section of Tokyo in 1945.
>
>None of which are WMD as the term is now defined. WMD are generally
>defined as chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. It's certainly true
>that many things that have been done in warfare are brutal. And to the
>victim, dead is dead whether killed by WMD or by a pointed stick. But the
>term WMD doesn't refer to all those other weapons.
>
>> Warfare is NOT a game. It is brutal. It isn't a spectator sport
>> enjoyed sitting in front of a television on Saturday afternoons.
>
>Gosh, really, Professor Len? Just who, in your fevered imagination, do you
>think believes that war isn't brutal?

Those who've never served in any military.

Those who want to put their heads in the sand and deny any of
the terrible stuff that happens.

>> Sometimes war is necessary.
>
>Yes, particularly in defense against aggression. Of course, which side is

>the aggressor and which the defender tends to be determined by the victor.

Does certain events come to mind on mentioning certain
place names like Lublin, Bergen-Belsen, Auschwitz?

>>>> Fortunately the people who make the
>>>> decisions are pacifist enough not to have used them since 1945.
>>>
>>>Pacifist enough, or not desperate enough?
>>
>> Not suicidal. Research the acronym "MAD" and find out if it worked.
>
>Was MAD a deterrent to the use of CW or BW? Didn't seem to be in
>Iran/Iraq.

"Mutually-Assured Destruction" involves two powers EACH
possessing annhilation weapons. That policy did not involve
Iraq.

Would you rather have waited a long time to FIND OUT, Jon?

Would it please you if, in the future, Iraq got to the point of USING
chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons capable of killing
MILLIONS? I'm sure you would. You are safe up in the outskirts
of Boston...nobody would DARE go in there and do anything...

>> Try 1988 and the southeastern part of Iraq for "pacifism" in action.
>
>Don't you mean northeastern Iraq, Prof? Anyway, I take it that in 1988 you
>were arguing that we should be attacking Iraq, right? Or were you a
>"pacifist" with regard to that conflict at the time?

No, Jon. [try to avoid the antagonistic "moral superior" phrasing]

I was forming an opinion on the Middle East at the time, getting
to travel to Fort Irwin on business involving military electronics.
That's a large desert warfare training center. You may heard
mention of it in Tom Clancy novels.

Jon, I'd already served my country in the military 1952 to 1960.

I don't really need some League person telling me where my
patriotism "should be." In ANYTHING.

>> Bye-bye a few hundred Kurds.
>
>A few thousand, actually. But who's counting?

>> Nasty old USA is "to blame" for all of those, isn't it?
>
>Eh? Of course not. Your point being what?

I don't know what in hell YOUR point is...but I admit some curiosity.

Are you here after an absence to stir up "action?"

Are you and your League cronies all "moral superiors" in anything
you mention.

Sure sounds like it...

>Still obsessing over Morse, Len? Some day you really must get a life!

I have a nice life, Jon. I've never used any morse, nor had to use
any morse in all the 50 years since I first fired up a transmitter on
HF while serving the US Army in Japan...nor any time thereafter
on legally transmitting everywhere in the EM spectrum from VLF
to about 22 GHz.

You seem to imply that having an amateur radio license makes you
some kind of "moral superior" on things NOT about amateur radio.
That implication is common to the PCTA. Strange behavior about
a hobby which is partly defined by 97.1.(e) in Title 47 CFR.

Have a nice day. I had one and expect to have one tomorrow.
Morse code isn't part of that.

Please explain how demonstrated skill in morsemanship makes
one an "expert" or "moral superior" on geopolitics.

2269. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 00:04:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b77lc4$n66$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64406

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@att.net> wrote in message
news:PqNka.51934$ja4.3336784@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Dear Larry,
> Trying to muddy the issue about justification for this war by
> interjecting labels like "liberal democrats" vs. "conservative
republicans"
> is not making sense. There many conservatives, patriots, republicans,
> clergymen, etc, who are questioning where this administration is going
with
> this manifest destiny stuff ("Pax Americana"), such as Pat Buchanan, Bob
> Knovak, William Saffire, etc.

Who elected them?

> Do we no longer agree with our founding
> fathers who recommended "avoiding foreign entanglements"?...and that is
not
> to preach isolationism, by the way. I am concerned that the U.S. has,
> perhaps needlessly, just grabbed the tiger by the tail. Someone tell me
> how this plays out and we get back to life, liberty, and the pursuit of
> happiness and, of course, manditory testing for morse efficiency.

It's playing out now...check in with FOX news once in awhile.

> Is OBL winning or losing? Has capitalism so failed us
> internationally that we have to resort to force of arms? Could we not
take
> the same $10E9 and convert our economy from hydrocarbon based to
> nuclear/hydrogen based and let our current oil fed foes starve or sell
them
> the technology for the price of laying down their arms?

Hey I really love my SUV, my several antique cars, etc.

> Dear "UNK",
> As to easily recognizing "evil", there are a few million readers
of
> the Koran who honestly discern YOU as evil.

Such people are being grossly mislead by those that
want to direct their thinking. Those that I respect of muslim
faith all seem to agree that true understanding of the Koran does not
and should not lead to hate for the west.

> And the U.S. recent and
> apparently future planned incursions, campaigns, etc. will reinforce their
> feelings. Going back in history, the Ottomans thought the Armenians were

> "evil". Many germans, at one time, thought the Poles, Jews, Czechs,
> Slavs, and/or Gypsies were "evil" (I kind of agree about the Gypsies by
the
> way after my problem in Rome). We humans need to be very careful about
> easily discerning evil as an obvious attribute, as it seems to escape our
> capacity to do so correctly from time to time.

If you can't see the evil in the Saddam regime...especially with more
and more knowledge that comes oout of Iraq, then that's pretty sad
commentary. Even CNN has now admitted they covered up
Saddam regime evils to protect their ability to stay in Iraq.

> Was Iraq a direct threat to the U.S. with WMD? I don't think so.
> We have "owned" Iraq for the last 11 years.

Guess I missed that chapter in history.

> We have bombed and missiled the
> s**t of of them from the air with satellite and on-ground covert work
> (Mossaud) assist during that period.

And as a result, Saddam had no forces?

> I am disgusted with "reason de jour"
> justification of this campaign. I finally heard one of the CNN/MSNBC/FOX
> chief propagandists say this morning "It is fortunate that we reporters do
> not have to adhere to a fixed set of principles".

CNN/MSNBC/FOX??? which is it? These are three separate
and distinct networks.

> The U.S. foreign policy
> needs to be a clear, fixed set of principles that our friends and foes
> cannot mistake.

The great thing about both our policy and our constitution has
been the ability to introduce change in reaction to
changing attitudes, both internally and globally.

> Oh... and please something other than "Might makes right.".

No other country has ever shown the respect for and support for
the people in countries we have been involved with militarily.
Japan, Germany, Italy after WW-2, Korea, etc. and now Iraq.

> Lastly, I never thought I would stand with Jon Bloom on any issue,
> but I do on this one. Having said that, I prefer to not respond any
> further as this subject should be (OT) on this newsgroup. There are
> multitudinous suitable groups carrying on this thread. And,
TRADITIONALLY,
> hams are supposed to avoid political discussions in the interest of
> brotherhood and international good will.

Your option.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2270. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 00:07:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b77lhqbec1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64407

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3E938AFA.F41FCF0A@att.net...
>
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> > Why is it that countries
> > that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side of
> > the fence from us now? In significant part, it's because we've told them
> > in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.
>
> Why Jon, I'm surprised you haven't heard. Don't you read the news?
> France, Germany and Russia hold over half the Iraqi debt, which is quite
large
> since the sanctions of '91.
> . Who you suppose will pay off if Saddam goes?
> Dick

Right on target Dick. As I commented in another reply to Jon,
all one needs do is follow the money.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2271. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 00:17:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030411201751.15821.00000087@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 64408

In article <20030411191849.18459.00000039@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030410191805.20747.00000269@mb-cv.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
>(Vshah101) writes:
>
>>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>>
>>>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>> Why do people misinterpret what I say? I agreed Morse code is a growth
>>>> industry, EE is not.
>
>EE isn't a growth industry? Then why did you go into it?
>
>>>Because you say it in such a manner that it can easily be misinterpreted.
>>
>>I try to be as clear as possible.
>
>You're usually vry unclear. PArt of the problem is that you attach your own
>definitions to words, rather than use the definitions everyone else uses. For
>example, you talk about "ham radio" as if it is not the same thing as
>"amateur
>radio". To everyone else, the two terms mean the same thing.

Try to control yourself while typing.

>>>Pointing out the increased numbers is merely stating a fact. In and of
>>>itself that is NOT advocating anything.
>>
>>Thats true, its just stating statistics. However, chosing how you look at
>the
>>numbers is another story.
>
>Are any of the facts presented incorrect?

Conclusions based on selective use of facts is biased, incorrect.

>>>However the fact can then be used
>>>to support advocating Morse.
>
>Is that a bad thing?

For licensing in US amateur radio it is considered "bad" by many.
So much so, they've not bothered to get into US amateur radio.

>>Thats what I mean. Chosing to look at the numbers that way is advocating
>>Morse code.
>
>Is that a bad thing?

That is biased, incorrect, a mistake, an error. It is spin,
propaganda, self-interest, and a lot of not too good
attributes.

>>N2EY claimed more Morse code sales indicates Morse code is growing,
>
>Morse code USE. Is that not a logical conclusion?

There is a dearth of business information in regards to the
"growth" of morse code use.

>>which means more poeple are interested in it,
>
>Is that not a logical conclusion? I don't think many people are buying new
>keys, paddles, keyers, software, filters, rigs and other Morse-code-related
>equipment and then not using it.

If your only "hammer" pounds out morse code, then everything
must indicate morsemanship to you.

>>which means Morse code is more useful
>>(according to N2EY's logic).
>
>If something is used more, is it not more useful?
>
>Why does it bother you if someone proves that Morse code is useful?

Morse code is NOT "useful." Of all the US radio services that
existed since the end of WW2, only two retain morse code
modes for any sort of communications purpose. One of them
is maritime radio services but the maritime world has gone over
to voice and data and GMDSS has supplanted the old 500 KHz
morse-required international distress and safety frequency.

Morse code mode is slow and error-prone in requiring humans
at each end to be the encoder and decoder. Maximum
throughput is, at best, 30 WPM only be very skilled and
experienced morsemen. The slowest teleprinters in radio
communications have been 100 WPM for four decades, can
do so 24/7 with enough paper to reload, don't need food,
don't need breaks, don't need to go to the bathroom. Data
rates can go to 200+ WPM equivalent and use forward-
error correction codings to improve reliability through
interference.

Every OTHER US radio service gets along quite fine without
using morse or ever envisioning its use. US amateur radio
licenses MUST have demonstrated morse code cognition
to have below-30-MHz privileges. The only logic in that is to

preserve a living museum of the airwaves and constant
re-creation of the past. That's hardly in all 5 parts of 97.1.

I'll just consider you as a museum artifact.

Enjoy your glass case.

2272. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 00:33:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b77n1iaid1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64409

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAB7B9F7.15CB3%stewart@say.net...
> "Bill Sohl" wrote:
> >
> > Try a different news channel. Most of the
> > Iraqi army were conscripted. Even those that
> > may have volunteered probably did so as the
> > better alternative to the plight of civilians
> > in Iraq.
>
> Does that make it any better, Bill? They joined the military, whether
> enlisted or drafted. Neither changes their understanding of why their
> country is being invaded, their knowledge of WMD, or their desire to
> defend their country.

Your point? And more to the latest...many obvioulsy had no
desire to defend the Saddam regime.

> Nor does either change the fact that many are not out
> cheering our invading Army right now - they're home crying over the loss
of
> a son, daughter, husband, wife, mother or father. War is ugly.

I never said it wasn't. The fact still remains that the coalition
executed the most precise offensives ever accomplished with
minimal civilian losses. Additionally, you seem to forget the
Americans that mourned the loss of a son, daugher, husband,
wife, mother or father on 911...or those that lost a son, daughter...
as part of the coalition losses.

> The government, military, and press, are working hard to
> make sure Americans never see that ugliness.

WHAT? This war has been covered by the press to the degree
that no other war ever was...front line stuff and all. Do you even
watch the news? It was within minutes of the first loss of coalition
forces that it was reported on TV. Every single coalition member
loss has almost instantly been reported.

> If we're going to scream for war, then we should
> also have the balls to honestly look at the results.

I absolutely do. More than you know...and that's something
I have done for many years. Where will you be on Memorial
Day this year?

> > The fact that any American doesn't understand why
> > is simply an indication that whoever that person/
> > persons are, they are either dumber than a rock or
> > they have NO access to media coverage of the events
> > leading to and the execution of the war itself
> > over the last 20 days.
>
> Or perhaps they're smart enough not to so
> easily be taken in by propaganda

So everything we hear or see is propaganda??

> - smart enough to know our government
> and military has not always told the
> truth about war, with no reason to believe
> anything has changed today.

Please point out the current untruths.

> I've watched the media over the last few
> weeks, and I've seen more accurate
> reporting coming out of the military's
> own public affairs personnel (which
> have a mandate to portray the military
> solely in a positive manner).

So the military isn't issuing propaganda? Which is it?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2273. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 00:37:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030411203753.23756.00000153@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 64412

In article <pan.2003.04.11.12.57.33.625935.25998@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 08:26:28 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>>
>> Slavery - the actual treatment of human beings as property - was legal
>> and protected (by force) in much of this country until only 160 years
>> ago.
>
>138 years. But who's counting? :-)

Right you are. Makes the point stronger.
>
>> Weapons of mass destruction are a relatively new thing, compared to the
>> long sorry history of warfare.
>
>Yes, but not as recent as people may think. The Greeks tossed infected
>bodies into besieged cities in a crude form of biological warfare. In the
>French and Indian War, British general Amherst distributed blankets
>infected with smallpox to aid in exterminating the Indians.

The Amherst story is somewhat in doubt. There's no clear evidence it was
actually done. The risks to Amherst's people make it doubtful.

Still, the idea was proposed. The letter that is quoted makes it clear that
Lord Jeff wanted to wipe out the Indians, and thought smallpox might do the
job.
>
>> Fortunately the people who make the
>> decisions are pacifist enough not to have used them since 1945.

At least not nukes.
>
>Pacifist enough, or not desperate enough?

Hopefully nobody ever gets that desperate.
>
>> Coalition air forces could have turned Bagdad into another 1945 Dresden
>> or Tokyo, but they chose not to, and used precision rather than brute
>> force. Not perfect but better.
>
>Vastly better for the residents of Baghdad.

And for those who have to clean up the mess. Remember the book "Slaughterhouse
Five"? Kurt Vonnegut was there, at Dresden. POW.
>

>> It's clear that support of SH and the Afghan mujahadeen in the 1980s
>> were mistakes. The challenge is to not make those mistakes again.
>
>SH, yes. In the case of the mujahadeen, it's not so clear.

It's clear to me.

>They, at least,
>were acting in legitimate self defense.

And we turned a blind eye to atrocities they committed. Do you think captured Soviets were treated as POWs under the Geneva convention?

>The error in Afghanistan came
>after the Soviets left when we abandoned the progressive elements of
>Afghan society, allowing the warloads and eventually the Taliban to take
>control and set the country back hundreds of years.

This was during whose administration?

>Had we engaged in that
>nasty ol' nation building then, 9/11 probably would never have happened.
>9/11 happened not because of a lack of warmaking but because of a lack of
>peacemaking.

Not enough pacifists. "Blessed are the peacemakers"....

Nation-building or not, it is my understanding that what really ticked off OBL & Co. was the presence of "infidel Crusader/Zionist" troops in the holy land of Arabia. Didja know he and some of his mujahadeen buddies showed up in SA in 1990 and wanted to free Kuwait themselves? Said it was an Arab problem, and Arabs should solve it without help from unbelievers. He was politely turned away. They shoulda let him have a crack at the Iraqis....
>
>What IS hopeful is that the Administration is saying it's committed to
>rebuilding Iraq. I hope that's true, because if we don't it will turn into
>Afghanistan squared. But when it comes to this Administration, I'm from
>Missouri.

There's a good article on slate.com about that entire issue.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2274. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 00:37:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030411203754.23756.00000154@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 64411

In article <d22b54c3.0304110126.4dcadcd@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030410182651.08544.00000038@mb-cb.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0304100417.abea89e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<20030409202655.18459.00000027@mb-cc.aol.com>...
>> >
>> >> In addition, there's the whole dimension of conflict resolution and not
>> >> empowering those who are likely to become violent. Selling SH's Iraq
>> weapons
>> >> and the technology to make them empowered him. Guess who sold his regime
>> things
>> >> like anthrax and botulinum toxins.
>> >>
>> >
>> >Guess who sold Saddam the AA missles which knocked down the Warthog
>> >and possibly the F-15. (Hint: Their capital is Paris . .)
>> >
>> Were they the same folks who had to install speed bumps on the Champs
>> Elysees to slow down incoming Panzers?
>
>I think so.

That line was from one of David Letterman's "Top Ten" lists entitled "Things
The French Are Doing To Keep Their Spirits Up After Germany Reunites".

>But I forget who it was who floated 3,000 miles in massive
>force on their own dime into that neighborhood and "urged" what was
>left of the Panzers to go back over those speed bumps the other way
>and head north in high gear. Help me here, you know how it is with us
>Old Farts, memory problems and all that . . .

Did that gig twice, in fact - 1917-18 and 1941-45. A lot of 'em are still
there, in the cemeteries.

Even those of us who were not born yet back then remember.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2275. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 00:38:15 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030411203815.23756.00000155@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 64410

In article <f45722ac.0304110425.24cb1df9@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Where have all the hams gone?
>
Gone to Internet, every one :-)

When will you ever learn? :-)

2276. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 00:48:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b77no4eel1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64413

Yes some would. I call them knee jerk, bleeding heart, commie liberals.

Dan/W4NTI

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.04.11.21.07.19.63909.25509@arrl.org...
> On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 16:24:59 -0400, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > news:pan.2003.04.07.04.14.38.840562.32723@arrl.org...
> >>
> >> When, exactly, was being a patriot a bad thing?
> >
> > From aproximately 1967 to 1973. About the time that the alleged 'flower
> > children' crawled out from under their rocks.
>
> That's your opinion. Others would say that those who protested the
> Vietnam war were patriotic.
>
> Jon

2277. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 00:50:14 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b77o11$q5b$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64415

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAB93DB2.15D98%stewart@say.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >
> > In this case, our cause is just. We seek to free an
> > imprisoned nation from the barbarism of a vicious,
> > totalitarian despot who would have threatened the
> > rest of the free world unchecked had we not finally
> > intervened. (snip)
>
>
> Lets keep the discussion within the realm of reality, Larry. Saddam
didn't
> threaten the "rest of the free world" even prior to the last Iraq war. He
> was a two-bit dictator of a third world country with a third world
military.
> He could not even defeat Iran, much less the rest of the free world.

Tell that to the Kuwati's.

> And,
> after the reduction of his military during and after the last war, he was
> even less of a threat to the free world leading into this war.

As we are seeing, however, he was perfectly willing to train,
fund and support the exportation of terrorism.

> As for WMD (if he actually had them leading up to this war), he did not
> use them even to save his country from a direct attack or to save his own
> life - not exactly what one would expect from a person intending to use
them
> on the "rest of the free world."

There is also the possibility that the destruction of the
Command/Control critically hampered any ability to
mobilize and deploy and WMD.

> > No, it is categorically NOT possible for any loyal
> > American to justify non-support for this righteous
> > campaign and the Commander-In-Chief who courageously
> > prosecuted it. (snip)
>
> Nonsense.
>
> > To withhold support for the President and this war
> > is to choose the continuation of the evil of the

> > Saddam Hussein regime. (snip)
>
> Nonsense.

You'd rather there was no war and Saddam still in power
and control?

> > (snip) These Anti-War protesters are merely mindless
> > parrots of empty rhetoric which reflects nothing more
> > than their own intellectual laziness and physical
> > cowardice.
>
> Nonsense.

To each his own opinion.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2278. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 00:50:34 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <Xns935AB58036CE3jlhoukattbicom@204.127.199.17>
Source record: 64414

"Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in
news:b76f1k$be9jq$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de:

> I personally have not seen the exact text, but recently in the
> magazine World Radio there was an article by James Wades, WB8SIW
> referencing amateur radio and public service. In this article from my
> understanding he makes a comment in regards to the idea that only 2%
> of hams participate in public service activities and the rest are
> "freeloaders."
>
> I hope to locate the text to get a better "read" on the article, but
> was wondering what your comments are? I see some of the point of this
> article possibly, in reference to the public service/emergency service
> communications are the "justification" of our vast allocations that we
> are afforded.
>
> Knowing Jim personally from a meeting before, my read on his
> personality is that he is one that is "never wrong, no matter what,"
> so the comment is not much surprise. He however is a EXTREMELY
> intelligent person who also is extremely active in NTS and other
> traffic activities, and has published a wonderful text regarding nets
> and traffic handling etc.

I found something that he had co-written and sent as an open letter over at
http://www.traverse.com/people/ka8hib/carc/feb01.htm and it reads about
like you say, although significantly tamer. I can't speak whether the World
Radio article is any different.

He's got a good point - although a bit overstated. We do have other
important public benefits in addition to emergency services. Suggesting
that only those people involved with ARES/RACES/SKYWARN are the ones
"paying the toll" is just hyperbole. However, increasing the number of
amateurs involved in these organizations is a darn good idea and it's an
idea that deserves promoting. It is a very important part of the service
and it's also one of the parts that is the most visible to the public at
large. Deeping our involvement in emergency communications is a very good
way to ensure the viability of amateur radio.

Joshua Houk
ac7ri

2279. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 00:55:29 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <957DBF8B5E6F0B7C.A915549CCB83AA41.0D317FF74CC80013@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64417

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030408062956.23756.00000074@mb-fj.aol.com...
> In article
<677B0FD5B2E506F9.119100F173E05EA4.CB710EDCD698FD92@lp.airnews.net>,
> "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
> >From: "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> >Date: Mon, 7 Apr 2003 21:37:01 -0500
> >
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030407204927.11628.00000030@mb-fz.aol.com...
> >>
> >> Or consider this thought experiment:
> >>
> >> Suppose President Bush announced that he wants to create a new
$1/gallon
> >> federal tax on retail sales of gasoline. Suppose he says the money from
> >> this
> >> new tax would go to pay for the war, fight terrorism, and reduce
America's
> >> dependence on imported oil. Suppose he further announces that govt.
> >> agencies
> >> and certain key industries would be exempt from the tax, but everyone
else
> >> would have to pay it. $1 per gallon of gasoline - other fuels exempt.
> >>
> >
> >Fer cryin' out loud, will someone shut him up??!!! (LOL) Jim!! Don't
say
> >stuff like that out loud!
>
> BWAAHAAHAAA!
>
> Let's see - suppose the war winds up costing $100 billion
($100,000,000,000)
> this year. Suppose the average retail gasoline user buys 500 gallons of
> gasoline under the new tax. And suppose there are 200 million
(200,000,000)
> average retail gasoline users. End result is $100 billion in new tax
revenue.
>
> Hmm..only $100 billion....doesn't leave anything for fighting terrorism or
> reducing dependency on imported oil....better make it $2/gallon.

> >
>
> >> Most of all, suppose he said "the country needs this tax as part of the
> >> war effort".
> >>
> >> How do you think people would react?
> >
> >Well, *IF* the poltiicians would even listen to their people (us), then
I'd
> >tell them, "Not only no, but Hell no."
>
> But Kim! It's the President (hypothetically) saying what we
(hypothetically)
> NEED! Aren't you a loyal American? How can you or anyone question him? He
has
> all the information, and in his judgement this is a hypothetical sacrifice
we
> need to make.
>
> (sardonic mode = OFF)
>
> >> Would anyone who spoke against this hypothetical new tax be giving aid
and
> >> comfort to the enemy?
> >>
> >Nope, but I'd dang sure be drumming the "go to war" drum...<sarcastic
grin>
> >
> I think you mean "stop the war" drum, don't you?
>

Well, that would be nice. But, no, what I meant was I'd be saying to those
who volunteer in the military, "off to war with you, I don't need that
damned tax."

>
> I think you've got the general public's reaction down perfectly.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

heh heh (sarcastic mode on)
I think we (at least you and I) are the general public. There's loads more
of them, I'd hazard to say.

Kim W5TIT

2280. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 00:57:35 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <68548AB81F532612.04047F1C07DFF26C.7959A1684FBAE13E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64418

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.04.08.10.34.38.819114.5721@arrl.org...
> On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 22:47:33 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > news:pan.2003.04.07.22.53.17.874763.9024@arrl.org...
> >
> >> Is it utterly unimportant if some people disagree that the attack is
> >> justified?
> >
> > It is to me.
>
> Okay, you know what you think and don't give a damn what anyone else
> thinks. Understood.
>
> >> I wish I shared your trust. The present administration seems daily less
> >> interested in hearing the opinions of anyone.
> >
> > And you base that statement on what?
>
> The fact that the Administration has, from the day it entered office,
> expressed disdain for those -- domestically and internationally -- who
> disagree with it. It's one thing to disagree about things, it's another to
> belittle and demean those with whom you disagree. Why is it that countries
> that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side of
> the fence from us now? In significant part, it's because we've told them
> in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.
>
> Jon
>

Here, here, Jon!!! Man, you have hit the nail on the head with that one. I love those Freudian Slips in news conferences where the Prez says, "my government...." 'Scuse me? Whose government?! His Administration, OUR government.

Kim W5TIT

2281. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 01:00:08 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <8BBF535BA84F3FAF.2511B3FD80E2617D.98A884ED00FF23C2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64419

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030408113357.13624.00000145@mb-fh.aol.com...
> In article
<61D891F3EDA9D475.F374DD75F5AC4BF8.6756145A52648264@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >
> >I absolutely support our troops, their efforts and their dedication.
> >However, I do not support the President's decision nor am I sure I
support
> >the war or not. So in my opinion yes, one can be done without the other.
I
> >have just seen a tidbit of news (didn't get the story yet--only got the
> >headline) about some possibility that chemical weapons capability was
> >discovered today. Thank goodness it was discovered and not used!
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Your intellectual vacuity leaves my head swirling in disbelief. You say
you
> can't support our President or this war, yet you praise our forces for
finding
> the very thing that Saddam Hussein intended to use to prosecute the lethal
> brutality of his terrorist regime. Why don't you do yourself a big favor
and
> just sit in the corner like a good little girl and play with your dolls,
and
> not interrupt while the adults are having a mature, cogent discussion of
issues
> you obviously lack the intellectual development and maturity to
understand? I
> could say that I'm embarrassed for you, but I've stopped caring about that
> years ago.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry, you're not capable of being embarrassed...you prove that with nearly
every post.

Kim W5TIT

2282. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 01:03:19 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b77opkult1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64416

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0304100834.7b551cac@posting.google.com...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304090509.6c9a4d25@posting.google.com>...
> > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.08.02.25.42.510174.8992@arrl.org>...
> > > On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 21:21:24 -0400, Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > Do you think that the Daschle Chicks are patriots? If so, why?
> > >
> > > Do you think they are not? If so, why?
> >
> > I think it's important for every American to have the right to voice
> > their displeasure with their government, -at no risk to themselves-,
> > while other Americans are dying on the battlefield to protect that
> > right.
> >
> > The Constitution doesn't mandate patriotism, and I think the Dixie
> > Chick merely exercised her right to be unpatriotic and stupid.
>
> Stupid, maybe. Unpatriotic? Not at all.
> Unless free speech has become unpatriotic.

Let me give you my view of the speech of desent.

There are several levels of disent...

1. Those that seriously and logically question why?
2. Those that simply say NO and do so in an overt fashion
such as public demonstrations.
3. Those that say NO and do so in an aggressively overt fashion
which can and often is used by our enemies to bolster the
position of our enemy (Jane Fonda going to Hanoi...perfect example)
4. Those that demonstrate and in so doing, violate the law which
infringes other people's rights.

I support 1 and don't consider it unpatriotic.
I support 2, but believe the participants should understand
they may be giving aid/comfort to the enemy and that they
should understand and accept responsibility for their
public comments.
I believe 3 and 4 are clearly unpatriotic.

Your mileage may vary,
but that's my opinion.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2283. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 01:04:32 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <B2721BD3DD214D6B.FA3BC933600ED5E6.F79774153C9FD206@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64420

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3E939DB3.28C419E@att.net...
>
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > Jon Bloom wrote:
> >
> > > Why is it that countries
> > > that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side
of
> > > the fence from us now? In significant part, it's because we've told
them
> > > in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.
> >
> > Why Jon, I'm surprised you haven't heard. Don't you read the news?
> > France, Germany and Russia hold over half the Iraqi debt, which is quite
large
> > since the sanctions of '91.
> > . Who you suppose will pay off if Saddam goes?
> >
> > Dick
>
> Oh, by the way, we DON'T give a damn what they think. And that happens
> to be a *very* widely held opinion. They sell weapons and war technology
to
> Saddam and Al Queda and don't give a damn what WE think about that, so why
should
> we ever again care what they think? All they're good for is stymieing
anything and
> everything constructive in the UN. And protecting *their* interests
regardless of
> any others.
>

There ya go painting that broad paintbrush again, Dick. You forget that we the peons are at the mercies of what our governments do. The people of France and Germany have no more control over what their government does than we do of ours--just like the Iraqi people not having much control over what their government did/does. Criticize where criticism is due. I do not fault the French or German, or any other, people in general. Nor should anyone.

Kim W5TIT

2284. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 01:07:17 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <B2E5A073A8241662.BC2A535B4A738826.06DA79014139A480@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64421

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@att.net> wrote in message
news:PqNka.51934$ja4.3336784@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Dear Larry,
> Trying to muddy the issue about justification for this war by
> interjecting labels like "liberal democrats" vs. "conservative
republicans"
> is not making sense. There many conservatives, patriots, republicans,
> clergymen, etc, who are questioning where this administration is going
with
> this manifest destiny stuff ("Pax Americana"), such as Pat Buchanan, Bob
> Knovak, William Saffire, etc. Do we no longer agree with our founding
> fathers who recommended "avoiding foreign entanglements"?...and that is
not
> to preach isolationism, by the way. I am concerned that the U.S. has,
> perhaps needlessly, just grabbed the tiger by the tail. Someone tell me
> how this plays out and we get back to life, liberty, and the pursuit of
> happiness and, of course, manditory testing for morse efficiency.
>
> Is OBL winning or losing? Has capitalism so failed us
> internationally that we have to resort to force of arms? Could we not
take
> the same $10E9 and convert our economy from hydrocarbon based to
> nuclear/hydrogen based and let our current oil fed foes starve or sell
them
> the technology for the price of laying down their arms?
>
> Dear "UNK",
> As to easily recognizing "evil", there are a few million readers
of
> the Koran who honestly discern YOU as evil. And the U.S. recent and
> apparently future planned incursions, campaigns, etc. will reinforce their
> feelings. Going back in history, the Ottomans thought the Armenians were
> "evil". Many germans, at one time, thought the Poles, Jews, Czechs,
> Slavs, and/or Gypsies were "evil" (I kind of agree about the Gypsies by
the
> way after my problem in Rome). We humans need to be very careful about
> easily discerning evil as an obvious attribute, as it seems to escape our
> capacity to do so correctly from time to time.
>
> Was Iraq a direct threat to the U.S. with WMD? I don't think so.
> We have "owned" Iraq for the last 11 years. We have bombed and missiled
the
> s**t of of them from the air with satellite and on-ground covert work
> (Mossaud) assist during that period. I am disgusted with "reason de

jour"
> justification of this campaign. I finally heard one of the CNN/MSNBC/FOX
> chief propagandists say this morning "It is fortunate that we reporters do
> not have to adhere to a fixed set of principles". The U.S. foreign policy
> needs to be a clear, fixed set of principles that our friends and foes
> cannot mistake. Oh... and please something other than "Might makes
right.".
>
> Lastly, I never thought I would stand with Jon Bloom on any issue,
> but I do on this one. Having said that, I prefer to not respond any
> further as this subject should be (OT) on this newsgroup. There are
> multitudinous suitable groups carrying on this thread. And,
TRADITIONALLY,
> hams are supposed to avoid political discussions in the interest of
> brotherhood and international good will.
>
> 73,
> Clay N4AOX
>

On the ham bands, yes. But not on the internet, not here, etc. AND, thank
you...I agree and agree and agree with your post.

Kim W5TIT

2285. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 01:12:45 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <4DB9C3A2E18C8F4D.717A17ADD44296FA.BE8B5F0D1AE97206@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64422

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAB93DB2.15D98%stewart@say.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >
> > In this case, our cause is just. We seek to free an
> > imprisoned nation from the barbarism of a vicious,
> > totalitarian despot who would have threatened the
> > rest of the free world unchecked had we not finally
> > intervened. (snip)
>
>
> Lets keep the discussion within the realm of reality, Larry. Saddam
didn't
> threaten the "rest of the free world" even prior to the last Iraq war. He
> was a two-bit dictator of a third world country with a third world
military.
>

With all due respect, Dwight...Iraq is no third world country. Iraq is in the state it is because of a bastard for a dictator. As N2EY had pointed out, Iraq had the capacity to become a resort country. I do agree their military is third world-ish. Goodness, imagine what our military leaders would think if our soldiers started doing what Iraq's did?! The irony is yet that our military leaders encouraged those soldiers to "put down their weapons."

>
> He could not even defeat Iran, much less the rest of the free world. And,
> after the reduction of his military during and after the last war, he was
> even less of a threat to the free world leading into this war.
>

People who lead through tyranny often haven't enough respect and admiration for winning anything. Same with parents who beat and abuse their children--same psychology.

>
> As for WMD (if he actually had them leading up to this war), he did not
> use them even to save his country from a direct attack or to save his own
> life - not exactly what one would expect from a person intending to use
them
> on the "rest of the free world."
>

Yeah, I still say that is very curious. And, my fear is that the "fat lady ain't sung yet."

>
> > No, it is categorically NOT possible for any loyal
> > American to justify non-support for this righteous
> > campaign and the Commander-In-Chief who courageously
> > prosecuted it. (snip)
>
>
> Nonsense.
>

But "sense" isn't in the mind of those who think like that, Dwight! :)

>
>
> > To withhold support for the President and this war
> > is to choose the continuation of the evil of the
> > Saddam Hussein regime. (snip)
>
>
> Nonsense.
>
>
> > (snip) These Anti-War protesters are merely mindless
> > parrots of empty rhetoric which reflects nothing more
> > than their own intellectual laziness and physical
> > cowardice.
>
>
> Nonsense.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Kim W5TIT

2286. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 01:14:58 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <5739A13E5F357876.440F271E3EACEDBD.FCF5830AED84EBE2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64423

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.04.09.13.02.16.611269.11986@arrl.org...
> On Wed, 09 Apr 2003 00:12:57 -0400, Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Oh, by the way, we DON'T give a damn what they think. And that happens
> > to be a *very* widely held opinion. They sell weapons and war technology
> > to Saddam
>
> As did the US in the 1980s, including materials for WMD. See:
>
http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename=article&contentId=A52241-2
002Dec29
>
> > and Al Queda and don't give a damn what WE think about that, so why
> > should we ever again care what they think? All they're good for is
> > stymieing anything and everything constructive in the UN. And protecting
> > *their* interests regardless of any others.
>
> So we should fight selfishness with selfishness, is that it? My
> second-grader thinks that way, too, but I'm trying to teach him to do the
> right thing even when others don't.
>
> Jon
>

Isn't that interesting? We teach our children these wonderful principles.
The very principles that, when defended and upheld as we are adults, become
the targets of accusatory slang, etc. Very curious.

Kim W5TIT

2287. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 01:19:29 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <E1529BCF9A1174C0.C556433227875D18.26D9E6F870A17369@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64424

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0304090930.36f37eaa@posting.google.com...
> Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:<BAB942BF.15D9A%stewart@say.net>...
> > "Len Over 21" wrote:
> >
> > > Do-nothing pacifism avoids responsibility.
> >
> >
> > I disagree. While I'm not a pacifist, I do come from a religious
> > background that advocates pacifism. As I see it, instead of your rather
> > bleak outlook, pacifism requires the ultimate in responsibility for
one's
> > actions - the idea that one is not going to lower oneself to the same
> > violence of another unless absolutely necessary, combined with the
restraint
> > to hold one's own violent tendencies in check. In a violent world, that
> > requires far more control, and bravery, then the ease of just striking
out
> > at anything one objects to.
>
> Kindly note the reaction of the average Iraqui to the coming of our
> armor & troops.
>

BRIAN, PUHLEEZE!!!! The Iraqi people are scared to death. Just two months
ago they would have done the exact same thing to the coming of the Iraqi
armor & troops. While I am proud of our troops, I distrust the glee and
happiness of a people who, to date, have been programmed to react exactly
the way they are to whomever is carrying the guns. Give this time...even if
the celebration is generally the majority of the people, it will end when
they realize they have to work hard now to bring their country into the 21st
Century.

>
> There are 26 million of them, we've lost 100 or so of
> ours so far. As ill-founded (YMMV) as the rationale is for getting
> into this quagmire is it not coming up a worthwhile endeavor anyway?
>
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> w3rv
>

> Quaker.
>

Give this time, people. Quit rushing to sides, for goodness sakes.

Kim W5TIT

2288. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 01:29:02 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3E06661CE87EB368.1CDF89C36B6A9B62.AF00FBBF2B9F699D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64425

```
"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0304101714.5982e678@posting.google.com...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0304100834.7b551cac@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304090509.6c9a4d25@posting.google.com>...
> > > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.08.02.25.42.510174.8992@arrl.org>...
> > > > On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 21:21:24 -0400, Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Do you think that the Daschle Chicks are patriots? If so, why?
> > > >
> > > > Do you think they are not? If so, why?
> > >
> > > I think it's important for every American to have the right to voice
> > > their displeasure with their government, -at no risk to themselves-,
> > > while other Americans are dying on the battlefield to protect that
> > > right.
> > >
> > > The Constitution doesn't mandate patriotism, and I think the Dixie
> > > Chick merely exercised her right to be unpatriotic and stupid.
> >
> > Stupid, maybe. Unpatriotic? Not at all. Unless free speech has become
unpatriotic.
>
> Is all free speech patriotic?
>

The speech may not be, but the concept is.

Kim W5TIT
```

2289. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 01:36:32 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <51CF0CFD76F705CA.633369C47B5E6B7E.ED7F4C8F48C0E290@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64426

yeah, and you're too wrapped up in your resentment and bitterness to be human about what you think, Dan. Why don't you just keep saying that prayer, "Kill 'em all and let God sort 'em out." Problem with that, what will God have left to sort?

Kim W5TIT

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message news:b778q8qbn1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> Syria is next. That will save you from 'thinking' about it. And guess
> what? I doubt the military gives two hoots about your opinion on the
> subject of US self defense. And thank goodness for that.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:94747B2B5A50BF12.DC06DC5B1570EDAC.15CD574D5721AB1B@lp.airnews.net...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:b6qf42jur1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > >
> news:DB8F8D62FBA3227C.A80D1F5907B3342B.2CD38C1E834FCC63@lp.airnews.net...
> > > > Dan, what proof do you have of this? "We" the people were told that
> > they
> > > > were in Iraq. Now, we were told this by our President who,
> presumably,
> > > has
> > > > the entire resources of our spying capabilities available to him.
> While
> > > > "we're" not done in Iraq yet, have *YOU* noticed that there's been
> > nothing
> > > > in the way of WMD or biological or chemical weapons found?
> > >
> > > Who cares, so what?
> > >
> > > Even if no WMD are found, the Iraqi regime was so inherently
> > > evil that the ending of that regime is of far more value towards
> > > global and regional stabilization than any WMD aspect.
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> > >
> > >
> > >

> >
> > Bill, I understand your sentiment. I also agree that evil is a bad
thing.
> > But I'm not so sure that the US gov't. or military needs to start
marching
> > in and changing things here and there. So far, we're only talking about
> > Iraq. My fear is what next? I don't know...I just don't think it's
> right.
> > I really don't. I think getting into messes like that is biting off
much
> > more than we can chew, militarily, politically, etc.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
>

2290. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 01:45:45 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3CD8C2D3F22BB7FC.B9386F758124F4E5.8F6865D02298F37C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64428

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b778vk$6nl$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b6qngd$jo8$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> >
news:94747B2B5A50BF12.DC06DC5B1570EDAC.15CD574D5721AB1B@lp.airnews.net...
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:b6qf42jur1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > >
> > > > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > > >
> >
news:DB8F8D62FBA3227C.A80D1F5907B3342B.2CD38C1E834FCC63@lp.airnews.net...
> > > > > Dan, what proof do you have of this? "We" the people were told
that
> > > they
> > > > > were in Iraq. Now, we were told this by our President who,
> > presumably,
> > > > has
> > > > > the entire resources of our spying capabilities available to him.
> > While
> > > > > "we're" not done in Iraq yet, have *YOU* noticed that there's been
> > > nothing
> > > > > in the way of WMD or biological or chemical weapons found?
> > > > >
> > > > > Who cares, so what?
> > > > >
> > > > > Even if no WMD are found, the Iraqi regime was so inherently
> > > > > evil that the ending of that regime is of far more value towards
> > > > > global and regional stabilization than any WMD aspect.
> > > > >
> > > > > Cheers,
> > > > > Bill K2UNK
> > > >
> > > > Bill, I understand your sentiment. I also agree that evil is a bad
> > thing.
> > >
> > > Exactly. And evil wins when honorable and honest people
> > > stand by and do nothing when confronted by evil.
> > >
> > > But I'm not so sure that the US gov't. or military needs to start

> marching
> > > in and changing things here and there.
> >
> > Sadly, you sound like too many of the anti-war groupies
> > who believe that because we do one thing in Iraq, we will or
> > must do the same thing in other places. The lesson to be learned
> > here is that we are not impotent nor unwilling to take needed
> > action when it warrants such.
> >
> > > So far, we're only talking about
> > > Iraq. My fear is what next? I don't know...I just don't think it's
> > right.
> > > I really don't. I think getting into messes like that is biting off
> much
> > > more than we can chew, militarily, politically, etc.
> >
> > I strongly disagree with your sentiments. We enjoy a democratic
> > system and the fruits of that system's 200+ years of success.
> > We have (IMHO) a moral obligation to confront extreme
> > evil when it threatens us in the long run.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
> >
> >
> >
> Correct in all aspects Bill. Syria is next. Or let me ammend that. It
> should be, since were already there and geared up to go.
>
> Didn't George Patton want to do that with 'our friends the Russians' ??
Boy
> did we miss a chance there.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

You aren't one of those "it's all the rest of the world's fault for the
situation I am in" are you?

Kim W5TIT

2291. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 01:50:26 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <F4B542A1CA0D2297.4AFD4E30CB6DCBFB.C7FD8F3D341626DF@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64429

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b77kdd$t99$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:pan.2003.04.08.10.34.38.819114.5721@arrl.org...
> > On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 22:47:33 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > > news:pan.2003.04.07.22.53.17.874763.9024@arrl.org...
> > >
> > >> Is it utterly unimportant if some people disagree that the attack is
> > >> justified?
> > >
> > > It is to me.
> >
> > Okay, you know what you think and don't give a damn what anyone else
> > thinks. Understood.
>
> You asked about "some people". Depending on who it is, I base my
> decision as to the value I place on their opinion. Most of the anti-war
> types
> I've seen interviewed are patently uninformed...hence I value little
> as to their opinion.
>

And, what of the military analysts that we've been inundated with the past
few weeks? What about their opinion and how objective could it possibly be?

> > >> I wish I shared your trust. The present administration seems daily
less
> > >> interested in hearing the opinions of anyone.
> > >
> > > And you base that statement on what?
> >
> > The fact that the Administration has, from the day it entered office,
> > expressed disdain for those -- domestically and internationally -- who
> > disagree with it.
>
> So?
>
> > It's one thing to disagree about things, it's another to
> > belittle and demean those with whom you disagree.
>
> Examples please of the administrations "belittling and demeaning".
>
```

So, you've missed them you are saying? Maybe you agreed with a president who keeps stating it's "his" government. That's just one of the many, many statements I've heard him make that really concern me. Then, there's the great Rumsfeld...oh, good grief, what a brat he must've been when he was a little boy.

> > Why is it that countries
> > that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side of
> > the fence from us now?
>
> Follow the money. Every day now we learn more about the back door
> cozy financial relationships between Saddam's regime and some of
> our "close allies."
>

We won't mention any of our financially "close allies" will we?

> > In significant part, it's because we've told them
> > in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.
>
> Not that they have essentially said/done the same thing
> to us.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

And the beat goes on...

Kim W5TIT

2292. ARLB029 - ... and Vietnam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 02:05:09 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304111805.bda9c6a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64427

```
SB QST @ ARL $ARLB029
ARLB029 IARU admits three new member-societies

ZCZC AG29
QST de W1AW
ARRL Bulletin 29 ARLB029
From ARRL Headquarters
Newington CT April 11, 2003
To all radio amateurs

SB QST ARL ARLB029
ARLB029 IARU admits three new member-societies

The International Amateur Radio Union (IARU) has admitted three new
member societies. The National Association Radioamateurs of Georgia
(NARG), the Federation of Radiosport of the Republic of Armenia
(FRRA) were voted in April 10; the Vietnam Amateur Radio Club (VARC)
officially joined IARU on April 4
----------------------------------------------------------------------

Perhaps Brian Kelly would like to welcome the Hmong to amateur radio.

...at no risk to himself.
```

2293. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 02:17:58 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.12.02.17.58.321715.29110@arrl.org>
Source record: 64430

On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 19:48:32 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>> It's one thing to disagree about things, it's another to belittle and
>> demean those with whom you disagree.

> Examples please of the administrations "belittling and demeaning".

Rumsfeld: [France and Germany are] "old Europe."

Perle: Sy Hersh [Pulitzer Prize winning reporter] is the closest thing
American journalism has to a terrorist.

DeLay: Fermez la bouche, Monsieur Daschle. [Okay, DeLay isn't part of the
Administration, but he's tight with them.]

Other examples can easily be found.

>> Why is it that countries
>> that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side of
>> the fence from us now?
>
> Follow the money. Every day now we learn more about the back door cozy
> financial relationships between Saddam's regime and some of our "close
> allies."

Examples?

Oh, and if it's all about following money, who's going to benefit
monetarily from those rebuilding-Iraq contracts that are being offered
only to selected US companies?

>> In significant part, it's because we've told them in so many words that
>> we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.
>
> Not that they have essentially said/done the same thing to us.

No, they've said they disagree with us. That's not the same thing.

Jon

2294. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 02:21:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304111821.5437c7fe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64431

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.11.22.47.14.716872.1240@arrl.org>...
> On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 17:23:13 -0400, Len Over 21 wrote:

> > Nasty old USA is "to blame" for all of those, isn't it?
>
> Eh? Of course not. Your point being what?

Jon, you need to say something relevant, and say it soon.

America is getting bored with sissified males that aren't willing to
pick up the sword, unless you're Amish, of course.

Are you Amish?

2295. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 02:23:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304111823.3a2983f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64432

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304110414.1674d136@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E961F0A.5A1CF86@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > Is all free speech patriotic?
> >
> > Having witnessed an interview with Scott Ridder on CNN this evening, I'd
> > have to say, "No".
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Well there you have it.

Yet Jon still doesn't have an answer.

2296. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 02:26:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304111826.6ece2315@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64433

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.11.21.07.19.63909.25509@arrl.org>...
> On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 16:24:59 -0400, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > news:pan.2003.04.07.04.14.38.840562.32723@arrl.org...
> >>
> >> When, exactly, was being a patriot a bad thing?
> >
> > From aproximately 1967 to 1973. About the time that the alleged 'flower
> > children' crawled out from under their rocks.
>
> That's your opinion. Others would say that those who protested the
> Vietnam war were patriotic.
>
> Jon

"Others" would be wrong. They could serve pennance by applying for
Vietnamese citizenship. Today is not too late, but 1973 would have
been better.

Brian

2297. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 02:29:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304111829.5d7eef00@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64434

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.11.16.28.58.178387.18686@arrl.org>...
> On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 11:53:12 -0400, Brian Kelly wrote:
> > The indisputable bottom line is that we saved hundreds of millions of
> > Western Europeans from living like the Poles, Hungarians and the Czechs
> > did for 45 or so years. Considerations of altruism or not aside who
> > benefitted most, the citizens of France and Italy for instance or us who
> > are at least 3,000 miles away from all of them? I think you agree with
> > me in this respect.
>
> I do, but I don't look down on those we helped just because we helped
> them, or because they haven't prostrated themselves at our feet in
> gratitude.

Sounds like a Morse argument to me. Why do you look down on no-coders
who haven't prostrated themselves?

Aw, forgettit.

2298. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 02:32:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304111832.42b49eee@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64435

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b777vqrnb1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> The reality of the VN war is that is has NOT ended for those that actually
> were involved.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Dan, would you mind explaining that?

Perhaps we can get Kelly to check in and give us a status report or a "SITREP."

Thanks, Brian

2299. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 02:40:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304111840.6d7ab5ee@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64436

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b779oo$v29$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> I read it, and I agree with him. Most 'hams' today are not only freeloaders
> on the work and sweat of those before, they have no concept at all that this
> is not a hobby. Its a service.
>
> We exist because of our demonstrated capabilities in providing emergency
> communications. For little to NO COST to the public.
>
> Thats why were here. Not to chat on 20 about uncle arthur paying you a
> visit last night.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Dan, you're full of bovine excrement. I'll open my ARS anyday to
anyone who is working emergency comms, just as I've opened my home and
cupboards to the evacuees of the Pinatuba eruption exiting the PI.

Who's Uncle Arthur, anyway? Sounds like that idiot Bruce. You still
hanging with him?

2300. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 02:44:22 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hd7cg42.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 64437

On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 01:44:11 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:

>Don't forget that Egypt receives a similar sum and most folks there
>don't even like us.

If you've done business in the Middle East you know what the
term "baksheesh" means.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2301. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 02:52:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304111852.74235840@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64438

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E96C2E0.CA11EF28@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E95D3BD.C17A360E@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E94E690.28EA89A3@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9243A1.F66483EF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > > > It was just a brief stop for a 2m mag mount antenna. My cheapy Pro-Am
> > > > > > 1/4 wave had some mashed coaxial cable. The coax had a silly molded
> > > > > > fitting at the antenna end which precluded repair. I selected a Hustler
> > > > > > 5/8 wave antenna and went on my way. There are lots of repeaters
> > > > > > between Columbus and Cincinnati but I made only four QSOs during the
> > > > > > drive. The longest and most pleasant was with a YL on the Cambridge
> > > > > > machine. I don't know where the abundance of Technician Class ops are
> > > > > > spending their time but it doesn't appear to be on 2m FM.
> > > > >
> > > > > We're going to lose some frequencies if the only thing going on are
> > > > > the repeaters automatically IDing every hour. Perhaps Len is right.
> > > > > Pretty soon amateur radio will be only about HF.
> > > >
> > > > But where are all of those new Technicians if not on 2m FM?
> > >
> > > They're on the web. Where are you?
> >
> > No amateur radio license is needed for internet access. I'm on 2m. I'm
> > on the internet. I'm on 160m through 70cm.

Ahem, this isn't ham radio. You may not realize it, but you're on the
web, too.

> > They're
> > > certainly not on 2m SSB or CW. Len wouldn't know those things. He
> > > isn't even a ham.
> > >

> > He's on the web, just like yew.
>
> That has nothing to do with amateur radio.

So you have nothing to do with amatuer radio as well? I haven't
logged you since 1991.

> > > > ARES on 147.06 in Lancaster had a nice net last night. Lots of public
> > > > service events coming up.
> > > >
> > > > > > We just might get through this thing if you're ready to open up a
> > > > > > little.
> > > > >
> > > > > I'm not really in the mood to "open up" on morse proficiency if opening
> > > > > up means I need to declare that someone whose maximum morse speed is
> > > > > five words per minute is proficient in the use of morse. That'd be
> > > > > dishonest.
> >
> > > > Dave, I wouldn't want you to be dishonest. Here's what I can do for
> > > > you. I recall that you stated that "20wpm is more proficient than
> > > > 13wpm." I'll tabulate all the wpm rates between 13 and 20wpm and you
> > > > can select the lowest one at which proficiency is achieved. We won't
> > > > even bother with 5wpm.
> > >
> > > I've also stated that 25 wpm is more proficient than 20, 30 wpm is more
> > > proficient than 25, 35 wpm is more proficient than 30 and 40 wpm is more
> > > proficient than 35.
> >
> > Really? I don't remember. When did you state that?
>
> Look it up.

Dave, that was a polite way of saying that you're lying.

> > > > OK. Here goes:
> > > >
> > > > 14wpm
> > > > 15wpm
> > > > 16wpm
> > > > 17wpm
> > > > 18wpm
> > > > 19wpm
> > > >
> > > > OK, which one is where proficiency begins?
> > >
> > > To further add to your confusion, I've stated that I believe morse
> > > proficiency begins at a point somewhat higher than 10 wpm. You'll need
> > > to begin typing numbers from 11 through 40. The answer will be in there
> > > somewhere.
> >
> > Welp, I don't think so. You said that "20wpm is more proficient than

> > 13wpm." And above, you -claim- to have stated that "40 is more
> > proficient than 35 which ismore proficient than 30 which is more
> > proficient than 25 which is more proficient than 20."
> >
> > Why do you want me to restart the list at 11?
>
> You really have to take some steps to deal with that reading
> comprehension problem of yours. Since I've stated that I believe that
> morse proficiency is somewhat higher than ten words per minute, any list
> would have to begin with a number higher than ten. The number "11"
> qualifies.
>
> > Do you think proficiency begins at 11wpm?
>
> No.
>
> > If so, why do you think it?
>
> I don't "think it".
>
> Dave K8MN

I'm convinced that you "don't think," and don't know what proficiency
is.

I'll amend the list to start at 11wpm. Here goes. Try real hard to
decide which is the lowest level of proficiency. Does Morse
proviciency begin at:

11wpm
12wpm
13wpm
14wpm
15wpm
16wpm
17wpm
18wpm
19wpm
20wpm
21wpm
22wpm
23wpm
24wpm
25wpm
26wpm
27wpm
28wpm
29wpm
30wpm
31wpm
32wpm

33wpm
34wpm
35wpm
36wpm
37wpm
38wpm
39wpm
40wpm?

Best of luck, Brian

2302. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 02:55:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304111855.1d764c53@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64439

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.11.10.01.41.941075.31793@arrl.org>...
> On Thu, 10 Apr 2003 09:50:06 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> >> The KKK, witch burnings, religious wars, and of course the Spanish Inquisition.
> >
> >
> > Wow, Jim! Caught me by surprise with that one. I wasn't expecting the
> > Spanish Inquisition......
>
> How about those nice red uniforms?
>
> Jon

A Catholic hater, no doubt.

2303. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 02:59:07 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.12.02.59.07.633633.29110@arrl.org>
Source record: 64440

On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 19:48:33 -0400, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <pan.2003.04.11.22.47.14.716872.1240@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>
>>Gosh, really, Professor Len? Just who, in your fevered imagination, do
>>you think believes that war isn't brutal?
>
> Those who've never served in any military.

Really? Then why were there people without a military backgound (as well
as people with one) protesting the war precisely on the grounds that war
is brutal?

There also are a lot of people around the world who have plenty of
experience with the brutality of war but who were not in the military. The
term in vogue these days for such people is "collateral damage."

Note, too, that only a small percentage of those serving in the military
have had direct experience of war. Thankfully, may I add.

> Those who want to put their heads in the sand and deny any of the
> terrible stuff that happens.

Name them.

>>> Sometimes war is necessary.
>>
>>Yes, particularly in defense against aggression. Of course, which side
>>is the aggressor and which the defender tends to be determined by the
>>victor.
>
> Does certain events come to mind on mentioning certain place names
> like Lublin, Bergen-Belsen, Auschwitz?

Your point being?

>>>>> Fortunately the people who make the
>>>>> decisions are pacifist enough not to have used them since 1945.
>>>>
>>>>Pacifist enough, or not desperate enough?
>>>
>>> Not suicidal. Research the acronym "MAD" and find out if it
>>> worked.
>>
>>Was MAD a deterrent to the use of CW or BW? Didn't seem to be in
>>Iran/Iraq.

>
> "Mutually-Assured Destruction" involves two powers EACH possessing
> annhilation weapons. That policy did not involve Iraq.

Exactly. There have been wars between a power with WMD and a power without (e.g., US/Vietnam, USSR/Afghanistan) yet WMD were not used. Clearly, MAD was not the deterrent in these cases. Something else must have been. What do you think it was?

> Would you rather have waited a long time to FIND OUT, Jon?

Nope.

> Would it please you if, in the future, Iraq got to the point of USING
> chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons capable of killing MILLIONS?
> I'm sure you would.

Len, are you really claiming that I would be pleased if Iraq used WMD? Do you know how utterly asinine that is?

> You are safe up in the outskirts
> of Boston...nobody would DARE go in there and do anything...

Your knowledge of US geography is no better than your knowledge of Iraq's!

>>> Try 1988 and the southeastern part of Iraq for "pacifism" in
>>> action.
>>
>>Don't you mean northeastern Iraq, Prof? Anyway, I take it that in 1988
>>you were arguing that we should be attacking Iraq, right? Or were you a
>>"pacifist" with regard to that conflict at the time?
>
> No, Jon.

Well then, there is more than one possible reason for the inaction against Iraq in 1988, isn't there? In fact, it wasn't pacifism that caused world inaction, it was apathy.

> [try to avoid the antagonistic "moral superior" phrasing]

Should I have told you to go research it? Or is that "antagonistic 'moral superior'" phrasing reserved to you?

> I was forming an opinion on the Middle East at the time, getting to
> travel to Fort Irwin on business involving military electronics.
> That's a large desert warfare training center. You may heard mention
> of it in Tom Clancy novels.

I don't recall having heard of Fort Irwin. All my military electronics business was conducted in the eastern US (Aberdeen Proving Ground, Fort Benning, Naval Research Lab) and in field locations (Aleutians, Diego Garcia). But I don't think any of that either validates or invalidates my point of view on Iraq.

> Jon, I'd already served my country in the military 1952 to 1960.

How is that relevant? Does military service automatically make all of your opinions correct?

> I don't really need some League person telling me where my patriotism
> "should be." In ANYTHING.

Has some League person been telling you that?

Do you feel free to tell others where their patriotism "should be"?

>>> Nasty old USA is "to blame" for all of those, isn't it?
>>
>>Eh? Of course not. Your point being what?
>
> I don't know what in hell YOUR point is...but I admit some curiosity.

What I'm curious about is whether you know what YOUR point is. I have my doubts.

> Are you here after an absence to stir up "action?"

Just passing the time of day, Len. How about you?

> Are you and your League cronies all "moral superiors" in anything you
> mention.
>
> Sure sounds like it...

Oh, my! "Moral superiors"? Who is the one in this conversation who's claiming moral superiority on the basis of military service and defense work? Not me.

>>Still obsessing over Morse, Len? Some day you really must get a life!
>
> I have a nice life, Jon. I've never used any morse, nor had to use
> any morse in all the 50 years since I first fired up a transmitter on
> HF while serving the US Army in Japan...nor any time thereafter on
> legally transmitting everywhere in the EM spectrum from VLF to about
> 22 GHz.
>
> You seem to imply that having an amateur radio license makes you some
> kind of "moral superior" on things NOT about amateur radio.

I don't imply it, you infer it based on your prejudices against amateurs and the League. I'm not responsible for your prejudices.

> Please explain how demonstrated skill in morsemanship makes one an
> "expert" or "moral superior" on geopolitics.

That's just silly. Your obsession is showing agin.

Jon

2304. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 03:27:45 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.12.03.27.44.838690.29110@arrl.org>
Source record: 64441

On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 20:37:53 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>
> The Amherst story is somewhat in doubt. There's no clear evidence it was
> actually done. The risks to Amherst's people make it doubtful.
>
> Still, the idea was proposed. The letter that is quoted makes it clear
> that Lord Jeff wanted to wipe out the Indians, and thought smallpox
> might do the job.

Bouquet made the suggestion, Amherst approved it and Bouquet acknowledged the approval and said it would be acted upon. If it wasn't actually carried thrugh -- I agree the record is inconclusive -- it wasn't for lack of intent.

>>Vastly better for the residents of Baghdad.
>
> And for those who have to clean up the mess. Remember the book
> "Slaughterhouse Five"? Kurt Vonnegut was there, at Dresden. POW.

Yes, but it has been years since I read it. Time for a re-read.

>>SH, yes. In the case of the mujahadeen, it's not so clear.
>
> It's clear to me.
>
>>They, at least,
>>were acting in legitimate self defense.
>
> And we turned a blind eye to atrocities they committed. Do you think
> captured Soviets were treated as POWs under the Geneva convention?

No, but that doesn't mean the Afghans' willingness to engage in warfare was illegitimate, does it? How they behaved during the war (and the Soviets weren't much better, by the way) is a separate issue.

>>The error in Afghanistan came
>>after the Soviets left when we abandoned the progressive elements of
>>Afghan society, allowing the warloads and eventually the Taliban to take
>>control and set the country back hundreds of years.
>
> This was during whose administration?

Both G. H. W. Bush and Clinton. The Taliban came to power in 1996, in large part because Pakistan (with the acquiescence of the US) wanted stability in Afghanistan rather than the chotic rule of local warloads and the attendant continual civil warfare.

By the way, a significant factor in US thinking was that they were looking for alternate oil and gas pipeline routes out of the Gulf.

> Not enough pacifists. "Blessed are the peacemakers"....

Peacemakers are not necessarily pacifists. Pacifists eschew war altogether. Peacemakers attempt to avoid or end war by creating the conditions for peace. Paradoxically, that sometimes means engaging in war in order to create the conditions for peace.

> Nation-building or not, it is my understanding that what really ticked
> off OBL & Co. was the presence of "infidel Crusader/Zionist" troops in
> the holy land of Arabia.

Yep. The thing is, he didn't return to Afghanistan until after the Taliban took control, in 1996. This was after he was expelled from Sudan. Suppose Afghanistan had been built up, starting in 1989, using the progressive elements that existed there to build a modern state (or what passes for one in that part of the world). It would probably not have been possible for OBL to return to Afghanistan from Sudan. Or if he did, he wouldn't have been able to set up the organization that he did. 9/11 might never have happened.

> Didja know he and some of his mujahadeen buddies showed up in SA in 1990
> and wanted to free Kuwait themselves? Said it was an Arab problem, and
> Arabs should solve it without help from unbelievers. He was politely
> turned away. They shoulda let him have a crack at the Iraqis....

Talk about your no-lose situation!

>>What IS hopeful is that the Administration is saying it's committed to
>>rebuilding Iraq. I hope that's true, because if we don't it will turn
>>into Afghanistan squared. But when it comes to this Administration, I'm
>>from Missouri.
>
> There's a good article on slate.com about that entire issue.

I'll check it out, thanks.

Jon

2305. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 03:45:52 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.12.03.45.52.158672.11732@arrl.org>
Source record: 64442

On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:29:56 -0400, Brian wrote:
>
> Sounds like a Morse argument to me. Why do you look down on no-coders
> who haven't prostrated themselves?

I don't.

> Aw, forgettit.

Works for me.

Jon

2306. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 03:56:56 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.12.03.56.55.900202.11732@arrl.org>
Source record: 64443

On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:26:05 -0400, Brian wrote:
> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
>> That's your opinion. Others would say that those who protested the
>> Vietnam war were patriotic.
>
> "Others" would be wrong. They could serve pennance by applying for
> Vietnamese citizenship. Today is not too late, but 1973 would have been
> better.

Feel free to go to Vietnam and pick up the battle where it left off in
1975. The same folks are still in control and I'm sure they'd be willing
to fight you. Hey, if it was right then, it's right now.

Jon

2307. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 03:57:53 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.12.03.57.51.355734.11732@arrl.org>
Source record: 64444

On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:23:22 -0400, Brian wrote:

> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304110414.1674d136@posting.google.com>...
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E961F0A.5A1CF86@earthlink.net>...
>> > Brian wrote:
>> >
>> > > Is all free speech patriotic?
>> >
>> > Having witnessed an interview with Scott Ridder on CNN this evening, I'd
>> > have to say, "No".
>> >
>> > Dave K8MN
>>
>> Well there you have it.
>
> Yet Jon still doesn't have an answer.

First ask an intelligent question.

Jon

2308. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 03:59:26 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.12.03.59.25.466012.11732@arrl.org>
Source record: 64445

On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:55:08 -0400, Brian wrote:
> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.11.10.01.41.941075.31793@arrl.org>...
>> On Thu, 10 Apr 2003 09:50:06 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
>> > N2EY wrote:
>> >
>> >> The KKK, witch burnings, religious wars, and of course the Spanish Inquisition.
>> >
>> >
>> > Wow, Jim! Caught me by surprise with that one. I wasn't expecting the
>> > Spanish Inquisition......
>>
>> How about those nice red uniforms?
>>
>> Jon
>
> A Catholic hater, no doubt.

Isn't following me around the NG making silly remarks beneath you? Oh,
never mind. Silly question.

Jon

2309. ARNewsline 1339 - April 11 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 04:00:15 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412000015.16068.00000974@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 64446

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1339 - April 11, 2003

The following is a closed circuit report. Here is Amateur Radio Newsline's support fund administrator, Andy Jarema, N6TCQ.

--

For the month of February we heard from: Monthly contributors Joseph Bartzi, Jr., KC8DKF of Wadsworth, OH, and Scott Hensley of the Area Communications Team, of San Jose, CA. Total contributions were $25, with NO clubs heard from. On the other hand, our expenses were $661.

That doesn't work! We need your help to keep these newscasts on the air!

I'll make you a deal: you send whatever you can, and I will take the next few weeks to catch up on who's been helping us stay on the air over the past year.

A reminder that Am,ateur Radio Newsline™ is a federal, 501 (c)(3) non-profit corporation. All contributions are tax-deductible.

The address for the Newsline Support fund is PO Box 660937, Arcadia, CA 91066. If you missed it, it will be given again at the end of this week's newscast. I'm Andy Jarema, N6TCQ.

--

Thanks Andy. That ends the closed circuit with Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1339 with a release date of Friday, April 11 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Australia says its time to restructure that nations Amateur Radio Service and ham radio in Iraq. These stories and more on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1339 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESTRUCTURING: AUSTRALIA SAYS TWO LICENSES WILL DO

The Wireless Institute of Australia says that its time to restructure ham radio down-under and that two licenses will do. David Jones, VK4OF, reports from last weekends W-I-A Annual General Meting in the city of Adelaide:

--
Audio report only. Hear it at http://www.arnewsline.org
--

Jones' report quotes a press release from Wireless Institute of Australia President Ernie Hocking, VK1LK. We will have more in future Amateur Radio Newsline reports. (Q-News)

**

AMERICA AT WAR: BAGDHAD RADIO CLUB STATION CLOSED FOR DURATION OF WAR

Ham radio will hopefully re-emerge in Iraq after the war has ended. In the meantime, the Daily DX and the ARRL Letter relay information from Diya Sayah, YI1DZ. This, on the plight of one of that nations best known Amateur Radio operations.

YI1DZ, is one of the primary operators at the Baghdad Radio Club YI1BGD station in Baghdad. He reported that just prior to the outbreak of hostilities in Iraq that he had dismantled the station. Also, that all of the equipment is stored in as safe a place as possible.

Daily D-X Editor Bernie McClenny, W3UR, says that he doubts there will be any activity in the near future from YI1BGD or any other Iraqui Amateur Radio station. The YI1BGD club station went on the air in the 1970s and the Iraqi Association for Radio Amateurs remains an International Amateur Radio Union member-society. (ARRL, Daily DX)

**

IN THE PUBLIC LIGHT: AMATEUR RADIO AT NAB-2003

I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, in Las Vegas Nevada, where the National Association of Broadcasters Convention Amateur Radio Reception is just winding down. An estimated 700 hams involved in the broadcast profession spent the last 2 hours enjoying one anmothers company. They also heard a brief talk by ARRL Presodent Jim Haynie, W5JBP, who used the occasion to thank thee Las Vegas Amateur Radio Club for an important monetary donation:

--

Haynie: "I want to thank the members for the $1000 donation to the (ARRL) Education and Technology Fund. We think it is particularly important in as much as the Big Project as we call it -- in slang terms -- is teaching kids about Amateur Radio who will hopefully be the next engineers at your radio station or something like that. This exposure to electronics is very important to Amateur Radio and very important for industry.

So with that, have a good time , and again my thanks to the Las Vegas Amateur Radio Club for your vey wonderful and generous donation."

--

Well over 100,000 broadcasters and those in allied businesses attended the 2003 National Association of Broadcasters convention. Among them where three friends who hads not seen one another in almost three decades. They are Dick Flanagan, W6OLD, Martin Geisler, WA6TIC and this writer. All of us were members of the Palisades Amateur Radio Club back in the 1970's. Ill be back with more about this radio club after a short airplane ride home.

Annd less we forget. The N-A-B Amateur Radio Reception was again co-sponsored by Kenwood Communications and CQ Magazine.

Reporting from a quiet alcove just outside the Las Vegas Convention Center on my way to McCarren airport, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, for the Amateur Radio Newsline. Don. (ARNewsline™)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the WD9AKO and K9BAR repeaters serving Bolngbrook Illinois.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RADIO LAW: HAM RADIO CC&R BILL REINTRODUCED IN CONGRESS

Another Congressional attempt is under way to provide relief to amateurs prevented by private deed covenants, conditions and restrictions from installing outdoor antennas. The ARRL Letter says that New York Representative Steve Israel has again introduced the "Amateur Radio Emergency Communications Consistency Act" into the current session of Congress. The measure, designated HR 1478, would require private land-use regulators such as homeowners' associations to reasonably accommodate Amateur Radio antennas consistent with the PRB-1 limited federal preemption. PRB-1 now applies only to states and municipalities. (ARRL)

**

RADIO LAW: CALIFORNIA PRB1-LIKE LAW TAKES A GIANT STEP

Some good news for hams living in the Golden State. ARRL Southwestern Division Director Art Goddard, W6XD, says that the California version of PRB-1 passed the Local Government Committee on a unanimous vote at its April 2nd meeting. Goddard says that the next step for A B 1228 is the full California State Assembly.

Representing ARRL at the Committee hearing were Dean Straw, N6BV and Pacific Director Bob Vallio, W6RGG. In his bulletin, Goddard took the time to thank Mike Mitchell, W6RW, Assembly member Bob Dutton and his staff as well. (ARRL SW Div. Newsletter)

**

SPECTRUM SHARING: SATELLITE-FED TRANSLATORS IN THE COMMERCIAL FM BAND

The FCC has assigned RM-10609 to a proposal by Calvary Chapel of Twin Falls and two smaller broadcasters. This, for authority to allow satellite-fed translators or Satellators in the "non-reserved" F M 92 to 108 MHz band. Amateur Radio's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, has more.

--
As we all know, 92 to 108 Mhz is the band that is currently used by commercial broadcasters, over-the-air-fed translators and most Low Powe F-M stations. Currently, what are called Satellators are restricted to the 88 to 92 MHz band and the translator must be owned by the primary station.

But Calvary Chapel of Twin Falls and the other petitioners want the FCC to allow satellite-fed translators in the non-reserved F M 92 to 108 MHz band. The petitioners claim this proposal will have little impact on existing stations in the spectrum. This is because there is currently a freeze on new terrestrial translators in that band.

The FCC has not indicated when it might act on the Calvary Chapel of Twin Falls rules change request.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

So far the only major objection has come from National Public Radio. N-P-R generally supports the Twin Falls petition, but proposes that coverage distance limitations be set for Satellator operations. More is on the web at http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/comsrch_v2.cgi (CGC Communicator)

**

HAM TESTING: FCC AND VEC'S TO MEET IN JULY

The 2003 National Conference of Volunteer Eximination Coordinators Conference in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania is set for July 25th. This is the annual get-together between the FCC and the Volunteer Examination Coordinators that maintain the question pools and handle all Amateur Radio testing.

Planners say that last years conference was a success and that they are looking for input for this year'a agenda. Please send any thoughts you have for this years conference to John Creel, WB3GXW. John's e-mail is WB3GXW@arrl.net (NCVEC)

**

RESCUE RADIO COMS: THE BOSTON MARATHON NEEDS YOU

If you are planning a trip to Massachusetts later this month and will have a hand held radio with you, the ARRL Letter says that the Boston Marathon can use you.

The 107th running of the event is slated for Patriots' Day, Monday, April 21st. Planners say that they still need more Amateur Radio volunteers to assist with communications for this year's event. If you want to donate your time, please contact Paul Topolski, WSEX by e-mail to w1sex@arrl.net or Steve Schwarm, W3EVE, at w3eve@arrl.net.

Once again, that's the Boston Marathon, on Monday April 21st and its looking for hams top help out. (ARRL)

**

ON THE AIRWAVES: THE LIBERAL RADIO NETWORK

Venture capitalists from Chicago are reportedly behind an effort to start a liberal leaning talk radio network. One that might offer an alternative to conservative talk show hosts heard across the airwaves these days.

The group will be called AnShell Media L.L.C.. Its backers are reportedly investing an initial $10 million. They are also hoping for assistance from like minded entrepreneurs.

With the intent to be on the air by this fall, the are talking with comedian and author Al Franken about working with the network. They also hope to attract other politically liberal entertainers and political guests as well. (ThePolicyPeport nerwsletter)

**

UPCOMING EVENTS: FIELD DAY - VCARS AT THE REAGAN LIBRARY

The Ventura County Amateur Radio Society will conduct it's Field Day 2003 operations on the grounds of the Ronald Reagan Persidential Library and Museum, in Simi Valley, California. According to Peter Heins, N6ZE, this will mark the third year of Field Day operations in conjunction with and co-sponsored by the Reagan facility. (N6ZE)

**

UPCOMING EVENTS: COMMEMORTING FRANK LLOYD WRIGHTS WESTCOTT HOUSE

The Westcott Wireless Preservation Association will be hosting special event station W8AGA on Saturday, May 3rd. The operation will taker place from Frank Lloyd Wright's Westcott house in Springfield, Ohio.

The Westcott Wireless Preservation Association serving the Westcott House Foundation by continuing radio operations at the Frank Lloyd Wright designed Westcott home. Wright designed Ohio's only prairie style house for Burton and Orpha Westcott in 1907. The house is now undergoing extensive restoration and will eventually be opened to the public as a house museum.

But in the here and now, the special event station is coming on the air. A special QSL card will be issued to any station with a confirmed QSO with W8AGA and who sends a QSL card and SASE to the Westcott Wireless Preservation Association. QSL information is on the web at

www.westcotthouse.org/w8aga (Press release)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: MILWAUKEE - A SUPER SUCCESS

On the convention and hamfest circuit, word that last weekends A-E-S Superfest in Milwaukee Wisconsin is being called a super success. A late season storm made for some fairly inclement weather but it did not dampen the spirit of the regions ham community that showed up in droves to see what was new and buy what was hot.

According to industry sources the weather may have played to the advantage of dealers by driving the crowds to the display floor. And while Friday was a bit slow, Saturday more than made up for it with lots of high tickeet items moving out. We are told that averaged out sales were pretty good on both days and nobody is complaining.

The Superfesrt is held every April and is sponsored by Amateur Electronic Supply. (ARNewsline™)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: RENO NEVADA IN MAY

And word that the Spring 2003 Reno Ham Swap will be held Saturday May 10th between 7:00 AM and 1:00 PM local time. The event is sponsored by the Reno Nevada Area Metro Simplex Amateur Radio Club. For Complete Details Visit the website at http://k7xc.tripod.com/hamswap/ (Via e-mail)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: BIG UK ARISS SUCCESS

Its one of the best ARISS contacts to date. This, as students at the Rushey Mead secondary school near Leicester England spent about 10 minutes talking with U-S Astronaut Ken Bowersox KD5JBP on board the International Space Station. It took place on Friday April 4th, and this is how it sounded:

--
contact audio
--

Rushey Mead is a U-K secondary school for 11 to 16 years olds. It also has an active amateur radio club. But for this special occasion, the GB2NSC station of the National Space Center was chosen for the space talk. John Heath, G7HIA operated the station. Here's more of the QSO.

--
contact audio
--

Students, teachers, parents, and the media were present as twelve youngsters asked questions about life in space of Ken Bowersox, KD5JBP.

More contact audio is at Howard Longs website. It is in cyberspace at http://users.skynet.be/fa059641/2003_04_01.htm (ARNewsline™ audio with courtesy of Howard Long, G6LVB.)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: PC SAT ECLIPSE POWER PROBLEMS

AMSAT says that PC Sat is still going strong, but is on ragged edge of power budget during maximum eclipses. This is according to Bob Bruinga, WB4APR, who reports that controllers have caught the satellite on several occasions doing a low power reset.

Bruninga adds that fortunately they have been able to restore the bird before the batteries went to negative power budget. WB4APR recommends that since there are as many as 50 users per day, it is best if everyone turns off any unattended user stations at night when PC Sat is in eclipse. (ANS)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: SECURITY PROBLEM WITH SENDMAIL - PSTCH AVAILABLE

According to its developer, the most widely used program for transferring e-mail between computer networks has a security flaw. One that could allow attackers to disrupt the flow of e-mail and intercept messages.

The program involved is called Sendmail. The security flaw does not directly affect your personal computers but it does put e-mail and information sent over the Internet at risk. Fixes for the vulnerability are available, free of charge, at Sendmail's Web site by applying a patch or upgrading to the latest version of Sendmail.

Atlanta-based Internet Security Systems Inc estimates that Sendmail handles as much as three-quarters of all Internet e-mail traffic. Sendmail Inc. which developed the program is located in Emeryville, California. (Published news reports)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: TUBE-TYPE PC'S

It seems that a venerable old friend simply refuses to die the death of technical obsolescence. The vacuum tube continues its reemergence into the audio marketplace, this time -- believe it or not -- in Personal Computerss.

The first tube motherboard appeared last year in response to PC gamers who craved the allegedly "more natural" sound produced by vacuum tube technology. Those who have seen the boasrds call it a strange sight to behold.

More on this May-December marriage of filament and silicon can be found at the website at http://www.neoseeker.com/Articles/Hardware/Reviews/aopenax4btube (CGC Communicator, Clayton Creekmore and neoseeker.com)

**

ON THE AIRWAVES: DIGITAL RADIO MONDIALE IS ON ITS WAY

After long years of gathering a consortium, prototyping and testing, Digital Radio Mondiale has announced that there will be an official launch at the World Radio Conference in Geneva, in June. Thiis according to a report in shortwave.com.

Digital Radio Mondiale, better known by its initials D-R-M is the world's only non-proprietary, digital broadcasting system for short-wave, medium-wave and long-wave with the ability to use existing frequencies and bandwidth across the globe. With near-FM quality sound, DRM hopes to revitalize the AM broadcasting bands below 30 Mhz in markets worldwide.

And right on the heels of the launch announcement came the granting of two highly significant standards for DRM. First, the International Electrotechnical Committee has given the Digital Radio Mondiale on-air system its highest stamp of approval as an International Standard. This was followed by the International Telecommunication Union granting permission for any broadcaster to use existing frequency assignments for DRM digital transmissions. This, provided that there is no interference with other stations. (ASWLC)

**

INTERNATIONAL -IRELAND" A WALKERS FESTIVAL

Over in Ireland, word that theTipperary Amateur Radio Group provided emergency communications support for up to 300 walkers expected to take part in the A-her-low Hillwalking Festival. The event was held the weekend of April 5th and 6th in Irland's Galty Mountainsl. (GB2RS)

**

DX

In DX, word that G3RWL, will be active as 8P6DR from Barbados through the 20th of April on 10 to 40 meters. He will also be on 80 and 6

meters if he can arrange the antennas. (GB2RS)

And VK3OT will be active as VK9XI from Christmas Island through April 21st. He will be concentrating on CW on the H-F bands and 6 metres. Priority will be given to High Frequency CW when 6 is closed. More info is on the web at http://members.datafast.net.au/electronics/path.htm

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: THE PARC FIELD DAY FILM LIVES AGAIN

And finally this week some very good news for ypou ham radio cinema fans. After having been among the missing for over two decaders, a famous ham radio movie has surfaced. And it will soon have its first official public screening since its restoration was completed. The guy who has the movie on his shelf -- our own Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has some background on this ham radio cinematic classic:

--
The film's real name is simply Field Day 1971. It is a tongue - in cheek look at the planning and execution of the ARRL Field Day operating event by what was then one of the most active radio clubs in the United States. My home radio club The famed Pallisades Amateur Rado Club of Culver City California. Home of "good-guy the gokld plated radio" repeater.

Field Day 1971 was produced and edited by George Hively, W6GRH, -- then WA6YEA -- as a club project over thirty years ago. Hively, who has spent his life in the motion picture business wrote the script, supervised the filming, edited it together and provided the music and the narriation. And notice we said filming. Field Day 1971 was produced long before the advent of home videotape. It was shot using Super 8 millimerter motion picture film and consumer cameras. The sound track was on a separate tape cassette. In fact, it still must be projected that way -- even today.

A preview screening of the restored movie took place a March 8th at the HandiHams winter camp in Malibu California. They loved it. As a result of that enthuiastic welcome, a public showing of Field Day 1971 to the California ham radio community has been tentatively scheduled for Wednesday evening May 14th. This, hosted by the Santa Clarita Amateur Radio Club that meets just North of Los Angeles.

And for those of you who are wondering where the movie has been hiding the past 20+ years, this might surprise you. It has been kept safe and well protected by a former PARC member -- Richard Burton, the ex-WB6JAC. Richard contacted us a few months ago asking if we would like to have the movie. We said yes, and with the assistance of Anita O'Delll, N2IHX, the movie was brought back to projectable condition.

Because there is only one projectable print of Field Day 1971 available it cannot be lent out. But W6GRH tells Amateur Radio Newsline that plans call for it to be transferred to video -- either VHS casssette or

possibly DVD. And the sound will always match the picture that way. We hope.

With Field Day `71 -- the movie -- sitting on my desk as I record this, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF.

--

Meantime, those wanting to attend this first public screening in two decades of this riotous movie, you should consult the Santa Clarita Valley Amateur Radio Club website for meeting details. Its on-line at www.w6jw.org. Scroll down and click on "Monthly Meetings" for more. (ARNewsline™)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's™ only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

Don't forget that the nominating period for the 2003 Amateur Radio Newsline™ Young Ham of the Year Award is now open. You will find all the rules and a fill-in-the blank nominating form in cyberspace at www.yhoty.org

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline™ is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

2310. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 04:00:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E978FB5.63A8C65B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64448

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 01:44:11 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >Don't forget that Egypt receives a similar sum and most folks there
> >don't even like us.
>
> If you've done business in the Middle East you know what the
> term "baksheesh" means.

In Africa, the term becomes "dash".

Dave K8MN

2311. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 04:01:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412000122.05767.00000246@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64447

>Subject: Re: Infidel no-coders
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/10/2003 7:13 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030410201338.20747.00000271@mb-cv.aol.com>

>Your ignorance leads you to believe that. Some no-coders know alot more than
>some Extras. Its better to be lean (without code) and mean than fat and
>sluggish.

You ned to read his post a bit more closely.

Can you say..."sarcasm"...?!?!

>Only an appliance operator would refer to 27MHz as a bad segment, which shows
>you bought into the cult and have a limited view of amateur radio (appliance
>operator group).

(1) 27 Mhz IS a "band segment". Not a segment of any Amateur allocation,
but it IS a segment. Or didn't your "comm prof" teach you that?

(2) How does MENTIONING any given part of the electromagmetic spectrum
identify one as an "appliance operator", Vipul?

Here....13.5MHz...There's a band segment...Now, can you tell if I have
only factory built stuff, or do I like to build stuff too?

>That's what the Church of CW would like you to believe. If all non-CW
>activity
>is a lie, would you like broadcast radios to have only CW broadcasts? Of
>course
>not.

But WHY not? Think of all the spectrum we'll save from all those wasted
sidebands!

>Its actually the CW "gangsters" that tries to recruit with Morse code and
>pressure amateurs to learn Morse code. Their recruitment of amateurs comes
>with
>the heavy recommendation (or pressure) of Morse code.

"CW gangsters"...?!?!?

BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
AHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! ! !

>They use deceptive media tactics, such as claiming accomplishments where
>there
>are none, using the best to represent the whole, claiming to participate in

>technical aspects (such as homebrewing), while really hating it, and other
>methods to spread their lies. The methods and lies told by the Morsers are
>what's "despicable"

What's TRULY "dispicable", Vipul, is that an allegedly educated person is
allowed to act out in public like you do!

Oh? Those dots, dashes and abbriviations were just noise that wee
pretended to fill the airwaves with until voice was invented?

Those dots, dashes and dashes CONTINUE to be noises that people just
aimlesly fill the airwaves from almost every country on the face of the
earth...?!?!?!

>>They should be hit
>>with shoes.
>
>No, free choice is the answer. Unfortunately, they may recruit through Morse,
>but drive away quality. Unfortunately, that does not look good to regulators.

Oh! But wait! YOU would force us to NEVER use code adn to NEVER learn it!
"Free choice" is OK while YOU ae getting what YOU want, Vippy?

>God is not in hell - the Devil is. Long-time Morsers tend to have more fat.
>Less physical activity does that, you know.

God is in all places at all times. How do you think he supervises EE
classes, Vippy?

>>I'm sorry I must have blacked out there for a minute. Did I say anything?
>
>You must have been possessed. Once you see the truth, you will be outraged.
>Lets just hope its not too late.

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAAHAHA ! ! ! !
! ! !

Steve, K4YZ

2312. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 04:07:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E979162.7A1E40AC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64450

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E96C2E0.CA11EF28@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E95D3BD.C17A360E@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E94E690.28EA89A3@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9243A1.F66483EF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > > > > > It was just a brief stop for a 2m mag mount antenna. My cheapy Pro-Am
> > > > > > > > 1/4 wave had some mashed coaxial cable. The coax had a silly molded
> > > > > > > > fitting at the antenna end which precluded repair. I selected a Hustler
> > > > > > > > 5/8 wave antenna and went on my way. There are lots of repeaters
> > > > > > > > between Columbus and Cincinnati but I made only four QSOs during the
> > > > > > > > drive. The longest and most pleasant was with a YL on the Cambridge
> > > > > > > > machine. I don't know where the abundance of Technician Class ops are
> > > > > > > > spending their time but it doesn't appear to be on 2m FM.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > We're going to lose some frequencies if the only thing going on are
> > > > > > > the repeaters automatically IDing every hour. Perhaps Len is right.
> > > > > > > Pretty soon amateur radio will be only about HF.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > But where are all of those new Technicians if not on 2m FM?
> > > > >
> > > > They're on the web. Where are you?
> > >
> > No amateur radio license is needed for internet access. I'm on 2m. I'm
> > on the internet. I'm on 160m through 70cm.
>
> Ahem, this isn't ham radio. You may not realize it, but you're on the
> web, too.
```

Re your reading comprehension problem: Read my sentence again,
especially the part reading, "I'm on the internet". Sheesh!

> > > They're
> > > > certainly not on 2m SSB or CW. Len wouldn't know those things. He
> > > > isn't even a ham.
> > > >
> > > He's on the web, just like yew.
> > >
> > That has nothing to do with amateur radio.
> >
> So you have nothing to do with amatuer radio as well? I haven't
> logged you since 1991.

I haven't logged W1AW in years but I know the station is on the air.
It is licensed. I'm licensed. You're licensed. Len isn't licensed.

> > > > > ARES on 147.06 in Lancaster had a nice net last night. Lots of public
> > > > > service events coming up.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > > We just might get through this thing if you're ready to open up a
> > > > > > > > little.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I'm not really in the mood to "open up" on morse proficiency if opening
> > > > > > > > up means I need to declare that someone whose maximum morse speed is
> > > > > > > > five words per minute is proficient in the use of morse. That'd be
> > > > > > > > dishonest.
> > > >
> > > > > > Dave, I wouldn't want you to be dishonest. Here's what I can do for
> > > > > > you. I recall that you stated that "20wpm is more proficient than
> > > > > > 13wpm." I'll tabulate all the wpm rates between 13 and 20wpm and you
> > > > > > can select the lowest one at which proficiency is achieved. We won't
> > > > > > even bother with 5wpm.
> > > > > >
> > > > > I've also stated that 25 wpm is more proficient than 20, 30 wpm is more
> > > > > proficient than 25, 35 wpm is more proficient than 30 and 40 wpm is more
> > > > > proficient than 35.
> > > >
> > > Really? I don't remember. When did you state that?
> > >
> > Look it up.
> >
> Dave, that was a polite way of saying that you're lying.

No, that was a polite way of saying, "Do I have to do everything for
you?"

> > > > > OK. Here goes:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > 14wpm
> > > > > > 15wpm
> > > > > > 16wpm
> > > > > > 17wpm

> > > > > 18wpm
> > > > > 19wpm
> > > > >
> > > > > OK, which one is where proficiency begins?
> > > > >
> > > > To further add to your confusion, I've stated that I believe morse
> > > > proficiency begins at a point somewhat higher than 10 wpm. You'll need
> > > > to begin typing numbers from 11 through 40. The answer will be in there
> > > > somewhere.
> > > >
> > > Welp, I don't think so. You said that "20wpm is more proficient than
> > > 13wpm." And above, you -claim- to have stated that "40 is more
> > > proficient than 35 which ismore proficient than 30 which is more
> > > proficient than 25 which is more proficient than 20."
> > >
> > > Why do you want me to restart the list at 11?
> >
> > You really have to take some steps to deal with that reading
> > comprehension problem of yours. Since I've stated that I believe that
> > morse proficiency is somewhat higher than ten words per minute, any list
> > would have to begin with a number higher than ten. The number "11"
> > qualifies.
> >
> > > Do you think proficiency begins at 11wpm?
> >
> > No.
> >
> > > If so, why do you think it?
> >
> > I don't "think it".

> I'm convinced that you "don't think," and don't know what proficiency
> is.

We can add those two to the growing list of things about which you've
been wrong.

> I'll amend the list to start at 11wpm. Here goes. Try real hard to
> decide which is the lowest level of proficiency. Does Morse
> proviciency begin at:
>
> 11wpm
> 12wpm
> 13wpm
> 14wpm
> 15wpm
> 16wpm
> 17wpm
> 18wpm
> 19wpm
> 20wpm

> 21wpm
> 22wpm
> 23wpm
> 24wpm
> 25wpm
> 26wpm
> 27wpm
> 28wpm
> 29wpm
> 30wpm
> 31wpm
> 32wpm
> 33wpm
> 34wpm
> 35wpm
> 36wpm
> 37wpm
> 38wpm
> 39wpm
> 40wpm?
>
> Best of luck, Brian

No luck needed, Brian. I believe that morse proficiency begins somewhat above the speed of ten words per minute.

Dave K8MN

2313. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 04:08:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412000817.05767.00000247@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64449

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/10/2003 6:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030410193657.20747.00000270@mb-cv.aol.com>

>After having 10 wpm, you lose your ability to do 5wpm. Therefore, 10 wpm is
>not
>more proficient than 5 wpm - they are two different skills.

How assinine.

Vippy, after you learned how to divide 468 by a frequency in MHz to find
the wavelength of a dipole on a calculator, did you forget how to do it on
paper? If so, I don't even want you around on Field Day or in ANY kind of
disaster situation...simulated or otherwise.

You never cease to amaze me with the narrowmindedness of your intellect.

73

Steve

2314. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 04:10:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412001017.05767.00000248@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64553

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/10/2003 8:33 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3E961BE1.AF6AFC06@earthlink.net>

>That'd be true if it actually happened. Someone who is proficient in
>morse at 35 wpm does not lose his ability to copy 5 wpm. Why don't you
>attempt to argue something about which you are knowledgeable?

Don't say THAT, Dave...that would leave the Nitwit Trio out in the cold
forever!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2315. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 04:12:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412001206.05767.00000249@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64551

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/10/2003 6:18 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030410191805.20747.00000269@mb-cv.aol.com>

>I try to be as clear as possible.

Try harder. MUCH harder.

73

Steve

2316. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 04:16:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412001646.12088.00000065@mb-cn.aol.com>
Source record: 64552

In article <pan.2003.04.12.02.59.07.633633.29110@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 19:48:33 -0400, Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <pan.2003.04.11.22.47.14.716872.1240@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
>> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>>
>>>Gosh, really, Professor Len? Just who, in your fevered imagination, do
>>>you think believes that war isn't brutal?
>>
>> Those who've never served in any military.
>
>Really? Then why were there people without a military backgound (as well
>as people with one) protesting the war precisely on the grounds that war
>is brutal?

Probably some SWINE members...Students Wildly Indignant
about Nearly Everything.

>There also are a lot of people around the world who have plenty of
>experience with the brutality of war but who were not in the military. The
>term in vogue these days for such people is "collateral damage."

We will all cry great sobbing tears of despair to help stop all
the warfare. There, that's done. Now...what next?

>Note, too, that only a small percentage of those serving in the military
>have had direct experience of war. Thankfully, may I add.
>
>> Those who want to put their heads in the sand and deny any of the
>> terrible stuff that happens.
>
>Name them.

League BoD. About modern US amateur radio, that is.

>>>> Sometimes war is necessary.
>>>
>>>Yes, particularly in defense against aggression. Of course, which side
>>>is the aggressor and which the defender tends to be determined by the
>>>victor.
>>
>> Does certain events come to mind on mentioning certain place names
>> like Lublin, Bergen-Belsen, Auschwitz?
>

>Your point being?

Which "side" was the aggressor in the Holocaust?

Do you need a PowerPoint Presentation and laser pointer to show
which side was "good" and which was "bad?"

>> "Mutually-Assured Destruction" involves two powers EACH possessing
>> annhilation weapons. That policy did not involve Iraq.
>
>Exactly. There have been wars between a power with WMD and a power without
>(e.g., US/Vietnam, USSR/Afghanistan) yet WMD were not used. Clearly, MAD
>was not the deterrent in these cases.

Jon, "MAD" wasn't really under discussion, just used as an analogy.

>Something else must have been. What
>do you think it was?

If I answer will you promise a prize? Are you Alex Trebek in drag?

>> Would you rather have waited a long time to FIND OUT, Jon?
>
>Nope.

Why not? You say "war is bad" then offer no solution to an
impending crisis clearly building and want to DO NOTHING.
Very peaceful.

>> Would it please you if, in the future, Iraq got to the point of USING
>> chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons capable of killing MILLIONS?
>> I'm sure you would.
>
>Len, are you really claiming that I would be pleased if Iraq used WMD? Do
>you know how utterly asinine that is?

Perhaps, but all we can see is your words.

You seem to WANT all those weapons of mass destruction NOW
to "prove" something.

>> You are safe up in the outskirts
>> of Boston...nobody would DARE go in there and do anything...
>
>Your knowledge of US geography is no better than your knowledge of Iraq's!

Whatever. Hartford, who cares. New England is several states
up in the northeastern tip of the USA. Not important to this
thread. Only important to the presumed aristocracy there.

>Well then, there is more than one possible reason for the inaction against
>Iraq in 1988, isn't there? In fact, it wasn't pacifism that caused world
>inaction, it was apathy.

Pacifism is a form of apathy.

>> [try to avoid the antagonistic "moral superior" phrasing]
>
>Should I have told you to go research it? Or is that "antagonistic 'moral
>superior'" phrasing reserved to you?

No. It is reserved for the League aristocracy.

>I don't recall having heard of Fort Irwin. All my military electronics
>business was conducted in the eastern US (Aberdeen Proving Ground, Fort
>Benning, Naval Research Lab) and in field locations (Aleutians, Diego
>Garcia). But I don't think any of that either validates or invalidates my
>point of view on Iraq.

Fort Irwin is the US Desert Warfare Training Center. That's where
the US armor and mechanized infantry trained to whip the Iraqis
in Desert Storm in '91 and again during Iraqi Freedom in 2003.
Training seems to have worked out. Want to fault it?

>> Jon, I'd already served my country in the military 1952 to 1960.
>
>How is that relevant? Does military service automatically make all of your
>opinions correct?

It lends one HELLUVA LOT OF RELEVANCE, Jon. It may not
be "correct" to your aristocratic outlook but it has relevance
after training to "close with, and destroy the enemy."

>> I don't really need some League person telling me where my patriotism
>> "should be." In ANYTHING.
>
>Has some League person been telling you that?

Several. For years. All of them were morse tested.

>Do you feel free to tell others where their patriotism "should be"?

I'm expressing an opinion.

If you don't like that opinion, go suck an egg. It's a free country
Jon. Remember those old civics lessons? Absolutely NOTHING
in the Constitution says I have to enjoy your opinions or tip my
to them or salute or whatever and shut up.

>>>> Nasty old USA is "to blame" for all of those, isn't it?
>>>
>>>Eh? Of course not. Your point being what?
>>
>> I don't know what in hell YOUR point is...but I admit some curiosity.
>
>What I'm curious about is whether you know what YOUR point is. I have my
>doubts.

Poor baby. You don't understand, really. Sometimes war is the
only solution out of a mess created by another.

Sooner or later some country was going to have to be the premptive
country in shutting down some regime or whatever threatening
others. In this new history, the USA and UK were partners in being
that first country.

I'm supporting that action. You don't like that. TS.

>> Are you here after an absence to stir up "action?"
>
>Just passing the time of day, Len. How about you?

You are mumbling about being a moral superior in realpolitik.
I don't think you are.

You might try to get back close to what the newsgroup was
created for in the first place. Amateur radio policy.

>> Are you and your League cronies all "moral superiors" in anything you
>> mention.
>>
>> Sure sounds like it...
>
>Oh, my! "Moral superiors"? Who is the one in this conversation who's
>claiming moral superiority on the basis of military service and defense
>work? Not me.

Yes, you've become a "moral superior" on geopolitics and
fighting for peace. You seem to dislike several politicians
who've made decisions...yet you don't seem to have the
qualifications to sit in judgement of them...other than that
wonderful "moral superiority."

Your "solutions" are to do nothing. Null solution.

>> You seem to imply that having an amateur radio license makes you some
>> kind of "moral superior" on things NOT about amateur radio.
>
>I don't imply it, you infer it based on your prejudices against amateurs
>and the League. I'm not responsible for your prejudices.

I'm not responsible for your aristocratic attitude, Jon.

[the cake was wonderful but some buttered rye bread would be nice]

I'm NOT "prejudiced" against "all radio amateurs." Just those too
full of themselves who think morse code is still king.

"The League" still can't get its act together on the morse code test
issue. They remain null, no opinion. No guts to take a stand on
the issue. Real "leadership" qualities there. <applause of one hand>

>> Please explain how demonstrated skill in morsemanship makes one an
>> "expert" or "moral superior" on geopolitics.
>
>That's just silly. Your obsession is showing agin.

"Agin?" Bad dialect.

War is bad, no-code is terrible evil filthy. Fight for peace.

There, I mumbled some phrases of familiar themes. Happy?

Now, what have you done to fulfill 97.1.(e)?

2317. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 04:23:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412002353.05767.00000250@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64554

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/11/2003 11:16 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030412001646.12088.00000065@mb-cn.aol.com>

>>Really? Then why were there people without a military backgound (as well
>>as people with one) protesting the war precisely on the grounds that war
>>is brutal?
>
> Probably some SWINE members...Students Wildly Indignant
> about Nearly Everything.

I like that one, Len...Gotta store it for future use.

>We will all cry great sobbing tears of despair to help stop all
> the warfare. There, that's done. Now...what next?

I've noticed with some humility that the fighting in Iraq HAS stopped as a
result of people laying in the street....

...and nearly all of them dressed in the uniform of the Army of Iraq and
with some various caliber holes of United States munitions in them.

>>Something else must have been. What
>>do you think it was?
>
> If I answer will you promise a prize? Are you Alex Trebek in drag?

Only if you remember to phrase your response in the form of a question...

Steve

2318. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 05:07:11 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hd7f583.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 64555

On 11 Apr 2003 09:54:13 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>> > Did you say four BILLION?! While we have homeless
>> > right here who freeze to death each winter for
>> > lack of shelter!
>>
>> That doesn't include the money sent by organizations, supporters, and
>> religious groups in this country.

This of course is PRIVATE money, not taxpayer money.
>
>Specifically the lobbying and threats of witheld minority bloc votes .
>.. Ain't democracy a bunch of fun?

Whatever works for survival.....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2319. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 05:07:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hd7jno4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 64556

On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 15:02:19 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:

> Well, I've heard others say that, but didn't know for sure. Anyway, I
>guess that answers part of my question above. So, why is that the case,
>Phil? The concept of equal rights for all and separation of church/state are
>fundamental to the American way of thinking. As such, the exclusion of
>others, based on religion or anything else, just doesn't feel right to me.

Firstly, there is no "separation of church and state" in the country although many - maybe even a majority - chafe at the power (mostly political) that the minority fundamentalist/Orthodox establishment wields as the swing vote in the constant coalition political system - Israel is the only significant country to still have a system of proportional representation by party in the legislature, and it's only been two years since the Prime Minister was elected by direct vote rather than by appointment within the party receiving the most votes.

When I lived there, I found that the concept of "separation" was foreign to even those who were dissatisfied with the religious control and felt that it was yet another thing that America was trying to foist upon them. It was literally a foreign concept.

We here regard "Jewish" as a religion. The Nazis regarded "Jewish" as a race. The truth lies somewhere between - it's a culture, an ethnicity. On the Israeli identity cards, that shows up as "nationality". We have friends who hold both US and Swedish passports (by birth) and who travel freely between the countries. They regard themselves not as Americans or Swedes but as "Jewish". This is very European - one can immigrate to most any European country, speak (or mis-speak) the language like a native, even become a citizen and be fully acclimated and integrated (to some extent) into the society, but yet they are not "French" or "Danish" or "Portugese" as the "people" there see it.

We here in the 'States have the concept of the Melting Pot, but as my erstwhile teacher the late Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall once said about the American Negroes (he used that term to his dying day) "we either didn't get into the pot or we didn't get melted down".

> I believe you once said you hold dual citizenship.

I had to relinquish my claim to Israeli citizenship when I returned to the 'States to work for the FCC. I can get it back only if I immigrate to Israel (again).

> If so, how do you
>reconcile the two political systems? They seem totally at odds with each
>other. Do you believe in the equal rights for all and separation of
>church/state like we have here or do you believe in the exclusion of others
>from full participation within a religious state? I truly hope this country
>is never controlled by any religion, though some religions are almost
>certainly seeking exactly that.

It has never neen a simple thing for me to resolve. Part of it is that I adhere to a denomination within Judaism which is considered unacceptable by the Orthodox (and vice versa, may I add), so I do believe in "freedom of worship separate from state control". However, I also believe that if I'm going to live in a country that is set up along ethnic lines that that is the system I can work is as long as the "ethnic" is mine.

Within that "ethnic" I strongly believe in equality. If I want a multi-ethnic culture, the "States is the place and that's one reason why I'm still here.

Interesting side light - when I was about to leave Israel to come to the 'States and work for the FCC, Motorola waved a lot of cash in front of me to come to Tehran and run their frequency management office (they were the communications management contractor to the Shah's government). That wasn't my "ethnic" and anyhow my then-wife missed all the conforts of the 'States.

>> (snip) In the Oslo Accords (1992), Israel agreed to
>> give 92% of the area to the Arabs for a separate
>> state upon lasting peace guarantees, which were not
>> forthcoming, so the territory remains in dispute.

> So, what is it going to take to end the dispute? I'm just as
> uncomfortable with the images of Israeli tanks shooting up Arab
> neighborhoods as I am with the Arab car bombings and so forth. Is
> there some sane way to end this madness or do we just accept an
> endless cycle of violence?

First of all, both Arafat and Sharon have got to go. It's a very personal thing between them for many years, just as the business between Bush and Sadaam became personal.

Then, reasonable leaders will have to sit doen and revive Oslo. It can work. How it will work I leave up to my nephew who is an Israeli diplomat (and holds both a US and Israeli amateur call sign, may I add).

Who said that life has to be simple?

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2320. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 06:30:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E97B261.EC41EACD@att.net>
Source record: 64557

Jon Bloom wrote:

> On Thu, 10 Apr 2003 23:04:05 -0400, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > I won't presume to speak for Dick, but I, for one, will spend the rest
> > of my life "disagreeing" with vicious despots who impose brutal regimes
> > of torture, rape, starvation, extortion, and death upon their innocent
> > citizens.
>
> If you've been reading the thread you should realize that's not germane.
> The topic is whether we should care at all what NON-despotic governments
> and their peoples think.

Actually you agree with, or at least are immobilized by, those who
vigorously oppose acting against said despots and strongly oppose those
who finally have decided to act to end the despots brutal grip and the
threat to us. These attitudes and actions at taken
not for any altrusitic reason but instead from the position of primary
concern for their own fianancial advantage. How does that make any
of you much better than the despots?

"The friend of my enemy is my enemy". There's little difference in being their
friends
and in looking the other way. And by according their opinions the same weight
as those opposed to the despots, you condone same. All in the name of
"go along, get along" It's an attitude sure to eventually bring us down should
it become predominant.
The old ways won't do in the age of fast transportation, easy border crossing
and easily portable WMD. Couple that with a religion which we are "bound" to
tolerate when one of its main goals is the subjugation or destruction of all
others, and you have the recipe for disaster.

I know, I know- France, Germany and Russia say they just want to give
diplomacy more time. Time we may well not have. Isn't twelve years, eight of
them Clinton era years,
enough? Saddam has stonewalled for so long he truly beleived that he could
carry on with it indefinitely....and would have, by your leave. Meanwhile arming

terrorists worldwide with who-knows-what to use on US in the US.

Fortunately we now have a President with something besides his sex life and
his
alleged "legacy" on his mind, one who *doesn't* duck for cover at every
political noise.

When a former Clinton primary adviser states on TV that he thanks the good Lord

every day that we have Bush instead of Gore in the White House, it may mean nothing to you but you're a small minority.

And yes- Syria may well be the next focus. It looks more and more like they hav
e
supplied and supported Saddams regime throughout, and nave helped store and hide the WMD. Also are givign haven to Saddam's terrorists, those who manage to escape their countrymen's wrath. If it proves out that Syria is where some of Saddam's WMD have been taken, what choice do we really have except to go destroy them, even if it does require attacking then Syrian regime? It is only marginally less despotic than Saddam's, and is definitely a supporter and hotbed

of terrorists who operate abroad..

2321. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 06:56:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412025633.05622.00000316@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64558

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 4/12/2003 12:07 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.hd7jno4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>

>First of all, both Arafat and Sharon have got to go. It's a
> very personal thing between them for many years, just as the
> business between Bush and Sadaam became personal.

Does anyone over there remember who started what, why, and who did what to whom in order to create the absolute enviroment of mayhem that exists today?

The Israelis insist it's the Palestinians fault, and the Palestinians vice versa. I sympathize with Israel's right to exist, but at the same time I don't see Palestinian tanks mowing over Israeli homes and building "settlements" where only weeks ago Palestinians already lived.

I say we disarm them both, cross breed them for two generations, then dare them to kill thier own blood.

Steve

2322. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 08:46:02 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304120046.628c985@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64559

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.11.16.28.58.178387.18686@arrl.org>...
> On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 11:53:12 -0400, Brian Kelly wrote:
> > The indisputable bottom line is that we saved hundreds of millions of
> > Western Europeans from living like the Poles, Hungarians and the Czechs
> > did for 45 or so years. Considerations of altruism or not aside who
> > benefitted most, the citizens of France and Italy for instance or us who
> > are at least 3,000 miles away from all of them? I think you agree with
> > me in this respect.
>
> I do, but I don't look down on those we helped just because we helped
> them, or because they haven't prostrated themselves at our feet in
> gratitude.

I don't expect any groveling by the Euros sixty or so years later, the
only reason I got into the subject of the Marshall Plan is because
it's a prime example of our well-established national inclinations,
e.g., there is no reason to expect that Iraq won't be another
beneficiary of our historic post war largess.

> >> For one thing, there are others who CAN help now. In 1948, who besides
> >> the US was in a position to supply significant financial help?
> >
> > Nobody. Which is my point.
>
> But others are in a position to supply help in this case. You asked for
> evidence that history won't repeat itself.

Ya made a wrong turn. I asked Dwight if he had any evidence which
indicated that we would treat Iraq any differently than we treated, as
examples, our former enemies the Germans and the Italians almost
immediately after WW2. But he ducked the bullet and responded "The
question now is what will happen next. Will we insert a government
that is truly concerned with the interests of the Iraqi people or will
it be a government more concerned with the political, military, and
business interests of us and our friends?"

So it seems that the question remains on the table in the minds of
some, mostly those who those who lost their bets about how events
would go in Iraq. Soreheads looking for a way out.

> One element of that is that it
> is at least POSSIBLE that others will help now. It was IMPOSSIBLE after
> WW2.

They're already circling their wagons. Sayeth Putin yesterday: "Well maybe we can help by writing off the $8-12 billion Iraq owes us". With Schroder and Chiraq clucking approvingly. Gee guys, thanks for all the "support". BLEH!

Then all three of 'em came off with this CRAP:

"But France, Germany and Russia, all opponents of the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq to topple Saddam Hussein (news - web sites), said they could not support any effort to begin a rebuilding program that was not led by the United Nations."

(Reuters)

This really cooks it for me. In other words they don't give a rat's patooie about relieving the suffering in Iraq, all they care about who controls the recovery effort. It's the Old Europe syndrome again, the suffering millions be damned, what really matters is CONTROL.

> >> Also, both the
> >> UN leadership
> >
> > Pffft! WHAT "UN leadership"? I still don't have qsl cards from some of
> > those "leader's" non-entities.
>
> Funny, I never thought of QSLing as the metric of UN leadership!

Kofi WHO? From WHERE? How do ya spell that . . ? I need the card . .

. . . allegory of course but I'm sure you get my drift.

> >> and the leaders of some of the key UN member countries have expressed a
> >> willingness to help rebuild Iraq.
> >
> > Those turkeys spent twelve years locked in debate and doing nothing
> > while Saddam Huessein spit in their faces
>
> Doesn't that also describe the behavior of the US until last year?

Yeah. Now that nonsense is over. Hugely.

> Do you
> think the US would have attacked SH had it not been for 9/11?

Of course not. We wouldn't have eventually nuked Hiroshima and Nagasaki if the Japs hadn't hit Pearl Harbor either. We almost invariably have to get caught with our drawers down around our ankles before we wake up, come roaring out of our "splendid isolation" and do what we gotta do. An unconventional war on terrorism was formally declared as a result of 9/11 as was conventional WW2 for us on 7/8 Dec 41. The Taliban & OBL have been one pair of targets, Saddam's regime is the latest. Unconventional. Fight fire with fire.

> > and now they suddenly want
> > to do something "useful" in Iraq? After 100+ Yanks gave their all to

> > depose the swine after "The UN" postulated even more aimless endless
> > debate about whether somebody should go in and get the job done or not?
>
> Why not find out whether they truly want to be useful? Why prejudge what
> their behavior will be? After all, if the UN process looks like it's going
> to become fruitless, we can always go ahead and do what needs to be done
> ourselves.

Bet the farm on that!

> If we blow off the UN we're letting them off the hook. They can
> say they were never given a chance to help. Instead, hold their feet to
> the fire.

That's pretty Machiavellian but I like it. Problem there is that
they'll screw it up and blame us for putting them in a position to
screw up.

> > I basically agree with that WRT to the current situation. What I do not
> > agree with however is the notion that the UN as a body has some inherent
> > right to tell us how much patience we need to develop for that
> > organization's impotence. While they do nothing and we fund it.
>
> Who said they could TELL us to do anything?

Are you kidding? The millions who have opposed our invasion of Iraq
without a UN mandate, a permission slip from the UN to take out
Saddam. If that ain't an attempt to tell us what we can and cannot do
I don't know what is. Din work. I hope they get used to it.

> I'm saying let's see if we can
> get agreement on what will be done.

Yeah, right: While they squabble puff and strut at great lengths as
usual the Iraquis are out of water, electricity, gauze pads and civil
government. Dubya is not gonna let that go very far before he flips
'em the 'ole digit again and we do what we gotta do.

> You know, my neighbor doesn't have the right to tell me what to do, nor I
> him, but if I'm doing something that disturbs him or he's doing something
> that disturbs me, I certainly want to talk to him about it. The bottom
> line is that if you don't like the way other UN member states are
> behaving, you're still better off talking to them than ignoring them. Talk
> costs nothing.

Normally yes, that's only common sense. But there can come a point
when the talking has gotten you nowhere and ya take it to the next
level and call the cops.

> Besides, Tony Blair wants to try to have the UN involved, and don't you
> think we owe him at least a shot at it? He's certainly been a stand-up
> guy.

I could not agree more.

> Why would you want to throw him under the wheels of the bus,
> politically speaking?

I'm not suggesting that, he very well might be able to get somewhere with it. I'm not a Dubya lemming by a long shot, I'm not at all enthralled by Texas Cowboy hipshot politics national and international and I think Tony can be the necessarey counterbalance if he has a shot at playing that role. But in the end he knowingly and voluntarily stuck his neck 'way out and as every politician knows sometimes ya get get the chopping block when ya do that.

>
> Jon

w3rv

2323. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 11:03:13 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412070313.26171.00001061@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 64560

From N2EY:

>EE isn't a growth industry? Then why did you go into it?

Because I liked build'g ckts. I did what I like doing. I didn't look to see if it was a growth industry or if it was popular.

>You're usually vry unclear. PArt of the problem is that you attach your own >definitions to words, rather than use the definitions everyone else uses.

Problem is every-1 else uses the wrong def. For ex., the word "Engineer" is often rongly used. Some "Engineers" R lower than the lowest of <REAL> techs.

>For
>example, you talk about "ham radio" as if it is not the same thing as
>"amateur
>radio". To everyone else, the two terms mean the same thing.

We have amateur radio licenses, not Ham radio licenses. "Ham radio" is a sub group of amateurs. Some Cbers R amateurs (tho this be illegal).

It is legal to xmit on the broadcast band without a license, so this can be "amateur radio", but NOT "Ham radio" (since they not have amateur radio license).

Just from this 1 example, "amateur radio" is NOT the same as "Ham radio", tho there R overlaps.

>>which means Morse code is more useful
>>(according to N2EY's logic).
>
>If something is used more, is it not more useful?

Here's the logic:
A: To many people, including me Morse code is fun so I use Morse code.
B: Is Morse really useful?
A: Yes, because many people use it.

You can substitute anything U find fun, such as cable TV. Then cable TV becomes useful.
Don't confuse "fun" with useful. More Hams use it because more Hams find it fun. That does not make it more useful.

2324. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 11:07:18 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412070718.26171.00001062@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 64561

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>> >Someone who is proficient in
>> >morse at 35 wpm does not lose his ability to copy 5 wpm.

Yes, others have said that also. I must be mistaken about losing 5 wpm skill.
Seems it does not happen with Morse code due to probably to something of Morse
code, which I am not aware of.

2325. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 11:18:18 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412071818.26171.00001063@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 64562

From K4YZ:
>How does MENTIONING any given part of the electromagmetic spectrum
>identify one as an "appliance operator", Vipul?

Because that band segment ,27 MHz, is not amateur radio, its CB.

>If all non-CW
>>activity
>>is a lie, would you like broadcast radios to have only CW broadcasts? Of
>>course
>>not.
>
> But WHY not? Think of all the spectrum we'll save from all those wasted
>sidebands!
>

So now you want EVERYONE to learn Morse code, even non-amateurs?

>Oh! But wait! YOU would force us to NEVER use code adn to NEVER learn it!
> "Free choice" is OK while YOU ae getting what YOU want, Vippy?

I would never force others not to use code, if they wanted to. So why should
code be imposed on people that don't want to learn it?

2326. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 11:58:06 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0304120358.17444c4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64563

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030410202708.11012.00000073@mb-fm.aol.com>...
> In article <b7d1465c.0304100332.6f5a359c@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net
> (Bert Craig) writes:
>
> >kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
> >news:<d22b54c3.0304021735.56e4cdc1@posting.google.com>...
> >> The last numbers I saw
> >> stated that Israel is kept economically afloat by annual four billion
> >> dollar handouts from us.
> >>
> >> w3rv
> >
> >Did you say four BILLION?!
>
> Peanuts compared to the cost of, say, a couple of B2 bombers.

Yeah, I suppose.

> >While we have homeless right here who
> >freeze to death each winter for lack of shelter!
> >
> Those homeless don't share vital intel data.

Point taken. :-)

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2327. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 12:38:31 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412083831.11628.00000062@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64564

In article <f45722ac.0304111829.5d7eef00@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Sounds like a Morse argument to me.

Everyhting sounds like a Morse argument to some people :-)

>Why do you look down on no-coders
>who haven't prostrated themselves?
>
HAve you stopped beating your dog? :-)

2328. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 12:38:31 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412083831.11628.00000061@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64567

In article <20030412002353.05767.00000250@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>> Probably some SWINE members...Students Wildly Indignant
>> about Nearly Everything.
>
> I like that one, Len...Gotta store it for future use.

It's from the '60s. Al Capp, who wrote and drew "Li'l Abner", as I recall.

Pan-fried shmoos, anyone? :-)

2329. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 12:38:32 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412083832.11628.00000063@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64566

In article <20030412001017.05767.00000248@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> Don't say THAT, Dave...that would leave the Nitwit Trio out in the cold >forever!

Are they any relation to the Nairobi Trio? :-)

2330. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 12:38:33 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412083833.11628.00000064@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64565

In article <3E979162.7A1E40AC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> So you have nothing to do with amatuer radio as well? I haven't
>> logged you since 1991.
>
>I haven't logged W1AW in years but I know the station is on the air.
>It is licensed. I'm licensed. You're licensed. Len isn't licensed.
>
He has a GROL. And a driver's license, I think. :-)

2331. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 13:22:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304120522.4d28ec11@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64568

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.12.03.57.51.355734.11732@arrl.org>...
> On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:23:22 -0400, Brian wrote:
>
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304110414.1674d136@posting.google.com>...
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E961F0A.5A1CF86@earthlink.net>...
> >> > Brian wrote:
> >> >
> >> > > Is all free speech patriotic?
> >> >
> >> > Having witnessed an interview with Scott Ridder on CNN this evening, I'd
> >> > have to say, "No".
> >> >
> >> > Dave K8MN
> >>
> >> Well there you have it.
> >
> > Yet Jon still doesn't have an answer.
>
> First ask an intelligent question.

Do you consider the Dixie Chick patriotic?

2332. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 13:23:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304120523.36cb9ce0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64569

```
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<3E06661CE87EB368.1CDF89C36B6A9B62.AF00FBBF2B9F699D@lp.airnews.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0304101714.5982e678@posting.google.com...
> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<c2356669.0304100834.7b551cac@posting.google.com>...
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
> news:<f45722ac.0304090509.6c9a4d25@posting.google.com>...
> > > > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:<pan.2003.04.08.02.25.42.510174.8992@arrl.org>...
> > > > > On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 21:21:24 -0400, Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > Do you think that the Daschle Chicks are patriots? If so, why?
> > > > >
> > > > > Do you think they are not? If so, why?
> > > >
> > > > I think it's important for every American to have the right to voice
> > > > their displeasure with their government, -at no risk to themselves-,
> > > > while other Americans are dying on the battlefield to protect that
> > > > right.
> > > >
> > > > The Constitution doesn't mandate patriotism, and I think the Dixie
> > > > Chick merely exercised her right to be unpatriotic and stupid.
> > >
> > > Stupid, maybe. Unpatriotic? Not at all. Unless free speech has become
> unpatriotic.
> >
> > Is all free speech patriotic?
> >
>
> The speech may not be, but the concept is.
>
> Kim W5TIT
```

Well there you have it.

2333. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 13:30:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304120530.566104f4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64570

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.12.03.56.55.900202.11732@arrl.org>...
> On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:26:05 -0400, Brian wrote:
> > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> >> That's your opinion. Others would say that those who protested the
> >> Vietnam war were patriotic.
> >
> > "Others" would be wrong. They could serve pennance by applying for
> > Vietnamese citizenship. Today is not too late, but 1973 would have been
> > better.
>
> Feel free to go to Vietnam and pick up the battle where it left off in
> 1975. The same folks are still in control and I'm sure they'd be willing
> to fight you. Hey, if it was right then, it's right now.

Why would I go fight them now, 30 years after the battle ended? I
don't have a duty to do so, and it would be wrong to do so now. Our
country is no longer at war with anyone in Vietnam.

2334. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 13:41:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304120541.7769e8d3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64571

```
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E979162.7A1E40AC@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E96C2E0.CA11EF28@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E95D3BD.C17A360E@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E94E690.28EA89A3@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9243A1.F66483EF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > > > > > > > It was just a brief stop for a 2m mag mount antenna. My cheapy Pro-Am
> > > > > > > > > > 1/4 wave had some mashed coaxial cable. The coax had a silly molded
> > > > > > > > > > fitting at the antenna end which precluded repair. I selected a Hustler
> > > > > > > > > > 5/8 wave antenna and went on my way. There are lots of repeaters
> > > > > > > > > > between Columbus and Cincinnati but I made only four QSOs during the
> > > > > > > > > > drive. The longest and most pleasant was with a YL on the Cambridge
> > > > > > > > > > machine. I don't know where the abundance of Technician Class ops are
> > > > > > > > > > spending their time but it doesn't appear to be on 2m FM.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > We're going to lose some frequencies if the only thing going on are
> > > > > > > > > > the repeaters automatically IDing every hour. Perhaps Len is right.
> > > > > > > > > > Pretty soon amateur radio will be only about HF.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > But where are all of those new Technicians if not on 2m FM?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > They're on the web. Where are you?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > No amateur radio license is needed for internet access. I'm on 2m. I'm
> > > > > > > on the internet. I'm on 160m through 70cm.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Ahem, this isn't ham radio. You may not realize it, but you're on the
> > > > > > web, too.
```

>
> Re your reading comprehension problem: Read my sentence again,
> especially the part reading, "I'm on the internet". Sheesh!

You clearly state that you are on ham radio, go back to the parts,
"I'm on 2m. I'm on 160m through 70cm."

You're not on ham radio in any way shape or form. You're only on the
internet when you're posting here.

> > > > They're
> > > > > certainly not on 2m SSB or CW. Len wouldn't know those things. He
> > > > > isn't even a ham.
> > > > >
> > > > He's on the web, just like yew.
> > > >
> > > That has nothing to do with amateur radio.
> > >
> > So you have nothing to do with amatuer radio as well? I haven't
> > logged you since 1991.
> >
> I haven't logged W1AW in years but I know the station is on the air.
> It is licensed. I'm licensed. You're licensed. Len isn't licensed.

Yet somehow you are able to communicate with Len. I wonder how that
can be if he isn't licensed in the amateur radio service?

Maybe this isn't ham radio?

> > > > > > ARES on 147.06 in Lancaster had a nice net last night. Lots of public
> > > > > > service events coming up.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > We just might get through this thing if you're ready to open up a
> > > > > > > > > little.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I'm not really in the mood to "open up" on morse proficiency if opening
> > > > > > > > up means I need to declare that someone whose maximum morse speed is
> > > > > > > > five words per minute is proficient in the use of morse. That'd be
> > > > > > > > dishonest.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave, I wouldn't want you to be dishonest. Here's what I can do for
> > > > > > > you. I recall that you stated that "20wpm is more proficient than
> > > > > > > 13wpm." I'll tabulate all the wpm rates between 13 and 20wpm and you
> > > > > > > can select the lowest one at which proficiency is achieved. We won't
> > > > > > > even bother with 5wpm.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > I've also stated that 25 wpm is more proficient than 20, 30 wpm is more
> > > > > > proficient than 25, 35 wpm is more proficient than 30 and 40 wpm is more
> > > > > > proficient than 35.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Really? I don't remember. When did you state that?
> > > >

> > > Look it up.
> >
> > Dave, that was a polite way of saying that you're lying.
>
> No, that was a polite way of saying, "Do I have to do everything for
> you?"
>
> > > > > > OK. Here goes:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > 14wpm
> > > > > > 15wpm
> > > > > > 16wpm
> > > > > > 17wpm
> > > > > > 18wpm
> > > > > > 19wpm
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > OK, which one is where proficiency begins?
> > > > > >
> > > > > To further add to your confusion, I've stated that I believe morse
> > > > > proficiency begins at a point somewhat higher than 10 wpm. You'll need
> > > > > to begin typing numbers from 11 through 40. The answer will be in there
> > > > > somewhere.
> > > >
> > > > Welp, I don't think so. You said that "20wpm is more proficient than
> > > > 13wpm." And above, you -claim- to have stated that "40 is more
> > > > proficient than 35 which ismore proficient than 30 which is more
> > > > proficient than 25 which is more proficient than 20."
> > > >
> > > > Why do you want me to restart the list at 11?
> > >
> > > You really have to take some steps to deal with that reading
> > > comprehension problem of yours. Since I've stated that I believe that
> > > morse proficiency is somewhat higher than ten words per minute, any list
> > > would have to begin with a number higher than ten. The number "11"
> > > qualifies.
> > >
> > > > Do you think proficiency begins at 11wpm?
> > >
> > > No.
> > >
> > > > If so, why do you think it?
> > >
> > > I don't "think it".
>
> > I'm convinced that you "don't think," and don't know what proficiency
> > is.
>
> We can add those two to the growing list of things about which you've
> been wrong.
>

> > I'll amend the list to start at 11wpm. Here goes. Try real hard to
> > decide which is the lowest level of proficiency. Does Morse
> > proviciency begin at:
> >
> > 11wpm
> > 12wpm
> > 13wpm
> > 14wpm
> > 15wpm
> > 16wpm
> > 17wpm
> > 18wpm
> > 19wpm
> > 20wpm
> > 21wpm
> > 22wpm
> > 23wpm
> > 24wpm
> > 25wpm
> > 26wpm
> > 27wpm
> > 28wpm
> > 29wpm
> > 30wpm
> > 31wpm
> > 32wpm
> > 33wpm
> > 34wpm
> > 35wpm
> > 36wpm
> > 37wpm
> > 38wpm
> > 39wpm
> > 40wpm?
> >
> > Best of luck, Brian
>
> No luck needed, Brian. I believe that morse proficiency begins somewhat
> above the speed of ten words per minute.
>
> Dave K8MN

That would be 11wpm. I listed it above as one of your choices.

2335. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 13:42:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304120542.103dce54@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64572

nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
news:<20030411203815.23756.00000155@mb-fj.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0304110425.24cb1df9@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Where have all the hams gone?
> >
> Gone to Internet, every one :-)
>
> When will you ever learn? :-)

Is that petula clark?

2336. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 14:37:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b798g1fih1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64573

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:B2721BD3DD214D6B.FA3BC933600ED5E6.F79774153C9FD206@lp.airnews.net...
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> news:3E939DB3.28C419E@att.net...
> >
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > > Jon Bloom wrote:
> > >
> > > > Why is it that countries
> > > > that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side
> of
> > > > the fence from us now? In significant part, it's because we've told
> them
> > > > in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.
> > >
> > > Why Jon, I'm surprised you haven't heard. Don't you read the news?
> > > France, Germany and Russia hold over half the Iraqi debt, which is
quite
> large
> > > since the sanctions of '91.
> > > . Who you suppose will pay off if Saddam goes?
> > >
> > > Dick
> >
> > Oh, by the way, we DON'T give a damn what they think. And that happens
> > to be a *very* widely held opinion. They sell weapons and war technology
> to
> > Saddam and Al Queda and don't give a damn what WE think about that, so
why
> > should
> > we ever again care what they think? All they're good for is stymieing
> > anything and
> > everything constructive in the UN. And protecting *their* interests
> > regardless of any others.
>
> There ya go painting that broad paintbrush again, Dick. You forget that
we
> the peons are at the mercies of what our governments do.

Don't YOU vote? That's how we, the people, influence our government.

> The people of
> France and Germany have no more control over what their government does

than
> we do of ours--just like the Iraqi people not having much control over
what
> their government did/does.

Don't the people of France and Germany vote?

> Criticize where criticism is due. I do not
> fault the French or German, or any other, people in general. Nor should
> anyone.

Why not? Assessing fault is as much a right as free speech.

I can recognize someone's right to free speech, but I am just as free
to fault that speech as being unAmerican, unpatriotic, etc.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2337. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 14:43:15 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b798qvaco1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64575

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:F4B542A1CA0D2297.4AFD4E30CB6DCBFB.C7FD8F3D341626DF@lp.airnews.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b77kdd$t99$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > news:pan.2003.04.08.10.34.38.819114.5721@arrl.org...
> > > On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 22:47:33 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > > > news:pan.2003.04.07.22.53.17.874763.9024@arrl.org...
> > > >
> > > >> Is it utterly unimportant if some people disagree that the attack
is
> > > >> justified?
> > > >
> > > > It is to me.
> > >
> > > Okay, you know what you think and don't give a damn what anyone else
> > > thinks. Understood.
> >
> > You asked about "some people". Depending on who it is, I base my
> > decision as to the value I place on their opinion. Most of the anti-war
> > types
> > I've seen interviewed are patently uninformed...hence I value little
> > as to their opinion.
> >
>
> And, what of the military analysts that we've been inundated with the past
> few weeks? What about their opinion and how objective could it possibly
be?

Those analysts that climed we were bogged down, the war would
become another Vietnam, we didn't have enough troops, the
supply line was too long...they were all wrong...and I never
accorded them any credibility when they said what they did.
In cointrast, the military advisors on FOX News were right
on target.

> > > >> I wish I shared your trust. The present administration seems daily
> less
> > > >> interested in hearing the opinions of anyone.
> > > >
> > > > And you base that statement on what?
> > >
> > > The fact that the Administration has, from the day it entered office,

> > > expressed disdain for those -- domestically and internationally -- who
> > > disagree with it.
> >
> > So?
> >
> > > It's one thing to disagree about things, it's another to
> > > belittle and demean those with whom you disagree.
> >
> > Examples please of the administrations "belittling and demeaning".
> >
>
> So, you've missed them you are saying? Maybe you agreed with a president
> who keeps stating it's "his" government.

Listen to almost any executive...be it a governor, mayor or president.
Saying it it his/her government, administration, etc is no big deal.

> That's just one of the many, many
> statements I've heard him make that really concern me.

Pretty lame if that's the best you can give me as an example.

> Then, there's the
> great Rumsfeld...oh, good grief, what a brat he must've been when he was a
> little boy.

Because?

> > > Why is it that countries
> > > that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side
of
> > > the fence from us now?
> >
> > Follow the money. Every day now we learn more about the back door
> > cozy financial relationships between Saddam's regime and some of
> > our "close allies."
>
> We won't mention any of our financially "close allies" will we?

Such as?

> > > In significant part, it's because we've told them
> > > in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.
> >
> > Not that they have essentially said/done the same thing
> > to us.
>
> And the beat goes on...

The news isn't exactly glowing for folks of your opinion.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2338. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 14:45:16 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.12.14.45.15.701519.2786@arrl.org>
Source record: 64574

On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 00:16:46 -0400, Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <pan.2003.04.12.02.59.07.633633.29110@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>
>>On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 19:48:33 -0400, Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>
>>> In article <pan.2003.04.11.22.47.14.716872.1240@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
>>> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>>>
>>>>Gosh, really, Professor Len? Just who, in your fevered imagination, do
>>>>you think believes that war isn't brutal?
>>>
>>> Those who've never served in any military.
>>
>>Really? Then why were there people without a military backgound (as well
>>as people with one) protesting the war precisely on the grounds that war
>>is brutal?
>
> Probably some SWINE members...Students Wildly Indignant about Nearly
> Everything.

Do they believe war isn't brutal?

>>There also are a lot of people around the world who have plenty of
>>experience with the brutality of war but who were not in the military.
>>The term in vogue these days for such people is "collateral damage."
>
> We will all cry great sobbing tears of despair to help stop all the
> warfare. There, that's done. Now...what next?

Why cry if we believe war isn't brutal?

>>Note, too, that only a small percentage of those serving in the military
>>have had direct experience of war. Thankfully, may I add.
>>
>>> Those who want to put their heads in the sand and deny any of the
>>> terrible stuff that happens.
>>
>>Name them.
>
> League BoD. About modern US amateur radio, that is.

Do they belive war isn't brutal? (I must have missed that paragraph in the
BoD minutes!)

Notice: Len, completely unable to justify his statement that those who've never served in any military believe that war isn't brutal, tries flailingly to change the subject.

> Which "side" was the aggressor in the Holocaust?

The ones who committed aggression against their own peoples and those of neighboring countries. That would be the Nazis and their allies.

> Do you need a PowerPoint Presentation and laser pointer to show which
> side was "good" and which was "bad?"

No, why, do you have a PowerPoint presentation? Does it show that the Soviets were good guys from December 7, 1941 until September 1, 1945 but bad guys before and after that period?

>>> "Mutually-Assured Destruction" involves two powers EACH possessing
>>> annhilation weapons. That policy did not involve Iraq.
>>
>>Exactly. There have been wars between a power with WMD and a power
>>without (e.g., US/Vietnam, USSR/Afghanistan) yet WMD were not used.
>>Clearly, MAD was not the deterrent in these cases.
>
> Jon, "MAD" wasn't really under discussion, just used as an analogy.

An analogy to what? The point under discussion was that decision makers had been pacifist enough (Jim says) or not desperate enough (I say) to use WMD (nukes, anyway) since 1945. You said "not suicidal" and invoked MAD. So, again, in analogy to what, exactly?

>>Something else must have been. What
>>do you think it was?
>
> If I answer will you promise a prize? Are you Alex Trebek in drag?

If you answer coherently you will perhaps clarify or correct your muddled thinking. It's okay with me if you are unable or unwilling to do that.

> Why not? You say "war is bad" then offer no solution to an impending
> crisis clearly building and want to DO NOTHING. Very peaceful.

When did I say that I wanted to do nothing, Len? My objection to what the Bush administration has done is that by being clumsily disingenuous about their purposes they botched the diplomacy leading up to the war, leaving us at odds with our natural allies and making it likely that we'll have to foot the entire bill (in contrast to Gulf I, where most of the financial cost was borne by others).

>>> Would it please you if, in the future, Iraq got to the point of
>>> USING chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons capable of killing
>>> MILLIONS?
>>> I'm sure you would.
>>
>>Len, are you really claiming that I would be pleased if Iraq used WMD?
>>Do you know how utterly asinine that is?

>
> Perhaps, but all we can see is your words.

Your interpretation of my words is unsupportable.

> You seem to WANT all those weapons of mass destruction NOW to "prove"
> something.

Did I say that? You might make more sense if you responded to what I said
rather than to what you wish I had said.

>>> You are safe up in the outskirts
>>> of Boston...nobody would DARE go in there and do anything...
>>
>>Your knowledge of US geography is no better than your knowledge of
>>Iraq's!
>
> Whatever. Hartford, who cares. New England is several states up in
> the northeastern tip of the USA. Not important to this thread. Only
> important to the presumed aristocracy there.

Is it all of New England that you believe presumes themselves to be an
aristocracy, or only part of it? If the latter, do you think the regional
geography is unimportant to the non-aristocratic part?
>
>>Well then, there is more than one possible reason for the inaction
>>against Iraq in 1988, isn't there? In fact, it wasn't pacifism that
>>caused world inaction, it was apathy.
>
> Pacifism is a form of apathy.

It can be if it's done unthinkingly. So is the unthinking beating of war
drums. Both pacifism and militarism can be the result of apathy or the
result of engaged thought.

>>> [try to avoid the antagonistic "moral superior" phrasing]
>>
>>Should I have told you to go research it? Or is that "antagonistic
>>'moral superior'" phrasing reserved to you?
>
> No. It is reserved for the League aristocracy.

But the phrasing was used by you.

> Fort Irwin is the US Desert Warfare Training Center. That's where
> the US armor and mechanized infantry trained to whip the Iraqis in
> Desert Storm in '91 and again during Iraqi Freedom in 2003. Training
> seems to have worked out. Want to fault it?

No, why do you think I want to fault it? Have I said anything that
suggests that? Or are your prejudices showing again?

>>> Jon, I'd already served my country in the military 1952 to 1960.
>>

>>How is that relevant? Does military service automatically make all of
>>your opinions correct?
>
> It lends one HELLUVA LOT OF RELEVANCE, Jon. It may not be "correct"
> to your aristocratic outlook but it has relevance after training to
> "close with, and destroy the enemy."

Did they train you in international relations, Len? Did they teach you
that your opinions about the justness of a war were going to always be
correct, or did they tell you that your opinions were subordinate to those
of the NCA, duly elected?

>>> I don't really need some League person telling me where my
>>> patriotism "should be." In ANYTHING.
>>
>>Has some League person been telling you that?
>
> Several. For years. All of them were morse tested.

There's that Morse obsession again!

>>Do you feel free to tell others where their patriotism "should be"?
>
> I'm expressing an opinion.
>
> If you don't like that opinion, go suck an egg. It's a free country
> Jon. Remember those old civics lessons? Absolutely NOTHING in the
> Constitution says I have to enjoy your opinions or tip my to them or
> salute or whatever and shut up.

Have I suggested you should shut up, Len? Have I asked you to salute
anything? No, all I've done is expressed my own opinion, which is
different from yours in some respects. Apparently, you feel that the mere
act of disagreeing with you constitutes an attack on your right to express
an opinion. You couldn't be more wrong. In my opinion, that is.

>>What I'm curious about is whether you know what YOUR point is. I have my
>>doubts.
>
> Poor baby. You don't understand, really. Sometimes war is the only
> solution out of a mess created by another.

Is THAT your point? You sure take a roundabout way to make it, dragging in
unrelated issues all the while. If you bother to pay attention to what
I've said, you'll know I agree that war is sometimes necessary.

> Sooner or later some country was going to have to be the premptive
> country in shutting down some regime or whatever threatening others.
> In this new history, the USA and UK were partners in being that first
> country.
>
> I'm supporting that action. You don't like that. TS.

What makes you think I don't like it? What makes you think I care whether
you do or don't support the war?

>>> Are you here after an absence to stir up "action?"
>>
>>Just passing the time of day, Len. How about you?
>
> You are mumbling about being a moral superior in realpolitik. I don't
> think you are.

I don't think I am either. See? We agree on something! I also don't think
you're a moral superior, but I'm not sure we agree on that.

> You might try to get back close to what the newsgroup was created for
> in the first place. Amateur radio policy.

If you feel this discussion shouldn't be taking place here, why are you
participating in it?

> Yes, you've become a "moral superior" on geopolitics and fighting for
> peace. You seem to dislike several politicians who've made
> decisions...yet you don't seem to have the qualifications to sit in
> judgement of them...other than that wonderful "moral superiority."

I'm just expressing an opinion. I think my opinion is better thought out
than yours, but there's no moral superiority involved.

> Your "solutions" are to do nothing. Null solution.

Wrong.

>>> You seem to imply that having an amateur radio license makes you
>>> some kind of "moral superior" on things NOT about amateur radio.
>>
>>I don't imply it, you infer it based on your prejudices against amateurs
>>and the League. I'm not responsible for your prejudices.
>
> I'm not responsible for your aristocratic attitude, Jon.

That attitude exists purely in your imagination, Len, informed solely by
your prejudices.

> I'm NOT "prejudiced" against "all radio amateurs." Just those too
> full of themselves who think morse code is still king.

Morse obsession.

>>That's just silly. Your obsession is showing agin.
>
> "Agin?" Bad dialect.

Ah, you are reduced to making fun of typos. Not a compelling argument for
your point of view, Len.

Jon

2339. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 14:48:31 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b79953tdc1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64576

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.04.12.02.17.58.321715.29110@arrl.org...
> On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 19:48:32 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> >> It's one thing to disagree about things, it's another to belittle and
> >> demean those with whom you disagree.
>
> > Examples please of the administrations "belittling and demeaning".
>
> Rumsfeld: [France and Germany are] "old Europe."
>
> Perle: Sy Hersh [Pulitzer Prize winning reporter] is the closest thing
> American journalism has to a terrorist.
>
> DeLay: Fermez la bouche, Monsieur Daschle. [Okay, DeLay isn't part of the
> Administration, but he's tight with them.]
>
> Other examples can easily be found.

So what. Why must everyone/anyone not be free to comment on
the vaulted press. Add Peter Arrnett to my list of traitors and
pond scum.

> >> Why is it that countries
> >> that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side of
> >> the fence from us now?
> >
> > Follow the money. Every day now we learn more about the back door cozy
> > financial relationships between Saddam's regime and some of our "close
> > allies."
>
> Examples?

France, Germany and Russia with oil contracts and selling banned
weopons to Saddam.

> Oh, and if it's all about following money, who's going to benefit
> monetarily from those rebuilding-Iraq contracts that are being offered
> only to selected US companies?

You tell me. Would you not want those contracts to go
to US companies?

> >> In significant part, it's because we've told them in so many words that
> >> we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.
> >

> > Not that they have essentially said/done the same thing to us.
>
> No, they've said they disagree with us. That's not the same thing.

Jon, that is bunk. Many hate what we are...free,
democratic and successful...and they don't care what we think

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2340. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 14:57:16 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412105716.08710.00000812@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 64577

>Sounds like that idiot Bruce.

Your Mama is an IDIOT. Just look at you, your living Proof that animals and Humans have mated.

2341. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 14:58:49 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412105849.08710.00000813@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 64578

>Because that band segment ,27 MHz, is not amateur radio, its CB.

Whats the difference, most of Ham Radio is nothing more than CB anyway.

2342. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 15:17:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E982DC9.DC3967FC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64579

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >> >Someone who is proficient in
> >> >morse at 35 wpm does not lose his ability to copy 5 wpm.
>
> Yes, others have said that also. I must be mistaken about losing 5 wpm skill.
> Seems it does not happen with Morse code due to probably to something of Morse
> code, which I am not aware of.

As you are one who is not proficient in morse and who does not use or even like morse, I'm sure there are any number of things about it of which you are not aware. That hasn't stopped you from making sweeping statements which have no basis in fact.

To quote a Clint Eastwood character: "A man's got to know his limitations".

Dave K8MN

2343. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 15:29:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E98307C.1E9B847A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64580

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E979162.7A1E40AC@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E96C2E0.CA11EF28@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E95D3BD.C17A360E@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E94E690.28EA89A3@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9243A1.F66483EF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > It was just a brief stop for a 2m mag mount antenna. My cheapy Pro-Am
> > > > > > > > > > > > 1/4 wave had some mashed coaxial cable. The coax had a silly molded
> > > > > > > > > > > > fitting at the antenna end which precluded repair. I selected a Hustler
> > > > > > > > > > > > 5/8 wave antenna and went on my way. There are lots of repeaters
> > > > > > > > > > > > between Columbus and Cincinnati but I made only four QSOs during the
> > > > > > > > > > > > drive. The longest and most pleasant was with a YL on the Cambridge
> > > > > > > > > > > > machine. I don't know where the abundance of Technician Class ops are
> > > > > > > > > > > > spending their time but it doesn't appear to be on 2m FM.
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > We're going to lose some frequencies if the only thing going on are
> > > > > > > > > > > > the repeaters automatically IDing every hour. Perhaps Len is right.
> > > > > > > > > > > > Pretty soon amateur radio will be only about HF.
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > But where are all of those new Technicians if not on 2m FM?
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > They're on the web. Where are you?
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > No amateur radio license is needed for internet access. I'm on 2m. I'm
> > > > > > > > > on the internet. I'm on 160m through 70cm.
```

> > >
> > > Ahem, this isn't ham radio. You may not realize it, but you're on the
> > > web, too.
> > >
> > Re your reading comprehension problem: Read my sentence again,
> > especially the part reading, "I'm on the internet". Sheesh!
>
> You clearly state that you are on ham radio, go back to the parts,
> "I'm on 2m. I'm on 160m through 70cm."
>
> You're not on ham radio in any way shape or form. You're only on the
> internet when you're posting here.

Actually, you have no way of knowing that. During the period which
elapsed between the time you asked the question and the time I responded
to it, I've managed to work in a number of other activities which had
nothing to do with usenet.

> > > > > They're
> > > > > > certainly not on 2m SSB or CW. Len wouldn't know those things. He
> > > > > > isn't even a ham.
> > > > > >
> > > > > He's on the web, just like yew.
> > > > >
> > > > That has nothing to do with amateur radio.
> > > >
> > > So you have nothing to do with amatuer radio as well? I haven't
> > > logged you since 1991.
> > >
> > I haven't logged W1AW in years but I know the station is on the air.
> > It is licensed. I'm licensed. You're licensed. Len isn't licensed.
>
> Yet somehow you are able to communicate with Len. I wonder how that
> can be if he isn't licensed in the amateur radio service?

I don't communicate with Len on the 2m ham band.

> Maybe this isn't ham radio?

You've taken a wrong turn somewhere. I stated that Len doesn't know
what goes on 2m FM as he isn't a licensed ham.

> > > I'll amend the list to start at 11wpm. Here goes. Try real hard to
> > > decide which is the lowest level of proficiency. Does Morse
> > > proviciency begin at:
> > >
> > > 11wpm
> > > 12wpm
> > > 13wpm
> > > 14wpm
> > > 15wpm
> > > 16wpm

> > > 17wpm
> > > 18wpm
> > > 19wpm
> > > 20wpm
> > > 21wpm
> > > 22wpm
> > > 23wpm
> > > 24wpm
> > > 25wpm
> > > 26wpm
> > > 27wpm
> > > 28wpm
> > > 29wpm
> > > 30wpm
> > > 31wpm
> > > 32wpm
> > > 33wpm
> > > 34wpm
> > > 35wpm
> > > 36wpm
> > > 37wpm
> > > 38wpm
> > > 39wpm
> > > 40wpm?

> > No luck needed, Brian. I believe that morse proficiency begins somewhat
> > above the speed of ten words per minute.

> That would be 11wpm. I listed it above as one of your choices.

You just jumped to another wrong conclusion. You also listed speeds of
12-40 wpm. All of those are somewhat higher than ten wpm.

Dave K8MN

2344. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 16:32:26 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412123226.23238.00000038@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64581

In article <75yla.358$D_1.146@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Steve Fleckenstein" <spfleck@citlink.net> writes:

>Simple. They want you to share in their pain.
>
"Oh the pain...the pain!!!"

(bad imitation of "Dr. Smith" from "Lost In Space") :-)

2345. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 16:36:34 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.12.16.36.33.684998.2786@arrl.org>
Source record: 64582

On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 02:30:31 -0400, Dick Carroll wrote:
>> If you've been reading the thread you should realize that's not
>> germane. The topic is whether we should care at all what NON-despotic
>> governments and their peoples think.
>
> Actually you agree with, or at least are immobilized by, those who
> vigorously oppose acting against said despots and strongly oppose those
> who finally have decided to act to end the despots brutal grip and the
> threat to us. These attitudes and actions at taken not for any
> altrusitic reason but instead from the position of primary concern for
> their own fianancial advantage. How does that make any of you much
> better than the despots?

The problem is, Dick, that does not in the least characterize my point of view. You want to pigeonhole everyone into one extreme or the other. I believe the Bush administration was inept in its diplomacy, and I'm not sanguine that they'll do better. And I'm distrustful of the Administration because I think they are disingenuous about their motives. But I also think that the removal of Saddam by force was justified. And I'm delighted that the human costs of doing so have been relatively light so far.

> "The friend of my enemy is my enemy". There's little difference in
> being their
> friends
> and in looking the other way. And by according their opinions the same
> weight as those opposed to the despots, you condone same. All in the
> name of "go along, get along" It's an attitude sure to eventually bring
> us down should it become predominant.

Our task is to change the views of those who were, and still ought to be, our friends. Had the rest of the world stood together against Saddam, there's a good chance that under the threat of troops ringing his country he would have grudgingly acquiesced in disarming himself of WMD. That was, after all, the stated purpose of the war. But we drove our partners away from us both before and after 9/11, making them suspicious of us. The blame for the disunity of the UN belongs to France, Germany, Russia AND the US.

I think the Rumsfeld/Wolfowitz/Perle coterie went out of their way to piss off "Old Europe" because the last thing they wanted was a peaceful resolution that resulted in a disarmed Iraq with SH still in power. They were committed to regime change from day one, and the WMD issue was a red herring used to scare Americans into supporting something they likely wouldn't have supported otherwise.

In the event, though, I think the war was justified by the massive human rights violations in Iraq. (Of course, we only seem to care about human rights violations when the violators are not our allies.) Too bad we weren't smart enough to convince others besides the Brits and Aussies to join us so we wouldn't have to carry the entire load.

> The old ways won't do in the age of fast transportation, easy border
> crossing
> and easily portable WMD. Couple that with a religion which we are
> "bound" to tolerate when one of its main goals is the subjugation or
> destruction of all others, and you have the recipe for disaster.

Your understanding of Islam is wretchedly misinformed.

> I know, I know- France, Germany and Russia say they just want to give
> diplomacy more time. Time we may well not have. Isn't twelve years,
> eight of them Clinton era years,
> enough? Saddam has stonewalled for so long he truly beleived that he
> could carry on with it indefinitely....and would have, by your leave.

If we (Bush I, Clinton AND Bush II) and other Western countries had had a consistent policy and been willing to make it effective, we might have been able to avoid this problem. If we had cared as much about the poor Iraqis in 1992 as we claim to now and hadn't stood by while SH suppressed their uprisings by massacring them, we might have toppled him then and perhaps avoided the problem. Those were failures of will and of diplomacy.

If we don't stand together with other democracies, we'll find ourselves in the position of always having to solve problems by going to war. Is that the best possible approach? Shouldn't we try to effect change peacefully where it is needed by standing together with others, resorting to war only when there is no other choice?

> Meanwhile arming terrorists worldwide with who-knows-what to use on US
> in the US.

There is scant evidence that Saddam was arming terrorists against the US, certainly not with WMD. There were perfectly valid reasons to eliminate Saddam. That isn't one of them.

> And yes- Syria may well be the next focus. It looks more and more like
> they have
> supplied and supported Saddams regime throughout, and nave helped store
> and hide the WMD.

Syria has had WMD and the means of delivering them for a long time.

There are reports of Iraqi WMD scientists fleeing to Syria. Some reports say they are expected to seek safety in France. Is France the next target after Syria? The French have WMD, too, after all!

> Also are givign haven to Saddam's terrorists, those who manage to escape
> their countrymen's wrath. If it proves out that Syria is where some of
> Saddam's WMD have been taken, what choice do we really have except to go
> destroy them, even if it does require attacking then Syrian regime? It

> is only marginally less despotic than Saddam's, and is definitely a
> supporter and hotbed of terrorists who operate abroad..

Are you aware that before the Iraq crisis the Administration itself said the Syrians had been quite helpful in rooting out Al Qaeda? Diplomatic efforts were responsible for that, not warfare. But I suppose you'd prefer we give up on the peaceful approaches that are working well. After all, we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.

Jon

2346. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 16:41:16 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <C2DF6A57CBCA3276.701FDE1AFC9A82D7.D9323447173F2B92@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64583

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0304120530.566104f4@posting.google.com...
> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.12.03.56.55.900202.11732@arrl.org>...
> > On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:26:05 -0400, Brian wrote:
> > > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > >> That's your opinion. Others would say that those who protested the
> > >> Vietnam war were patriotic.
> > >
> > > "Others" would be wrong. They could serve pennance by applying for
> > > Vietnamese citizenship. Today is not too late, but 1973 would have
been
> > > better.
> >
> > Feel free to go to Vietnam and pick up the battle where it left off in
> > 1975. The same folks are still in control and I'm sure they'd be willing
> > to fight you. Hey, if it was right then, it's right now.
>
> Why would I go fight them now, 30 years after the battle ended? I
> don't have a duty to do so, and it would be wrong to do so now. Our
> country is no longer at war with anyone in Vietnam.
>

Give 'em time, give 'em time...

Kim W5TIT

2347. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 16:46:34 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <520241A31E9F97F0.C842FF8F50815C5B.6CE2A40F6A2A671E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64585

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b798g1fih1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:B2721BD3DD214D6B.FA3BC933600ED5E6.F79774153C9FD206@lp.airnews.net...
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3E939DB3.28C419E@att.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > > Jon Bloom wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Why is it that countries
> > > > > that have been our close allies for many years are on the other
side
> > of
> > > > > the fence from us now? In significant part, it's because we've
told
> > them
> > > > > in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else
thinks.
> > > >
> > > > Why Jon, I'm surprised you haven't heard. Don't you read the news?
> > > > France, Germany and Russia hold over half the Iraqi debt, which is
> quite
> > large
> > > > since the sanctions of '91.
> > > > . Who you suppose will pay off if Saddam goes?
> > > >
> > > > Dick
> > >
> > > Oh, by the way, we DON'T give a damn what they think. And that happens
> > > to be a *very* widely held opinion. They sell weapons and war
technology
> > to
> > > Saddam and Al Queda and don't give a damn what WE think about that, so
> why
> > > should
> > > we ever again care what they think? All they're good for is stymieing
> > > anything and
> > > everything constructive in the UN. And protecting *their* interests
> > > regardless of any others.
> >

> > There ya go painting that broad paintbrush again, Dick. You forget that
> we
> > the peons are at the mercies of what our governments do.
>
> Don't YOU vote? That's how we, the people, influence our government.
>

I vote. Do I think it counts? No.

> >
> > The people of
> > France and Germany have no more control over what their government does
> than
> > we do of ours--just like the Iraqi people not having much control over
> what
> > their government did/does.
>
> Don't the people of France and Germany vote?
>

You lay too much importance on voting, Bill. It *used* to mean something.
I don't think it does any more. There's too much evidence that the
politicians do whatever the hell they damned well please once they are in
office.

> >
> > Criticize where criticism is due. I do not
> > fault the French or German, or any other, people in general. Nor should
> > anyone.
>
> Why not? Assessing fault is as much a right as free speech.
>

Because I think it's pretty damned stupid to blame a whole country of people
for what their governments are doing. Now, if you think it's OK and the
right thing to do, you go right ahead. But, I think you're wrong to do so.

>
> I can recognize someone's right to free speech, but I am just as free
> to fault that speech as being unAmerican, unpatriotic, etc.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

You seem to be forgetting that my point is that PEOPLE of a nation cannot
generally be blamed for what their governments are doing. I certainly don't
want to blamed for anything my government does, since I DIDN'T vote for
them. Nor do I want to be blamed when I think I'm voting for someone who'll
actually represent the people and they turn around and act like every one

else--doing what they please.

Kim W5TIT

2348. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 16:50:44 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <190C01C7D728489B.4F5A5DD9A592C336.7608E782287189F7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64586

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b798qv$aco$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:F4B542A1CA0D2297.4AFD4E30CB6DCBFB.C7FD8F3D341626DF@lp.airnews.net...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:b77kdd$t99$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > > news:pan.2003.04.08.10.34.38.819114.5721@arrl.org...
> > > > On Mon, 07 Apr 2003 22:47:33 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > > > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > > > > news:pan.2003.04.07.22.53.17.874763.9024@arrl.org...
> > > > >
> > > > >> Is it utterly unimportant if some people disagree that the attack
> is
> > > > >> justified?
> > > > >
> > > > > It is to me.
> > > >
> > > > Okay, you know what you think and don't give a damn what anyone else
> > > > thinks. Understood.
> > >
> > > You asked about "some people". Depending on who it is, I base my
> > > decision as to the value I place on their opinion. Most of the
anti-war
> > > types
> > > I've seen interviewed are patently uninformed...hence I value little
> > > as to their opinion.
> > >
> >
> > And, what of the military analysts that we've been inundated with the
past
> > few weeks? What about their opinion and how objective could it possibly
> be?
>
> Those analysts that climed we were bogged down, the war would
> become another Vietnam, we didn't have enough troops, the
> supply line was too long...they were all wrong...and I never
> accorded them any credibility when they said what they did.
> In cointrast, the military advisors on FOX News were right
> on target.
>
```

OH? You think so, obviously.

> > > > >> I wish I shared your trust. The present administration seems
daily
> > less
> > > > > >> interested in hearing the opinions of anyone.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > And you base that statement on what?
> > > > > >
> > > > > The fact that the Administration has, from the day it entered
office,
> > > > > expressed disdain for those -- domestically and internationally --
who
> > > > > disagree with it.
> > > > >
> > > > So?
> > > > >
> > > > > It's one thing to disagree about things, it's another to
> > > > > belittle and demean those with whom you disagree.
> > > > >
> > > > Examples please of the administrations "belittling and demeaning".
> > > > >
> > > >
> > So, you've missed them you are saying? Maybe you agreed with a
president
> > who keeps stating it's "his" government.
>
> Listen to almost any executive...be it a governor, mayor or president.
> Saying it it his/her government, administration, etc is no big deal.
>

Maybe you think so. I do not. I don't think it's OK for a person in a
political office in the United States to make it appear that they are an
island unto themselves.

> > That's just one of the many, many
> > statements I've heard him make that really concern me.
>
> Pretty lame if that's the best you can give me as an example.
>

If you think I'm going to make personal/physical effort to give you examples
of things you can see and hear (and obviously agree with/don't mind) on TV
every day, then you're wrong. The effort isn't worth it, Bill, you've made
your mind up...just as I have.

> > Then, there's the
> > great Rumsfeld...oh, good grief, what a brat he must've been when he was
a
> > little boy.
>
> Because?
>

> > > > Why is it that countries
> > > > that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side
> of
> > > > the fence from us now?
> > >
> > > Follow the money. Every day now we learn more about the back door
> > > cozy financial relationships between Saddam's regime and some of
> > > our "close allies."
> >
> > We won't mention any of our financially "close allies" will we?
>
> Such as?
>
> > > > In significant part, it's because we've told them
> > > > in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.
> > >
> > > Not that they have essentially said/done the same thing
> > > to us.
> >
> > And the beat goes on...
>
> The news isn't exactly glowing for folks of your opinion.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

Yep, like that last one, Bill. You're a politician aren't you?

Kim W5TIT

2349. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 16:53:31 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <F09B2214947A8137.8FBD6D3EDCDCC5FF.1D529E2EBDA6BFA7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64587

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b79953tdc1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:pan.2003.04.12.02.17.58.321715.29110@arrl.org...
> > On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 19:48:32 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > >> It's one thing to disagree about things, it's another to belittle and
> > >> demean those with whom you disagree.
> >
> > > Examples please of the administrations "belittling and demeaning".
> >
> > Rumsfeld: [France and Germany are] "old Europe."
> >
> > Perle: Sy Hersh [Pulitzer Prize winning reporter] is the closest thing
> > American journalism has to a terrorist.
> >
> > DeLay: Fermez la bouche, Monsieur Daschle. [Okay, DeLay isn't part of
the
> > Administration, but he's tight with them.]
> >
> > Other examples can easily be found.
>
> So what. Why must everyone/anyone not be free to comment on
> the vaulted press. Add Peter Arrnett to my list of traitors and
> pond scum.
>

Uh huh. You'll discount/discredit any points that aren't in line with your
side, Bill. Who said they are not free? No one said that, Bill. You're
trying to twist from what the actual point is that was made. Evidence is
pointed up and you respond with, "So what?" INDEED....

> > >> Why is it that countries
> > >> that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side
of
> > >> the fence from us now?
> > >
> > > Follow the money. Every day now we learn more about the back door
cozy
> > > financial relationships between Saddam's regime and some of our "close
> > > allies."
> >
> > Examples?
>

> France, Germany and Russia with oil contracts and selling banned
> weopons to Saddam.
>
> > Oh, and if it's all about following money, who's going to benefit
> > monetarily from those rebuilding-Iraq contracts that are being offered
> > only to selected US companies?
>
> You tell me. Would you not want those contracts to go
> to US companies?
>
> > >> In significant part, it's because we've told them in so many words
that
> > >> we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.
> > >
> > > Not that they have essentially said/done the same thing to us.
> >
> > No, they've said they disagree with us. That's not the same thing.
>
> Jon, that is bunk. Many hate what we are...free,
> democratic and successful...and they don't care what we think
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

You've been in the trunk too long....

Kim W5TIT

2350. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 17:08:48 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.12.17.08.48.5332.2786@arrl.org>
Source record: 64584

On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 04:46:02 -0400, Brian Kelly wrote:
> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:<pan.2003.04.11.16.28.58.178387.18686@arrl.org>...
>> But others are in a position to supply help in this case. You asked for
>> evidence that history won't repeat itself.
>
> Ya made a wrong turn. I asked Dwight if he had any evidence which
> indicated that we would treat Iraq any differently than we treated, as
> examples, our former enemies the Germans and the Italians almost
> immediately after WW2.

What you said was: "Did you notice that we didn't get much if any help from the UN when we almost single-handedly rebuilt Europe after WW2? What shred of evidence do you have which indicates that history will not repeat itself in the case of Iraq?" Perhaps you can see why I took "shred of evidence ... that history will not repeat itself" as referring to the helpfulness of others rather than to the behavior of the US.

As for shreds of evidence about US behavior, consider the case of Afghanistan. Despite assurances from the US that copious help would be coming, the Administration's attention to the problem has been spotty. For example, the Administration's 2003 budget included no request for Afghan humanitarian or reconstruction aid at all! This oversight isn't indicative of a program that has a high priority. One wonders if Iraq will suffer from the same neglect once we're on to the next adventure.

> So it seems that the question remains on the table in the minds of some,
> mostly those who those who lost their bets about how events would go in
> Iraq. Soreheads looking for a way out.

I'm not a sorehead. But the question remains on the table in my mind.

> This really cooks it for me. In other words they don't give a rat's
> patooie about relieving the suffering in Iraq, all they care about who
> controls the recovery effort. It's the Old Europe syndrome again, the
> suffering millions be damned, what really matters is CONTROL.

No question that they are concerned about control. So are we!

>> Do you
>> think the US would have attacked SH had it not been for 9/11?
>
> Of course not. We wouldn't have eventually nuked Hiroshima and Nagasaki
> if the Japs hadn't hit Pearl Harbor either.

So why should France and Germany condone attacking SH? Put it another way: If it had been the Eiffel tower and the Brandenburg Gate that OBL's crowd

had attacked, would the US have supported them attacking Iraq? I'm not so sure.

> We almost
> invariably have to get caught with our drawers down around our ankles
> before we wake up, come roaring out of our "splendid isolation" and do
> what we gotta do. An unconventional war on terrorism was formally
> declared as a result of 9/11 as was conventional WW2 for us on 7/8 Dec
> 41. The Taliban & OBL have been one pair of targets, Saddam's regime is
> the latest. Unconventional. Fight fire with fire.

There is little evidence that Saddam was directly supporting OBL and crowd, and certainly not with WMD. Saddam was a slug and deserved to be squashed. But it's unclear that doing so will help win the war on terrorism.

>> If we blow off the UN we're letting them off the hook. They can say
>> they were never given a chance to help. Instead, hold their feet to the
>> fire.
>
> That's pretty Machiavellian but I like it. Problem there is that they'll
> screw it up and blame us for putting them in a position to screw up.

They can only get away with that for so long. Even their own people will smell a rat eventually. If, that is, we stop insulting them and making them think the US is the problem.

>> > I basically agree with that WRT to the current situation. What I do
>> > not agree with however is the notion that the UN as a body has some
>> > inherent right to tell us how much patience we need to develop for
>> > that organization's impotence. While they do nothing and we fund it.
>>
>> Who said they could TELL us to do anything?
>
> Are you kidding? The millions who have opposed our invasion of Iraq
> without a UN mandate, a permission slip from the UN to take out Saddam.
> If that ain't an attempt to tell us what we can and cannot do I don't
> know what is. Din work. I hope they get used to it.

There's a difference between requiring permission and wanting to achieve consensus. If your characterization were correct, those millions would have continued to oppose the war after the 48-hour ultimatim. But most did not. Clearly, once they became convinced that diplomacy had run its course, they were satisfied. That hardly translates to requiring the UN's permission.

>> You know, my neighbor doesn't have the right to tell me what to do, nor
>> I him, but if I'm doing something that disturbs him or he's doing
>> something that disturbs me, I certainly want to talk to him about it.
>> The bottom line is that if you don't like the way other UN member
>> states are behaving, you're still better off talking to them than
>> ignoring them. Talk costs nothing.

>
> Normally yes, that's only common sense. But there can come a point when
> the talking has gotten you nowhere and ya take it to the next level and
> call the cops.

Yep. And I'm all for that when it gets to that level.

Jon

2351. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 18:12:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412141226.19789.00000159@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 64588

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/12/2003 6:03 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030412070313.26171.00001061@mb-fd.aol.com>

>Because I liked build'g ckts. I did what I like doing. I didn't look to see
>if
>it was a growth industry or if it was popular.

Gee whiz...ya think SOME folks get into Amateur Radio for similar reasons
and without wondering if it's "popular" or not...?!?!

>Problem is every-1 else uses the wrong def. For ex., the word "Engineer" is
>often rongly used. Some "Engineers" R lower than the lowest of <REAL> techs.

You been drinking last night, or do you have an 8-year old ghost writing
for you today?

Do you realize just how silly this sounds and looks?

>We have amateur radio licenses, not Ham radio licenses. "Ham radio" is a sub
>group of amateurs. Some Cbers R amateurs (tho this be illegal).

WHOA! Where in the Blue Blazes did you come up with THAT gem...?!?!
CBer's can't be licensed Amateurs and vice versa...?!?!

SHOW ME in ANY part of the FCC rules and regs that say THAT, Vipul ! ! !

>It is legal to xmit on the broadcast band without a license, so this can be
>"amateur radio", but NOT "Ham radio" (since they not have amateur radio
>license).

Ahhhhh....You ARE drunk! Or stoned...Or maybe both?

It is NOT illegal to "xmit on the broadcast band without a license"...

Read part 15, Vippy.

>Just from this 1 example, "amateur radio" is NOT the same as "Ham radio", tho
>there R overlaps.

Amateur Radio and "Ham" radio are one in the same. No "overlaps"
involved. The same thing.

Now go sober up and don't come back before you do. Or fire that 8-year
old. Your "stuff" is hard enough to follow as it is.

Where did you go to college again?

Steve

2352. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 18:14:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412141438.19789.00000160@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 64589

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/12/2003 6:07 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030412070718.26171.00001062@mb-fd.aol.com>

>Yes, others have said that also. I must be mistaken about losing 5 wpm skill.
>Seems it does not happen with Morse code due to probably to something of
>Morse
>code, which I am not aware of.

The insanity of this assertion, Vipul, is like saying that because I can I
can speak at normal conversational rates, I can no longer communicate by saing
one word at a time.

Are we getting the point yet?

Steve

2353. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 18:19:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412141935.19789.00000161@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 64590

>Subject: Re: Infidel no-coders
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/12/2003 6:18 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030412071818.26171.00001063@mb-fd.aol.com>

>From K4YZ:
>>How does MENTIONING any given part of the electromagmetic spectrum
>>identify one as an "appliance operator", Vipul?
>
>Because that band segment ,27 MHz, is not amateur radio, its CB.

OK...Well, I have mentioned 27Mhz on numerous occassions...Does the mere mentioning of CB make me an appliance operator?

>>If all non-CW
>>>activity
>>>is a lie, would you like broadcast radios to have only CW broadcasts? Of
>>>course
>>>not.
>>
>> But WHY not? Think of all the spectrum we'll save from all those
>wasted
>>sidebands!
>>
>
>So now you want EVERYONE to learn Morse code, even non-amateurs?

Sure...Why not. If Morse Code was taught from grade school, it would be exceedingly easy to learn and become a part of our normal activities of daily living. In ONE GENERATION, we could reduce the ened for electromagnetic spectrum by at LEAST 90%.

>I would never force others not to use code, if they wanted to. So why should
>code be imposed on people that don't want to learn it?

If we teach it from "Day 1", they won't know the difference.

Steve

(is anyone else laughing as hard as I am...???)

2354. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 18:21:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412142156.19789.00000162@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 64591

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test)
>Date: 4/12/2003 7:38 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030412083832.11628.00000063@mb-fz.aol.com>

>> Don't say THAT, Dave...that would leave the Nitwit Trio out in the cold
>>forever!
>
>Are they any relation to the Nairobi Trio?

The Nairobi Trio? Three thinly clad women applying hair-removal lotion to
their legs?

Steve

2355. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 18:50:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412145056.23756.00000164@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 64593

In article <20030412070313.26171.00001061@mb-fd.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From N2EY:
>
>>EE isn't a growth industry? Then why did you go into it?
>
>Because I liked build'g ckts.

You could do that as a hobby.

> I did what I like doing. I didn't look to see
>if it was a growth industry or if it was popular.
>
Then don't complain when others don't share your interest ;-)

>>You're usually vry unclear. PArt of the problem is that you attach your own
>>definitions to words, rather than use the definitions everyone else uses.
>
>Problem is every-1 else uses the wrong def.

That's YOUR problem, not theirs.

Example: If everyone else calls a 2N2222 a transistor, and you insist on calling it a cheese sandwich, you're the one who is the cause of confusion.

>For ex., the word "Engineer" is
>often rongly used.

Did you know that AOL software contains a spellchecker?

>Some "Engineers" R lower than the lowest of <REAL> techs.
>
"Lower"? In what way?

>>For
>>example, you talk about "ham radio" as if it is not the same thing as
>>"amateur
>>radio". To everyone else, the two terms mean the same thing.
>
>We have amateur radio licenses, not Ham radio licenses.

That's right. But the two terms mean the same thing. Been that way for many decades. Only you make a distinction.

>"Ham radio" is a sub
>group of amateurs.

No, the two groups are the same. Identical sets.

>Some Cbers R amateurs (tho this be illegal).
>
A cber who gets an amateur radio license is both an amateur radio operator and a cber. I know several who have dine just that - most are nice folks, a few are not. Nothing illegal about any of it as long as all FCC rules are followed.

>It is legal to xmit on the broadcast band without a license, so this can be
>"amateur radio", but NOT "Ham radio" (since they not have amateur radio
>license).

Incorrect. By definition, amateur radio requires an amateur radio license. The term "amateur radio" is DEFINED that way.
>
>Just from this 1 example, "amateur radio" is NOT the same as "Ham radio", tho
>there R overlaps.
>
Which version of AOL are you using? The spellchecker is in every version from at least 3.0

>>>which means Morse code is more useful
>>>(according to N2EY's logic).
>>
>>If something is used more, is it not more useful?
>
>Here's the logic:
>A: To many people, including me Morse code is fun so I use Morse code.

That's true for me. It could be true for you, too.

>B: Is Morse really useful?

Yes, by definition

>A: Yes, because many people use it.
>
>You can substitute anything U find fun, such as cable TV. Then cable TV
>becomes useful.

Only if it is actually used.

>Don't confuse "fun" with useful.

I don't.

A thing is useful if it has a use. Last night I used Morse code on the amateur radio 40 meter band to communicate with 3 other radio amateurs. Lots of fun.

I used the homebrew 100 watt 80/40/20 meter transceiver I designed about 8 years ago for those QSOs. It is powered by homebrew power supplies, and sits on a homebrew table and shelf arrangement that also holds my homebrew transmatch/SWR meter/antenna&rig selector, homebrew speaker, homebrew T/R system. All of which I designed and built myself. Also on the table are an Elecraft K2 (designed by others but built by me), a Telechron mechanical

digital 24 hour clock (built from the parts of several junk clocks of the same manufacture) and my six radiotelegraph keys (all factory made). Plus a lamp from Ikea, some pencils and paper, etc. No computer yet.

When's the last time you contacted another radio amateur using a transceiver you designed and built yourself, Vipul?

>More Hams use it because more Hams find it
>fun. That does not make it more useful.

Sure it does!

In the following deiscussion, the term "ham" and "radio amateur" mean the same thing - just like in any other rational discussion)

If only two hams use Morse code, then it is only useful for those two hams to communicate with each other. One possible 2-way QSO.

If three hams use Morse code, then it is useful for those three hams to communicate with each other. Three possible two-way QSOs and one possible three-way QSO. Total of four possible QSOs

If four hams use Morse code, then it is useful for those four hams to communicate with each other. Six possible two-way QSOs, four possible three-way QSOs and one possible four-way QSOs. Total of eleven possible QSOs.

You can work out the progression for yourself. It's clear that as the number of hams using Morse increases, so do the number of possible QSOs. More possible QSOs equals more useful.

You cannot escape the logic. Not only is Morse code useful for radio amateurs, it becomes more useful as more hams use use it.

None of which means any particular ham MUST use it, or that atest for it MUST be retained. Just that it's useful.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2356. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 18:50:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412145058.23756.00000165@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 64594

In article <20030411201751.15821.00000087@mb-cg.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>>
>>Are any of the facts presented incorrect?
>
> Conclusions based on selective use of facts is biased, incorrect.

Are any of the facts presented incorrect?
>
>>>>However the fact can then be used
>>>>to support advocating Morse.
>>
>>Is that a bad thing?
>
> For licensing in US amateur radio it is considered "bad" by many.

Advocating the USE of Morse is bad?

Who considers it bad besides you and Vipul?

> So much so, they've not bothered to get into US amateur radio.

Who are these "many" who have allegedly been turned away?
>
>>>Thats what I mean. Chosing to look at the numbers that way is advocating
>>>Morse code.
>>
>>Is that a bad thing?
>
> That is biased, incorrect, a mistake, an error.

Yes, you and Vipul make many such errors. Try to fix them.

> It is spin,
> propaganda, self-interest, and a lot of not too good
> attributes.

Glad to see you're finally recognizing your mistakes ;-)
>
>>>N2EY claimed more Morse code sales indicates Morse code is growing,
>>
>>Morse code USE. Is that not a logical conclusion?
>
> There is a dearth of business information in regards to the
> "growth" of morse code use.

Vibroplex is still in business, MFJ is in business, Ten-Tec, lots of other companies.

I wouldn't take business advice from somebody who confuses "bankrupt" with "unprofitable", though.

>
>>>which means more poeple are interested in it,
>>
>>Is that not a logical conclusion? I don't think many people are buying new
>>keys, paddles, keyers, software, filters, rigs and other Morse-code-related
>>equipment and then not using it.
>
> If your only "hammer" pounds out morse code, then everything
> must indicate morsemanship to you.

I don't use a hammer for that, even though I have several hammers. Also drills, saws, soldering tools, wrenches, pliers, socket sets, and a number of other tools.

For sending Morse code I have a selection of four Vibroplex bugs, a J-37 straight key, and a new Mini-Paddle (thanks to the generous ham who gave me the latter).

>
>>>which means Morse code is more useful
>>>(according to N2EY's logic).
>>
>>If something is used more, is it not more useful?
>>
>>Why does it bother you if someone proves that Morse code is useful?
>
> Morse code is NOT "useful."

That is biased, incorrect, a mistake, an error. It is spin, propaganda, self-interest, and a lot of not too good attributes.

In short, Len, it's just plain wrong.

If a thing has a use, it is useful. I used Morse code to communicate with three different hams last night on the 40 meter band. Great QSOs.

Of course Morse code is not useful to someone who doesn't know how to use it, just as a book is not useful to someone who cannot read (except perhaps as fuel or to prop up wobbly furniture).

> Of all the US radio services that
> existed since the end of WW2, only two retain morse code
> modes for any sort of communications purpose.

So what?

> One of them
> is maritime radio services but the maritime world has gone over
> to voice and data and GMDSS has supplanted the old 500 KHz

> morse-required international distress and safety frequency.

And the other is...amateur radio! And this is...an amateur radio newsgroup! And we're discussing whether Morse code is useful...in amateur radio!

How about that, Captain Obvious? ;-) ;-) ;-)

Since Morse code IS used in amateur radio, it IS useful to amateur radio operators.

Why does that bother you so much?
>
> Morse code mode is slow and error-prone in requiring humans
> at each end to be the encoder and decoder.

Guess people shouldn't talk to each other then, huh? Humans at each end, encoding, decoding, making mistakes....

> Maximum
> throughput is, at best, 30 WPM only be very skilled and
> experienced morsemen.

That is biased, incorrect, a mistake, an error. It is spin, propaganda, self-interest, and a lot of not too good attributes.

In short, Len, it's just plain wrong.

The *best* skilled ops do at least twice 30 WPM. I can do 40-45 wpm on a good day. Effective throughput is much higher due to the use of abbreviations, prosigns, Q signals, etc.

> The slowest teleprinters in radio
> communications have been 100 WPM for four decades,

That is biased, incorrect, a mistake, an error. It is spin, propaganda, self-interest, and a lot of not too good attributes.

In short, Len, it's just plain wrong.

Lots of 60 wpm teletype in use, though not as much as before. I was using 60 wpm machines on the air in the mid-70s. Less than four decades ago.

> can
> do so 24/7 with enough paper to reload, don't need food,
> don't need breaks, don't need to go to the bathroom. Data
> rates can go to 200+ WPM equivalent and use forward-
> error correction codings to improve reliability through
> interference.

Sure. Very useful. Just like Morse code. Hams use all sorts of modes, Len.

> Every OTHER US radio service gets along quite fine without
> using morse or ever envisioning its use.

So? Their needs, goals and resources are different.

What is wrong with live and let live?

> US amateur radio
> licenses MUST have demonstrated morse code cognition
> to have below-30-MHz privileges.

Until the treaty is changed and FCC drops Element 1, that is true. A simple, 5 wpm, receive-only, one-time-in-your-life test is all that's been required for almost 3 years now.

On the other hand, no code skill has been required for an amateur radio license giving all privileges above 30 MHz. Been that way for over 12 years. Lots of real, genuine, first-class, fine-and-upstanding hams hold that class of license. All part of the big happy family we call amateur radio.

Besides, we're talking about Morse code USE, not the TEST. The test is all but gone.

But the USE will continue for a long, long time. Live with it.

2357. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 18:51:24 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412145124.23756.00000166@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 64592

In article <20030412105716.08710.00000812@mb-fj.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>>Sounds like that idiot Bruce.
>
>Your Mama is an IDIOT. Just look at you, your living Proof that animals and
>Humans have mated.

It takes one to.....
Pot calling the.....
You spot it, you got....

no, no, it's just TOO easy.....:-)

2358. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 20:11:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412161131.18459.00000047@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 64595

In article <b77opkult1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Let me give you my view of the speech of desent.
>
>There are several levels of disent...
>
>1. Those that seriously and logically question why?

Agreed.

>2. Those that simply say NO and do so in an overt fashion
>such as public demonstrations.

Agreed.

>3. Those that say NO and do so in an aggressively overt fashion
>which can and often is used by our enemies to bolster the
>position of our enemy (Jane Fonda going to Hanoi...perfect example)

Jane Fonda didn't just say no. Nor did she just go to North Vietnam, which in
itself is not unpatriotic. (She could have brought back valuable intelligence
just by describing what she saw - highly patriotic).

What Hanoi Jane did was to voluntarily commit actions in enemy territory that
directly resulted in harm to American POWs and possibly others. These actions
are well documented (see:

http://www.snopes.com

for a detailed description of what has and has not been proven about her
actions there).

In addition, her actions actually damaged the antiwar movement and probably
extended the war. Just my opinion.

>4. Those that demonstrate and in so doing, violate the law which
>infringes other people's rights.

See below
>
>I support 1 and don't consider it unpatriotic.

Agreed.

>I support 2, but believe the participants should understand
>they may be giving aid/comfort to the enemy and that they
>should understand and accept responsibility for their
>public comments.

That depends on what the comments are. Each has to be judged on its merits.

>I believe 3 and 4 are clearly unpatriotic.

I agree 100% on 3.

4 is another "it depends" case. Blocking traffic or destroying govt. property is simply criminal activity UNLESS it can be shown that a law is being intentionally broken so that said law can be tested in court. This was done by civil rights demonstrators who sat at the "wrong" lunch counters and refused to give up bus seats.

That said, it's hard to see how blocking traffic in San Francisco can force the courts to test the legality of any war.

--

For a radio-related example, imagine if the FCC somehow banned all live radio/TV/internet coverage of anti-war demonstrations. (I doubt very much any administration would do this, but let's do the thought experiment anyway.)

Suppose some hams defied the ban and used ATV linked to websites to cover various anti-war demonstrations. Suppose they were hauled into court on rules violation charges. (FCC knew who they were because they scrupulously followed all other FCC rules, including ID and non-broadcast rules).

They would then be able to challenge the constitutional basis of the law banning the coverage. (I'm guessing they would win). Their actions would certainly be patriotic because they were forcing the system to work in accordance with the Constitution.

Anybody besides me remember the NSIN?

>Your mileage may vary,
>but that's my opinion.
>
Sounds pretty reasonable to me, Bill.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2359. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 20:41:12 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412164112.12142.00000083@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 64598

In article <f45722ac.0304120542.103dce54@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
>news:<20030411203815.23756.00000155@mb-fj.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0304110425.24cb1df9@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >Where have all the hams gone?
>> >
>> Gone to Internet, every one :-)
>>
>> When will you ever learn? :-)
>
>Is that petula clark?
>
no. :-)

not e.e.cummings either :-)

be happy in your work

2360. Re: ARLB029 - ... and Vietnam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 20:41:13 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412164113.12142.00000085@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 64596

In article <f45722ac.0304111805.bda9c6a@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>The International Amateur Radio Union (IARU) has admitted three new
>member societies. The National Association Radioamateurs of Georgia
>(NARG), the Federation of Radiosport of the Republic of Armenia
>(FRRA) were voted in April 10; the Vietnam Amateur Radio Club (VARC)
>officially joined IARU on April 4

Are they for or against code testing?

2361. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 20:41:13 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412164113.12142.00000084@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 64597

In article <20030412141438.19789.00000160@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> The insanity of this assertion, Vipul, is like saying that because I can I
>can speak at normal conversational rates, I can no longer communicate by
>saing
>one word at a time.

I can only say one word at a time. What does it sound like to say more than one word at the same time? :-)

2362. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 20:43:54 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412164354.26171.00001100@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 64599

From K4YZ:

> WHOA! Where in the Blue Blazes did you come up with THAT gem...?!?!
>CBer's can't be licensed Amateurs and vice versa...?!?!

No, I meant CBers experimenting WITHOUT an amateur radio licence -thats illegal. Technically they are radio amateurs (not professional).

>It is NOT illegal to "xmit on the broadcast band without a license"...

Thats what I said. So, you agree with what I said.

Since they are xmitting on this band, they are radio amatuers.
But, since they don't have amateur radio license, they are not a Ham.

Therefore, there are some radio amateurs that are not Hams.

>Now go sober up and don't come back before you do. Or fire that 8-year
>old. Your "stuff" is hard enough to follow as it is.
>Where did you go to college again?

Lots of EE college students write like that. I have emails to prove it.

2363. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 20:49:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412164906.08890.00000889@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 64600

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test)
>Date: 4/12/2003 3:41 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030412164113.12142.00000084@mb-fr.aol.com>

>I can only say one word at a time. What does it sound like to say more than
>one
>word at the same time?

Try reading Vipul's or Markie's posts...Kinda like that!

Steve

2364. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 21:02:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412170213.08890.00000890@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 64502

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/12/2003 3:43 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030412164354.26171.00001100@mb-fd.aol.com>

>> WHOA! Where in the Blue Blazes did you come up with THAT gem...?!?!
>>CBer's can't be licensed Amateurs and vice versa...?!?!
>
>No, I meant CBers experimenting WITHOUT an amateur radio licence -thats
>illegal. Technically they are radio amateurs (not professional).

You're STILL wrong, Vipul. CBers CAN "experiment" without an Amateur license...They just can't make any adjustments to the transmitter itself. There are DOZENS of other things they can do with their stations that doesn't violate Part 95.

>>It is NOT illegal to "xmit on the broadcast band without a license"...
>
>Thats what I said. So, you agree with what I said.

That's NOT what you said. No, I do NOT agree with you.

>Since they are xmitting on this band, they are radio amatuers.
>But, since they don't have amateur radio license, they are not a Ham.

People transmitting on a Part 97 allocation without a license and not in compliance with Part 15 are BOOTLEGGERS.

>Therefore, there are some radio amateurs that are not Hams.

Nope. Licensure under Part 97 is necessary to be considered a "radio amateur". Anyone else is just a "radio hobbyist".

>>Now go sober up and don't come back before you do. Or fire that 8-year
>>old. Your "stuff" is hard enough to follow as it is.
>>Where did you go to college again?
>
>Lots of EE college students write like that. I have emails to prove it.

Does writing like an idiot make it OK to be an idiot, Vipul?

Steve

2365. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 21:13:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412171346.08928.00001050@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 64504

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>Date: 4/12/2003 4:57 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <eZ%la.862$7F2.478690@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>

>It's an inherent ability of the
>human brain....(SNIP)

The operative word there being "human", Dee...

Steve

2366. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 21:17:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412171739.08928.00001051@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 64505

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>Date: 4/12/2003 5:07 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <N60ma.905$7F2.482613@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>

>You are all messed up in your definitions. Where on earth did you get them?

From his "Viptionary"...?!?!

>You cannot impose your personal preference of definitions on terms as
>actually used. It just doesn't work and makes a mess of any attempt to
>communicate.

Must be a student of George Orwell.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2367. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 21:23:19 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412172319.26171.00001103@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 64507

From N2EY:

>>>EE isn't a growth industry? Then why did you go into it?
>>
>>Because I liked build'g ckts.
>
>You could do that as a hobby.

True, but I couldn't imagine doing in anything else. So I would not know what else to major in.

>>Problem is every-1 else uses the wrong def.
>That's YOUR problem, not theirs.

No, thats society's problem. Unclear (or even dishonest) definitions badly affect those involved.

>If everyone else calls a 2N2222 a transistor, and you insist on
>calling it a cheese sandwich

What if others call a cheese sandwich a 2N2222, and I say "no that's a cheese sandwich"?

>>It is legal to xmit on the broadcast band without a license, so this can be
>>"amateur radio", but NOT "Ham radio" (since they not have amateur radio
>>license).
>
>Incorrect. By definition, amateur radio requires an amateur radio license.
>The
>term "amateur radio" is DEFINED that way.

It seems too complicated for you. I will try to be clearer. Try to follow.

A radio amateur includes someone that experiments with radio circuits.

It is legal to build circuits and transmit on the broadcast band. A person who builds a circuit and transmits on the broadcast band is a radio amateur.

If that person does not have an amateur radio license, that person cannot be a Ham.

Only one example is needed to prove the assertion. There exists a group of radio amateurs (broadcast band experimenters) such that they are not Ham (no amateur radio license).

So "amateur radio" is not the same as "Ham radio".

>I used the homebrew 100 watt 80/40/20 meter transceiver I designed about 8
>years ago for those QSOs. It is powered by homebrew power supplies, and sits

>on
>a homebrew table and shelf arrangement that also holds my homebrew
>transmatch/SWR meter/antenna&rig selector, homebrew speaker, homebrew T/R
>system.

Wow, that's cool!

>You cannot escape the logic. Not only is Morse code useful for radio
>amateurs,
>it becomes more useful as more hams use use it.
>
>None of which means any particular ham MUST use it, or that atest for it MUST
>be retained. Just that it's useful.

That's a fair statement.

2368. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 21:36:45 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412173645.26171.00001104@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 64508

From K4YZ:

>OK...Well, I have mentioned 27Mhz on numerous occassions...Does the mere
>mentioning of CB make me an appliance operator?

No, but the author referred to people who operate on CB as "filthy". The author then proposed "Morse code" as the solution for this. Morse code is operating an appliance - although with real-time <human> encoding/decoding.

>Sure...Why not. If Morse Code was taught from grade school, it would be
>exceedingly easy to learn and become a part of our normal activities of daily
>living. In ONE GENERATION, we could reduce the ened for electromagnetic
>spectrum by at LEAST 90%.
>

You heard it here. K4YZ wants EVERYONE (not just radio amateurs) to learn Morse code.

We have more than enough spectrum to make our lives easier. There is no great need of conservation. In fact, much of TV spectrum and even amateur radio spectrum is unused. Learning Morse code would be an unneeded burden on everyone.

>If we teach it from "Day 1", they won't know the difference.
>
>Steve
>
>(is anyone else laughing as hard as I am...???)

Yes, I am. That's really funny!

2369. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 21:46:14 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412174614.20407.00000835@mb-fu.aol.com>
Source record: 64509

>It takes one to.....
>Pot calling the.....
>You spot it, you got....
>

Is this the best you can do, come on be a little original, I know its hard for you to be orignial

2370. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 21:57:30 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <eZ%la.862$7F2.478690@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64501

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030412070718.26171.00001062@mb-fd.aol.com...
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >> >Someone who is proficient in
> >> >morse at 35 wpm does not lose his ability to copy 5 wpm.
>
> Yes, others have said that also. I must be mistaken about losing 5 wpm
skill.
> Seems it does not happen with Morse code due to probably to something of
Morse
> code, which I am not aware of.
>

Nothing special at all. Auctioneers do not lose the ability to talk at normal speeds. Musicians can still play Brahms lullaby even after they've mastered "The Flight of the Bumblebee". It's an inherent ability of the human brain to be able to handle information at the highest speed it is trained for and speeds SLOWER than that.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2371. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 22:07:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <N60ma.905$7F2.482613@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64503

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030412070313.26171.00001061@mb-fd.aol.com...
> From N2EY:
>
> >EE isn't a growth industry? Then why did you go into it?
>
> Because I liked build'g ckts. I did what I like doing. I didn't look to
see if
> it was a growth industry or if it was popular.
>
> >You're usually vry unclear. PArt of the problem is that you attach your
own
> >definitions to words, rather than use the definitions everyone else uses.
>
> Problem is every-1 else uses the wrong def. For ex., the word "Engineer"
is
> often rongly used. Some "Engineers" R lower than the lowest of <REAL>
techs.
>
> >For
> >example, you talk about "ham radio" as if it is not the same thing as
> >"amateur
> >radio". To everyone else, the two terms mean the same thing.
>
> We have amateur radio licenses, not Ham radio licenses. "Ham radio" is a
sub
> group of amateurs. Some Cbers R amateurs (tho this be illegal).
>
> It is legal to xmit on the broadcast band without a license, so this can
be
> "amateur radio", but NOT "Ham radio" (since they not have amateur radio
> license).
>
> Just from this 1 example, "amateur radio" is NOT the same as "Ham radio",
tho
> there R overlaps.
>

You are all messed up in your definitions. Where on earth did you get them?
We are licensed in the Amateur Radio Service. This is the exact term used
in the FCC rules. Common speech reserves the term amateur radio (not
capitalized) to those licensed in the Amateur Radio Service. Ham radio is a
slang term for the Amateur Radio Service. They are one and the same thing.
Ham radio is thus NOT a subset of amateur radio. On the other hand, CB is

never referred to as amateur radio in common speech either by the ham radio community or the CB radio community. FCC rules use the term Citizen's Band Radio Service and the common term is CB radio.

You cannot impose your personal preference of definitions on terms as actually used. It just doesn't work and makes a mess of any attempt to communicate. You need to use the terms in the same manner as the majority of speakers use them. It is this majority consensus of usage that eventually becomes the dictionary definition. Dictionaries are intended to document and support the current usage of the language not freeze it in time. This is why dictionaries are periodically revised, to capture the new and/or changed meanings of words as used in common speech.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2372. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 22:16:31 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <3f0ma.934$7F2.485309@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64506

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030412164354.26171.00001100@mb-fd.aol.com...
> From K4YZ:
>
> Lots of EE college students write like that. I have emails to prove it.
>

Egad, someone remind me to require all EE college students applying for jobs to submit samples of English composition. Clear communications is paramount and if they can't or won't do it, I'm not hiring!!

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2373. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 22:33:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412183339.03676.00000570@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 64511

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/12/2003 4:23 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030412172319.26171.00001103@mb-fd.aol.com>

>True, but I couldn't imagine doing in anything else. So I would not know what
>else to major in.

English Composition is a sure bet to not be on the list.

>No, thats society's problem. Unclear (or even dishonest) definitions badly
>affect those involved.

Sorry Vippy...YOU are the one with the perception problem here. It's YOUR
place to fix it. Sorry you don't agree.

>What if others call a cheese sandwich a 2N2222, and I say "no that's a cheese
>sandwich"?

Then you've still got a problem. If everyone ELSE calls it a 2N2222, then
YOU had better call it one too if you expect to eat.

>It seems too complicated for you. I will try to be clearer. Try to follow.

WE understand fine. That you want to call a spade a carrot, is fine, but
it's still a spade and you're wrong. Sorry.

>It is legal to build circuits and transmit on the broadcast band. A person
>who
>builds a circuit and transmits on the broadcast band is a radio amateur.

No...A person who builds a circuit and transmits on the broadcast band is
either an amateur BROADCASTER, or a radio HOBBYIST.

A Radio Amateur is a person who has taken the Amateur Radio examination(s)
and possesses an Amateur Radio license.

>Only one example is needed to prove the assertion. There exists a group of
>radio amateurs (broadcast band experimenters) such that they are not Ham (no
>amateur radio license).

Still need your "one example", Vipul. They are radio HOBBYISTS or amateur
BROADCASTERS. They are NOT "radio amateurs" regardless of how YOU rationalize
it.

>So "amateur radio" is not the same as "Ham radio".

Yes it is...One in the same... Absolutely NO difference.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2374. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 22:45:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412184521.03676.00000572@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 64512

>Subject: Re: Infidel no-coders
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/12/2003 4:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030412173645.26171.00001104@mb-fd.aol.com>

>No, but the author referred to people who operate on CB as "filthy". The
>author
>then proposed "Morse code" as the solution for this. Morse code is operating
>an
>appliance - although with real-time <human> encoding/decoding.

In the Amateur Radio applicaiton, "appliance" refers to commercially designed and constructed radio equipment. I have several radios that do not meet that criteria. It has NOTHING to do with CB or Morse Code.

>You heard it here. K4YZ wants EVERYONE (not just radio amateurs) to learn
>Morse
>code.

And You ALSO heard it here (or at least where I said "is anyone else laughing as hard as I am) that it was sarcasm.

Sarcasm is hard to understand when you have a hard time understanding the language in which it is being used.

>We have more than enough spectrum to make our lives easier.

Perhaps at this exact second in time we do, but if you were ALSO paying attention to agendas outside of Amatuer Radio, spectrum allocations are hot topics, and reallocating them is a big business.

That's why the "Amateur Radio Spectrum Protection Act" is important for Amatuers to not only support, but promote.

>There is no great need of conservation.

(Is it really possible for ONE individual to be so ignorant of current events?)

>In fact, much of TV spectrum and even amateur radio
>spectrum is unused.

Yep. I guess it is.

>Learning Morse code would be an unneeded burden on
>everyone.

Why?

>>(is anyone else laughing as hard as I am...???)
>
>Yes, I am. That's really funny!

The problem is you ae laughing with the crowd with no understanding of WHY you are laughing...The "LAUGHTER" light came on and you reacted.

Steve

2375. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 23:01:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7a5r8$1bn$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64513

Sorry Brian...if you need it explained, it can't be. And Im not trying to be a smart alec.

Dan/W4NTI

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message news:f45722ac.0304111832.42b49eee@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message news:<b777vqrnb1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > The reality of the VN war is that is has NOT ended for those that actually
> > were involved.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Dan, would you mind explaining that?
>
> Perhaps we can get Kelly to check in and give us a status report or a "SITREP."
>
> Thanks, Brian

2376. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 23:11:57 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <131ma.1193$7F2.517434@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64510

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030412172319.26171.00001103@mb-fd.aol.com...
> From N2EY:
>
> >>Problem is every-1 else uses the wrong def.
> >That's YOUR problem, not theirs.
>
> No, thats society's problem. Unclear (or even dishonest) definitions badly
> affect those involved.
>
> >If everyone else calls a 2N2222 a transistor, and you insist on
> >calling it a cheese sandwich
>
> What if others call a cheese sandwich a 2N2222, and I say "no that's a
cheese
> sandwich"?

Check the forward of any dictionary. The correct definition of a term is what the majority of users mean by the term. Dictionaries document the language as used they do not limit the language. If everyone chose to call that sandwich a 2N2222 then that would become not only the term for the transistor but also a term for that sandwich.

Afterall if language were static, we wouldn't have a word for sandwich. It is named for the Earl of Sandwich, who didn't want to interrupt his card game and so told his cook to place some meat between a couple of slices of bread and give it to him. Thus was born the sandwich. But if terms could not take on new meanings, the word Sandwich would have remained limited to use to describe the Earl of Sanwich's domain.

Words can have more than one meaning. Context clarifies the selection of meaning. One can eat a mint or they can visit the mint. One understands from the way it is used that the word mint means a candy in the first part of the sentence but a place where coins are made in the second part of the sentence.

Even though language grows and develops, a single person cannot create his own definitions. No one will understand him. The definitions grow and shift but the usage of the general population not an individual's preference.

Languages grow, develop, and change. That is the way life is.

Dee D. Flint.

2377. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-12 23:42:08 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412194208.25912.00000536@mb-ff.aol.com>
Source record: 64514

From Dee Flint, N8UZE:

>It's an inherent ability of the
>human brain to be able to handle information at the highest speed it is
>trained for and speeds SLOWER than that.

For some real-time encoding/decoding schemes, you <may> lose your ability to realtime encode/decode at a speed lower than a certain speed.

I know its hard to imagine. It seems counter-intuitive, but it does occur. I, myself have had that condition <on occasion>.

2378. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 00:06:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7a9rk$u3i$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64515

```
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:520241A31E9F97F0.C842FF8F50815C5B.6CE2A40F6A2A671E@lp.airnews.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b798g1$fih$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> >
news:B2721BD3DD214D6B.FA3BC933600ED5E6.F79774153C9FD206@lp.airnews.net...
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3E939DB3.28C419E@att.net...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Jon Bloom wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > Why is it that countries
> > > > > > that have been our close allies for many years are on the other
> side
> > > of
> > > > > > the fence from us now? In significant part, it's because we've
> told
> > > them
> > > > > > in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else
> thinks.
> > > > >
> > > > > Why Jon, I'm surprised you haven't heard. Don't you read the
news?
> > > > > France, Germany and Russia hold over half the Iraqi debt, which is
> > quite
> > > large
> > > > > since the sanctions of '91.
> > > > > . Who you suppose will pay off if Saddam goes?
> > > > >
> > > > > Dick
> > > >
> > > > Oh, by the way, we DON'T give a damn what they think. And that
happens
> > > > to be a *very* widely held opinion. They sell weapons and war
> technology
> > > to
> > > > Saddam and Al Queda and don't give a damn what WE think about that,
so
> > why
```

> > > > should
> > > > we ever again care what they think? All they're good for is
stymieing
> > > > anything and
> > > > everything constructive in the UN. And protecting *their* interests
> > > > regardless of any others.
> > >
> > > There ya go painting that broad paintbrush again, Dick. You forget
that
> > we
> > > the peons are at the mercies of what our governments do.
> >
> > Don't YOU vote? That's how we, the people, influence our government.
>
> I vote. Do I think it counts? No.

Pretty sorry attitude. Sounds like the only thing you'd be happy
to see is a government led by yourself...or by someone who
is 100% in sync with whatever your beliefs are. You don't want
a democracy if the majority doesn't agree with you...IMHO of course.

> > > The people of
> > > France and Germany have no more control over what their government
does
> > than
> > > we do of ours--just like the Iraqi people not having much control over
> > what
> > > their government did/does.
> >
> > Don't the people of France and Germany vote?
>
> You lay too much importance on voting, Bill. It *used* to mean something.
> I don't think it does any more. There's too much evidence that the
> politicians do whatever the hell they damned well please once they are in
> office.

They come up for re-election every 2,3,4 or 6 years depending
on the office they hold.

> > > Criticize where criticism is due. I do not
> > > fault the French or German, or any other, people in general. Nor
should
> > > anyone.
> >
> > Why not? Assessing fault is as much a right as free speech.
>
> Because I think it's pretty damned stupid to blame a whole country of
people
> for what their governments are doing. Now, if you think it's OK and the
> right thing to do, you go right ahead. But, I think you're wrong to do
so.

I'll give you that point to a degree.

> > I can recognize someone's right to free speech, but I am just as free
> > to fault that speech as being unAmerican, unpatriotic, etc.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
> >
> >
> >
>
> You seem to be forgetting that my point is that PEOPLE of a nation cannot
> generally be blamed for what their governments are doing.

That's true to a point...but the argument has
its limits. I was just following orders doesn't
cut it in the extremes of violence, brutality, etc.

> I certainly don't
> want to blamed for anything my government does, since I DIDN'T vote for
> them.

Has anyone blamed you for anything the USA has done?

> Nor do I want to be blamed when I think I'm voting for someone who'll
> actually represent the people and they turn around and act like every one
> else--doing what they please.

Sounds like a personal problem. Bottom line, you either participate
in government by voting or perhaps even running yourself...or you
just bitch about things you don't like.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2379. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 00:19:08 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7aainvmv1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64516

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030412161131.18459.00000047@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <b77opkult1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>
> >Let me give you my view of the speech of desent.
> >
> >There are several levels of disent...
> >
> >1. Those that seriously and logically question why?
>
> Agreed.
>
> >2. Those that simply say NO and do so in an overt fashion
> >such as public demonstrations.
>
> Agreed.
>
> >3. Those that say NO and do so in an aggressively overt fashion
> >which can and often is used by our enemies to bolster the
> >position of our enemy (Jane Fonda going to Hanoi...perfect example)
>
> Jane Fonda didn't just say no. Nor did she just go to North Vietnam, which
in
> itself is not unpatriotic.

Going to Hanoi was unpatriotic in and of itself. Now IF she
was spying for us and that was later disclosed, then I'd
chnage my mind. In the same light, Sean Penn and others
that went to Iraq before the war started are equally
unpatriotic in my book.

> (She could have brought back valuable intelligence
> just by describing what she saw - highly patriotic).

But she didn't.

> What Hanoi Jane did was to voluntarily commit actions in enemy territory
that
> directly resulted in harm to American POWs and possibly others. These
actions
> are well documented (see:
>
> http://www.snopes.com

>
> for a detailed description of what has and has not been proven about her
> actions there).
>
> In addition, her actions actually damaged the antiwar movement and
probably
> extended the war. Just my opinion.
>
> >4. Those that demonstrate and in so doing, violate the law which
> >infringes other people's rights.
>
> See below
> >
> >I support 1 and don't consider it unpatriotic.
>
> Agreed.
>
> >I support 2, but believe the participants should understand
> >they may be giving aid/comfort to the enemy and that they
> >should understand and accept responsibility for their
> >public comments.
>
> That depends on what the comments are. Each has to be judged on its
merits.
>
> >I believe 3 and 4 are clearly unpatriotic.
>
> I agree 100% on 3.
>
> 4 is another "it depends" case. Blocking traffic or destroying govt.
property
> is simply criminal activity UNLESS it can be shown that a law is being
> intentionally broken so that said law can be tested in court. This was
done by
> civil rights demonstrators who sat at the "wrong" lunch counters and
refused to
> give up bus seats.

Let's be serious here...I'm not talking about lunch counter
laws, back of the bus, etc. I'm talking about blocking
roads, access to buildings, etc.

> That said, it's hard to see how blocking traffic in San Francisco can
force the
> courts to test the legality of any war.

It's not testing the legality of a war...those that block roadways
should be arrested because they have NO right to violate
laws which, in so violating, the abridge the rights of others.

> For a radio-related example, imagine if the FCC somehow banned all live
> radio/TV/internet coverage of anti-war demonstrations. (I doubt very much
any
> administration would do this, but let's do the thought experiment anyway.)
>
> Suppose some hams defied the ban and used ATV linked to websites to cover
> various anti-war demonstrations. Suppose they were hauled into court on
rules
> violation charges. (FCC knew who they were because they scrupulously
followed
> all other FCC rules, including ID and non-broadcast rules).
>
> They would then be able to challenge the constitutional basis of the law
> banning the coverage. (I'm guessing they would win). Their actions would
> certainly be patriotic because they were forcing the system to work in
> accordance with the Constitution.

You're right, it is a bad example.

> Anybody besides me remember the NSIN?
>
> >Your mileage may vary,
> >but that's my opinion.
> >
> Sounds pretty reasonable to me, Bill.

I usually try for reasonable.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2380. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 00:26:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412202625.11628.00000070@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64517

In article <f45722ac.0304111855.1d764c53@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
>news:<pan.2003.04.11.10.01.41.941075.31793@arrl.org>...
>> On Thu, 10 Apr 2003 09:50:06 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
>> > N2EY wrote:
>> >
>> >> The KKK, witch burnings, religious wars, and of course the Spanish
>Inquisition.
>> >
>> >
>> > Wow, Jim! Caught me by surprise with that one. I wasn't expecting the
>> > Spanish Inquisition......
>>
>> How about those nice red uniforms?
>>
>> Jon
>
>A Catholic hater, no doubt.
>
Is the Inquisition something for Catholics to be proud of? Did the nuns teach
you about it in parochial school?

Did they explain about Galileo?

2381. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 00:26:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412202625.11628.00000069@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64519

In article <pan.2003.04.11.10.01.41.941075.31793@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>On Thu, 10 Apr 2003 09:50:06 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
>> N2EY wrote:
>>
>>> The KKK, witch burnings, religious wars, and of course the Spanish
>Inquisition.
>>
>>
>> Wow, Jim! Caught me by surprise with that one. I wasn't expecting the
>> Spanish Inquisition......
>
>How about those nice red uniforms?
>
I shall poke you with the soft cushions for that.

One side benefit of the rebuilding of Iraq will be the ability of the Whizzo
Chocolate Company to once again offer Crunchy Frog.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2382. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 00:26:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412202626.11628.00000071@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64521

In article <20030412173645.26171.00001104@mb-fd.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>You heard it here. K4YZ wants EVERYONE (not just radio amateurs) to learn
>Morse
>code.

Sounds like a good idea. Toss in ASL, semaphore, and a few foreign languages for good measure.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2383. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 00:26:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412202627.11628.00000072@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64520

In article <20030412172319.26171.00001103@mb-fd.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>>>Problem is every-1 else uses the wrong def.
>>That's YOUR problem, not theirs.
>
>No, thats society's problem.

That attitude is why you don't get a lot of intetrest in your ideas.

>Unclear (or even dishonest) definitions badly
>affect those involved.

Which is why the majority opinion defines what words mean.

>>If everyone else calls a 2N2222 a transistor, and you insist on
>>calling it a cheese sandwich
>
>What if others call a cheese sandwich a 2N2222, and I say "no that's a cheese
>sandwich"?

If everyone else calls it a 2N2222, then you're wrong to call it a cheese sandwich.

But the fact is that everyone else calls it a 2N2222 a transistor and you are calling it a cheese sandwich.

>>>It is legal to xmit on the broadcast band without a license, so this can be
>>>"amateur radio", but NOT "Ham radio" (since they not have amateur radio
>>>license).
>>
>>Incorrect. By definition, amateur radio requires an amateur radio license.
>>The term "amateur radio" is DEFINED that way.
>
>It seems too complicated for you.

Nope. I've known these terms for almost 40 years.

> I will try to be clearer. Try to follow.
>
>A radio amateur includes someone that experiments with radio circuits.

Only if that person holds a valid amateur radio license.
>
>It is legal to build circuits and transmit on the broadcast band.

Only under two conditions:

1) With a valid broadcast service license and approved equipment
2) Under some old Part 95 or Part 15 rules (I'm not exactly sure which) that permit extremely low-power unlicensed operation.

Neither is amateur radio.

>A person who
>builds a circuit and transmits on the broadcast band is a radio amateur.

Not unless they hold a valid amateur radio license. And the broadcast-band operation is not amateur radio.
>
>If that person does not have an amateur radio license, that person cannot be
>a Ham.

Without a valid amateur radio license, that person is not a radio amateur.
>
>Only one example is needed to prove the assertion.

You have not provided even one.

>There exists a group of
>radio amateurs (broadcast band experimenters) such that they are not Ham (no
>amateur radio license).

Incorrect. If they broadcast under the low-power rules, they are radio experimenters, not radio amateurs.
>
>So "amateur radio" is not the same as "Ham radio".

Incorrect. They are one and the same.

Human language is idiomatic. Word and phrase definitions are not always perfectly logical. A cathouse is not a house for cats.
>
>>I used the homebrew 100 watt 80/40/20 meter transceiver I designed about 8
>>years ago for those QSOs. It is powered by homebrew power supplies, and
>>sits on
>>a homebrew table and shelf arrangement that also holds my homebrew
>>transmatch/SWR meter/antenna&rig selector, homebrew speaker, homebrew >>T/R system.
>
>Wow, that's cool!
>
I think so.

It's also very useful.

>>You cannot escape the logic. Not only is Morse code useful for radio
>>amateurs,
>>it becomes more useful as more hams use use it.
>>
>>None of which means any particular ham MUST use it, or that atest for it
>>MUST
>>be retained. Just that it's useful.

>
>That's a fair statement.
>
Well, there you have it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2384. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 00:26:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412202628.11628.00000073@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64518

In article <3f0ma.934$7F2.485309@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030412164354.26171.00001100@mb-fd.aol.com...
>> From K4YZ:
>>
>> Lots of EE college students write like that. I have emails to prove it.
>>
>
>Egad, someone remind me to require all EE college students applying for jobs
>to submit samples of English composition.

I had to do that in order to get into EE school (University of Pennsylvania, Moore School of Electrical Engineering, Class of 1976).

>Clear communications is paramount
>and if they can't or won't do it, I'm not hiring!!
>
I agree! It's particularly important in engineering applications because miscommunication can have serious consequences to life and property.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2385. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 00:52:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412205238.29656.00000494@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64522

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/12/2003 6:42 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030412194208.25912.00000536@mb-ff.aol.com>

>I know its hard to imagine. It seems counter-intuitive, but it does occur.
>I, myself have had that condition <on occasion>.

Oh? What's the name of this condition, Vipul?

Steve

2386. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 00:59:36 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.13.00.59.36.133777.7305@arrl.org>
Source record: 64523

On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 10:48:31 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:pan.2003.04.12.02.17.58.321715.29110@arrl.org...
>> Other examples can easily be found.
>
> So what. Why must everyone/anyone not be free to comment on the vaulted
> press.

I don't know what that means.

>> > Follow the money. Every day now we learn more about the back door
>> > cozy financial relationships between Saddam's regime and some of our
>> > "close allies."
>>
>> Examples?
>
> France, Germany and Russia with oil contracts and selling banned weopons
> to Saddam.

How are the oil contracts "back door" relationships? Those were not, as far as I know, ever secret. Iraq was permitted to sell a quantity of oil via the oil-for-food program. Somebody was going to get the contracts to do the work.

As for banned weapons sales, I'm aware of some reporting that Russia sold some weapons. I'm unaware of reporting about French and German weapons sales. Can you point me to it? (We're talking post-Gulf War, I assume. Prior to that, pretty much every arms-exporting country, including the US and Britain, sold nasty stuff to Iraq. In the US case, that included chemical and biological weapons.)

>> Oh, and if it's all about following money, who's going to benefit
>> monetarily from those rebuilding-Iraq contracts that are being offered
>> only to selected US companies?
>
> You tell me.

Bill, you cannot rationally argue that France/Germany/Russia opposed the war solely because they benefited from antebellum business relationships unless you also argue that the US favored the war because of expected postwar relationships. If you insist on following the money to France, Germany and Russia, you must also follow the money to the US unless you are completely bereft of objectivity.

> Would you not want those contracts to go
> to US companies?

I'd want those contracts to go to the lowest-price qualified bidder. It's mostly our money being spent, after all.

>> No, they've said they disagree with us. That's not the same thing.
>
> Jon, that is bunk. Many hate what we are...free, democratic and
> successful...and they don't care what we think

Bill, that is bunk. It's not our democracy and freedom they hate, it's that we are the torch bearers for what they see as centuries of Western repression. The Crusades are more than dusty history in the Muslim world, and they view Israel and US support for Israel as being more of the same. I think they're off-base there, but that's how they see it nonetheless. If the US were a despotic regime but still had exhibited the policies toward the Arab world of the past 50+ years, they would hate us just as much. If you don't understand that you simply haven't bothered to find out what they are thinking. The "they hate our freedom" argument is just foolish pandering.

Jon

2387. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 01:05:10 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.13.01.05.10.514208.7305@arrl.org>
Source record: 64524

On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 00:23:53 -0400, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> I've noticed with some humility that the fighting in Iraq HAS
> stopped as a
> result of people laying in the street....
>
> ...and nearly all of them dressed in the uniform of the Army of
> Iraq and
> with some various caliber holes of United States munitions in them.

Looks to me like most of the uniforms of the Army of Iraq found lying in the street are missing an inhabitant. And, coincidentally, there seem to be a lot of folks with military haircuts and a fresh set of civilian clothes wandering, unarmed, toward their homes. Pretty amazing stuff.

Jon

2388. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 01:05:52 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.13.01.05.50.995144.7305@arrl.org>
Source record: 64525

On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 09:22:06 -0400, Brian wrote:

> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.12.03.57.51.355734.11732@arrl.org>...
>> On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:23:22 -0400, Brian wrote:
>>
>> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304110414.1674d136@posting.google.com>...
>> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E961F0A.5A1CF86@earthlink.net>...
>> >> > Brian wrote:
>> >> >
>> >> > > Is all free speech patriotic?
>> >> >
>> >> > Having witnessed an interview with Scott Ridder on CNN this evening, I'd
>> >> > have to say, "No".
>> >> >
>> >> > Dave K8MN
>> >>
>> >> Well there you have it.
>> >
>> > Yet Jon still doesn't have an answer.
>>
>> First ask an intelligent question.
>
> Do you consider the Dixie Chick patriotic?

Do you consider that an intelligent question?

2389. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 01:33:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030412213318.01323.00000523@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 64526

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: Jon Bloom jbloom@arrl.org
>Date: 4/12/2003 8:05 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <pan.2003.04.13.01.05.10.514208.7305@arrl.org>

>Looks to me like most of the uniforms of the Army of Iraq found lying in
>the street are missing an inhabitant.

Too true!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2390. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 01:41:03 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.13.01.41.02.925265.7305@arrl.org>
Source record: 64527

On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 16:11:31 -0400, N2EY wrote:
> In article <b77opkult1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>
>>Let me give you my view of the speech of desent.
>>
>>There are several levels of disent...
>>
>>1. Those that seriously and logically question why?
>
> Agreed.
>
>>2. Those that simply say NO and do so in an overt fashion such as public
>>demonstrations.
>
> Agreed.
>
>>3. Those that say NO and do so in an aggressively overt fashion which
>>can and often is used by our enemies to bolster the position of our
>>enemy (Jane Fonda going to Hanoi...perfect example)
>
> Jane Fonda didn't just say no. Nor did she just go to North Vietnam,
> which in itself is not unpatriotic. (She could have brought back
> valuable intelligence just by describing what she saw - highly
> patriotic).
>
> What Hanoi Jane did was to voluntarily commit actions in enemy territory
> that directly resulted in harm to American POWs and possibly others.
> These actions are well documented (see:
>
> http://www.snopes.com
>
> for a detailed description of what has and has not been proven about her
> actions there).
>
> In addition, her actions actually damaged the antiwar movement and
> probably extended the war. Just my opinion.

Interesting. I never gave much thought to how her actions may have damaged
the antiwar movement, but I see your point. So her behavior was not only
erroneous and unpatriotic but counterproductive to the end she desired.
That's about as lose-lose as you can get!

>>4. Those that demonstrate and in so doing, violate the law which
>>infringes other people's rights.
>
> See below
>>
>>I support 1 and don't consider it unpatriotic.
>
> Agreed.
>
>>I support 2, but believe the participants should understand they may be
>>giving aid/comfort to the enemy and that they should understand and
>>accept responsibility for their public comments.
>
> That depends on what the comments are. Each has to be judged on its
> merits.
>
>>I believe 3 and 4 are clearly unpatriotic.
>
> I agree 100% on 3.

The problem is, the difference between 2 and 3 is hazy at best. While Hanoi Jane's behavior was clearly in the category of 3, there are many who believe that ANY overt protest of the war is "aggressive" and likely to be used by our enemies to bolster their position. Even among those more tolerant of public protest, there are probably many possible protest behaviors that would be viewed as 2 by large numbers of people and as 3 by other large numbers of people.

> 4 is another "it depends" case. Blocking traffic or destroying govt.
> property is simply criminal activity UNLESS it can be shown that a law
> is being intentionally broken so that said law can be tested in court.
> This was done by civil rights demonstrators who sat at the "wrong" lunch
> counters and refused to give up bus seats.

I'm not sure I agree that intent is the principal issue. Seems to me that the effect of the behavior is more important. Blocking traffic in downtown SF is annoying but doesn't really inhibit the war effort. Blocking access to a military base would be a different case, even if the intent in both instances were the same.

(I remember reading that some antiwar group said prior to the start of the war in Iraq that they were going to attempt to illegally enter a base in California once the war started. I don't recall the name of the group or the base, and I never heard whether they did try or if so, what happened.)

> That said, it's hard to see how blocking traffic in San Francisco can
> force the courts to test the legality of any war.

Yeah, blocking traffic is not the best example, but I don't have a better one handy.

Of course, if the law in question is declared unconstitutional, no crime was committed and it's not a "4" case.

Jon

2391. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 01:43:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304121743.54273f26@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64528

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<C2DF6A57CBCA3276.701FDE1AFC9A82D7.D9323447173F2B92@lp.airnews.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0304120530.566104f4@posting.google.com...
> > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:<pan.2003.04.12.03.56.55.900202.11732@arrl.org>...
> > > On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:26:05 -0400, Brian wrote:
> > > > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > > >> That's your opinion. Others would say that those who protested the
> > > >> Vietnam war were patriotic.
> > > >
> > > > "Others" would be wrong. They could serve pennance by applying for
> > > > Vietnamese citizenship. Today is not too late, but 1973 would have
> been
> > > > better.
> > >
> > > Feel free to go to Vietnam and pick up the battle where it left off in
> > > 1975. The same folks are still in control and I'm sure they'd be willing
> > > to fight you. Hey, if it was right then, it's right now.
> >
> > Why would I go fight them now, 30 years after the battle ended? I
> > don't have a duty to do so, and it would be wrong to do so now. Our
> > country is no longer at war with anyone in Vietnam.
> >
>
> Give 'em time, give 'em time...

Not in your lifetime. Everytime US Forces are sent to do something,
the liberal media is ready to call it "another Vietnam." I heard it
said about Grenada, Kuwait, Somalia, Haiti, Rwanda, and the Former
Yugoslavia (FY for Dave).

Vietnam made some good faith gestures allowing us to search for and
recover some of the remains of service men KIA over there. I saw the
repatriation of some remains while on Guam. The Color Guard rolled
out to a C-141 Starlifter and brought them in. Katie Kuerk and
Jeraldo weren't there.

And no, I didn't get permission from my commander to be there.

2392. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 01:48:49 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304121748.154d73e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64529

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.12.17.08.48.5332.2786@arrl.org>...
> On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 04:46:02 -0400, Brian Kelly wrote:

> > Normally yes, that's only common sense. But there can come a point when
> > the talking has gotten you nowhere and ya take it to the next level and
> > call the cops.
>
> Yep. And I'm all for that when it gets to that level.
>
> Jon

Jon, you don't make that call. You're not the President.

2393. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 01:52:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304121752.5c25079d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64530

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030412174614.20407.00000835@mb-fu.aol.com>...
> >It takes one to.....
> >Pot calling the.....
> >You spot it, you got....
> >
>
> Is this the best you can do, come on be a little original, I know its hard for
> you to be orignial

Is Far Side paying you royalties for drawing you into their comics?

2394. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 01:59:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304121759.1424ceb5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64531

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<eZ%la.862$7F2.478690@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>
> Nothing special at all. Auctioneers do not lose the ability to talk at
> normal speeds. Musicians can still play Brahms lullaby even after they've
> mastered "The Flight of the Bumblebee". It's an inherent ability of the
> human brain to be able to handle information at the highest speed it is
> trained for and speeds SLOWER than that.
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE

Apparently, copying code slower than one's maximum speed acts as a
depressant and put the operator into a state of unconsciousness. At
least that's what several Extra codesters here have claimed. Which
lays to rest the old Morse Tales of benevolent Extras cruising the
Novice subbands and handing out contacts, unless they are able to do
so while asleep.

2395. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 02:03:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304121803.6536fb05@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64532

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E98307C.1E9B847A@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E979162.7A1E40AC@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E96C2E0.CA11EF28@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E95D3BD.C17A360E@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E94E690.28EA89A3@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9243A1.F66483EF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > > > > > > > > > > It was just a brief stop for a 2m mag mount antenna. My cheapy Pro-Am
> > > > > > > > > > > > > 1/4 wave had some mashed coaxial cable. The coax had a silly molded
> > > > > > > > > > > > > fitting at the antenna end which precluded repair. I selected a Hustler
> > > > > > > > > > > > > 5/8 wave antenna and went on my way. There are lots of repeaters
> > > > > > > > > > > > > between Columbus and Cincinnati but I made only four QSOs during the
> > > > > > > > > > > > > drive. The longest and most pleasant was with a YL on the Cambridge
> > > > > > > > > > > > > machine. I don't know where the abundance of Technician Class ops are
> > > > > > > > > > > > > spending their time but it doesn't appear to be on 2m FM.
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > We're going to lose some frequencies if the only thing going on are
> > > > > > > > > > > > > the repeaters automatically IDing every hour. Perhaps Len is right.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Pretty soon amateur radio will be only about HF.
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > But where are all of those new Technicians if not on 2m FM?
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > They're on the web. Where are you?
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > No amateur radio license is needed for internet access. I'm on 2m. I'm

> > > > > on the internet. I'm on 160m through 70cm.
> > > >
> > > > Ahem, this isn't ham radio. You may not realize it, but you're on the
> > > > web, too.
> > >
> > > Re your reading comprehension problem: Read my sentence again,
> > > especially the part reading, "I'm on the internet". Sheesh!
> >
> > You clearly state that you are on ham radio, go back to the parts,
> > "I'm on 2m. I'm on 160m through 70cm."
> >
> > You're not on ham radio in any way shape or form. You're only on the
> > internet when you're posting here.
>
> Actually, you have no way of knowing that. During the period which
> elapsed between the time you asked the question and the time I responded
> to it, I've managed to work in a number of other activities which had
> nothing to do with usenet.

You are amazing.

> > > > > > They're
> > > > > > > certainly not on 2m SSB or CW. Len wouldn't know those things. He
> > > > > > > isn't even a ham.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > He's on the web, just like yew.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That has nothing to do with amateur radio.
> > > > >
> > > > > So you have nothing to do with amatuer radio as well? I haven't
> > > > > logged you since 1991.
> > >
> > > I haven't logged W1AW in years but I know the station is on the air.
> > > It is licensed. I'm licensed. You're licensed. Len isn't licensed.
> >
> > Yet somehow you are able to communicate with Len. I wonder how that
> > can be if he isn't licensed in the amateur radio service?
>
> I don't communicate with Len on the 2m ham band.

How do you do it?

> > Maybe this isn't ham radio?
>
> You've taken a wrong turn somewhere. I stated that Len doesn't know
> what goes on 2m FM as he isn't a licensed ham.

2M is not personal cell phone communications. It can be legally
monitored in America. License not required.

> > > > I'll amend the list to start at 11wpm. Here goes. Try real hard to
> > > > decide which is the lowest level of proficiency. Does Morse

> > > > proviciency begin at:
> > > >
> > > > 11wpm
> > > > 12wpm
> > > > 13wpm
> > > > 14wpm
> > > > 15wpm
> > > > 16wpm
> > > > 17wpm
> > > > 18wpm
> > > > 19wpm
> > > > 20wpm
> > > > 21wpm
> > > > 22wpm
> > > > 23wpm
> > > > 24wpm
> > > > 25wpm
> > > > 26wpm
> > > > 27wpm
> > > > 28wpm
> > > > 29wpm
> > > > 30wpm
> > > > 31wpm
> > > > 32wpm
> > > > 33wpm
> > > > 34wpm
> > > > 35wpm
> > > > 36wpm
> > > > 37wpm
> > > > 38wpm
> > > > 39wpm
> > > > 40wpm?
>
> > > No luck needed, Brian. I believe that morse proficiency begins somewhat
> > > above the speed of ten words per minute.
>
> > That would be 11wpm. I listed it above as one of your choices.
>
> You just jumped to another wrong conclusion. You also listed speeds of
> 12-40 wpm. All of those are somewhat higher than ten wpm.
>
> Dave K8MN

You are free to choose. If you cannot make a decision, too bad for
you.

2396. Re: ARLB029 - ... and Vietnam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 02:07:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304121807.5cc60a71@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64534

nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
news:<20030412164113.12142.00000085@mb-fr.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0304111805.bda9c6a@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >The International Amateur Radio Union (IARU) has admitted three new
> >member societies. The National Association Radioamateurs of Georgia
> >(NARG), the Federation of Radiosport of the Republic of Armenia
> >(FRRA) were voted in April 10; the Vietnam Amateur Radio Club (VARC)
> >officially joined IARU on April 4
>
> Are they for or against code testing?

Which one(s)?

2397. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 02:10:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304121810.674bc366@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64535

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.12.03.59.25.466012.11732@arrl.org>...
> On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:55:08 -0400, Brian wrote:
> > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.11.10.01.41.941075.31793@arrl.org>...
> >> On Thu, 10 Apr 2003 09:50:06 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
> >> > N2EY wrote:
> >> >
> >> >> The KKK, witch burnings, religious wars, and of course the Spanish Inquisition.
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > Wow, Jim! Caught me by surprise with that one. I wasn't expecting the
> >> > Spanish Inquisition......
> >>
> >> How about those nice red uniforms?
> >>
> >> Jon
> >
> > A Catholic hater, no doubt.
>
> Isn't following me around the NG making silly remarks beneath you? Oh,
> never mind. Silly question.
>
> Jon

You have the opportunity to explain what you meant by "those nice red uniforms," Jon

2398. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 02:14:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030412221432.24176.00000166@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 64536

In article <f45722ac.0304041214.5a33ebf8@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Which is why we need to remove the code-tape generals, advanced, and
>extras from the rolls of the "proficient" when trying to quantify
>Morse Code as a growth industry.

Brian:

Sounds good to me, as long as we're getting rid of the Question Pool
Techs right along with them! Let's clean up our collective acts, and
leave only truly qualified, proficient radio amateurs in our ranks! Oooops --
sorry about that -- good bye, Brian! I hope you and Kim enjoy your
new hobbies!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2399. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 02:14:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030412221433.24176.00000167@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 64537

In article <pan.2003.04.11.09.23.22.142615.31793@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>On Thu, 10 Apr 2003 23:04:05 -0400, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>> I won't presume to speak for Dick, but I, for one, will spend the rest
>> of my life "disagreeing" with vicious despots who impose brutal regimes
>> of torture, rape, starvation, extortion, and death upon their innocent
>> citizens.
>
>If you've been reading the thread you should realize that's not germane.
>The topic is whether we should care at all what NON-despotic governments
>and their peoples think.
>
>Jon

Jon:

I have been reading the thread. If NON-despotic governments and their
peoples don't have the stomach to get rid of a brutal tyrant like SH, then
I most certainly DO NOT care what they think. The salvation of my own
soul depends on my definitely NOT tolerating a regime that brutally
tortures, rapes, and murders it's subjects, merely for me to gain whatever
political advantage I can by doing so. Fortunately, we now have a
President who is thinking along those lines, and has the moral courage
to put an end to the barbarism of the Saddam Hussein regime.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2400. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 02:38:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E98CDE8.FAB969AE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64538

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E98307C.1E9B847A@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E979162.7A1E40AC@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E96C2E0.CA11EF28@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E95D3BD.C17A360E@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E94E690.28EA89A3@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9243A1.F66483EF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>...

>
> > > > > > > > > > > > They're
> > > > > > > > > > > > > certainly not on 2m SSB or CW. Len wouldn't know those things. He
> > > > > > > > > > > > > isn't even a ham.
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > He's on the web, just like yew.
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > That has nothing to do with amateur radio.
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > So you have nothing to do with amatuer radio as well? I haven't
> > > > > > > > > > > > logged you since 1991.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > I haven't logged W1AW in years but I know the station is on the air.
> > > > > > > > > > > It is licensed. I'm licensed. You're licensed. Len isn't licensed.
> > > > > > > > > >
```

> > > Yet somehow you are able to communicate with Len. I wonder how that
> > > can be if he isn't licensed in the amateur radio service?
> >
> > I don't communicate with Len on the 2m ham band.
>
> How do you do it?

Wires. Len's a big landline man. But you drift. We're talking about
the absence of the new Techs on 2m, not of Len's internet activity.

> > > Maybe this isn't ham radio?
> >
> > You've taken a wrong turn somewhere. I stated that Len doesn't know
> > what goes on 2m FM as he isn't a licensed ham.
>
> 2M is not personal cell phone communications. It can be legally
> monitored in America. License not required.

I don't believe that Len is monitoring 2m. I'm sure he isn't doing it
around Pittsburgh, Columbus or Cincinnati.

> > > > > I'll amend the list to start at 11wpm. Here goes. Try real hard to
> > > > > decide which is the lowest level of proficiency. Does Morse
> > > > > proviciency begin at:
> > > > >
> > > > > 11wpm
> > > > > 12wpm
> > > > > 13wpm
> > > > > 14wpm
> > > > > 15wpm
> > > > > 16wpm
> > > > > 17wpm
> > > > > 18wpm
> > > > > 19wpm
> > > > > 20wpm
> > > > > 21wpm
> > > > > 22wpm
> > > > > 23wpm
> > > > > 24wpm
> > > > > 25wpm
> > > > > 26wpm
> > > > > 27wpm
> > > > > 28wpm
> > > > > 29wpm
> > > > > 30wpm
> > > > > 31wpm
> > > > > 32wpm
> > > > > 33wpm
> > > > > 34wpm
> > > > > 35wpm
> > > > > 36wpm

> > > > > 37wpm
> > > > > 38wpm
> > > > > 39wpm
> > > > > 40wpm?
> >
> > > > No luck needed, Brian. I believe that morse proficiency begins somewhat
> > > > above the speed of ten words per minute.
> >
> > > That would be 11wpm. I listed it above as one of your choices.
> >
> > You just jumped to another wrong conclusion. You also listed speeds of
> > 12-40 wpm. All of those are somewhat higher than ten wpm.

> You are free to choose. If you cannot make a decision, too bad for
> you.

You're right. I am free to choose. I have chosen. You still jumped to
an incorrect conclusion.

All you really need to know is that someone whose maximum morse speed is
only five words per minute is not proficient (skilled, expert) in the
use of morse.

Dave K8MN

2401. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 02:41:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E98CEAF.FC846C72@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64539

Brian wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.12.03.59.25.466012.11732@arrl.org>...
> > On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:55:08 -0400, Brian wrote:
> > > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.11.10.01.41.941075.31793@arrl.org>...
> > >> On Thu, 10 Apr 2003 09:50:06 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
> > >> > N2EY wrote:
> > >> >
> > >> >> The KKK, witch burnings, religious wars, and of course the Spanish Inquisition.
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >> > Wow, Jim! Caught me by surprise with that one. I wasn't expecting the
> > >> > Spanish Inquisition......
> > >>
> > >> How about those nice red uniforms?
> > >>
> > >> Jon
> > >
> > > A Catholic hater, no doubt.
> >
> > Isn't following me around the NG making silly remarks beneath you? Oh,
> > never mind. Silly question.
> >
> > Jon
>
> You have the opportunity to explain what you meant by "those nice red uniforms," Jon

Are you perhaps the only soul here not familiar with the Monty Python
routine? You'd appear less silly if you'd check it out.

Dave K8MN

2402. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 02:44:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E98CF69.A4A3B274@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64541

Brian wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.12.03.59.25.466012.11732@arrl.org>...
> > On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:55:08 -0400, Brian wrote:
> > > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.11.10.01.41.941075.31793@arrl.org>...
> > >> On Thu, 10 Apr 2003 09:50:06 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
> > >> > N2EY wrote:
> > >> >
> > >> >> The KKK, witch burnings, religious wars, and of course the Spanish Inquisition.
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >> > Wow, Jim! Caught me by surprise with that one. I wasn't expecting the
> > >> > Spanish Inquisition......
> > >>
> > >> How about those nice red uniforms?
> > >>
> > >> Jon
> > >
> > > A Catholic hater, no doubt.
> >
> > Isn't following me around the NG making silly remarks beneath you? Oh,
> > never mind. Silly question.
> >
> > Jon
>
> You have the opportunity to explain what you meant by "those nice red uniforms," Jon

Here, Brian. Learn.

http://www.ai.mit.edu/people/paulfitz/spanish/script.html

Dave K8MN

2403. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 02:45:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E98CF3A.9E8562B0@att.net>
Source record: 64540

Jon Bloom wrote:

> On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 10:48:31 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > news:pan.2003.04.12.02.17.58.321715.29110@arrl.org...
> >> Other examples can easily be found.
> >
> > So what. Why must everyone/anyone not be free to comment on the vaulted
> > press.
>
> I don't know what that means.
>
> >> > Follow the money. Every day now we learn more about the back door
> >> > cozy financial relationships between Saddam's regime and some of our
> >> > "close allies."
> >>
> >> Examples?
> >
> > France, Germany and Russia with oil contracts and selling banned weopons
> > to Saddam.
>
> How are the oil contracts "back door" relationships? Those were not, as
> far as I know, ever secret. Iraq was permitted to sell a quantity of oil
> via the oil-for-food program. Somebody was going to get the contracts to
> do the work.
>
> As for banned weapons sales, I'm aware of some reporting that Russia sold
> some weapons. I'm unaware of reporting about French and German weapons
> sales. Can you point me to it? (We're talking post-Gulf War, I assume.
> Prior to that, pretty much every arms-exporting country, including the US
> and Britain, sold nasty stuff to Iraq. In the US case, that included
> chemical and biological weapons.)
>
> >> Oh, and if it's all about following money, who's going to benefit
> >> monetarily from those rebuilding-Iraq contracts that are being offered
> >> only to selected US companies?
> >
> > You tell me.
>
> Bill, you cannot rationally argue that France/Germany/Russia opposed the
> war solely because they benefited from antebellum business relationships
> unless you also argue that the US favored the war because of expected
> postwar relationships. If you insist on following the money to France,
> Germany and Russia, you must also follow the money to the US unless you

> are completely bereft of objectivity.
>
> > Would you not want those contracts to go
> > to US companies?
>
> I'd want those contracts to go to the lowest-price qualified bidder. It's
> mostly our money being spent, after all.
>
> >> No, they've said they disagree with us. That's not the same thing.
> >
> > Jon, that is bunk. Many hate what we are...free, democratic and
> > successful...and they don't care what we think
>
> Bill, that is bunk. It's not our democracy and freedom they hate, it's
> that we are the torch bearers for what they see as centuries of Western
> repression. The Crusades are more than dusty history in the Muslim world,
> and they view Israel and US support for Israel as being more of the same.
> I think they're off-base there, but that's how they see it nonetheless. If
> the US were a despotic regime but still had exhibited the policies toward
> the Arab world of the past 50+ years, they would hate us just as much. If
> you don't understand that you simply haven't bothered to find out what
> they are thinking. The "they hate our freedom" argument is just foolish
> pandering.
>
> Jon

Jon it is really distressing to see that you are so very poorly informed. So
much
so that to think about even beginning to straighten you out one is left
wondering where in the world to begin.

2404. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 03:00:31 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <jp4ma.284$N_3.23443@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64533

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030412194208.25912.00000536@mb-ff.aol.com...
> From Dee Flint, N8UZE:
>
> >It's an inherent ability of the
> >human brain to be able to handle information at the highest speed it is
> >trained for and speeds SLOWER than that.
>
> For some real-time encoding/decoding schemes, you <may> lose your ability
to
> realtime encode/decode at a speed lower than a certain speed.
>
> I know its hard to imagine. It seems counter-intuitive, but it does occur.
> I, myself have had that condition <on occasion>.
>
>

What real time encoding schemes are you referring to? Did it ever occur to
you that you hadn't practiced enough to really establish mastery of it?

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2405. WD4IHS ..COWARD or just a big pussy???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 03:52:22 UTC
From: "Chuck...K1KW" <coneal@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <W95ma.109848$ug3.214372@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 64542
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Hey folks,

I get an email from WD4IHS with an AOL account about a
QSO I had on 20M. Well, based upon his comments,
it seems that he didn't like what I said on the air, so he replies with a
tirade
via email from his AOL account. Well, I think, I wonder why he
didn't reply to me on the air? So I reply to him via email to his
AOL account. Then, this COWARD has my email rejected by
AOL, I guess he doesn't want to hear what I said to him. Well, below is
the entire exchange. It is here now for all the world to see..
I guess Jeffy will have to deal with this...let's see AOL block this
out...If any of you know this clown, show him this.

73,
Chuck K1KW..

MY REPLY IS BELOW:

Hey,

Chill out...

If you listened you would have seen that the group agreed that the VE7 had
a wide
signal and they were working with him on it.

So...what's your beef?

AND...Why didn't you break in? Do you have a call that you would be
proud of, or even be heard? Did you listen for the rest of the interchange
or just fire from the hip....?

BTW, what were you drinking? Before you send such a missive again,
get your wife or significant other to OK it...because you are obviously
out of control, based upon that totally maundering email you sent to
me......

73,
Chuck...K1KW

----- Original Message -----
From: WD4IHS@aol.com
To: coneal@attbi.com
Sent: Saturday, April 12, 2003 9:02 PM
Subject: POLICING THE AMATEUR BANDS...

Hey Chuck,
My name is Jeff and I was listening on 20 meters a few minutes ago
and I noticed those gentleman were having a nice conversation.You could
have told them they were splattering and then moved on,but,you had to keep
on
and on about it.You say you have been a ham since 63 or whenever but
I thought you would have learned some manners by now.First of all,I live in
Brentwood,Tennessee and you were wider than they were just talking normal.
You have entirely too much background noise and you are over driving your
amp
and/or your mic. gain is too high.I realize that some people HAVE to run
a KW for whatever reason but sometimes they are not necessary...DAH.YOU
were causing much more interference than any of those other guys were at
all.
You need to look at your own signal and back your mic gain down some and
QUIT over driving your amp.I got my ticket in 77(big deal).Was it necessary
to screw up there QSO like that?You might ought to stay off the rig when you
have been drinking huh?Oh well,some constructive critisism might go along
way
here! Like,MIND YOUR OWN BUSINESS and worry about yourself.I can not stand
people who police the bands and try to tell people what to do.He who knows
it
all,knows NOTHING.Think before you ruin somebodys QSO next time.

73's,Jeff.

2406. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 04:25:56 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413002556.08861.00000615@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 64543

>Is Far Side paying you royalties for drawing you into their comics?
>

Hey Dork BOY still cant pass the EXTRA can you?

2407. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 05:17:32 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABE6B2B.16A51%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64544

"Brian Kelly" wrote:

> (snip) You didn't respond to my question, I'll
> try again but with a different spin: What makes
> you think we won't approach the reconstruction of
> Iraq differently from the way we handled the same
> problem in Europe?

I have no idea how we'll handle it. But, I do know this is an entirely different situation. For one thing, we had the Soviet Union to contend with after that war. And, for that, we needed a stable Europe to base troops, equipment, and weapons. That doesn't exist today in the Middle East (we can stage war with only lukewarm allies in the area). As a result, needs other than defense will play a larger role in this situation. What effect that has is yet to be seen.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2408. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 05:29:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABE6DF8.16A54%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64545

"N2EY" wrote:

> (snip) The mission of pacifism in the 21st
> century is to oppose the policies that lead
> to wars, and go after them long before the
> shooting starts. It's clear that support of
> SH and the Afghan mujahadeen in the 1980s
> were mistakes. The challenge is to not make
> those mistakes again.

Agreed.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2409. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 05:37:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABE6FBD.16A56%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64546

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:

> From aproximately 1967 to 1973. About the time
> that the alleged 'flower children' crawled out
> from under their rocks.

And about when did we first get involved in Vietnam? Sometime in the late 40's or early 50's? That means the government had about 17 years to do what it wanted to do before the first "flower children crawled out from under their rocks," as you put it. Wasn't 17 years long enough to handle a tiny country like Vietnam? If not, they had another six years or so after that. It was time to get our troops out of there.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2410. Re: WD4IHS ..COWARD or just a big pussy???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 05:48:50 UTC
From: Harley1200 <DemocratsLie@anon.com>
Message-ID: <b7atnu$23u$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 64547
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Chuck...K1KW" <coneal@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:W95ma.109848$ug3.214372@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
Hey folks,

I get an email from WD4IHS with an AOL account about a
QSO I had on 20M. Well, based upon his comments,
it seems that he didn't like what I said on the air, so he replies with a
tirade
via email from his AOL account. Well, I think, I wonder why he
didn't reply to me on the air? So I reply to him via email to his
AOL account. Then, this COWARD has my email rejected by
AOL, I guess he doesn't want to hear what I said to him. Well, below is
the entire exchange. It is here now for all the world to see..
I guess Jeffy will have to deal with this...let's see AOL block this
out...If any of you know this clown, show him this.

73,
Chuck K1KW..

MY REPLY IS BELOW:

Hey,

Chill out...

If you listened you would have seen that the group agreed that the VE7 had
a wide
signal and they were working with him on it.

So...what's your beef?

AND...Why didn't you break in? Do you have a call that you would be
proud of, or even be heard? Did you listen for the rest of the interchange
or just fire from the hip....?

BTW, what were you drinking? Before you send such a missive again,
get your wife or significant other to OK it...because you are obviously
out of control, based upon that totally maundering email you sent to
me......

73,
Chuck...K1KW

----- Original Message -----
From: WD4IHS@aol.com
To: coneal@attbi.com
Sent: Saturday, April 12, 2003 9:02 PM

Subject: POLICING THE AMATEUR BANDS...

Hey Chuck,
My name is Jeff and I was listening on 20 meters a few minutes ago
and I noticed those gentleman were having a nice conversation.You could
have told them they were splattering and then moved on,but,you had to keep
on
and on about it.You say you have been a ham since 63 or whenever but
I thought you would have learned some manners by now.First of all,I live in
Brentwood,Tennessee and you were wider than they were just talking normal.
You have entirely too much background noise and you are over driving your
amp
and/or your mic. gain is too high.I realize that some people HAVE to run
a KW for whatever reason but sometimes they are not necessary...DAH.YOU
were causing much more interference than any of those other guys were at
all.
You need to look at your own signal and back your mic gain down some and
QUIT over driving your amp.I got my ticket in 77(big deal).Was it necessary
to screw up there QSO like that?You might ought to stay off the rig when you
have been drinking huh?Oh well,some constructive critisism might go along
way
here! Like,MIND YOUR OWN BUSINESS and worry about yourself.I can not stand
people who police the bands and try to tell people what to do.He who knows
it
all,knows NOTHING.Think before you ruin somebodys QSO next time.

73's,Jeff.

Jeff. He used a word I've never seen before. What the heck is "maundering
"?????
Maybe he has a dictionary I am not aware of????

2411. Re: WD4IHS ..COWARD or just a big pussy???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 05:59:19 UTC
From: Telamon <telamon_spamshield@pacbell.net.is.invalid>
Message-ID: <telamon_spamshield-D62F01.22591912042003@newssvr14-ext.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64548
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <b7atnu$23u$0@pita.alt.net>,
"Harley1200" <DemocratsLie@anon.com> wrote:

<snip>
>
> Jeff. He used a word I've never seen before. What the heck is
> "maundering "????? Maybe he has a dictionary I am not aware of????
>

maunder - to talk or say something in a vague, rambling, or incoherent
way.

--
Telamon
Ventura, California

2412. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 06:28:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABE7BCB.16A5A%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64549

"Bill Sohl" wrote:
>
> Your point? And more to the latest...many
> obvioulsy had no desire to defend the Saddam
> regime.

I think you get my point very well. The press, government, and military, are describing those as Saddam's forces, Saddam's soldiers, Saddam's Army, Saddam's Republican Guard, and so on, when they are in fact nothing more than Iraq's military - man and women who became soldiers for the same reasons soldiers all over the world do. They have no more say in their government than soldiers elsewhere do (even less if you believe they were as oppressed as claimed) and their motives are no less honorable then the soldiers elsewhere. Yet we are killing them in the most massive and effective manner possible, which is sad (not something to shout for joy over). Our soldiers are dying there. Again, not something to shout for joy over.

The war dead are always forgotten, perhaps more by those supporting war than by those opposed. Other than the families, most today cannot even name a single person who died in the Kosovo, the last Iraq war, Panama, Granada, or Vietnam. They are forgotten. Their families are forgotten. The best we can do is have a national holiday to remember that some people died in war. Heck, even our disabled veterans are largely ignored and discarded.

> (snip) I never said it wasn't. The fact
> still remains that the coalition executed
> the most precise offensives ever accomplished
> with minimal civilian losses. (snip)

How do you know that, Bill? You don't have any knowledge of that personally. We don't know how many civilians or others are being killed - the military has never even gave an estimate of Iraqi casualties from the first Iraq war. The MOAB has been delivered to Iraq - not exactly a weapon intended to prevent collateral damage. Where do they intend to use it, especially with most of the remaining Iraqi troops isolated in towns? What other massive ordinance has been used? And where?

> WHAT? This war has been covered by the press
> to the degree that no other war ever was...
> front line stuff and all. Do you even watch
> the news? It was within minutes of the first
> loss of coalition forces that it was reported
> on TV. (snip)

Reported is not seeing, Bill.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2413. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 06:34:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABE7D3A.16A5C%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64550

"Bill Sohl" wrote:

> (snip) There is also the possibility that the
> destruction of the Command/Control critically
> hampered any ability to mobilize and deploy
> and WMD.

Effective WMD use requires independent deployment and launch authority
when Command & Control is lost. It is believed such practice exists in
virtually all nations with WMD.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2414. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 07:18:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABE8771.16A5E%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64601

"Phil Kane" wrote:
>
> Firstly, there is no "separation of church and
> state" in the country although many - maybe even
> a majority - chafe at (snip)

A fascinating read, Phil. I learned more about the Jewish people in that one message than I've learned in the books I've read. Books do fine at covering places and issues, but not so well at covering the way people feel and think. And, of course, I'm always much more interested in the latter. Thanks for taking the time to respond. I've love to go into more (in fact, I'd love to sit and talk with you for four or five hours), but this thread is getting way out there as it is. So perhaps we should let it go with that. Thanks again.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2415. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 07:41:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABE8CDC.16A60%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64602

"Brian Kelly" wrote:

> Ya made a wrong turn. I asked Dwight if he had any evidence
> which indicated that we would treat Iraq any differently
> than we treated, as examples, our former enemies the Germans
> and the Italians almost immediately after WW2. But he
> ducked the bullet and responded "The question now is what
> will happen next. (snip)

I didn't duck anything, Brian. You asked me for evidence which indicated what we "would" do, which is obviously impossible to provide. I can't now provide evidence of the future. Instead of that, we should be talking about the next step.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2416. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 07:45:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABE8DF4.16A62%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64603

"Brian" wrote:
>
> Why would I go fight them now, 30 years after
> the battle ended? I don't have a duty to do
> so, and it would be wrong to do so now. Our
> country is no longer at war with anyone in
> Vietnam.

Give it time, Brian. I'm sure they're somewhere on the list of old enemies
to get or old scores to settle.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2417. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 08:41:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABE9AED.16A67%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64604

"Dwight Stewart" wrote:
>
> It's also very hard to figure out what this
> has to do with radio.

The above was not posted by me. Notice the source path of that message does not match my normal messages. It was posted by a CB'er who is convinced I'm someone else - someone from the CB newsgroup he doesn't like. I've told him many times that I'm not that person, but he simply will not listen. Instead, he is now posting messages with my name added (some with even my routine signature below). Please be wary of all messages with content that is out of my normal character in this newsgroup.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2418. Re: WD4IHS ..COWARD or just a big pussy???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 10:14:44 UTC
From: Pappy <Anon@anon.com>
Message-ID: <b7bdaf$8mi$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 64605
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

<idiotdetector@work.now> wrote in message
news:8d1i9vkk2dkm1bf4lidavc61k233k7vps1@4ax.com...
"Harley Har Har" wrote:

>Jeff. He used a word I've never seen before.
>What the heck is "maundering" ?????
>Maybe he has a dictionary I am not aware of????

It's called the English dictionary.

This is true. It is a valid word.
Now if only I can find some pictures to color....
Is that not part of the 5 wpm Extra test????

2419. Re: WD4IHS ..COWARD or just a big pussy???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 10:23:07 UTC
From: "K.S.Blake" <polar@tiscali.com>
Message-ID: <b7bdum$f50$1@newsg3.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 64606
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I agree with the guy if you kept going on and on about it, you should of
just told them once and moved on, since when are you a ham authority anyway.
get a life for Christ's sake. We have guys like you over here in the UK that
think they know everything.
We call them pain in the butts.
--

--

K.S.Blake
MW1001SWL
MW1FCP
.

"Chuck...K1KW" <coneal@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:W95ma.109848$ug3.214372@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
> Hey folks,
>
> I get an email from WD4IHS with an AOL account about a
> QSO I had on 20M. Well, based upon his comments,
> it seems that he didn't like what I said on the air, so he replies with a
> tirade
> via email from his AOL account. Well, I think, I wonder why he
> didn't reply to me on the air? So I reply to him via email to his
> AOL account. Then, this COWARD has my email rejected by
> AOL, I guess he doesn't want to hear what I said to him. Well, below is
> the entire exchange. It is here now for all the world to see..
> I guess Jeffy will have to deal with this...let's see AOL block this
> out...If any of you know this clown, show him this.
>
> 73,
> Chuck K1KW..
>
> MY REPLY IS BELOW:
>
> Hey,
>
> Chill out...
>
> If you listened you would have seen that the group agreed that the VE7
had
> a wide
> signal and they were working with him on it.
>

> So...what's your beef?
>
> AND...Why didn't you break in? Do you have a call that you would be
> proud of, or even be heard? Did you listen for the rest of the
interchange
> or just fire from the hip....?
>
> BTW, what were you drinking? Before you send such a missive again,
> get your wife or significant other to OK it...because you are obviously
> out of control, based upon that totally maundering email you sent to
> me......
>
> 73,
> Chuck...K1KW
>
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: WD4IHS@aol.com
> To: coneal@attbi.com
> Sent: Saturday, April 12, 2003 9:02 PM
> Subject: POLICING THE AMATEUR BANDS...
>
>
> Hey Chuck,
> My name is Jeff and I was listening on 20 meters a few minutes ago
> and I noticed those gentleman were having a nice conversation.You could
> have told them they were splattering and then moved on,but,you had to keep
> on
> and on about it.You say you have been a ham since 63 or whenever but
> I thought you would have learned some manners by now.First of all,I live
in
> Brentwood,Tennessee and you were wider than they were just talking normal.
> You have entirely too much background noise and you are over driving your
> amp
> and/or your mic. gain is too high.I realize that some people HAVE to run
> a KW for whatever reason but sometimes they are not necessary...DAH.YOU
> were causing much more interference than any of those other guys were at
> all.
> You need to look at your own signal and back your mic gain down some and
> QUIT over driving your amp.I got my ticket in 77(big deal).Was it
necessary
> to screw up there QSO like that?You might ought to stay off the rig when
you
> have been drinking huh?Oh well,some constructive critisism might go along
> way
> here! Like,MIND YOUR OWN BUSINESS and worry about yourself.I can not stand
> people who police the bands and try to tell people what to do.He who knows
> it
> all,knows NOTHING.Think before you ruin somebodys QSO next time.
>

> 73's,Jeff.
>
>

2420. Re: WD4IHS ..COWARD or just a big pussy???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 10:32:17 UTC
From: rhf-mail@usa.com
Message-ID: <3ef6beca.0304130232.4b2aaa8f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64607
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Harley1200 / Telamon,

Trust... But, Verify !
- - - Ronald Reagan

'maunder' = http://www.bartleby.com/61/89/M0158900.html

Peace Through Strength ~ RHF
.
.
= = = Telamon <telamon_spamshield@pacbell.net.is.invalid> wrote in message
= = = news:<telamon_spamshield-D62F01.22591912042003@newssvr14-ext.news.prodigy.com>...
> In article <b7atnu$23u$0@pita.alt.net>,
> "Harley1200" <DemocratsLie@anon.com> wrote:
>
> <snip>
> >
> > Jeff. He used a word I've never seen before. What the heck is
> > "maundering "????? Maybe he has a dictionary I am not aware of????
> >
>
> maunder - to talk or say something in a vague, rambling, or incoherent
> way.

2421. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 11:23:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413072325.22632.00000445@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 64608

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: Dwight Stewart stewart@say.net
>Date: 4/13/2003 12:17 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <BABE6B2B.16A51%stewart@say.net>

>"Brian Kelly" wrote:
>
>> (snip) You didn't respond to my question, I'll
>> try again but with a different spin: What makes
>> you think we won't approach the reconstruction of
>> Iraq differently from the way we handled the same
>> problem in Europe?
>
>
> I have no idea how we'll handle it. But, I do know this is an entirely
>different situation. For one thing, we had the Soviet Union to contend with
>after that war. And, for that, we needed a stable Europe to base troops,
>equipment, and weapons.

Oh? We DON'T have to "contend" with today? And Iran, and Syria, amd our "friend" Saudi Arabia?

>That doesn't exist today in the Middle East (we can
>stage war with only lukewarm allies in the area). As a result, needs other
>than defense will play a larger role in this situation. What effect that has
>is yet to be seen.

From what I have seen so far, the difference is a lot more sand, the dictators don't speak a Latin-based language, and this time we didn't wait to have the dictator start the war on one of our "allies" and then draw us in unprepared.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2422. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 11:50:17 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413075017.18293.00000621@mb-ff.aol.com>
Source record: 64609

From Larry Roll K3LT:

>Sounds good to me, as long as we're getting rid of the Question Pool
>Techs right along with them! Let's clean up our collective acts, and
>leave only truly qualified, proficient radio amateurs in our ranks!

There we have it - the establishment Morse coders want to participate in
"cleansing".

2423. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 11:52:32 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413075232.18293.00000622@mb-ff.aol.com>
Source record: 64611

From K4YZ:

>>I know its hard to imagine. It seems counter-intuitive, but it does occur.
>>I, myself have had that condition <on occasion>.
>
> Oh? What's the name of this condition, Vipul?

Alien time-dependent programming.

Actually its called motor memory. That's when you can encode fairly fast, but go lower than a certain speed and you are unable to encode at that speed.

2424. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 11:56:38 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413075638.18293.00000623@mb-ff.aol.com>
Source record: 64612

From K4YZ

>>What if others call a cheese sandwich a 2N2222, and I say "no that's a
>cheese
>>sandwich"?
>
> Then you've still got a problem. If everyone ELSE calls it a 2N2222,
>then
>YOU had better call it one too if you expect to eat.

Thats true.

>No...A person who builds a circuit and transmits on the broadcast band is
>either an amateur BROADCASTER, or a radio HOBBYIST.
>
> A Radio Amateur is a person who has taken the Amateur Radio
>examination(s)
>and possesses an Amateur Radio license.

If you look in the dictionary, the definition of the word amateur is: one who cultivates any study from without pursuing it professionally or with a view to a gain.

This could apply to our broadcast band circuit builder.

The definition of amateur says nothing about passing a test. Once you take this belief, it would be impossible to convince you otherwise.

2425. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 11:59:21 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413075921.23238.00000044@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64613

In article <20030412142156.19789.00000162@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 12 Apr 2003 18:21:56 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>>From: nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test)
>>Date: 4/12/2003 7:38 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030412083832.11628.00000063@mb-fz.aol.com>
>
>>> Don't say THAT, Dave...that would leave the Nitwit Trio out in the cold
>>>forever!
>>
>>Are they any relation to the Nairobi Trio?
>
> The Nairobi Trio? Three thinly clad women applying hair-removal lotion
>to their legs?

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Have you never heard of Ernie Kovacs?

2426. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 11:59:21 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413075921.23238.00000045@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64614

In article <20030412194208.25912.00000536@mb-ff.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
(Vshah101) writes:

>For some real-time encoding/decoding schemes, you <may> lose your ability to
>realtime encode/decode at a speed lower than a certain speed.

What real-time encoding/decoding schemes are you talking about?
>
>I know its hard to imagine.

What real-time encoding/decoding schemes are you talking about?

>It seems counter-intuitive, but it does occur.

What real-time encoding/decoding schemes are you talking about?

>I, myself have had that condition <on occasion>.
>
What real-time encoding/decoding schemes are you talking about?

2427. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 12:03:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304130403.3361244a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64610

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030413002556.08861.00000615@mb-cd.aol.com>...
> >Is Far Side paying you royalties for drawing you into their comics?
> >
>
> Hey Dork BOY still cant pass the EXTRA can you?

I'm just waiting for a couple of gullible no-coders to come along and
make a $250 wager. How long do you think that will take?

2428. Re: How's This For Courage? (really now?!?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 12:14:40 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304130414.5530978d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64616

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E98CF69.A4A3B274@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.12.03.59.25.466012.11732@arrl.org>...
> > > On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:55:08 -0400, Brian wrote:
> > > > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.11.10.01.41.941075.31793@arrl.org>...
> > > >> On Thu, 10 Apr 2003 09:50:06 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
> > > >> > N2EY wrote:
> > > >> >
> > > >> >> The KKK, witch burnings, religious wars, and of course the Spanish Inquisition.
> > > >> >
> > > >> >
> > > >> > Wow, Jim! Caught me by surprise with that one. I wasn't expecting the
> > > >> > Spanish Inquisition......
> > > >>
> > > >> How about those nice red uniforms?
> > > >>
> > > >> Jon
> > > >
> > > > A Catholic hater, no doubt.
> > >
> > > Isn't following me around the NG making silly remarks beneath you? Oh,
> > > never mind. Silly question.
> > >
> > > Jon
> >
> > You have the opportunity to explain what you meant by "those nice red uniforms," Jon
>
> Here, Brian. Learn.
>
> http://www.ai.mit.edu/people/paulfitz/spanish/script.html
>
> Dave K8MN

They would appear to be Catholic, especially the one referred to as Cardianl.

2429. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 12:26:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413082613.23238.00000046@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64617

In article <20030413075638.18293.00000623@mb-ff.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>>No...A person who builds a circuit and transmits on the broadcast band is
>>either an amateur BROADCASTER, or a radio HOBBYIST.
>>
>> A Radio Amateur is a person who has taken the Amateur Radio
>>examination(s)
>>and possesses an Amateur Radio license.
>
>If you look in the dictionary, the definition of the word amateur is: one who
>cultivates any study from without pursuing it professionally or with a view
>to a gain.

That's the general definition. In regards to radio, the term "radio amateur" means someone with a valid amateur radio license.
>
>This could apply to our broadcast band circuit builder.

No, it cannot.
>
>The definition of amateur says nothing about passing a test.

Look up the terms for "professional" and "engineer". They say nothing about tests, either. But a "professional engineer" is someone licensed by the state to practice certain types of engineering. The abbreviation "P.E." refers to such a professional engineer. Referring to anyone who does not have the appropriate license as a "professional engineer" can get you into trouble. Claiming to be a "professional engineer" without the license can constitute fraud.

Human languages are idiomatic. Learn to live with it. A cat house is not a house for cats.

N2EY

Once you take
>this belief, it would be impossible to convince you otherwise.
>

2430. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 12:37:05 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413083705.18293.00000624@mb-ff.aol.com>
Source record: 64618

From N2EY:

>>So "amateur radio" is not the same as "Ham radio".
>
>Incorrect. They are one and the same.

Amateur radio is the license. Ham radio is the culture, traditions, set of beliefs.

Some Hams use the word "true" Ham. There would be no need for "true" Hams if everyone that had an amateur radio license is a Ham. There would be no "infidel" no coders.

A "true" Ham stays true to the traditions and belief of HAM radio.

"Usually, the spread of HAM radio, say the entusiasts, is more through word of mouth and passes on from one member of a family to the other. At times from one good friend to another. This anyway makes the hobby prone to be called a cult."

2431. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 12:44:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304130444.43023c10@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64619

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030412221432.24176.00000166@mb-fc.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0304041214.5a33ebf8@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Which is why we need to remove the code-tape generals, advanced, and
> >extras from the rolls of the "proficient" when trying to quantify
> >Morse Code as a growth industry.
>
> Brian:
>
> Sounds good to me, as long as we're getting rid of the Question Pool
> Techs right along with them! Let's clean up our collective acts, and
> leave only truly qualified, proficient radio amateurs in our ranks! Oooops --
> sorry about that -- good bye, Brian! I hope you and Kim enjoy your
> new hobbies!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

How does that help us quantify Morse Code as a growth industry?

Do try to stay on topic.

2432. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 12:48:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <3E995C8F.DD54A57E@say.net>
Source record: 64620

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> Oh? We DON'T have to "contend" with today? And
> Iran, and Syria, amd our "friend" Saudi Arabia?

Actually, if you read back over my message, you'll see nothing was said about potential advisories. Instead, what I said was that we don't need strong allies in the Middle East to position forward bases today - "we can stage war with only lukewarm allies in the area." We're doing it right now, with allies that can only be considered lukewarm.

> From what I have seen so far, the difference
> is a lot more sand, the dictators don't speak a
> Latin-based language, and this time we didn't wait
> to have the dictator start the war on one of our
> "allies" and then draw us in unprepared.

I have no idea how that relates to anything said. What difference? What dictators?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2433. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 13:02:21 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <xddma.1182$N_3.180668@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64615

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030413075638.18293.00000623@mb-ff.aol.com...
> From K4YZ
>
> >>What if others call a cheese sandwich a 2N2222, and I say "no that's a
> >cheese
> >>sandwich"?
> >
> > Then you've still got a problem. If everyone ELSE calls it a
2N2222,
> >then
> >YOU had better call it one too if you expect to eat.
>
> Thats true.
>
> >No...A person who builds a circuit and transmits on the broadcast band is
> >either an amateur BROADCASTER, or a radio HOBBYIST.
> >
> > A Radio Amateur is a person who has taken the Amateur Radio
> >examination(s)
> >and possesses an Amateur Radio license.
>
> If you look in the dictionary, the definition of the word amateur is: one
who
> cultivates any study from without pursuing it professionally or with a
view to
> a gain.
>
> This could apply to our broadcast band circuit builder.
>
> The definition of amateur says nothing about passing a test. Once you take
this
> belief, it would be impossible to convince you otherwise.
>

Dictionaries often do not contain the usage definitions of terms used by specialized groups of people. As I said in my other replies, the people involved in radio limit the use of the term radio amateur to those licensed in the Amateur Radio Service not to unlicensed experimenters or circuit builders.

The person who builds circuits for a hobby is not a radio amateur. He is an amateur circuit builder. That the circuits may be for a radio is irrelevant.

Dee Flint N8UZE

2434. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 13:06:49 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304130506.135f700@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64621

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030412141935.19789.00000161@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Infidel no-coders
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 4/12/2003 6:18 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030412071818.26171.00001063@mb-fd.aol.com>

> >So now you want EVERYONE to learn Morse code, even non-amateurs?
>
> Sure...Why not. If Morse Code was taught from grade school, it would be
> exceedingly easy to learn and become a part of our normal activities of daily
> living. In ONE GENERATION, we could reduce the ened for electromagnetic
> spectrum by at LEAST 90%.

Why not? Because Morse isn't even a part of "normal activities" for
professional communicators. In ONE GENERATION you could throw back
throughput by many magnitudes and increase the need for
electromagnetic spectrum by at LEAST 90%. Imagine having HDTV
transmitted at screaming 40wpm. People wouldn't buy it. People quit
buying Morse in by the 60's, so why this retro idea now?

2435. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 13:22:52 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.13.13.22.50.847158.20145@arrl.org>
Source record: 64622

On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 21:48:49 -0400, Brian wrote:

> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.12.17.08.48.5332.2786@arrl.org>...
>> On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 04:46:02 -0400, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
>> > Normally yes, that's only common sense. But there can come a point when
>> > the talking has gotten you nowhere and ya take it to the next level and
>> > call the cops.
>>
>> Yep. And I'm all for that when it gets to that level.
>>
>> Jon
>
> Jon, you don't make that call. You're not the President.

It takes the President to call the cops?

Jon

2436. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 13:29:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E996642.DE106977@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64623

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > "Bill Sohl" wrote:

> The war dead are always forgotten, perhaps more by those supporting war
> than by those opposed.

That's a large and likely incorrect "perhaps".

> Other than the families, most today cannot even name
> a single person who died in the Kosovo, the last Iraq war, Panama, Granada,
> or Vietnam. They are forgotten. Their families are forgotten.

All the dead except those who are famous are forgotten. Who will
remember you or me after two generations? Do you remember my
great-grandmother? Do you think that I remember your late Uncle?

> The best we
> can do is have a national holiday to remember that some people died in war.

What would you suggest as a substitute for such a holiday, Dwight?

> Heck, even our disabled veterans are largely ignored and discarded.

What are you offering as proof for such a statement?

> > (snip) I never said it wasn't. The fact
> > still remains that the coalition executed
> > the most precise offensives ever accomplished
> > with minimal civilian losses. (snip)
>
> How do you know that, Bill? You don't have any knowledge of that
> personally. We don't know how many civilians or others are being killed -
> the military has never even gave an estimate of Iraqi casualties from the
> first Iraq war. The MOAB has been delivered to Iraq - not exactly a weapon
> intended to prevent collateral damage. Where do they intend to use it,
> especially with most of the remaining Iraqi troops isolated in towns?

I have plenty of familiarity with its grandpappy, the Daisy Cutter and
tell you exactly when such a weapon woud be used. The U.S. has not
employed the MOAB in Iraq. The only scenario in which it would be used
is out in open terrain if large numbers of Iraqi soldiers massed. That
is not likely to happen.

> > WHAT? This war has been covered by the press
> > to the degree that no other war ever was...
> > front line stuff and all. Do you even watch
> > the news? It was within minutes of the first

> > loss of coalition forces that it was reported
> > on TV. (snip)
>
> Reported is not seeing, Bill.

Let us know what you personally observe after your arrival, Dwight.

Dave K8MN

2437. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 13:34:18 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.13.13.34.17.777431.20145@arrl.org>
Source record: 64624

On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 22:14:33 -0400, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I have been reading the thread. If NON-despotic governments and their
> peoples don't have the stomach to get rid of a brutal tyrant like SH,
> then I most certainly DO NOT care what they think. The salvation of my
> own soul depends on my definitely NOT tolerating a regime that brutally
> tortures, rapes, and murders it's subjects, merely for me to gain
> whatever political advantage I can by doing so. Fortunately, we now
> have a President who is thinking along those lines, and has the moral
> courage to put an end to the barbarism of the Saddam Hussein regime.

That raises a number of questions. Since you feel the US should eliminate by force any despotic regime that it can eliminate by force, I wonder if you think the US should first attempt to eliminate such despotic regimes without force? If so, do you feel that the US should attempt to elicit allies in these efforts? If so, do you think the US should dictate to those potential allies the specifics of the efforts to be made, ignoring any potential ally that doesn't agree in every particular with the US view?

Jon

2438. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 13:35:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E996788.E9CB7DA3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64625

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Brian Kelly" wrote:
>
> > Ya made a wrong turn. I asked Dwight if he had any evidence
> > which indicated that we would treat Iraq any differently
> > than we treated, as examples, our former enemies the Germans
> > and the Italians almost immediately after WW2. But he
> > ducked the bullet and responded "The question now is what
> > will happen next. (snip)
>
> I didn't duck anything, Brian. You asked me for evidence which indicated
> what we "would" do, which is obviously impossible to provide. I can't now
> provide evidence of the future.

Are you telling us that no pattern of predictable behavior by the USG
toward defeated enemies can be seen from our past actions?

> Instead of that, we should be talking about
> the next step.

Why, Dwight, that would be providing an answer about what we're likely
to do in the future *grin*. You and I aren't likely to participate in
making decisions about the next step so such talk would be a waste of
time.

Dave K8MN

2439. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 13:39:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E996897.D8D8D909@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64626

No CW Test wrote:
>
> In article <20030412142156.19789.00000162@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
> >Date: 12 Apr 2003 18:21:56 GMT
> >
> >>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >>From: nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test)
> >>Date: 4/12/2003 7:38 AM Central Daylight Time
> >>Message-id: <20030412083832.11628.00000063@mb-fz.aol.com>
> >
> >>> Don't say THAT, Dave...that would leave the Nitwit Trio out in the cold
> >>>forever!
> >>
> >>Are they any relation to the Nairobi Trio?
> >
> > The Nairobi Trio? Three thinly clad women applying hair-removal lotion
> >to their legs?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Have you never heard of Ernie Kovacs?

Take a breath, Old Timer. Have you stopped to realize just how long
Ernie Kovacs has been dead? There exists an entire group of young
adults who aren't even familiar with John Belushi.

Dave K8MN

2440. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 13:47:01 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413094701.01650.00001062@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 64627

>I'm just waiting for a couple of gullible no-coders to come along and
>make a $250 wager. How long do you think that will take

For you it will take alot more than 2 of your CBplusser Buddies. And as far as the time frame for you to get Extra, Id say as soon as the FCC starts giving them away without testing you might just get one.

2441. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 14:32:29 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <42AA915F1F97FE5F.16A81EACDE3BCF37.D9DB97FF6F576FCA@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64629

```
"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3E94DC70.DBDE5C57@att.net...
>
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > "Len Over 21" wrote:
> >
> > > Do-nothing pacifism avoids responsibility.
> >
> > I disagree. While I'm not a pacifist, I do come from a religious
> > background that advocates pacifism. As I see it, instead of your rather
> > bleak outlook, pacifism requires the ultimate in responsibility for
one's
> > actions - the idea that one is not going to lower oneself to the same
> > violence of another unless absolutely necessary, combined with the
restraint
> > to hold one's own violent tendencies in check. In a violent world, that
> > requires far more control, and bravery, then the ease of just striking
out
> > at anything one objects to.
>
> So we object to Saddam so we just struck out at him.
>
> Dwight you need to get on Ebay and bid on a clue.
>

Hey, Dick? Simple questions. What do *you* think will happen now that Iraq
has been liberated of Saddam Hussein? And, in what way do *you* think
anything about 9/11/01 has been vindicated? In what way do *you* think any
impact at all has been made on any of the above?

Kim W5TIT
```

2442. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 14:36:18 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <0AAE092165AAD2D1.5544E74F8B3EC7F2.344056C975E10A9D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64630

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b7a9rk$u3i$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:520241A31E9F97F0.C842FF8F50815C5B.6CE2A40F6A2A671E@lp.airnews.net...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:b798g1$fih$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > >
> news:B2721BD3DD214D6B.FA3BC933600ED5E6.F79774153C9FD206@lp.airnews.net...
> > > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3E939DB3.28C419E@att.net...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > Jon Bloom wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Why is it that countries
> > > > > > > that have been our close allies for many years are on the
other
> > side
> > > > > of
> > > > > > > the fence from us now? In significant part, it's because we've
> > told
> > > > > them
> > > > > > > in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else
> > thinks.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Why Jon, I'm surprised you haven't heard. Don't you read the
> news?
> > > > > > France, Germany and Russia hold over half the Iraqi debt, which
is
> > > quite
> > > > > large
> > > > > > since the sanctions of '91.
> > > > > > . Who you suppose will pay off if Saddam goes?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dick
> > > > >
> > > > > Oh, by the way, we DON'T give a damn what they think. And that
> happens
> > > > > to be a *very* widely held opinion. They sell weapons and war
```

> > technology
> > > > to
> > > > > Saddam and Al Queda and don't give a damn what WE think about
that,
> so
> > > why
> > > > > should
> > > > > we ever again care what they think? All they're good for is
> stymieing
> > > > > anything and
> > > > > everything constructive in the UN. And protecting *their*
interests
> > > > > regardless of any others.
> > > >
> > > > There ya go painting that broad paintbrush again, Dick. You forget
> that
> > > we
> > > > the peons are at the mercies of what our governments do.
> > >
> > Don't YOU vote? That's how we, the people, influence our government.
> >
> I vote. Do I think it counts? No.
>
> Pretty sorry attitude. Sounds like the only thing you'd be happy
> to see is a government led by yourself...or by someone who
> is 100% in sync with whatever your beliefs are. You don't want
> a democracy if the majority doesn't agree with you...IMHO of course.
>

Bullshit, Bill, and that's a copout of a response. My opinion of politicians is a popular one among citizens, especially over the past few years. But, it doesn't sound like you can even approach discussing a subject such as this without some kind of innuendo or insults, so I'll just end it at that.

Maybe you've such a high opinion of yourself you can't get past your own reflection.

Kim W5TIT

2443. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 14:40:42 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <7A0D999C23808320.B00F3DCA0CA7043F.5048FC829C5ED2EB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64631

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.04.13.00.59.36.133777.7305@arrl.org...
> On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 10:48:31 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > news:pan.2003.04.12.02.17.58.321715.29110@arrl.org...
> >> Other examples can easily be found.
> >
> > So what. Why must everyone/anyone not be free to comment on the vaulted
> > press.
>
> I don't know what that means.
>
> >> > Follow the money. Every day now we learn more about the back door
> >> > cozy financial relationships between Saddam's regime and some of our
> >> > "close allies."
> >>
> >> Examples?
> >
> > France, Germany and Russia with oil contracts and selling banned weopons
> > to Saddam.
>
> How are the oil contracts "back door" relationships? Those were not, as
> far as I know, ever secret. Iraq was permitted to sell a quantity of oil
> via the oil-for-food program. Somebody was going to get the contracts to
> do the work.
>
> As for banned weapons sales, I'm aware of some reporting that Russia sold
> some weapons. I'm unaware of reporting about French and German weapons
> sales. Can you point me to it? (We're talking post-Gulf War, I assume.
> Prior to that, pretty much every arms-exporting country, including the US
> and Britain, sold nasty stuff to Iraq. In the US case, that included
> chemical and biological weapons.)
>
> >> Oh, and if it's all about following money, who's going to benefit
> >> monetarily from those rebuilding-Iraq contracts that are being offered
> >> only to selected US companies?
> >
> > You tell me.
>
> Bill, you cannot rationally argue that France/Germany/Russia opposed the
> war solely because they benefited from antebellum business relationships
> unless you also argue that the US favored the war because of expected
> postwar relationships. If you insist on following the money to France,
> Germany and Russia, you must also follow the money to the US unless you

> are completely bereft of objectivity.
>

I think you may have something right there, Jon. IMHO, of course...

> > Would you not want those contracts to go
> > to US companies?
>
> I'd want those contracts to go to the lowest-price qualified bidder. It's
> mostly our money being spent, after all.
>
> >> No, they've said they disagree with us. That's not the same thing.
> >
> > Jon, that is bunk. Many hate what we are...free, democratic and
> > successful...and they don't care what we think
>
> Bill, that is bunk. It's not our democracy and freedom they hate, it's
> that we are the torch bearers for what they see as centuries of Western
> repression. The Crusades are more than dusty history in the Muslim world,
> and they view Israel and US support for Israel as being more of the same.
> I think they're off-base there, but that's how they see it nonetheless. If
> the US were a despotic regime but still had exhibited the policies toward
> the Arab world of the past 50+ years, they would hate us just as much. If
> you don't understand that you simply haven't bothered to find out what
> they are thinking. The "they hate our freedom" argument is just foolish
> pandering.
>
> Jon
>

Absolutely. But, some can't see the forest for the trees...

Kim W5TIT

2444. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 14:46:47 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <459B4CC537F1059C.6BB16BE52E576245.7DEF4DDE4021697D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64632

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0304121743.54273f26@posting.google.com...
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<C2DF6A57CBCA3276.701FDE1AFC9A82D7.D9323447173F2B92@lp.airnews.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0304120530.566104f4@posting.google.com...
> > > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > news:<pan.2003.04.12.03.56.55.900202.11732@arrl.org>...
> > > > On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:26:05 -0400, Brian wrote:
> > > > > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > > > >> That's your opinion. Others would say that those who protested
the
> > > > >> Vietnam war were patriotic.
> > > > >
> > > > > "Others" would be wrong. They could serve pennance by applying
for
> > > > > Vietnamese citizenship. Today is not too late, but 1973 would
have
> > been
> > > > > better.
> > > >
> > > > Feel free to go to Vietnam and pick up the battle where it left off
in
> > > > 1975. The same folks are still in control and I'm sure they'd be
willing
> > > > to fight you. Hey, if it was right then, it's right now.
> > >
> > > Why would I go fight them now, 30 years after the battle ended? I
> > > don't have a duty to do so, and it would be wrong to do so now. Our
> > > country is no longer at war with anyone in Vietnam.
> > >
> >
> > Give 'em time, give 'em time...
>
> Not in your lifetime. Everytime US Forces are sent to do something,
> the liberal media is ready to call it "another Vietnam." I heard it
> said about Grenada, Kuwait, Somalia, Haiti, Rwanda, and the Former
> Yugoslavia (FY for Dave).
>
> Vietnam made some good faith gestures allowing us to search for and
> recover some of the remains of service men KIA over there. I saw the
> repatriation of some remains while on Guam. The Color Guard rolled
> out to a C-141 Starlifter and brought them in. Katie Kuerk and
> Jeraldo weren't there.

>
> And no, I didn't get permission from my commander to be there.
>

I came in late to a media frenzy on Rumsfeld this morning. Something about he hoped Syria would not be a haven for war criminals and terrorists. So, let's see...Syria may be next like Dan said. Then, oh...let's see, probably Iran; next, Libya; next... [not in reference to the Iraq war being another Viet Nam (I think those kind of comments are crap), but more in reference to the US now becoming and remaining an aggressor on nation after nation.

Kim W5TIT

2445. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 14:56:57 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <1130A533BDB7B63D.CA76423FCE0CB923.D6B7D03075FC0A1A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 64633

```
"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3E98CF3A.9E8562B0@att.net...
>
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> > On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 10:48:31 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > > news:pan.2003.04.12.02.17.58.321715.29110@arrl.org...
> > >> Other examples can easily be found.
> > >
> > > So what. Why must everyone/anyone not be free to comment on the
vaulted
> > > press.
> >
> > I don't know what that means.
> >
> > >> > Follow the money. Every day now we learn more about the back door
> > >> > cozy financial relationships between Saddam's regime and some of
our
> > >> > "close allies."
> > >>
> > >> Examples?
> > >
> > > France, Germany and Russia with oil contracts and selling banned
weopons
> > > to Saddam.
> >
> > How are the oil contracts "back door" relationships? Those were not, as
> > far as I know, ever secret. Iraq was permitted to sell a quantity of oil
> > via the oil-for-food program. Somebody was going to get the contracts to
> > do the work.
> >
> > As for banned weapons sales, I'm aware of some reporting that Russia
sold
> > some weapons. I'm unaware of reporting about French and German weapons
> > sales. Can you point me to it? (We're talking post-Gulf War, I assume.
> > Prior to that, pretty much every arms-exporting country, including the
US
> > and Britain, sold nasty stuff to Iraq. In the US case, that included
> > chemical and biological weapons.)
> >
> > >> Oh, and if it's all about following money, who's going to benefit
> > >> monetarily from those rebuilding-Iraq contracts that are being
```

offered
> > >> only to selected US companies?
> > >
> > > You tell me.
> >
> > Bill, you cannot rationally argue that France/Germany/Russia opposed the
> > war solely because they benefited from antebellum business relationships
> > unless you also argue that the US favored the war because of expected
> > postwar relationships. If you insist on following the money to France,
> > Germany and Russia, you must also follow the money to the US unless you
> > are completely bereft of objectivity.
> >
> > > Would you not want those contracts to go
> > > to US companies?
> >
> > I'd want those contracts to go to the lowest-price qualified bidder.
It's
> > mostly our money being spent, after all.
> >
> > >> No, they've said they disagree with us. That's not the same thing.
> > >
> > > Jon, that is bunk. Many hate what we are...free, democratic and
> > > successful...and they don't care what we think
> >
> > Bill, that is bunk. It's not our democracy and freedom they hate, it's
> > that we are the torch bearers for what they see as centuries of Western
> > repression. The Crusades are more than dusty history in the Muslim
world,
> > and they view Israel and US support for Israel as being more of the
same.
> > I think they're off-base there, but that's how they see it nonetheless.
If
> > the US were a despotic regime but still had exhibited the policies
toward
> > the Arab world of the past 50+ years, they would hate us just as much.
If
> > you don't understand that you simply haven't bothered to find out what
> > they are thinking. The "they hate our freedom" argument is just foolish
> > pandering.
> >
> > Jon
>
>
>
> Jon it is really distressing to see that you are so very poorly informed.
So
> much
> so that to think about even beginning to straighten you out one is left
> wondering where in the world to begin.
>

I'm curious to know what happens to people like that, in your world, Dick?
What should be done if you can't "straighten" Jon out?

Kim W5TIT

2446. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 15:22:18 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Kgfma.1229$N_3.229764@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64628

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030413083705.18293.00000624@mb-ff.aol.com...
> From N2EY:
>
> >>So "amateur radio" is not the same as "Ham radio".
> >
> >Incorrect. They are one and the same.
>
> Amateur radio is the license. Ham radio is the culture, traditions, set
of
> beliefs.
>
> Some Hams use the word "true" Ham. There would be no need for "true" Hams
if
> everyone that had an amateur radio license is a Ham. There would be no
> "infidel" no coders.
>
> A "true" Ham stays true to the traditions and belief of HAM radio.

Those who promote this "true" ham nonsense are not endorsed by the amateur radio (i.e. ham radio) community as a whole. There is no "ham radio cult" as you try to imply.

The "infidel" no coder thread was satire (i.e. a particular form of humor) and not intended (at least initially) to be taken seriously.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2447. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 15:51:52 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E998798.8010300@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 64653

Jon Bloom wrote:

>>>First ask an intelligent question.
>>
>>Do you consider the Dixie Chick patriotic?
>
>
> Do you consider that an intelligent question?

Texans are ashamed that the Dixie Clucks are from Texas.

2448. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:08:18 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.13.16.08.17.978352.6044@arrl.org>
Source record: 64634

On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 22:45:55 -0400, Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Jon it is really distressing to see that you are so very poorly
> informed. So
> much
> so that to think about even beginning to straighten you out one is left
> wondering where in the world to begin.

Dick, it fascinates me how people like you think. They first determine prejudicially which "side" is correct. They then accept uncritically any evidence or argument that seems to support that prejudicial conclusion while dismissing any evidence or argument that appears to contradict it. Since they can't acknowlege that any evidence or argument which contradicts their point of view has any shred of validity, they resort to attacking the motives or intelligence of those presenting the argument -- or by making vague statements about their being poorly informed. (In fact, by refusing to consider the body of information that makes them uncomfortable, it is they who end up poorly informed.)

This approach is comforting because it allows one to divide the world into "us" and "them." Or, as the President says, you're either with us or you're against us. And those who adopt this mode of thinking in fact ARE living in a bipolar world, because by accepting only one side of the argument they do divide into two camps that can happily lob verbal hand grenades at one another, feeling, no doubt, mighty righteous all the while. This wouldn't be so bothersome except that this approach is more and more the way most public debate takes place in the US. It's not particularly healthy for democratic decision making.

Of course, there are some of us who are more open minded. We recognize that there are generally elements of justice on both sides of an argument. This really irritates the bipolar types, who respond by calling us wishy-washy, wusses or fence-sitters. Trapped as they are in a world where EVERYTHING comes down to a good-versus-evil debate, they can't stand being unable to pigeonhole everyone.

Jon

2449. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:26:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413122643.15869.00000071@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 64639

In article <3f0ma.934$7F2.485309@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>> Lots of EE college students write like that. I have emails to prove it.
>
>Egad, someone remind me to require all EE college students applying for jobs
>to submit samples of English composition. Clear communications is paramount
>and if they can't or won't do it, I'm not hiring!!

You aren't the only "personnel officer" in here. There's another, one of the Gang of Four...he drives a bus now.

Want to argue "English composition" with me, Dee? I've been a published author since 1968...national publications, involving electronics and radio. That was before I got my degree. I was selling words after that.

Oh, and I've been doing the in-department second interviews of young EEs applying for engineering positions since 1972.

Just thought I'd mention that. :-)

2450. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:26:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413122643.15869.00000070@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 64640

In article <pan.2003.04.12.14.45.15.701519.2786@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>Ah, you are reduced to making fun of typos. Not a compelling argument for
>your point of view, Len.

Jon, go back to standby mode and no transmission. Just like
many months before.

You don't have any solutions for Iraq, just a lot of arrogant
opinions about "peace" and doing nothing.

This is an AMATEUR RADIO newsgroup, Jon, NOT a forum of
experts in realpolitik with the wisdom of ages.

Make like an amateur RADIO person working for ARRL.

You won't be drafted or have to fight. US military doesn't take
artifacts from museums to serve.

2451. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:26:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413122647.15869.00000072@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 64636

In article <20030412171739.08928.00001051@mb-fj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> Must be a student of George Orwell.

Try getting a passing grade as a student of English, Steamy.

Temper fry.

2452. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:26:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413122648.15869.00000074@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 64635

In article <20030412170213.08890.00000890@mb-fj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> Does writing like an idiot make it OK to be an idiot, Vipul?

It works for you!

2453. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:26:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413122648.15869.00000073@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 64637

In article <N60ma.905$7F2.482613@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>You are all messed up in your definitions. Where on earth did you get them?
>We are licensed in the Amateur Radio Service. This is the exact term used
>in the FCC rules. Common speech reserves the term amateur radio (not
>capitalized) to those licensed in the Amateur Radio Service. Ham radio is a
>slang term for the Amateur Radio Service. They are one and the same thing.
>Ham radio is thus NOT a subset of amateur radio. On the other hand, CB is
>never referred to as amateur radio in common speech either by the ham radio
>community or the CB radio community. FCC rules use the term Citizen's Band
>Radio Service and the common term is CB radio.

Citizens Band Radio Service is a SERVICE! :-)

Check Part 95 to see if there is a possessive form of the title.
Don't use apostrophes where they shouldn't be used, madam
teacher.

>You cannot impose your personal preference of definitions on terms as
>actually used. It just doesn't work and makes a mess of any attempt to
>communicate. You need to use the terms in the same manner as the majority
>of speakers use them. It is this majority consensus of usage that
>eventually becomes the dictionary definition. Dictionaries are intended to
>document and support the current usage of the language not freeze it in
>time. This is why dictionaries are periodically revised, to capture the new
>and/or changed meanings of words as used in common speech.

Gosh, Dee, are you wanting to take over the "Technically Speaking"
column in the IEEE Spectrum? :-)

Bob Lucky will strike again! :-)

You ought to tutor one of the ARS artifacts in here on the improper
misdirection into "use" when TEST was really the subject.

Have you had a cheese sandwich recently? Did it taste like a
2N2222? Do you know what a 2N2222 is? :-)

2N2222s are good in tuna (tins).

Beep, beep.

2454. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:26:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413122649.15869.00000075@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 64638

In article <20030412164354.26171.00001100@mb-fd.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From K4YZ:
>
>> WHOA! Where in the Blue Blazes did you come up with THAT gem...?!?!
>>CBer's can't be licensed Amateurs and vice versa...?!?!
>
>No, I meant CBers experimenting WITHOUT an amateur radio licence -thats
>illegal. Technically they are radio amateurs (not professional).
>
>>It is NOT illegal to "xmit on the broadcast band without a license"...
>
>Thats what I said. So, you agree with what I said.
>
>Since they are xmitting on this band, they are radio amatuers.
>But, since they don't have amateur radio license, they are not a Ham.
>
>Therefore, there are some radio amateurs that are not Hams.
>
>>Now go sober up and don't come back before you do. Or fire that 8-year
>>old. Your "stuff" is hard enough to follow as it is.
>>Where did you go to college again?
>
>Lots of EE college students write like that. I have emails to prove it.

Steamy Stalker ain't no "EE" and couldn't pass a college
English course unless he beat up the instructor. :-)

2455. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:26:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413122652.15869.00000076@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 64642

In article <20030412145058.23756.00000165@mb-fj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030411201751.15821.00000087@mb-cg.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>>Are any of the facts presented incorrect?
>>
>> Conclusions based on selective use of facts is biased, incorrect.
>
>Are any of the facts presented incorrect?

That is biased, incorrect, a mistake, an error. It is spin,
propaganda, self-interest, and a lot of not too good
attributes.

Jimmie, Jimmie...tsk, tsk, tsk. You HAVE to be the
antagonistic supporter of morse, don't you?

You try to mirror my own paragraphs to "prove" something.

You don't prove anything other than you are a biased
morse fanatic. Give it a rest.

>>>>>However the fact can then be used
>>>>>to support advocating Morse.
>>>
>>>Is that a bad thing?
>>
>> For licensing in US amateur radio it is considered "bad" by many.
>
>Advocating the USE of Morse is bad?

When there are better modes, more useful modes, YES.

If you want to maintain an Ancient Radiotelegraphy
Society in perpetuity, then NO.

The subject sub-thread was LICENSING. Look up above in
the quote: "For licensing..." LICENSING, not "use."

Hello...? LICENSING involves TESTING. Capice?

>Who considers it bad besides you and Vipul?

Everyone who isn't a morse code fanatic.

The other radio services have given up on morse code for
anything of use in communications.

>> So much so, they've not bothered to get into US amateur radio.
>
>Who are these "many" who have allegedly been turned away?

The ones you dislike.

Reverend Jimmie ought to understand that there are NO polls
done by any ARRL to show such "facts."

You are in denial, Jimmie.

>> That is biased, incorrect, a mistake, an error.
>
>Yes, you and Vipul make many such errors. Try to fix them.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Getting angry are you?

Try to practice some tolerance...you would get such returned.

You are being spiteful. Not good.

>Glad to see you're finally recognizing your mistakes ;-)

Not mistakes, Jimmie.

You must learn to contain yourself...besides putting yourself
in that mean-spirited box. Learn tolerance. It's very Jesuit.

>> There is a dearth of business information in regards to the
>> "growth" of morse code use.
>
>Vibroplex is still in business, MFJ is in business, Ten-Tec, lots of other
>companies.

Then by all means, promote them. Business trades don't.

Remember that I was the one who pointed out your ERROR
about amazon.com allegedly not being profitable.

You are about as reliable on business matters as the
National Enquirer.

>I wouldn't take business advice from somebody who confuses "bankrupt" with
>"unprofitable", though.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...poor baby, still stung over the correction about
amazon.com. Amazon has had over a half year of dividend
earnings. Mid-way through that period you insisted they were
"losing money!"

Now you want to engage in wordplay to misdirect the subject.

You MADE A MISTAKE before. Admit it. Show some machismo.

>For sending Morse code I have a selection of four Vibroplex bugs, a J-37
>straight key, and a new Mini-Paddle (thanks to the generous ham who gave me
>the latter).

Enjoy. You will be the last bastion of beeping. Beep away.

>If a thing has a use, it is useful. I used Morse code to communicate with
three
>different hams last night on the 40 meter band. Great QSOs.

Call the staff at "60 Minutes." Have them cover the event!

Show the world that the Ancient Radiotelegraphy Society is
showing them the best, most useful way to communicate.

>Of course Morse code is not useful to someone who doesn't know how to use it,
>just as a book is not useful to someone who cannot read (except perhaps as
>fuel or to prop up wobbly furniture).

It's propping up the old men of ARRL. Very useful for that.

>> Of all the US radio services that
>> existed since the end of WW2, only two retain morse code
>> modes for any sort of communications purpose.
>
>So what?

So, did you just leave the shtetl last week?

EVERYONE ELSE in the world of radio has either dropped
morsemanship or never considered it for use in the beginning.

Morse code is dying off in radio. It is on life-support only
in amateur radio. AMATEURS.

Ancient Radiotelegraphy Society. Beepers.

>And the other is...amateur radio! And this is...an amateur radio newsgroup!
>And we're discussing whether Morse code is useful...in amateur radio!

There's a LOT more bandwidth wasted on two other threads
discussing war and world affairs relative to war...done mostly
by AMATEURS in an AMATEUR RADIO NEWSGROUP.

Hello? Are you so schizoid you compartmentalize everything?

Jimmie, morse code is useful only to morse fanatics. Morse
fanatics are those who can't envision themselves using any
mode but on-off keying.

>How about that, Captain Obvious? ;-) ;-) ;-)

Kiss my yes, Reverend Jimmie.

>Since Morse code IS used in amateur radio, it IS useful to amateur radio
>operators.

NOT to ALL of them. You've lost your perspective. In fact, it
retreated to the vanishing point.

>Why does that bother you so much?

It doesn't. The morse code TEST is really the subject.

You keep on, keep on, keep on misdirecting into "use" to get
away from the morse code TEST.

>> Morse code mode is slow and error-prone in requiring humans
>> at each end to be the encoder and decoder.
>
>Guess people shouldn't talk to each other then, huh? Humans at each end,
>encoding, decoding, making mistakes....

That's exactly why the commercial communications carriers did
away with manual telegraphy, Jimmie.

You are very slow but we can all see some light at the end of
your fanatic tunnel.

>> Maximum
>> throughput is, at best, 30 WPM only be very skilled and
>> experienced morsemen.
>
>That is biased, incorrect, a mistake, an error. It is spin,
>propaganda, self-interest, and a lot of not too good
>attributes.
>
>In short, Len, it's just plain wrong.
>
>The *best* skilled ops do at least twice 30 WPM. I can do 40-45 wpm on a good
>day. Effective throughput is much higher due to the use of abbreviations,
>prosigns, Q signals, etc.

Sustain that "throughput" for as long as paper is available.

Teleprinters of 60 years ago could do better than that (60 WPM)
as long as the paper lasted and was reloaded. Nice printed
copy, easily legible, same copy at both ends. No bathroom
breaks, no need to sleep or eat. Not distracted by other humans.

>> The slowest teleprinters in radio
>> communications have been 100 WPM for four decades,
>
>That is biased, incorrect, a mistake, an error. It is spin,
>propaganda, self-interest, and a lot of not too good
>attributes.
>
>In short, Len, it's just plain wrong.
>
>Lots of 60 wpm teletype in use, though not as much as before. I was using 60
>wpm machines on the air in the mid-70s. Less than four decades ago.

Yes, your "surplus" variety, teleprinters that were getting old
when I was in the US military in the 1950s. Phased out in
favor of the Model 28s and 33s that came in at the end of the
1960s. Those models were in industry at the end of the 1960s
and used as distant computer terminals.

I'm sure you would have used spark transmitters too if they
weren't outlawed.

>> do so 24/7 with enough paper to reload, don't need food,
>> don't need breaks, don't need to go to the bathroom. Data
>> rates can go to 200+ WPM equivalent and use forward-
>> error correction codings to improve reliability through
>> interference.
>
>Sure. Very useful. Just like Morse code. Hams use all sorts of modes, Len.

I've already used far more modes than in permissible to US radio
amateurs. Not a single manual test for them in US amateur radio.

The only manual test for any mode in US amateur radio is morse
code. TEST, Jimmie. NOT "use." Only for privileges below
30 MHz.

>> Every OTHER US radio service gets along quite fine without
>> using morse or ever envisioning its use.
>
>So? Their needs, goals and resources are different.

No kidding! [see, you can learn to understand the other world
of radio!]

Those in the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society have NO use for
any other mode but on-off keying morse codes.

>What is wrong with live and let live?

Why do you ask? You sure as hell don't practice it!

>On the other hand, no code skill has been required for an amateur radio
>license
>giving all privileges above 30 MHz. Been that way for over 12 years. Lots of
>real, genuine, first-class, fine-and-upstanding hams hold that class of
>license. All part of the big happy family we call amateur radio.

Yes, I've seen the "big happy family." Class distinction deeply
rooted. Elitism, fractioned opinions. Olde-tyme thinking hams
acting like puerile bigots to everything not in the standards and
practices of the 1930s.

Jimmie, ARRL can't get more than a quarter of all US amateur
radio licensees as members. Been that way for years.

>Besides, we're talking about Morse code USE, not the TEST. The test is all
>but gone.

The TEST is NOT gone. You act like you are gone.

You keep misdirecting from TEST to "use." You don't have a valid reason for retaining the TEST except for ITU-R S25.5.

Remember, LICENSING involves TEST, not "use." Can't "use" until the TEST is passed. Capice?

>But the USE will continue for a long, long time. Live with it.

So is reenactments of the Revolutionary War and Civil War in the USA. Still done. Stagecoaches are still around as a mode of transportation but other than amusement park rides, they aren't carriers in transportation. Muskets still exist but they aren't effective firearms compared to modern weaponry...although the myths about their "effectiveness" continue.

Spark has been outlawed in the USA for years. It needed on-off keying to carry communications information. No other mode could be made to work with spark. I'm sure the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society would keep on using spark till the end of their lifespan.

Once the FCC decides to eliminate the US amateur radio code test, it will be GONE, Jimmie. Kaput. Defunct. Tossed out. Live with THAT. It will become fact.

Some museum artifacts will still be sitting around vibrating their plexes and slapping bugs. In old, quavering voices they will sound off about their "prowess" in manual telegraphy by almost getting as fast as the teleprinters of WW2. It will be a quaint sight. A living museum of long-ago radio.

Enjoy your glass case in the museum. Beep, beep, OM.

2456. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:26:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413122653.15869.00000077@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 64641

In article <20030412145056.23756.00000164@mb-fj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>You can work out the progression for yourself. It's clear that as the number
of
>hams using Morse increases, so do the number of possible QSOs. More possible
>QSOs equals more useful.
>
>You cannot escape the logic. Not only is Morse code useful for radio amateurs,
>it becomes more useful as more hams use use it.
>
>None of which means any particular ham MUST use it, or that atest for it MUST
>be retained. Just that it's useful.

On-off keying morse code mode is the second-highest mode
used according to a poll by ARRL. It was second to VOICE
on HF some years ago.

Above 30 MHz, amateur radio use of on-off keying morse code
is in a definite minority, useful only for some specialized
activities. Has so little use up there that only morse fanatics
have to try to maximize a minimum. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

You must "atest" to those two facts, for they ARE facts.

[Jimmie, step away from the pulpit...it's Sunday and let the
real pros preach, okay?]

2457. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:26:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413122654.15869.00000078@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 64648

In article <20030412141226.19789.00000159@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker fries again) writes:

>>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/12/2003 6:03 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030412070313.26171.00001061@mb-fd.aol.com>
>
>>Because I liked build'g ckts. I did what I like doing. I didn't look to see
>if
>>it was a growth industry or if it was popular.
>
> Gee whiz...ya think SOME folks get into Amateur Radio for similar reasons
>and without wondering if it's "popular" or not...?!?!

Explain your reasons...which a lot of others have already surmised.

>>Problem is every-1 else uses the wrong def. For ex., the word "Engineer" is
>>often rongly used. Some "Engineers" R lower than the lowest of <REAL> techs.
>
> You been drinking last night, or do you have an 8-year old ghost writing
>for you today?

Explain your own continual bouts of rage-induced typographical
errors and bad sentence structure.

Be a true role-model instead of a loud-mouth.

> Do you realize just how silly this sounds and looks?

Everyone already has seen how silly, mean, and generally bad
your continued attack postings have been.

>>We have amateur radio licenses, not Ham radio licenses. "Ham radio" is a sub
>>group of amateurs. Some Cbers R amateurs (tho this be illegal).
>
> WHOA! Where in the Blue Blazes did you come up with THAT gem...?!?!
>CBer's can't be licensed Amateurs and vice versa...?!?!
>
> SHOW ME in ANY part of the FCC rules and regs that say THAT, Vipul ! ! !

Take off the invisible robe, amateur chief justice. You can't even
understand that "service" is a regulatory word throughout Title 47.

How are you doing on 97.1.(e)? Stop any wars with that yet?

>>It is legal to xmit on the broadcast band without a license, so this can be
>>"amateur radio", but NOT "Ham radio" (since they not have amateur radio

>>license).
>
> Ahhhhh....You ARE drunk! Or stoned...Or maybe both?

Take you Prozac and Lithium like a good little patient and you
wouldn't have all those hysterical outbursts.

Maybe something stronger is needed? See a Real Doctor
about that.

> It is NOT illegal to "xmit on the broadcast band without a license"...
>
> Read part 15, Vippy.

Read it closer, myopia man. It is not illegal to transmit on the ham
bands in the same Part 15.

>>Just from this 1 example, "amateur radio" is NOT the same as "Ham radio",
>tho
>>there R overlaps.
>
> Amateur Radio and "Ham" radio are one in the same. No "overlaps"
>involved. The same thing.

Poor baby. Steamy must have called his cheese sandwich "2N3904."

Call a bowl of tomato soup "2N3906" and Steamy could have a
complementary pair. :-)

Problem is, if Steamy had a REAL 2N3904 and 2N3906 he wouldn't
know how to hook them up or how they operate together. Not even
at DC. That would give him intellectual indigestion. :-)

> Now go sober up and don't come back before you do. Or fire that 8-year
>old. Your "stuff" is hard enough to follow as it is.

Kiss my yes, big-badass hammus idiotaurus.

Get a tranquilizer before fisting your keyboard again.

> Where did you go to college again?

You didn't. Steamy got NO college degree, never worked in an
engineering department. Tsk, tsk, tsk. He can't sustain his
English sentences or stop the rage-induced typos.

Temper fry.

2458. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:26:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413122655.15869.00000079@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 64643

In article <20030412001206.05767.00000249@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/10/2003 6:18 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030410191805.20747.00000269@mb-cv.aol.com>
>
>
>>I try to be as clear as possible.
>
> Try harder. MUCH harder.

Follow your own advice. You haven't yet done so.

Temper fry.

2459. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:26:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413122655.15869.00000080@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 64646

In article <20030412171346.08928.00001050@mb-fj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>>Date: 4/12/2003 4:57 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <eZ%la.862$7F2.478690@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
>
>>It's an inherent ability of the
>>human brain....(SNIP)
>
> The operative word there being "human", Dee...

That lets you out.

Temper fry.

2460. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:26:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413122656.15869.00000081@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 64645

In article <20030412141438.19789.00000160@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/12/2003 6:07 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030412070718.26171.00001062@mb-fd.aol.com>
>
>>Yes, others have said that also. I must be mistaken about losing 5 wpm skill.
>>Seems it does not happen with Morse code due to probably to something of
>>Morse code, which I am not aware of.
>
> The insanity of this assertion, Vipul, is like saying that because I can I
>can speak at normal conversational rates, I can no longer communicate by saing
>one word at a time.
>
> Are we getting the point yet?

All the readers are "getting the point" even if you are "saing" words.

All you are doing so far is some childish STALKING of someone
you believe you can bully. Poor baby.

Steamy can't WRITE in a conversational tone. He BARKS ORDERS,
still thinking his stripes are on in a different "service."

Steamy ought to address his opponents with the salutation MAGGOT
in the worst tradition of the USMC.

Temper fry.

2461. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:26:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413122657.15869.00000082@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 64644

In article <20030412142156.19789.00000162@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>>From: nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test)
>>Date: 4/12/2003 7:38 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030412083832.11628.00000063@mb-fz.aol.com>
>
>>> Don't say THAT, Dave...that would leave the Nitwit Trio out in the cold
>>>forever!
>>
>>Are they any relation to the Nairobi Trio?
>
> The Nairobi Trio? Three thinly clad women applying hair-removal lotion
>to their legs?

Ignorant slut. Tsk, tsk, tsk. The "Nairobi Trio" were a staple visual schtick of the late Ernie Kovacs on television.

Three humans in ape suits, one playing a piano, one on bongos, one ready for the literal visual "punch line." Same music each time. Simple, wonderful humor.

Kovac's "Nairobi Trio" began slightly before 1956 on NBC television. Steam was still wetting his diapers then, crying his little eyes out. Come to think of it, he is still doing that.

2462. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:26:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413122658.15869.00000083@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 64647

In article <eZ%la.862$7F2.478690@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030412070718.26171.00001062@mb-fd.aol.com...
>> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>>
>> >> >Someone who is proficient in
>> >> >morse at 35 wpm does not lose his ability to copy 5 wpm.
>>
>> Yes, others have said that also. I must be mistaken about losing 5 wpm
skill.
>> Seems it does not happen with Morse code due to probably to something of
Morse
>> code, which I am not aware of.
>
>Nothing special at all. Auctioneers do not lose the ability to talk at
>normal speeds. Musicians can still play Brahms lullaby even after they've
>mastered "The Flight of the Bumblebee". It's an inherent ability of the
>human brain to be able to handle information at the highest speed it is
>trained for and speeds SLOWER than that.

Auctioneers are engaged in a business. US amateur radio is
NOT for pecuniary interest.

Music is a no-no on US amateur radio since it is too much like
broadcasting.

Teleprinting is a go-go on US amateur radio. An old Model 15
surplus Teletype terminal can sustain 60 WPM output for an
hour or more until it runs out of paper...and it would be at least
50 years old. A newer (surplus) Model 28 can sustain 100 WPM
as long as it has paper (they take fan-fold).

There's very little problem of most humans, untrained since
childhood school days to read legible type at least 200 WPM
equivalent. I can do roughly 1000 WPM read-only and it's been
a long time since my childhood. :-)

US amateur radio regulations classify teleprinting in the general
"data" category.

2463. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:34:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304130834.2cfc8557@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64649

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.12.17.08.48.5332.2786@arrl.org>...
> On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 04:46:02 -0400, Brian Kelly wrote:
> > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message

>
> What you said was: "Did you notice that we didn't get much if any help
> from the UN when we almost single-handedly rebuilt Europe after WW2? What
> shred of evidence do you have which indicates that history will not repeat
> itself in the case of Iraq?" Perhaps you can see why I took "shred of
> evidence ... that history will not repeat itself" as referring to the
> helpfulness of others rather than to the behavior of the US.

Point.

> As for shreds of evidence about US behavior, consider the case of
> Afghanistan. Despite assurances from the US that copious help would be
> coming, the Administration's attention to the problem has been spotty. For
> example, the Administration's 2003 budget included no request for Afghan
> humanitarian or reconstruction aid at all! This oversight isn't indicative
> of a program that has a high priority. One wonders if Iraq will suffer
> from the same neglect once we're on to the next adventure.

Humanitarian aid and reconstruction funding for both Afghanistan and
Iraq are line items in the off-the-budget $80 billion war funding
package passed by congress on Saturday, $2.5 billion of it earmarked
for aid and the reconstruction of Iraq alone. Even before the fighting
has stopped. And that's just first pass emergency funding.

Conjurs up visions of some backwater entity calling Rumsfeld and
hollering "Invade us, invade us!"

The Japs pledged $200 million for Afghanistan, last I saw they'd
forked over only $32 million so far.

> > This really cooks it for me. In other words they don't give a rat's
> > patooie about relieving the suffering in Iraq, all they care about who
> > controls the recovery effort. It's the Old Europe syndrome again, the
> > suffering millions be damned, what really matters is CONTROL.
>
> No question that they are concerned about control. So are we!

The difference is that it was US (U.S., U.K., Aussies) who sent people
in to die for the sake of the Iraquis and global security while Putin,
Shroeder & Chiraq Inc. did everything they could to stymie our effort.
In other words we earned the right to call the shots with blood. Twice
over as far as I'm concerned. When was the last time any of 'em

cleared out a despotic regime and worked to establish a democracy in it's place?

The control thing has much deeper roots, it's about the ongoing effort to homogenize the U.S. into some fuzzy "one world" template. Ref: Marx. 'Nother whole discussion but it ain't gonna happen, we are not gonna get pulled down to the level of the proponents of that vision or fall under their control. This one even gets down to raw, primeval jealousy and egos.

> >> Do you
> >> think the US would have attacked SH had it not been for 9/11?
> >
> > Of course not. We wouldn't have eventually nuked Hiroshima and Nagasaki
> > if the Japs hadn't hit Pearl Harbor either.
>
> So why should France and Germany condone attacking SH? Put it another way:
> If it had been the Eiffel tower and the Brandenburg Gate that OBL's crowd
> had attacked, would the US have supported them attacking Iraq? I'm not so
> sure.

You're taking the discussion into the realm of what-ifs. Works for antenna optimization analyses, does not work when using crystal ball outputs as they relate to geopolitics. I pass.

> There is little evidence that Saddam was directly supporting OBL and
> crowd, and certainly not with WMD.

Premature conclusions. Doesn't really matter anyway at this point, the deed is done. Tomorrow is all that matters, we can catch up with the rest in the history books.

> Saddam was a slug and deserved to be
> squashed. But it's unclear that doing so will help win the war on
> terrorism.

Don't put that in the bank, events are moving at lightning speed as we peck at our keyboards. One of our major conservative Iranian arch-enemy politicians is now suddenly and publicly "suggesting" dialoge with the U.S. North Korea just all but completely reversed it's stand on it's "terms" for talks abt that flashpoint. There's the other two members of the "Evil Axis" obviously just a tad, shall we say "concerned" after our romp thru Iraq.

All of it within the past two days. Sharon is also reversing course and is completely uncharacteristically tossing olive branches at the Palestinians. Some "message traffic" is definitely being transmitted and read . .

This thing is ballooning. Comes as a bit of a jolt to me quite frankly.

> > Are you kidding? The millions who have opposed our invasion of Iraq
> > without a UN mandate, a permission slip from the UN to take out Saddam.
> > If that ain't an attempt to tell us what we can and cannot do I don't
> > know what is. Din work. I hope they get used to it.
>
> There's a difference between requiring permission and wanting to achieve
> consensus.

The whole stink has centered on the lack of a Security Council resolution. Any of the members who have veto rights can torpedo any resolution if they choose to do so. Two comments in this regard: (1) Tote up the total number of vetos the U.S. has dropped on a proposed resolution vs. the number of vetos the rest of those members have exercised going back to the inception of the UN. (2) Hell will freeze tight before we bow to a veto by the Red Chinese.

Which in concept is exactly what we did.

Looks to me like Putin, Shroeder & Chiraq Inc. have wound up marginalizing both themselves and the UN certainly in the eyes of one helluva lotta U.S. citizens and no doubt beyond.

> If your characterization were correct, those millions would
> have continued to oppose the war after the 48-hour ultimatim. But most did
> not. Clearly, once they became convinced that diplomacy had run its
> course, they were satisfied. That hardly translates to requiring the UN's
> permission.

They folded their tents and shaddup after it became clear that they made ineffectual idiots of themselves.

> Jon

b.

2464. Re: WD4IHS ..COWARD or just a big pussy???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:46:44 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7c48gml1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64650
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

According to 'QRZ' he is a hightly HF qualified Technician class operator.
Nuff said Chuck?

Dan/W4NTI

"Chuck...K1KW" <coneal@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:W95ma.109848$ug3.214372@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
> Hey folks,
>
> I get an email from WD4IHS with an AOL account about a
> QSO I had on 20M. Well, based upon his comments,
> it seems that he didn't like what I said on the air, so he replies with a
> tirade
> via email from his AOL account. Well, I think, I wonder why he
> didn't reply to me on the air? So I reply to him via email to his
> AOL account. Then, this COWARD has my email rejected by
> AOL, I guess he doesn't want to hear what I said to him. Well, below is
> the entire exchange. It is here now for all the world to see..
> I guess Jeffy will have to deal with this...let's see AOL block this
> out...If any of you know this clown, show him this.
>
> 73,
> Chuck K1KW..
>
> MY REPLY IS BELOW:
>
> Hey,
>
> Chill out...
>
> If you listened you would have seen that the group agreed that the VE7
had
> a wide
> signal and they were working with him on it.
>
> So...what's your beef?
>
> AND...Why didn't you break in? Do you have a call that you would be
> proud of, or even be heard? Did you listen for the rest of the
interchange
> or just fire from the hip....?
>
> BTW, what were you drinking? Before you send such a missive again,
> get your wife or significant other to OK it...because you are obviously

> out of control, based upon that totally maundering email you sent to
> me......
>
> 73,
> Chuck...K1KW
>
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: WD4IHS@aol.com
> To: coneal@attbi.com
> Sent: Saturday, April 12, 2003 9:02 PM
> Subject: POLICING THE AMATEUR BANDS...
>
>
> Hey Chuck,
> My name is Jeff and I was listening on 20 meters a few minutes ago
> and I noticed those gentleman were having a nice conversation.You could
> have told them they were splattering and then moved on,but,you had to keep
> on
> and on about it.You say you have been a ham since 63 or whenever but
> I thought you would have learned some manners by now.First of all,I live
in
> Brentwood,Tennessee and you were wider than they were just talking normal.
> You have entirely too much background noise and you are over driving your
> amp
> and/or your mic. gain is too high.I realize that some people HAVE to run
> a KW for whatever reason but sometimes they are not necessary...DAH.YOU
> were causing much more interference than any of those other guys were at
> all.
> You need to look at your own signal and back your mic gain down some and
> QUIT over driving your amp.I got my ticket in 77(big deal).Was it
necessary
> to screw up there QSO like that?You might ought to stay off the rig when
you
> have been drinking huh?Oh well,some constructive critisism might go along
> way
> here! Like,MIND YOUR OWN BUSINESS and worry about yourself.I can not stand
> people who police the bands and try to tell people what to do.He who knows
> it
> all,knows NOTHING.Think before you ruin somebodys QSO next time.
>
> 73's,Jeff.
>
>

2465. Re: WD4IHS ..COWARD or just a big pussy???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:48:48 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <Qxgma.442211$L1.125771@sccrnsc02>
Source record: 64651
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"K.S.Blake" <polar@tiscali.com> wrote in message
news:b7bdum$f50$1@newsg3.svr.pol.co.uk...
> I agree with the guy if you kept going on and on about it, you should of
> just told them once and moved on, since when are you a ham authority
anyway.
> get a life for Christ's sake. We have guys like you over here in the UK
that
> think they know everything.
> We call them pain in the butts.
> --
>
>
> --
>
> K.S.Blake
> MW1001SWL
> MW1FCP
> .
>
> "Chuck...K1KW" <coneal@attbi.com> wrote in message
> news:W95ma.109848$ug3.214372@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
> > Hey folk

Snipppp .....

The sun comes up in the morning ...
It is generally dark at night .....
Bears generally XXXX in the woods .....
The Pope is Catholic ......
Work SSB for aggravation .....
Get on CW or the digital modes and don't put up with this crap ....It will
amaze you that radio can be relaxing and not a source of burrs in the
underwear.

73 God Bless KI3R Tom nr Pittsburgh

2466. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 16:50:13 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.13.16.50.13.194215.14016@arrl.org>
Source record: 64652

On Sun, 13 Apr 2003 12:26:43 -0400, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> Jon, go back to standby mode and no transmission. Just like many
> months before.

Is that an order?

> You don't have any solutions for Iraq, just a lot of arrogant
> opinions about "peace" and doing nothing.

Your inability to handle my opinions isn't sufficient reason for me to
stop posting them.

> This is an AMATEUR RADIO newsgroup, Jon, NOT a forum of experts in
> realpolitik with the wisdom of ages.

If that's what you believe, why don't you exert some of that leadership you
frequently cite as lacking and lead by example?

> You won't be drafted or have to fight. US military doesn't take
> artifacts from museums to serve.

Len, an insult from you is pure balm to me.

Jon

2467. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 17:56:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413135617.04143.00000056@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64656

In article <f45722ac.0304130444.43023c10@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>news:<20030412221432.24176.00000166@mb-fc.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0304041214.5a33ebf8@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >Which is why we need to remove the code-tape generals, advanced, and
>> >extras from the rolls of the "proficient" when trying to quantify
>> >Morse Code as a growth industry.
>>
>> Brian:
>>
>> Sounds good to me, as long as we're getting rid of the Question Pool
>> Techs right along with them! Let's clean up our collective acts, and
>> leave only truly qualified, proficient radio amateurs in our ranks! Oooops
>--
>> sorry about that -- good bye, Brian! I hope you and Kim enjoy your
>> new hobbies!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>How does that help us quantify Morse Code as a growth industry?
>
>Do try to stay on topic.

The "growth" thing must be on his brain. It could be a bad day
on the bus route or too many cheese sandwiches... :-)

2468. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 17:56:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413135618.04143.00000058@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64654

In article <20030413082613.23238.00000046@mb-fy.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Human languages are idiomatic. Learn to live with it. A cat house is not a >house for cats.

Cheese sandwiches are still cheese sandwiches. They are NOT called by registered EIA part numbers for transistors.

2469. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 17:56:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413135618.04143.00000057@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64661

In article <f45722ac.0304130506.135f700@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
>news:<20030412141935.19789.00000161@mb-cc.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Infidel no-coders
>> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>> >Date: 4/12/2003 6:18 AM Central Daylight Time
>> >Message-id: <20030412071818.26171.00001063@mb-fd.aol.com>
>
>> >So now you want EVERYONE to learn Morse code, even non-amateurs?
>>
>> Sure...Why not. If Morse Code was taught from grade school, it would
>be
>> exceedingly easy to learn and become a part of our normal activities of
>daily
>> living. In ONE GENERATION, we could reduce the ened for electromagnetic
>> spectrum by at LEAST 90%.
>
>Why not? Because Morse isn't even a part of "normal activities" for
>professional communicators. In ONE GENERATION you could throw back
>throughput by many magnitudes and increase the need for
>electromagnetic spectrum by at LEAST 90%. Imagine having HDTV
>transmitted at screaming 40wpm. People wouldn't buy it. People quit
>buying Morse in by the 60's, so why this retro idea now?

Brian, don't try to reason with Steamy Stalker.

He doesn't know the difference between a cheese sandwich
and a transistor! :-)

2470. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 17:56:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413135619.04143.00000059@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64660

In article <xddma.1182$N_3.180668@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Dictionaries often do not contain the usage definitions of terms used by >specialized groups of people. As I said in my other replies, the people >involved in radio limit the use of the term radio amateur to those licensed >in the Amateur Radio Service not to unlicensed experimenters or circuit >builders.

Dee, I've been "involved in radio" for about 53 years. I take exception to what you've said.

Very little "experimentation" in radio (or electronics) requires any license. Only the TRANSMISSION of RF energy beyond a regulated specific value requires a federal license.

>The person who builds circuits for a hobby is not a radio amateur. He is an >amateur circuit builder. That the circuits may be for a radio is >irrelevant.

I'm a professional "circuit builder" (actually a designer and builder). I design and build "circuits" for my own use but I'm not an "amateur" at it. That includes radio applications, irrelevant though you may think it is.

Quit calling cheese sandwiches by registered EIA part numbers. Nobody else (except a few truly ignorant amateurs in here) had done that since the 2N2222 debuted about 4 decades ago.

2471. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 17:56:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413135620.04143.00000060@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64655

In article <20030412202628.11628.00000073@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>Egad, someone remind me to require all EE college students applying for jobs
>>to submit samples of English composition.
>
>I had to do that in order to get into EE school (University of Pennsylvania,
>Moore School of Electrical Engineering, Class of 1976).

Tsk, tsk, tsk...I didn't. I'd already gotten my first patent in
radio-electronics in 1974, had sold my first writing to a
national magazine in 1968...all without needing any
EE degree. :-)

>>Clear communications is paramount
>>and if they can't or won't do it, I'm not hiring!!
>>
>I agree! It's particularly important in engineering applications because
>miscommunication can have serious consequences to life and property.

Yes. Walk around work calling cheese sandwiches "2N2222"
and your manager will fire you. No income and you will fail to
pay your mortgage and lose your property. In going over the
bend you may hurt others, threatening their life. Serious.

Jimmie, a cheese sandwich IS a cheese sandwich. It is NOT
a transistor.

Write that on the whiteboard 100 times and try to believe it.

2472. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 17:56:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413135622.04143.00000061@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64658

In article <20030412202627.11628.00000072@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030412172319.26171.00001103@mb-fd.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
>(Vshah101) writes:
>
>>>>Problem is every-1 else uses the wrong def.
>>>That's YOUR problem, not theirs.
>>
>>No, thats society's problem.
>
>That attitude is why you don't get a lot of intetrest in your ideas.

Your attitude is why so few are interested (not "intetrested")
in antique radio.

Careful on your typing lest everyone starts calling you
"k4yz" or "wa8ulx." :-)

>>What if others call a cheese sandwich a 2N2222, and I say "no that's a
>>cheese sandwich"?
>
>If everyone else calls it a 2N2222, then you're wrong to call it a cheese
>sandwich.

If you start calling cheese sandwiches by EIA transistor part
numbers, you've gone over the edge, flipped out, and should
have your dusty old sheepskin recycled as a dashboard
cover!

Holy snit, Batman...US amateur radio is now represented by
some ignorant sluts who can't understand basic semiconductors!

>But the fact is that everyone else calls it a 2N2222 a transistor and you are
>calling it a cheese sandwich.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, "everyone else" is NOT calling it a "2N2222."

K4YZ thinks so. [he's an ignorant slut anyway]

DO try to stay with the program. Do NOT go to the same therapist
as some of these so-called "amateur extras" do.

Remember, Jim Fixx is watching over you... :-)

2473. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 17:56:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413135624.04143.00000062@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64662

In article <20030412183339.03676.00000570@mb-fm.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/12/2003 4:23 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030412172319.26171.00001103@mb-fd.aol.com>
>
>>True, but I couldn't imagine doing in anything else. So I would not know
>what
>>else to major in.
>
> English Composition is a sure bet to not be on the list.

HOW would you know? You've never demonstrated that in here except a lot of shouting and hollering and order-giving.

>>No, thats society's problem. Unclear (or even dishonest) definitions badly
>>affect those involved.
>
> Sorry Vippy...YOU are the one with the perception problem here. It's
>YOUR place to fix it. Sorry you don't agree.

Lots of readers observe that Steamy Stalker has not only a perception problem but a bully complex with a side-order of fried ignorance.

>>What if others call a cheese sandwich a 2N2222, and I say "no that's a cheese
>>sandwich"?
>
> Then you've still got a problem. If everyone ELSE calls it a 2N2222,
then
>YOU had better call it one too if you expect to eat.

HOW would you know the difference between a 2N2222 and, say, a 2N5764? Steamy, you wouldn't know the difference between a 2N3904 and 2N3906 (or a 2N2222) if you choked on it. Those three have become much-used transistors used over the last 30 years and are still used.

In your short "career" as a purchasing agent, did you order any transistor numbers for lunch? Why not? :-)

>>It seems too complicated for you. I will try to be clearer. Try to follow.
>
> WE understand fine. That you want to call a spade a carrot, is fine, but
>it's still a spade and you're wrong. Sorry.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, you are rambling again. You should have used the
word "shovel" instead of "spade" since you keep shoveling all that
snit more than anyone else in here.

Try to get with the program and learn some basic semiconductor
electronics. Try the new book "Transistors for Dummies" subtitled
"and for Steve."

You could also get a specialty cookbook all about sandwiches and
quote where some of them are allegedly called by EIA transistor
part numbers.

[one ignorant slut for an "amateur extra." "extra" what?!?]

> No...A person who builds a circuit and transmits on the broadcast band is
>either an amateur BROADCASTER, or a radio HOBBYIST.

Ignorant slut. No "building" any circuits is required. Just like
the majority in US amateur radio, "amateur broadcasters" use
ready-built equipment.

> A Radio Amateur is a person who has taken the Amateur Radio
>examination(s) and possesses an Amateur Radio license.

And, in some sad cases doesn't know transistor part numbers
from cheese sandwiches...like yourself.

[no wonder that purchasing agent job didn't last long...]

> Still need your "one example", Vipul. They are radio HOBBYISTS or
amateur
>BROADCASTERS. They are NOT "radio amateurs" regardless of how YOU
>rationalize it.

What WILL Steamy Stalker do for an encore?

Call a beef roast an "FT-101?"

Call pressed duck an "ARC-5?" :-)

>>So "amateur radio" is not the same as "Ham radio".
>
> Yes it is...One in the same... Absolutely NO difference.

I'm going to call you "WA8ULX." Makes about as much
sense as anything you've written in here so far.

2474. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 17:56:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413135625.04143.00000063@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64659

In article <131ma.1193$7F2.517434@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030412172319.26171.00001103@mb-fd.aol.com...
>> From N2EY:
>>
>> >>Problem is every-1 else uses the wrong def.
>> >That's YOUR problem, not theirs.
>>
>> No, thats society's problem. Unclear (or even dishonest) definitions badly
>> affect those involved.
>>
>> >If everyone else calls a 2N2222 a transistor, and you insist on
>> >calling it a cheese sandwich
>>
>> What if others call a cheese sandwich a 2N2222, and I say "no that's a
>cheese
>> sandwich"?
>
>Check the forward of any dictionary. The correct definition of a term is
>what the majority of users mean by the term. Dictionaries document the
>language as used they do not limit the language. If everyone chose to call
>that sandwich a 2N2222 then that would become not only the term for the
>transistor but also a term for that sandwich.

Oh, my, the "definitions" in here become as fuzzy as the
old sandwiches in the back of morsemen's refrigerators. :-)

Dee, if you insist on making ridiculous definitions ("if everyone
chose to call that sandwich a 2N2222") then I'd say you were
seriously deficient in basic electronics and are close to failure
of keeping that radio-electronics-based hobby license grant.

>Afterall if language were static, we wouldn't have a word for sandwich.

If language was static WE WOULD NOT HAVE LANGUAGES.

Period. Review basic etymology if you have a need of calling
cheese sandwiches a 2N2222 (or 2N3904 or 2N3906, whatever).

>It
>is named for the Earl of Sandwich, who didn't want to interrupt his card
>game and so told his cook to place some meat between a couple of slices of
>bread and give it to him. Thus was born the sandwich. But if terms could
>not take on new meanings, the word Sandwich would have remained limited to

>use to describe the Earl of Sanwich's domain.

If all languages were static, morse code abbreviations would all
be QRN. :-)

>Words can have more than one meaning. Context clarifies the selection of
>meaning. One can eat a mint or they can visit the mint. One understands
>from the way it is used that the word mint means a candy in the first part
>of the sentence but a place where coins are made in the second part of the
>sentence.

"Amateur radio is a SERVICE!" :-)

The word "service" throughout Title 47 CFR is a regulatory term
denoting a type and kind of radio activity under regulation.

>Even though language grows and develops, a single person cannot create his
>own definitions. No one will understand him. The definitions grow and
>shift but the usage of the general population not an individual's
>preference.

Except in US amateur radio among the olde-tyme hammes who
insist on making the standards and practices of the 1930s forever
inflexible, static, unchanging, and the ONLY jargon permitted to
be used. :-)

>Languages grow, develop, and change. That is the way life is.

Except in US amateur radio...etc., etc., etc. :-)

2475. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 17:56:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413135626.04143.00000064@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64657

In article <20030412205238.29656.00000494@mb-fb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/12/2003 6:42 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030412194208.25912.00000536@mb-ff.aol.com>
>
>>I know its hard to imagine. It seems counter-intuitive, but it does occur.
>>I, myself have had that condition <on occasion>.
>
> Oh? What's the name of this condition, Vipul?

What's the name of YOUR condition...besides compulsive-obsessive sociopathy?

2476. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 18:06:39 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.13.18.06.39.331305.14016@arrl.org>
Source record: 64663

On Sun, 13 Apr 2003 12:34:15 -0400, Brian Kelly wrote:
> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:<pan.2003.04.12.17.08.48.5332.2786@arrl.org>...
>
> Humanitarian aid and reconstruction funding for both Afghanistan and
> Iraq are line items in the off-the-budget $80 billion war funding
> package passed by congress on Saturday, $2.5 billion of it earmarked for
> aid and the reconstruction of Iraq alone. Even before the fighting has
> stopped. And that's just first pass emergency funding.

Let's hope it's well spent. It's not just about the amount of dollars. Some of the resources going into Afghanistan have been spent in ways that are questionable, supporting regional warlords at the expense of the central government. While it's understandable to try to get the warloads to help us chase down OBL and crew, one wonders what the longer term ramifications will be if the government in Kabul remains too weak to assert sovereignty over the whole country.

Fortunately, Iraq is not Afghanistan. I think it will be easier to put dollars to work to good effect there.

> Conjurs up visions of some backwater entity calling Rumsfeld and
> hollering "Invade us, invade us!"

"The Mouse that Roared" -- funny, funny book and movie.

> The Japs pledged $200 million for Afghanistan, last I saw they'd forked
> over only $32 million so far.

If I'm not mistaken, the pledged amount was to be provided over a 5-year period. If you have more details, I'd be interestsd in them.

>> No question that they are concerned about control. So are we!
>
> The difference is that it was US (U.S., U.K., Aussies) who sent people
> in to die for the sake of the Iraquis and global security while Putin,
> Shroeder & Chiraq Inc. did everything they could to stymie our effort.
> In other words we earned the right to call the shots with blood. Twice
> over as far as I'm concerned. When was the last time any of 'em cleared
> out a despotic regime and worked to establish a democracy in it's place?

NATO did just that in the Balkans a few years ago. In Gulf War I, the French had forces involved. Maybe the Germans, too, I don't remember for sure. The French even took a few casualties. (Funny, you don't hear much about that these days.) There are German forces working alongside US forces in Afghanistan right now. (Another thing you probably won't see on Fox.) French forces are also involved right now in trying to stabilize a

highly volatile situation in the Ivory Coast. And they recently deployed troops to the Central African Republic to protect foreign nationals there.

> The control thing has much deeper roots, it's about the ongoing effort
> to homogenize the U.S. into some fuzzy "one world" template.

The concern that much of the world has is that when there is one power that is overwhelmingly superior militarily, the rest of the world is at the mercy of that power. That scares them. Now, most Americans react to that with disbelief. After all, we're the good guys, aren't we? We'd never use our military power to force others to do things just to serve our interests, right? Except that we HAVE done just that in the past. Consider the Mexican War. The Spanish-American War. The Panama Canal. Invasion of the Dominican Republic (multiple times). During the cold war, there was a power balance, and to most of the world there was one side that was clearly preferable -- the US. But now that there is but one superpower, what prevents us from doing whatever the hell we want? (Some of that superpower's citizens have been arguing on this forum that we should do exactly that.) Not only with regard to perceived threats to our safety, but also with perceived threats to our econonic interests. It's not exactly unknown to use military power to advance economic interests, you know. (See: Honduras and the United Fruit company.)

Taking all that into account, it's clear that what France, Germany and Russia are trying to do is to form a bloc that will oppose what they view as some of the more dangerous behaviors of the US. That doesn't mean that they will oppose the US in all things or even most things. But I think they believe that the more the US uses its military, the easier it will be for it to resort to military action instead of exhausting peaceful means. When all you have is a hammer....

> This one even gets down to raw, primeval jealousy and egos.

On both sides?

>> So why should France and Germany condone attacking SH? Put it another
>> way: If it had been the Eiffel tower and the Brandenburg Gate that
>> OBL's crowd had attacked, would the US have supported them attacking
>> Iraq? I'm not so sure.
>
> You're taking the discussion into the realm of what-ifs. Works for
> antenna optimization analyses, does not work when using crystal ball
> outputs as they relate to geopolitics. I pass.

All I'm asking is that you try to put yourself in the other fellow's shoes. If you're unwilling to do that, you're certain to never understand his point of view.

>> There is little evidence that Saddam was directly supporting OBL and
>> crowd, and certainly not with WMD.
>
> Premature conclusions. Doesn't really matter anyway at this point, the
> deed is done. Tomorrow is all that matters, we can catch up with the

> rest in the history books.

That's true, but we write history books so we can draw lessons from them.

>> Saddam was a slug and deserved to be
>> squashed. But it's unclear that doing so will help win the war on
>> terrorism.
>
> Don't put that in the bank, events are moving at lightning speed as we
> peck at our keyboards. One of our major conservative Iranian arch-enemy
> politicians is now suddenly and publicly "suggesting" dialoge with the
> U.S. North Korea just all but completely reversed it's stand on it's
> "terms" for talks abt that flashpoint. There's the other two members of
> the "Evil Axis" obviously just a tad, shall we say "concerned" after our
> romp thru Iraq.

Don't put any of that in the bank, either. Almost everyone outside the US is "concerned."

I object to terms like "romp" to describe the Iraq war. There are 115 (last I looked) American families that haven't found it to be a romp at all. To them the Iraq war was a terribly painful experience, and I think we owe it to them to respect that.

> All of it within the past two days. Sharon is also reversing course and
> is completely uncharacteristically tossing olive branches at the
> Palestinians.

I saw that. Maybe he thinks the US is serious. Do you suppose he could have been made to think that without a war? By, for example, withdrawing much of the US aid to Israel?

> Some "message traffic" is definitely being transmitted and read . .
>
> This thing is ballooning. Comes as a bit of a jolt to me quite frankly.

We heard the same sort of thing after Kabul fell. Why, we were certain to get OBL within a few days! The result since then has been a mixed bag. Much that is good has happened. Some that is bad has happened. Even though events are moving fast now, I suspect we won't be able to truly judge the end result for years. Unfortunately, we don't have the luxury of waiting years to make decisions that will affect the end result.

> Looks to me like Putin, Shroeder & Chiraq Inc. have wound up
> marginalizing both themselves and the UN certainly in the eyes of one
> helluva lotta U.S. citizens and no doubt beyond.

I think there are a lot beyond the US that would agree that they're marginalized. They might not agree on who's responsible. They mostly wouldn't think it's a good thing, and there are a lot in the US, including me, who would agree with that part.

>> If your characterization were correct, those millions would have
>> continued to oppose the war after the 48-hour ultimatim. But most did

>> not. Clearly, once they became convinced that diplomacy had run its
>> course, they were satisfied. That hardly translates to requiring the
>> UN's permission.
>
> They folded their tents and shaddup after it became clear that they made
> ineffectual idiots of themselves.

I'm talking about the polling data, Brian. No tents or loud talk involved. Most of those in the US who wanted a UN resolution supported the war once the President declared diplomacy at an end. Clearly, they didn't feel the UN's permission was required. Equally clearly, they didn't feel it was unimportant.

Jon

2477. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 18:33:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413143328.11628.00000078@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64664

In article <20030412164354.26171.00001100@mb-fd.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From K4YZ:
>
>> WHOA! Where in the Blue Blazes did you come up with THAT gem...?!?!
>>CBer's can't be licensed Amateurs and vice versa...?!?!
>
>No, I meant CBers experimenting WITHOUT an amateur radio licence -thats
>illegal.

Yup.

>Technically they are radio amateurs (not professional).

WRONG. They are lawbreakers.

>Since they are xmitting on this band, they are radio amatuers.

WRONG. They are either broadcasters or users of Part 95/15 equipment.

>But, since they don't have amateur radio license, they are not a Ham.

They are neither radio amateurs nor hams.
>
>Therefore, there are some radio amateurs that are not Hams.

WRONG.
>
>>Now go sober up and don't come back before you do. Or fire that 8-year
>>old. Your "stuff" is hard enough to follow as it is.
>>Where did you go to college again?
>
>Lots of EE college students write like that.

Makes me ashamed.

2478. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 18:33:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413143330.11628.00000080@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64665

In article <20030413083705.18293.00000624@mb-ff.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From N2EY:
>
>>>So "amateur radio" is not the same as "Ham radio".
>>
>>Incorrect. They are one and the same.
>
>Amateur radio is the license.

That's right. Without the license, it's not amateur radio.

>Ham radio is the culture, traditions, set of
>beliefs.

The two are one and the same.

The "infidel no-coder" thread was a satirical comment.

N2EY

2479. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 18:33:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413143330.11628.00000079@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64666

In article <131ma.1193$7F2.517434@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Check the forward of any dictionary. The correct definition of a term is
>what the majority of users mean by the term. Dictionaries document the
>language as used they do not limit the language. If everyone chose to call
>that sandwich a 2N2222 then that would become not only the term for the
>transistor but also a term for that sandwich.

I agree 100%, Dee. Well said!
>
>Afterall if language were static, we wouldn't have a word for sandwich. It
>is named for the Earl of Sandwich, who didn't want to interrupt his card
>game and so told his cook to place some meat between a couple of slices of
>bread and give it to him. Thus was born the sandwich. But if terms could
>not take on new meanings, the word Sandwich would have remained limited to
>use to describe the Earl of Sanwich's domain.

There was an excellent skit on Saturday Night Live years and years ago wgich takes place at a fancy ball. First the Earl and Lady of Sandwich are introduced, and the Earl explains his new idea about serving meat between slices of bread. Then Lord and Lady Wilkinson explain their new method of swordplay, using two matched swords. Finally Lord and Lady Dou.....no, wait, this is a family newgroup.....
>
>Words can have more than one meaning. Context clarifies the selection of
>meaning. One can eat a mint or they can visit the mint. One understands
>from the way it is used that the word mint means a candy in the first part
>of the sentence but a place where coins are made in the second part of the
>sentence.

English is a language where the meanings of words are affected by sentence position, context and ending. English dictionary definitions are never complete for that reason.
>
>Even though language grows and develops, a single person cannot create his
>own definitions. No one will understand him. The definitions grow and
>shift but the usage of the general population not an individual's
>preference.

An individual can create a new word or definition, but it takes the acceptance of the majority to make the usage "proper".

Consider the word spam. Originally it was Spam, a brand name of a form of packaged meat. It was supplied in great quantities during WW2 because it could be eaten uncooked or cooked, and did not require refrigeration until the can

was opened. Civilians in England received lots of it via Lend Lease and in the years following WW2. It was so omnipresent that it became unpopular (hence the Monty Python skit of the '70s) and the word became a generic reference to all meat products of that general type..

Its meaning was transformed by the invention of junk email, which many endure as omnipresent and unwanted. Many people have no knowledge of the original meaning.

It is a true statement that I love Spam but hate spam.
>
>Languages grow, develop, and change. That is the way life is.
>
Exactly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

hmmmm.....how about spam spam spam spam baked beans and spam?

2480. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 18:34:07 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413143407.11628.00000081@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64667

In article <3E996897.D8D8D909@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>Date: Sun, 13 Apr 2003 13:39:34 GMT
>
>No CW Test wrote:
>>
>> In article <20030412142156.19789.00000162@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>>
>> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>> >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>> >Date: 12 Apr 2003 18:21:56 GMT
>> >
>> >>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>> >>From: nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test)
>> >>Date: 4/12/2003 7:38 AM Central Daylight Time
>> >>Message-id: <20030412083832.11628.00000063@mb-fz.aol.com>
>> >
>> >>> Don't say THAT, Dave...that would leave the Nitwit Trio out in the cold
>> >>>forever!
>> >>
>> >>Are they any relation to the Nairobi Trio?
>> >
>> > The Nairobi Trio? Three thinly clad women applying hair-removal
>lotion
>> >to their legs?
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Have you never heard of Ernie Kovacs?
>
>Take a breath, Old Timer.

I intend to keep doing that on a regular basis :-)

>Have you stopped to realize just how long
>Ernie Kovacs has been dead?

Ernie Kovacs was a television comedy
pioneer. He "pushed the envelope" of
television technology beyond what the
"conventional wisdom" (CW) of the
time thought possible. His name ranks

with Mr. Gleason, Ms. Ball, Mr. Caesar
Mr. Benny and others of that era.

None of the above were radio amateurs
and none needed Morse code skill or
Morse code tests to bring humor to the
audiences of their time. :-)

It is said that Davy Sarnoff was a real
cut-up. Everyone who worked for him
laughed at his jokes :-)

>There exists an entire group of young
>adults who aren't even familiar with John Belushi.
>
There exists an entire group of young
and not-so-young adults for whom
"muddy waters" is a description, not
a proper name.....:-)

2481. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 18:48:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304131048.4196dcf0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64668

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BABE8CDC.16A60%stewart@say.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" wrote:
>
> > Ya made a wrong turn. I asked Dwight if he had any evidence
> > which indicated that we would treat Iraq any differently
> > than we treated, as examples, our former enemies the Germans
> > and the Italians almost immediately after WW2. But he
> > ducked the bullet and responded "The question now is what
> > will happen next. (snip)
>
>
> I didn't duck anything, Brian. You asked me for evidence which indicated
> what we "would" do, which is obviously impossible to provide. I can't now
> provide evidence of the future.

No, my exact words were "What shred of evidence do you have which
indicates that history will not repeat itself in the case of Iraq?".
In other words what information do you currently possess . . ?

That is not a request to predict the future.

> Instead of that, we should be talking about
> the next step.

I think that's already being addressed Dwight.

>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

w3rv

2482. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 19:07:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hd962d7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 64669

On 12 Apr 2003 06:56:33 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>Does anyone over there remember who started what, why, and who
>did what to whom in order to create the absolute enviroment of
>mayhem that exists today?

The Arabs trying to push the Jews into the sea goes back to
the 1920s. It was instigated by your friends and mine, the
British, who loved to see the two factions go at each other as
long as they weren't the targets. When the Brits saw that the
Jews were going to be the winners in the struggle in the 1930s,
the Brits sided with the Arabs. Only WW-II got in the way,
otherwise the State of Israel would have been proclaimed
unilaterally earlier than 1948.

>The Israelis insist it's the Palestinians fault, and the
>Palestinians vice versa. I sympathize with Israel's right to
>exist, but at the same time I don't see Palestinian tanks mowing
>over Israeli homes and building "settlements" where only weeks
>ago Palestinians already lived.

They would if they could. When I was living there in the 1960s,
Arab raids across the border into Israel were regular occurrences,
and today only the technology (suicide bombing, Katyusha rockets)
is different.

"Never Again" means Never Again....

>I say we disarm them both, cross breed them for two generations,
>then dare them to kill thier own blood.

Wash your mouth out with laundry soap.....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2483. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 19:07:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hd959v6.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 64670

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>> While we have homeless right here who
>> freeze to death each winter for lack of shelter!
>
> Those homeless don't share vital intel data.

Nor do they beta-test our advanced weapons system (mostly
the electronics).

"Fee for service..."

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2484. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 19:07:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E99B56C.A2F304D1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64671

No CW Test wrote:
>
> In article <3E996897.D8D8D909@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >Date: Sun, 13 Apr 2003 13:39:34 GMT
> >
> >No CW Test wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <20030412142156.19789.00000162@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >(Steve
> >> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
> >>
> >> >Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >> >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
> >> >Date: 12 Apr 2003 18:21:56 GMT
> >> >
> >> >>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
> >> >>From: nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test)
> >> >>Date: 4/12/2003 7:38 AM Central Daylight Time
> >> >>Message-id: <20030412083832.11628.00000063@mb-fz.aol.com>
> >> >
> >> >>> Don't say THAT, Dave...that would leave the Nitwit Trio out in the cold
> >> >>>forever!
> >> >>
> >> >>Are they any relation to the Nairobi Trio?
> >> >
> >> > The Nairobi Trio? Three thinly clad women applying hair-removal
> >lotion
> >> >to their legs?
> >>
> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Have you never heard of Ernie Kovacs?
> >
> >Take a breath, Old Timer.
>
> I intend to keep doing that on a regular basis :-)
>
> >Have you stopped to realize just how long
> >Ernie Kovacs has been dead?
>
> Ernie Kovacs was a television comedy
> pioneer. He "pushed the envelope" of

> television technology beyond what the
> "conventional wisdom" (CW) of the
> time thought possible. His name ranks
> with Mr. Gleason, Ms. Ball, Mr. Caesar
> Mr. Benny and others of that era.

I didn't ask for a synopsis of his place in television history. I asked if you realized how long he's been dead. The others you mentioned lived well past Ernie Kovacs and they all had longer careers in TV, Percy Dovetonsils.

> None of the above were radio amateurs
> and none needed Morse code skill or
> Morse code tests to bring humor to the
> audiences of their time. :-)

At least you share with them the distinction of not being a radio amateur...and not needing morse code skill...and not needing morse code tests. So the basic differences between you and them would be the fame, the money and the sense of humor.

> It is said that Davy Sarnoff was a real
> cut-up. Everyone who worked for him
> laughed at his jokes :-)

Pity that no one works for you. You might get an intentional laugh.

> >There exists an entire group of young
> >adults who aren't even familiar with John Belushi.
> >
> There exists an entire group of young
> and not-so-young adults for whom
> "muddy waters" is a description, not
> a proper name.....:-)

I knew Muddy Waters. You're no Muddy Waters.

Dave K8MN

2485. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 19:08:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413150828.11628.00000082@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64674

In article <20030413122643.15869.00000070@mb-cq.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <pan.2003.04.12.14.45.15.701519.2786@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
><jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>
>>Ah, you are reduced to making fun of typos. Not a compelling argument for
>>your point of view, Len.
>
> Jon, go back to standby mode and no transmission.

Translation: Len wants you to SHUT UP.

> Just like many months before.

Translation: Len doesn't have a good counterargument.
>
> You don't have any solutions for Iraq, just a lot of arrogant
> opinions about "peace" and doing nothing.

Translation: Len doesn't want to get into details and facts.
>
> This is an AMATEUR RADIO newsgroup, Jon, NOT a forum of
> experts in realpolitik with the wisdom of ages.

Translation: "We've always done it this way"
>
> Make like an amateur RADIO person working for ARRL.

Translation: Len wants you to SHUT UP.
>
> You won't be drafted or have to fight.

Neither will Len....

> US military doesn't take
> artifacts from museums to serve.
>
No translation necessary...
>
>

2486. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 19:08:47 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413150847.11628.00000083@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64672

In article <20030413135624.04143.00000062@mb-fb.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>HOW would you know the difference between a 2N2222 and, say,
> a 2N5764?

Look them up in the data books.......;-)

2487. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 19:08:47 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413150847.11628.00000084@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 64673

In article <20030413122648.15869.00000074@mb-cq.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030412170213.08890.00000890@mb-fj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
>Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
>> Does writing like an idiot make it OK to be an idiot, Vipul?
>
> It works for you!

Seems to work for lots of folks :-)

2488. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 19:35:17 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E99BBF5.F04088F3@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 64676

JJ wrote:

>
>
> If you want to limit it to just a service and take the hobby
> aspect away, then there should be nothing on the air that does not
> have anything to do with public service. Therefore the bands would
> be unused 99% of the time and the amateur "service" would only
> need a fraction of the frequencies it now has.
> It is the chat about uncle arthur and other non-public service
> things that keep the bands in use so that all the frequency space
> allocated to amateur radio is there when public service is needed.
> I see nothing in the regulations that state that everyone who
> obtains an amateur radio operator's license is required to
> participate in public service.

I would agree. Part of the reason the FCC lets us "play" is that
it gives encouragement for us to build/ buy radios, antennas etc.
To build repeater systems and whatnot that can, when need
arises, to assist in public service. Also it helps having roving
ears on the bands to find the occasional distress call quickly.
Roving ears that were looking for some DX or such.

2489. Re: ARLB029 - ... and Vietnam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 19:39:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304131139.6997157a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64675

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304111805.bda9c6a@posting.google.com>...
> SB QST @ ARL $ARLB029
> ARLB029 IARU admits three new member-societies
>
> ZCZC AG29
> QST de W1AW
> ARRL Bulletin 29 ARLB029
> From ARRL Headquarters
> Newington CT April 11, 2003
> To all radio amateurs
>
> SB QST ARL ARLB029
> ARLB029 IARU admits three new member-societies
>
> The International Amateur Radio Union (IARU) has admitted three new
> member societies. The National Association Radioamateurs of Georgia
> (NARG), the Federation of Radiosport of the Republic of Armenia
> (FRRA) were voted in April 10; the Vietnam Amateur Radio Club (VARC)
> officially joined IARU on April 4
> --
>
> Perhaps Brian Kelly would like to welcome the Hmong to amateur radio.
>
> ...at no risk to himself.

Dipshit.

2490. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 23:19:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413191921.01663.00000270@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64677

>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/13/2003 6:50 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030413075017.18293.00000621@mb-ff.aol.com>

>There we have it - the establishment Morse coders want to participate in
>"cleansing".

Why is it that I am not surprised that you have a problem with
cleanliness?

He said "clean up our collective acts..."

NOT "...let's engage in ethnic cleansing".

I know English is not your strength, but if you're gonna live and work in
the United States, you owe it to yourself to learn the language and all it's
inflections, Vipul.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2491. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 23:44:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413194401.01663.00000271@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64678

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/13/2003 6:56 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030413075638.18293.00000623@mb-ff.aol.com>

>If you look in the dictionary, the definition of the word amateur is: one who
>cultivates any study from without pursuing it professionally or with a view
>to
>a gain.

If you look in the dictionary you will also find the definitions for "egg"
and "head".

If you take the words seperately you are discussing two completely
concepts, both even being able to be adjectives, nouns or verbs. (ie: to
"head" the project [as in to lead], or to "egg" someone on, as to intimidate
someone into doing somethinng they might not otherwise do.)

But put them together, in either position, and you have even MORE
meanings. For example one can be an "egghead", a person who's sole world is
inside a computer, or a person who hasn't got the sense gave him.

Or one can be the head egg, an affectionate reference to the leader,
manager, boss, etc.

Therefore we can see how one can take the words "amateur" and "radio" and
get two completely different applications.

A "radio amateur" is a person licensed in the Amateur Radio Service, NOT a
person who simply enjoys building radio circuits. That is a radio hobbyist.

"Amateur Radio" is a radio service regulated by the Federal Communications
Commission with various purposes, those which can be found, but not limited to,
47CFR97.1.

>This could apply to our broadcast band circuit builder.

Not unless he has an Amateur Radio license.

>The definition of amateur says nothing about passing a test. Once you take
>this
>belief, it would be impossible to convince you otherwise.

If you take only ONE word, you'd be correct. But you are not. You are in
the United States. We speak English. Perhaps where you hail from they allow
anyone to redefine language and definitions at will, but we find that grossly
counterproductive and an impedement to communication.

Try to get over it.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2492. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 23:46:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413194618.01663.00000272@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64679

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 4/13/2003 7:26 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030413082613.23238.00000046@mb-fy.aol.com>

>A cat house is not a house for cats.

YeeeeeeeeeHA!

K4YZ

2493. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 23:48:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413194809.01663.00000273@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64680

>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>From: nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test)
>Date: 4/13/2003 6:59 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030413075921.23238.00000044@mb-fy.aol.com>

>Ernie Kovacs?

Aren't they made by Hoover?

Steve, K4YZ

2494. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 23:57:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413195750.01663.00000274@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64681

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test)
>Date: 4/13/2003 2:08 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030413150847.11628.00000084@mb-fz.aol.com>
>
>In article <20030413122648.15869.00000074@mb-cq.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20030412170213.08890.00000890@mb-fj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>>Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>>
>>> Does writing like an idiot make it OK to be an idiot, Vipul?
>>
>> It works for you!
>
>Seems to work for lots of folks :-)

Especially for SOME claiming degreed engineer status...Kelly and Miccolis excepted, Lennie and Vippy most ESPECIALLY included!

Steve

2495. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-13 23:58:48 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413195848.18724.00000601@mb-fn.aol.com>
Source record: 64682

From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com

>I would agree. Part of the reason the FCC lets us "play" is that
>it gives encouragement for us to build/ buy radios, antennas etc.
>To build repeater systems and whatnot that can, when need
>arises, to assist in public service.

Once in a while someone asks for volunteers for something, but I don't know why they need Hams for that

Most Hams use the bands to play. Mostly for contesting, working DX, etc. Skill building for emergency comm. is usually not discussed. The most that will be done is preparation for Field Day. Amateur radio is a playland, in which you're on your own.

Repeater systems are for a small percentage of Ham. Few actually participate. Most Hams USE repeaters.

I know of one repeater club. Unfortunately, I'm too worn out from the other clubs I've been to, to try to sign up. I don't believe it would work out.

Also, others have made promises, which they then seem to be too busy or something else comes up. However, Hams will take a day off just to attend a Hamfest. Its really a matter of priorities.

Skill building clubs do not exist. Help in antenna setup, tuning antennas and receivers, troubleshooting circuits, etc do not exist. Homebrewing clubs do not exist.

2496. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 00:14:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413201445.01663.00000275@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64683

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 4/13/2003 2:07 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.hd962d7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
>
>On 12 Apr 2003 06:56:33 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
>>Does anyone over there remember who started what, why, and who
>>did what to whom in order to create the absolute enviroment of
>>mayhem that exists today?
>
> The Arabs trying to push the Jews into the sea goes back to
> the 1920s. It was instigated by your friends and mine, the
> British, who loved to see the two factions go at each other as
> long as they weren't the targets. When the Brits saw that the
> Jews were going to be the winners in the struggle in the 1930s,
> the Brits sided with the Arabs. Only WW-II got in the way,
> otherwise the State of Israel would have been proclaimed
> unilaterally earlier than 1948.

This problem predates the existence of the United States by several
centuries, Phil. The United Staes and the Brits are the New Kids On The Block.
The J's and P's were going at this long before either of us arrived.

>>The Israelis insist it's the Palestinians fault, and the
>>Palestinians vice versa. I sympathize with Israel's right to
>>exist, but at the same time I don't see Palestinian tanks mowing
>>over Israeli homes and building "settlements" where only weeks
>>ago Palestinians already lived.
>
> They would if they could. When I was living there in the 1960s,
> Arab raids across the border into Israel were regular occurrences,
> and today only the technology (suicide bombing, Katyusha rockets)
> is different.

And would they be any more "right" or "wrong"? Thier ancestors are
buried in those same grounds, Phil. So what gives the Israelis the right to be
"the cowboys" and evict Palistineans from lands they occupied for centuries?
(Please don't cite for me the US analogy that we did it...Yes, we did, and it
was an ugly, shameful period)

> "Never Again" means Never Again....
>
>>I say we disarm them both, cross breed them for two generations,
>>then dare them to kill thier own blood.

>
> Wash your mouth out with laundry soap.....

Why? They get to have all the sex they can handle then stop killing each other. What's wrong with that?

Steve

2497. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 00:27:42 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413202742.23238.00000048@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64684

In article <20030411194833.05202.00000068@mb-cl.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

(someone else wrote):

>>Just who, in your fevered imagination, do you
>>think believes that war isn't brutal?

Len wrote:
>
> Those who've never served in any military.

That would include, among others, Presidents Franklin Delano Roosevelt and William Jefferson Clinton.

Their only military service was as Commander In Chief.

Guess they believe(d) war isn't brutal, eh? :-)

Former Vice President Al Gore was in Vietnam, as I recall. Former Vice President Dan Quayle was in the National Guard.

2498. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 00:28:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413202818.01663.00000276@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 64685

>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/13/2003 6:58 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030413195848.18724.00000601@mb-fn.aol.com>

>Once in a while someone asks for volunteers for something, but I don't know
>why
>they need Hams for that.

Maybe because they need trained radio operators who possess skills and
assets they don't...???

Maybe we can just hire a bunch of Waffle House waitresses to "call out"
the messages through megaphones instead?

>Most Hams use the bands to play. Mostly for contesting, working DX, etc.
>Skill
>building for emergency comm. is usually not discussed.

Once again you "Open Mouth Insert Foot".

Would you care for examples nationwide, or just in your "neighborhood",
Vipul?

>The most that will be
>done is preparation for Field Day. Amateur radio is a playland, in which
>you're
>on your own.

In which you MAY be on your own, if you so choose. Otherwise you amy
participate in any oen of the dozens of nets, ARES or RACES training or drills,
or jsut sit and listen.

>I know of one repeater club. Unfortunately, I'm too worn out from the other
>clubs I've been to, to try to sign up. I don't believe it would work out.

Just as well. Your reputation may preceed you.

>Also, others have made promises, which they then seem to be too busy or
>something else comes up.

Such as?

>However, Hams will take a day off just to attend a
>Hamfest. Its really a matter of priorities.

Such as?

>Skill building clubs do not exist. Help in antenna setup, tuning antennas and
>receivers, troubleshooting circuits, etc do not exist.

Wrong.

>Homebrewing clubs do
>not
>exist.

Probably wrong, when one considers that the numerous QRP clubs all promote homebrewing (although not thier prime focus). Even more wrong when one considers that many high school "clubs" promote education through "homebrewing" and other such projects.

If you want a club for EXCLUSIVE homebrewing topics, quit yer bellyachin' and get it done. Your excuses are exhausted.

Steve

2499. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 00:46:31 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7d0i2$8ap$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64686

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BABE7BCB.16A5A%stewart@say.net...
> "Bill Sohl" wrote:
> >
> > Your point? And more to the latest...many
> > obvioulsy had no desire to defend the Saddam
> > regime.
>
>
> I think you get my point very well. The press, government, and military,
> are describing those as Saddam's forces, Saddam's soldiers, Saddam's Army,
> Saddam's Republican Guard, and so on, when they are in fact nothing more
> than Iraq's military - man and women who became soldiers for the same
> reasons soldiers all over the world do.

As we are learning...that isn't true. Turns out many of those closest to
SH are not even Iraqi at all. As to your claim that the rest of the Iraq
military were just the same as other forces...well, let's just
agree to disagree. In fact, many (most?) were conscripted...in stark
contrast to the 100% volunteer US military.

> They have no more say in their
> government than soldiers elsewhere do (even less if you believe they were
as
> oppressed as claimed) and their motives are no less honorable then the
> soldiers elsewhere.

So the German SS were just like other military too?
Many of the Iraqi military apparently had no problems
with acts of torture, etc. but I guess they were just
following orders.

> Yet we are killing them in the most massive and
> effective manner possible, which is sad (not something to shout for joy
> over).

They all could have just surrendered too. No surrender, then
they faced the consequences.

> Our soldiers are dying there.

Agreed, and we all are unhappy about that.

> Again, not something to shout for joy over.

Who has shouted for joy about it?

> The war dead are always forgotten, perhaps more by those supporting war
> than by those opposed. Other than the families, most today cannot even
name
> a single person who died in the Kosovo, the last Iraq war, Panama,
Granada,
> or Vietnam. They are forgotten. Their families are forgotten. The best we
> can do is have a national holiday to remember that some people died in
war.
> Heck, even our disabled veterans are largely ignored and discarded.

Come to my home town. We don't forget.

> > (snip) I never said it wasn't. The fact
> > still remains that the coalition executed
> > the most precise offensives ever accomplished
> > with minimal civilian losses. (snip)
>
> How do you know that, Bill? You don't have any knowledge of that
> personally.

Have you followed the news at all? Are all the journalists
falsly reporting?

> We don't know how many civilians or others are being killed -
> the military has never even gave an estimate of Iraqi casualties from the
> first Iraq war.

The number of inocent civilians sure isn't of any numebrs that
have caused the bulk of Iraq to be glad we have liberated them.

> The MOAB has been delivered to Iraq - not exactly a weapon
> intended to prevent collateral damage.

Depends on the target.

> Where do they intend to use it,
> especially with most of the remaining Iraqi troops isolated in towns? What
> other massive ordinance has been used? And where?

Other than the MOAB, what other massive ordinance
troubles you? Where was it used?

> > WHAT? This war has been covered by the press
> > to the degree that no other war ever was...
> > front line stuff and all. Do you even watch
> > the news? It was within minutes of the first
> > loss of coalition forces that it was reported
> > on TV. (snip)
>
> Reported is not seeing, Bill.

Probably over 1000 reporters, photogs, etc covering the war
and you don't think that is "seeing"? Perhaps you should go
on your own fact finding trip?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2500. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 00:55:39 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7d139$o4a$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64687

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:0AAE092165AAD2D1.5544E74F8B3EC7F2.344056C975E10A9D@lp.airnews.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b7a9rk$u3i$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> >
news:520241A31E9F97F0.C842FF8F50815C5B.6CE2A40F6A2A671E@lp.airnews.net...
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:b798g1fih1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > > Don't YOU vote? That's how we, the people, influence our
government.
> > >
> > > I vote. Do I think it counts? No.
> >
> > Pretty sorry attitude. Sounds like the only thing you'd be happy
> > to see is a government led by yourself...or by someone who
> > is 100% in sync with whatever your beliefs are. You don't want
> > a democracy if the majority doesn't agree with you...IMHO of course.
> >
>
> Bullshit, Bill, and that's a copout of a response. My opinion of
> politicians is a popular one among citizens, especially over the past few
> years. But, it doesn't sound like you can even approach discussing a
> subject such as this without some kind of innuendo or insults, so I'll
just
> end it at that.

You stated... "I vote. Do I think it counts? No."

Just what then would it take to satisfy you as to your role
and/or participation in the governmental decision process?
I offered a perspective of what I think you want. If that's
not accurate, then please enlighten us as to what type
of government would make you happy...since, clearly,
our current government leaves you quite unhappy.

> Maybe you've such a high opinion of yourself
> you can't get past your own reflection.

I have no better or worse opinion of myself for anything
stated above. What your closing comment as to my
opinion of myself has to do with this thread makes no sense
to me at all.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2501. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 00:59:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413205905.04143.00000081@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64689

In article <3E96C906.EAA3D44C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> Except for a few land purchases here in the East and some remaining
>> "reservations", most of the USA's land area was obtained from its
>> original inhabitants by force of arms.
>>
>> But today almost all of that sort of behavior is considered
>> unacceptable, and forbidden by law. Long slow progress, but progress
>> nonetheless.
>
>I should hope that it is unacceptable. I certainly don't want the
>descendants of the original inhabitants showing up around here
>attempting to regain their land by force of arms. After all, I paid for
>it.

Ah, but if you follow the purchase chain back far enough, did someone buy it
from the original inhabitants?

>
>> Or consider this: Women got the right to vote in the USA in 1920 -
>> almost 150 years after the nation's founding on the principle of "all
>> MEN are created equal". Did they have to use violence to get it?
>
>Not as long as there were men willing to do almost anything to avoid the
>sharp-tongued nagging of a spouse or who were interested in having meals
>prepared or saw the benefit of sex on a regular basis.

Not a new thing at all. My ancestors had a play about that whole deal, called
"Lysistrata". That play is still performed, now and then.

>Voting rights
>for women was the easy hurdle compared to the very real crisis now
>before us: Do women have a right to membership in an all male, private
>golf club?

I say that if it's really a private club (no tax money spent there), then no,
they don't. But I would not belong to nor patronize such a club.

>The Great Cincinnati ARA Stag Hamfest name was changed a
>couple of decades back and it has been all down hill from that point.
>
>> Weapons of mass destruction are a relatively new thing, compared to
>> the long sorry history of warfare. Fortunately the people who make the
>> decisions are pacifist enough not to have used them since 1945.

>
>Way back when I was a kid living in this area in the 1950's, a chemical
>plant a short distance down the Ohio had two huge storage tanks full of
>mustard gas, a World War I-era relic. The tanks were poorly secured and
>in poor physical condition as evidenced by their rusty surface. I
>shudder to think what would have happened should a tank rupture have
>taken place. Those tanks are long gone

Probably due to the efforts of those dern flower-child, tree-hugging liberal
environmentalist types......;-)

>but a number of chemical plants
>in the area still produce or use some vile stuff like phosgene.

One word: Plastics.

>If a
>large enough quantity of that stuff ever gets loose in the narrow Ohio
>Valley, the descendants of the original inhabitants won't even need to
>use force to reclaim their land.
>
Bingo!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2502. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 00:59:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413205906.04143.00000082@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64688

In article <b79953tdc1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Add Peter Arrnett to my list of traitors and
>pond scum.

Bill,

Do not judge Arnett too harshly until the full story is out.

In today's Phila. Inquirer, there's a story about how CNN and other journalists were harrassed, threatened, tortured and killed by SH's regime. They kept much of what went on hushed up because of threats and reprisals to those still in-country, as well as translators, sources, crewmen, etc.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2503. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 01:06:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7d1nm$hi3$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64690

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.04.13.00.59.36.133777.7305@arrl.org...
> On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 10:48:31 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > news:pan.2003.04.12.02.17.58.321715.29110@arrl.org...
> >> Other examples can easily be found.
> >
> > So what. Why must everyone/anyone not be free to comment on the vaulted
> > press.
>
> I don't know what that means.

It means if a government official, elected official, or militrary
person wants to be critical of certain press coverage, that's
as much their right as the press has a right to report.
Just because someone is elected or accepts public office,
they don't lose their rights to opine as to press reporting.

> >> > Follow the money. Every day now we learn more about the back door
> >> > cozy financial relationships between Saddam's regime and some of our
> >> > "close allies."
> >>
> >> Examples?
> >
> > France, Germany and Russia with oil contracts and selling banned weopons
> > to Saddam.
>
> How are the oil contracts "back door" relationships? Those were not, as
> far as I know, ever secret. Iraq was permitted to sell a quantity of oil
> via the oil-for-food program. Somebody was going to get the contracts to
> do the work.
>
> As for banned weapons sales, I'm aware of some reporting that Russia sold
> some weapons. I'm unaware of reporting about French and German weapons
> sales. Can you point me to it? (We're talking post-Gulf War, I assume.
> Prior to that, pretty much every arms-exporting country, including the US
> and Britain, sold nasty stuff to Iraq. In the US case, that included
> chemical and biological weapons.)

The French built a nucleur facility, Russian night vision goggles
have been found, etc.

> >> Oh, and if it's all about following money, who's going to benefit
> >> monetarily from those rebuilding-Iraq contracts that are being offered
> >> only to selected US companies?

> >
> > You tell me.
>
> Bill, you cannot rationally argue that France/Germany/Russia opposed the
> war solely because they benefited from antebellum business relationships
> unless you also argue that the US favored the war because of expected
> postwar relationships.

I didn't say that was their only reason.

> If you insist on following the money to France,
> Germany and Russia, you must also follow the money to the US unless you
> are completely bereft of objectivity.

I have no problem with $$ coming here.

> > Would you not want those contracts to go
> > to US companies?
>
> I'd want those contracts to go to the lowest-price qualified bidder. It's
> mostly our money being spent, after all.

As determined by who? The UN?

> >> No, they've said they disagree with us. That's not the same thing.
> >
> > Jon, that is bunk. Many hate what we are...free, democratic and
> > successful...and they don't care what we think
>
> Bill, that is bunk. It's not our democracy and freedom they hate, it's
> that we are the torch bearers for what they see as centuries of Western
> repression. The Crusades are more than dusty history in the Muslim world,
> and they view Israel and US support for Israel as being more of the same.

The extremists of the OBL cause hate us for exactly the
reason I stated. Do you realize that Kim W5TIT wouldn't even have a voice
in this discussion if OBL's mindset held the day.

> I think they're off-base there, but that's how they see it nonetheless. If
> the US were a despotic regime but still had exhibited the policies toward
> the Arab world of the past 50+ years, they would hate us just as much.

BUT, the US is NOT a despotic regime...so your comment makes
no sense.

> If
> you don't understand that you simply haven't bothered to find out what
> they are thinking. The "they hate our freedom" argument is just foolish
> pandering.

Tell that to the women in Iraq, Syria and several other countries.
Tell that to the non-Muslims in those countries.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2504. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 01:15:24 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7d288$4b2$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64691

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.04.13.01.41.02.925265.7305@arrl.org...
> On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 16:11:31 -0400, N2EY wrote:
> > In article <b77opkult1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> >
> >>Let me give you my view of the speech of desent.
> >>
> >>There are several levels of disent...
> >>
> >>1. Those that seriously and logically question why?
> >
> > Agreed.
> >
> >>2. Those that simply say NO and do so in an overt fashion such as public
> >>demonstrations.
> >
> > Agreed.
> >
> >>3. Those that say NO and do so in an aggressively overt fashion which
> >>can and often is used by our enemies to bolster the position of our
> >>enemy (Jane Fonda going to Hanoi...perfect example)
> >
> > Jane Fonda didn't just say no. Nor did she just go to North Vietnam,
> > which in itself is not unpatriotic. (She could have brought back
> > valuable intelligence just by describing what she saw - highly
> > patriotic).
> >
> > What Hanoi Jane did was to voluntarily commit actions in enemy territory
> > that directly resulted in harm to American POWs and possibly others.
> > These actions are well documented (see:
> >
> > http://www.snopes.com
> >
> > for a detailed description of what has and has not been proven about her
> > actions there).
> >
> > In addition, her actions actually damaged the antiwar movement and
> > probably extended the war. Just my opinion.
>
> Interesting. I never gave much thought to how her actions may have damaged
> the antiwar movement, but I see your point. So her behavior was not only
> erroneous and unpatriotic but counterproductive to the end she desired.

> That's about as lose-lose as you can get!
>
> >>4. Those that demonstrate and in so doing, violate the law which
> >>infringes other people's rights.
> >
> > See below
> >>
> >>I support 1 and don't consider it unpatriotic.
> >
> > Agreed.
> >
> >>I support 2, but believe the participants should understand they may be
> >>giving aid/comfort to the enemy and that they should understand and
> >>accept responsibility for their public comments.
> >
> > That depends on what the comments are. Each has to be judged on its
> > merits.
> >
> >>I believe 3 and 4 are clearly unpatriotic.
> >
> > I agree 100% on 3.
>
> The problem is, the difference between 2 and 3 is hazy at best. While
> Hanoi Jane's behavior was clearly in the category of 3, there are many who
> believe that ANY overt protest of the war is "aggressive" and likely to be
> used by our enemies to bolster their position. Even among those more
> tolerant of public protest, there are probably many possible protest
> behaviors that would be viewed as 2 by large numbers of people and as 3 by
> other large numbers of people.

Here again, being in the US allows me and others to make whatever
determination (2 vs 3) we want as individuals and we are then
free to express our opinions publicly as to what we think of the
actions of one or more protestors.

> > 4 is another "it depends" case. Blocking traffic or destroying govt.
> > property is simply criminal activity UNLESS it can be shown that a law
> > is being intentionally broken so that said law can be tested in court.
> > This was done by civil rights demonstrators who sat at the "wrong" lunch
> > counters and refused to give up bus seats.
>
> I'm not sure I agree that intent is the principal issue. Seems to me that
> the effect of the behavior is more important. Blocking traffic in downtown
> SF is annoying but doesn't really inhibit the war effort.

But blocking traffic, besides being annoying, can cause
life threatening impact on emergency vehicles.

> Blocking access
> to a military base would be a different case, even if the intent
> in both instances were the same.

>
> (I remember reading that some antiwar group said prior to the start of the
> war in Iraq that they were going to attempt to illegally enter a base in
> California once the war started. I don't recall the name of the group or
> the base, and I never heard whether they did try or if so, what happened.)

They did try to block a shipping terminal...see example below.

> > That said, it's hard to see how blocking traffic in San Francisco can
> > force the courts to test the legality of any war.
>
> Yeah, blocking traffic is not the best example, but I don't have a better
> one handy.

How about blocking the access/egress of people who work at
military bases or at shipping terminals that are traporting war
materials?

> Of course, if the law in question is declared unconstitutional, no crime
> was committed and it's not a "4" case.

Agreed.

But laws that forbid blocking traffic will (IMHO)
never be ruled unconstitutional.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2505. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 01:24:08 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304131724.2c8bb01f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64692

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030413150828.11628.00000082@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> In article <20030413122643.15869.00000070@mb-cq.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >In article <pan.2003.04.12.14.45.15.701519.2786@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
> ><jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
> >
> >>Ah, you are reduced to making fun of typos. Not a compelling argument for
> >>your point of view, Len.
> >
> > Jon, go back to standby mode and no transmission.
>
> Translation: Len wants you to SHUT UP.
>
> > Just like many months before.
>
> Translation: Len doesn't have a good counterargument.
> >
> > You don't have any solutions for Iraq, just a lot of arrogant
> > opinions about "peace" and doing nothing.
>
> Translation: Len doesn't want to get into details and facts.
> >
> > This is an AMATEUR RADIO newsgroup, Jon, NOT a forum of
> > experts in realpolitik with the wisdom of ages.
>
> Translation: "We've always done it this way"
> >
> > Make like an amateur RADIO person working for ARRL.
>
> Translation: Len wants you to SHUT UP.
> >
> > You won't be drafted or have to fight.
>
> Neither will Len....
>
> > US military doesn't take
> > artifacts from museums to serve.
> >
> No translation necessary...
> >
> >

(radio crackles to life) "Hold yer fire, disengage, disengage, he's just a rear widget vet from another century! (squelch tail).

w3rv

2506. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 01:38:14 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7d3j2odm1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64693

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030413205906.04143.00000082@mb-fb.aol.com...
> In article <b79953tdc1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Add Peter Arrnett to my list of traitors and
> >pond scum.
>
> Bill,
> Do not judge Arnett too harshly until the full story is out.
>
> In today's Phila. Inquirer, there's a story about how CNN and other
journalists
> were harrassed, threatened, tortured and killed by SH's regime. They kept
much
> of what went on hushed up because of threats and reprisals to those still
> in-country, as well as translators, sources, crewmen, etc.

Which just shows them and CNN as being hypocrits by only now
coming to the forfront with this. The CNN management
caved to the SH regime because CNN didn't want to
lose their foriegn bureau status in Iraq. How many other despotic
regimes is CNN manipulating their reporting for so they (CNN)
don't have to leave that country? So much for
journalistic honesty.

By the way, this story broke on Fox News two or three days ago.
The Philly Inq is a few days late on this...but better late
than never in this case.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2507. "No Matches Found"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 02:16:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413221614.19375.00000421@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64694

QUOTE FROM WWW.FCC.GOV/WTB/ULS SEARCH ENGINE

Specified Search

Radio Service = CM, RR
Licensee Name like LEONARD H ANDERSON
State = California

No matches found To try again, you can perform a new search or refine your existing search.

UNQUOTE

Truly, VERY truly, UNlicnesed.

So sayeth the FCC.

Steve

2508. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 02:54:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdaz418.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 64695

On Sun, 13 Apr 2003 21:06:33 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>It means if a government official, elected official, or militrary
>person wants to be critical of certain press coverage, that's
>as much their right as the press has a right to report.
>Just because someone is elected or accepts public office,
>they don't lose their rights to opine as to press reporting.

Oh, I certainly believe in that, but the reality was that for
the time that I was with the Feds I certainly was a second-class
citizen in that regard.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2509. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 03:18:24 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030413231824.10704.00000290@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 64696

From K4YZ:

> "Amateur Radio" is a radio service regulated by the Federal Communications
>Commission with various purposes, those which can be found, but not limited
>to,
>47CFR97.1.

Yes "Amateur Radio" is listed in 47CFR97.1.

Is "Ham Radio" listed in the FCC regs? I believe not. It may (or may not) say something like: as they like to be called. That's not an official term.

There is no <official> term for the word "Ham Radio".

Hams like to dominate the amateur radio service, so they will make the claim that "Ham Radio = Amateur Radio". This will help convert amateur radio to THEIR agenda.

"Ham" radio is <mostly> amateur radio, but it also is includes a set of beliefs and traditions. Since there often is no logical reason for <some of> these traditions or beliefs, it is sometimes referred to as a cult.

2510. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 04:04:32 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b7e7ip$d7hfl$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 64719

We had a discussion on one night's net around here, and the one main consensus was the choice of wording.

Also was discussed, was volunteering in public service activities both in amateur radio, AS WELL AS other volunteer and/or public service related involvement. I wonder how involved other hams are outside of ham radio as well?

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> I found something that he had co-written and sent as an open letter over at
> http://www.traverse.com/people/ka8hib/carc/feb01.htm and it reads about
> like you say, although significantly tamer. I can't speak whether the World
> Radio article is any different.
>
> He's got a good point - although a bit overstated. We do have other
> important public benefits in addition to emergency services. Suggesting
> that only those people involved with ARES/RACES/SKYWARN are the ones
> "paying the toll" is just hyperbole. However, increasing the number of
> amateurs involved in these organizations is a darn good idea and it's an
> idea that deserves promoting. It is a very important part of the service
> and it's also one of the parts that is the most visible to the public at
> large. Deeping our involvement in emergency communications is a very good
> way to ensure the viability of amateur radio.
>
> Joshua Houk
> ac7ri

2511. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 04:09:48 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b7e7is$d7hfl$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 64720

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b779oo$v29$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> I read it, and I agree with him. Most 'hams' today are not only
freeloaders
> on the work and sweat of those before, they have no concept at all that
this
> is not a hobby. Its a service.

From what I have seen, I believe his numbers are just a little off. I can only speak of what I have witnessed locally, but I think that number is probably closer to 20% involved/80% uninvolved. That's typically the case in most organizations, 20% give or take a little, carry the most weight.

>
> We exist because of our demonstrated capabilities in providing emergency
> communications. For little to NO COST to the public.

Bingo, and our retribution is the frequencies we have to enjoy when not participating in those public service or emergency communications to recreate or experiment in.

>
> Thats why were here. Not to chat on 20 about uncle arthur paying you a
> visit last night.
>

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2512. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 04:12:39 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b7e7it$d7hfl$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 64721

I would like to see a compiled list of technologies/equipment developed by
the amateur community that we enjoy today..... (Kinda like the inventions
we are reminded about during black history month...)

I wonder how long that list would be. For example, the MDT's (mobile data
terminals) in police cars could be an example of such. Basically it is
packet radio of sorts...

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

>
> I would agree. Part of the reason the FCC lets us "play" is that
> it gives encouragement for us to build/ buy radios, antennas etc.
> To build repeater systems and whatnot that can, when need
> arises, to assist in public service. Also it helps having roving
> ears on the bands to find the occasional distress call quickly.
> Roving ears that were looking for some DX or such.
>
>

2513. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 04:19:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414001957.17921.00000374@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64697

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/13/2003 10:18 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030413231824.10704.00000290@mb-cq.aol.com>

>From K4YZ:
>
>> "Amateur Radio" is a radio service regulated by the Federal Communications
>>Commission with various purposes, those which can be found, but not limited
>>to,
>>47CFR97.1.
>
>Yes "Amateur Radio" is listed in 47CFR97.1.

Well I am glad you can accept that.

>Is "Ham Radio" listed in the FCC regs? I believe not. It may (or may not)
>say
>something like: as they like to be called. That's not an official term.

Try to find "DXer", "ragchewer", "LID", and a host of hundreds of other popularly accepted "terms", Vippy, and I can assure you that they won't be found in Part 97 either...but they exist.

>There is no <official> term for the word "Ham Radio".

But "Ham Radio" is universally accepted as being understood as "Amateur Radio", both in the United States and abroad. Even in Japan, where words don't necessarily translate well.

Go ahead...stick it in your search engine and hit "send". Tell me that "Ham Radio" give you hits on flower arrangements.....

>Hams like to dominate the amateur radio service, so they will make the claim
>that "Ham Radio = Amateur Radio". This will help convert amateur radio to
>THEIR
>agenda.

Ham Radio IS Amateur Radio and vice versa.

There is no "agenda", accept in the mind of apocalyptic or paranoid persons. Are you apocalyptic or paranoid, Vipul?

>"Ham" radio is <mostly> amateur radio, but it also is includes a set of
>beliefs
>and traditions. Since there often is no logical reason for <some of> these
>traditions or beliefs, it is sometimes referred to as a cult

Amateur Radio is not refered to by any credible source (I say "cedible" since I know it excludes you, Vippy) as a "cult".

It does not meet the criteria under ANY circumstances as a "cult".

You continue to insist on calling it a cult and only make yourself look more-and-more silly. Why do you do that?

Steve, K4YZ

2514. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 04:40:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9A3C23.FE71AC3F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64698

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3E96C906.EAA3D44C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >
> >> Except for a few land purchases here in the East and some remaining
> >> "reservations", most of the USA's land area was obtained from its
> >> original inhabitants by force of arms.
> >>
> >> But today almost all of that sort of behavior is considered
> >> unacceptable, and forbidden by law. Long slow progress, but progress
> >> nonetheless.
> >
> >I should hope that it is unacceptable. I certainly don't want the
> >descendants of the original inhabitants showing up around here
> >attempting to regain their land by force of arms. After all, I paid for
> >it.
>
> Ah, but if you follow the purchase chain back far enough, did someone buy it
> from the original inhabitants?

I don't have any way of finding out. This area was settled beginning in
1769. The original inhabitants, the Adena people were long gone leaving
some burial mounds filled with artifacts. The American Indians had no
permanent settlements here. They used this part of the Ohio Valley as a
hunting ground. The old, log section of my home was built as a
blacksmith shop around 1846. As far as the state of West Virginia is
concerned, the place belongs to me and the missus.

> >Voting rights
> >for women was the easy hurdle compared to the very real crisis now
> >before us: Do women have a right to membership in an all male, private
> >golf club?
>
> I say that if it's really a private club (no tax money spent there), then no,
> they don't. But I would not belong to nor patronize such a club.

You probably don't have to worry about it. Guys like you and me don't
get invited to join. The necessity for an invitation looks pretty solid
for the club.

Dave K8MN

2515. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 04:49:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9A3E3E.5ADBF83@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64699

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From K4YZ:
>
> > "Amateur Radio" is a radio service regulated by the Federal Communications
> >Commission with various purposes, those which can be found, but not limited
> >to,
> >47CFR97.1.
>
> Yes "Amateur Radio" is listed in 47CFR97.1.
>
> Is "Ham Radio" listed in the FCC regs? I believe not. It may (or may not) say
> something like: as they like to be called. That's not an official term.
>
> There is no <official> term for the word "Ham Radio".
>
> Hams like to dominate the amateur radio service, so they will make the claim
> that "Ham Radio = Amateur Radio". This will help convert amateur radio to THEIR
> agenda.
>
> "Ham" radio is <mostly> amateur radio, but it also is includes a set of beliefs
> and traditions. Since there often is no logical reason for <some of> these
> traditions or beliefs, it is sometimes referred to as a cult.

Vipul,

Your square-headed, nonsensical posts about amateur radio being
different from ham radio, about amateur radio being "sometimes referred
to as a cult and about people who can copy fifteen word per minute morse
not being able to copy five wpm are beginning to grate on my
sensibilities.

Dave K8MN

2516. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 05:07:59 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b7e7iu$d7hfl$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 64722

I have done a little experiment similarly around here... I have 100 repeaters programmed into a scanner of mine and connected the output to a PC sound card, and used a VOX type of program to record the audio for a 24 hour period four different times over the past 9 months for the hell of it. The range includes about a 50-60 mile radius of Midland, Michigan and the average time recorded for each time was about 34-37 minutes for each 24 hour timeframe. That included repeater ID's, announcements, and the time statements. This included 6 meter, 1.25 meter, 2 meter and 70 centimeter repeaters.

Wow.... talk about all these evil no-coders hogging the VHF/UHF band eh? (sarc.)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> To further your claims, several central and southern Ohio repeaters
> are linked throughout the state, and even across several states. If
> anyone is listening, they're listening for specific people, not your
> average traveler.
>
> I've programmed in every possible 2M repeater pair, and every 2M FM
> simplex frequency, with 146.52 my "priority" frequency. I put my
> radio on scan when I'm in my car. It's generally a waste of
> electricity. Very few times do I hear anyone talking outside of drive
> time and then only on a couple of repeaters.
>
> Where have all the hams gone?

2517. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 05:12:06 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b7e7j0$d7hfl$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 64723

Actually the human brain is much more capable that we as a species are utilizing it. Studies estimate at only up to 10 percent usage of the total capacity of the brain capabilities by even our most intelligent.

Evolutionarily speaking we have advanced over the past thousand or two years, and maybe in 2000 or more years we will be even more powerful in reference to brain power! Who knows....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:eZ%la.862$7F2.478690@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030412070718.26171.00001062@mb-fd.aol.com...
> > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >
> > >> >Someone who is proficient in
> > >> >morse at 35 wpm does not lose his ability to copy 5 wpm.
> >
> > Yes, others have said that also. I must be mistaken about losing 5 wpm
> skill.
> > Seems it does not happen with Morse code due to probably to something of
> Morse
> > code, which I am not aware of.
> >
>
> Nothing special at all. Auctioneers do not lose the ability to talk at
> normal speeds. Musicians can still play Brahms lullaby even after they've
> mastered "The Flight of the Bumblebee". It's an inherent ability of the
> human brain to be able to handle information at the highest speed it is
> trained for and speeds SLOWER than that.
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
>

2518. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 05:44:02 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b7e7j1$d7hfl$7@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 64724

Lemme see if I have it then..... you guys (drafted or not) were put into a bullsh*t war/police action with a ton of crap and tactics and you still served proudly, are tramatized to various extents (depending on the person) and recieved little to no credit for serving the armed services upon return. Is this pretty close? (will try to figure better wording later....)

As I said before here, I may not support or believe in prior wars or police actions and the idiot politicians engaging them, but I proudly support those that served! Since I am currently not involved in the armed services right now, but in emergency services domestically, I feel the best I can do is to do my job the best I can, and in my free time do EVERYTHING within my capabilities to help the families the soldiers have left behind here...

Support our troops, and thier families!

(and no... this is not an attempt to "kiss ass", it is truly how I feel and anyone that knows me locally will back this up)
--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b7a5r8$1bn$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> Sorry Brian...if you need it explained, it can't be. And Im not trying
to
> be a smart alec.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0304111832.42b49eee@posting.google.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<b777vqrnb1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > > The reality of the VN war is that is has NOT ended for those that
> actually
> > > were involved.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > Dan, would you mind explaining that?
> >
> > Perhaps we can get Kelly to check in and give us a status report or a

> "SITREP."
> >
> > Thanks, Brian
>
>

2519. On a lighter note....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 05:47:59 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b7e7j2$d7hfl$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 64725

So... since we never can get away from the code issue, are the Iraqi people pro-coders??

Just kidding..... couldn't resist!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2520. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 06:11:04 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <Xns935CEBD71C3C9jlhoukattbicom@204.127.204.17>
Source record: 64700

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in
news:20030413195848.18724.00000601@mb-fn.aol.com:

> Homebrewing clubs do not exist.

I think groups like NorCal, NOGA, and NJ-QRP would disagree.

Joshua AC7RI

2521. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 06:12:36 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABFC993.16D05%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64701

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
>> Heck, even our disabled veterans are largely ignored
>> and discarded.
>
> What are you offering as proof for such a statement?

The many articles over the last twenty to thirty years describing
treatment of disabled veterans in VA hospitals and so on. The personal
experiences of both me and my wife (both disabled veterans). Discussions
with literally thousands of disabled veterans during our many interactions
with the VA over the years.

> I have plenty of familiarity with its grandpappy,
> the Daisy Cutter and tell you exactly when such a
> weapon woud be used. The U.S. has not employed the
> MOAB in Iraq. The only scenario in which it would
> be used is out in open terrain if large numbers of
> Iraqi soldiers massed. That is not likely to
> happen. (snip)

The deployment of that weapon to Iraq was discussed in a military press
briefing just a few days ago. Since, at that time, the Iraqi troops in open
terrain had long been defeated, leaving only troops in towns and cities, the
ultimate purpose of that deployment remains unexplained.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2522. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 06:47:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABFD1B2.16D07%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64702

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> Are you telling us that no pattern of predictable
> behavior by the USG toward defeated enemies can
> be seen from our past actions?

You mean the USA? No, there is no predictable pattern of helping our enemies following our many military involvements. We did not after WWI. We did following WWII and Korea (South Korea). We did not following the Bay of Pigs (Cuba), Vietnam, Lebanon, Grenada, Panama, Somalia, Serbia, or the first US/Iraq war. Heck, there is not even a predictable pattern of helping those we sided with after some conflicts (Afghanistan, for example).

> Why, Dwight, that would be providing an answer
> about what we're likely to do in the future
> *grin*. You and I aren't likely to participate
> in making decisions about the next step so such
> talk would be a waste of time.

You asked for evidence of the future, Dave ("I asked Dwight if he had any evidence..."). No, I don't have "evidence" of what we would do in the future. And, since you know I cannot possibly have evidence of that, ignoring that question is not "ducking the bullet." However, we can discuss the next step - a discussion and evidence are two different things.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2523. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 07:21:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABFD9D5.16D09%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64703

"W5TIT" wrote:
>
> I came in late to a media frenzy on Rumsfeld this
> morning. Something about he hoped Syria would
> not be a haven for war criminals and terrorists.
> So, let's see...Syria may be next like Dan said.
> Then, oh...let's see, probably Iran; next, Libya;
> next... (snip)

We're stepping on some major toes in that region. Turkey, an ally for almost 50 years, is mad as heck that we're helping the Kurds. The Kurds are the most hated people in that region (Turkey, Northern Iraq, Northern Iran, and Northern Syria) - an anger fostered over many centuries. Given a choice of the US aiding Kurds or its neighbors of Iran and Syria, Turkey will side with Iran and Syria. If we turn Turkey into an enemy, Saudi Arabia will likely turn on us (strong ties with Turkey). Likewise, probably one or perhaps two of the former Soviet satellite states on Turkey's border will side with them (again, strong ties). If we start playing around on Russia's borders, Russia is not likely to just to sit around doing nothing. NATO is not likely to help if we end up in a conflict with Russia over vague issues with Syria (and Russia knows it). Besides, Russia would be thrilled to see Turkey walk away from the US. It is not a pretty picture, but all of this is possible. We're playing a game of global brinkmanship that has a growing chance of getting us all killed.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2524. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 07:53:40 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABFE143.16D0B%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64704

"Jon Bloom" wrote:
>
> Dick, it fascinates me how people like you think.
> They first determine prejudicially which "side"
> is correct. They then accept uncritically any
> evidence or argument that seems to support that
> prejudicial conclusion while dismissing any
> evidence or argument that appears to contradict
> it. Since they can't acknowlege that any evidence
> or argument which contradicts their point of view
> has any shred of validity, they resort to attacking
> the motives or intelligence of those presenting
> the argument -- or by making vague statements about
> their being poorly informed. (In fact, by refusing
> to consider the body of information that makes them
> uncomfortable, it is they who end up poorly
> informed.)
>
> This approach is comforting because it allows one
> to divide the world into "us" and "them." Or, as
> the President says, you're either with us or you're
> against us. And those who adopt this mode of
> thinking in fact ARE living in a bipolar world,
> because by accepting only one side of the argument
> they do divide into two camps that can happily
> lob verbal hand grenades at one another, feeling,
> no doubt, mighty righteous all the while. This
> wouldn't be so bothersome except that this approach
> is more and more the way most public debate takes
> place in the US. It's not particularly healthy for
> democratic decision making.
>
> Of course, there are some of us who are more open
> minded. We recognize that there are generally
> elements of justice on both sides of an argument.
> This really irritates the bipolar types, who
> respond by calling us wishy-washy, wusses or
> fence-sitters. Trapped as they are in a world where
> EVERYTHING comes down to a good-versus-evil debate,
> they can't stand being unable to pigeonhole everyone.

Very well said, Jon. Both groups (left and right) do this to some extent,
but many Republicans have taken it to the next step - stubbornly blind
obedience to whatever the Republican leadership says. And, even though I

consider myself conservative, I can't stand this way of thinking - agreement with some conservative views does not bind me to total acceptance of everything said by the Republican leadership. Sadly, those who blindly follow cannot even understand that way of thinking.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2525. Re: No more FCC regulation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 08:16:43 UTC
From: Ginger Eakle <virginiaeakle@peoplepc.com>
Message-ID: <v9krl6dpu74aa5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 64705

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3E89C43C.B4EDF9AD@crosslink.net...
> From EHam
>
> Eham.net has learned that the FCC will soon announce that all licensing
> and regulation of the Amateur Service will cease, effective upon
> publication of the applicable Order in the Federal Register. Eham was
> told that the FCC is taking this step for two reasons. First, this
> action will reduce the FCC's budgetary needs in this era of federal
> deficits. Second, the FCC noted that so-called "freeband" unlicensed HF
> operation has matured to the point where it no longer has significant
> negative impact. Therefore, the FCC reached the conclusion that the
> current Amateur Service testing, licensing, and regulatory structure
> serves little or no real purpose.
>
> Eham's source emphasized that HF operation will continue to be permitted
> by any U.S. resident in the current amateur allocations below 30 MHz.
> These frequencies, along with the 26-28 MHz band, will become officially
> available for any non-commercial, non-broadcasting communication
> purpose. All other Amateur allocations (above 30 MHz) will be withdrawn,
> and will be reallocated to commercial interests. .....
Great April Fool's Joke. ROFL

2526. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 08:26:56 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414042656.12142.00000128@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 64706

In article <b7d1nm$hi3$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Tell that to the non-Muslims in those countries.

Tariq Aziz is/was a Chaldean Christian

2527. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 08:30:44 UTC
From: Ginger Eakle <virginiaeakle@peoplepc.com>
Message-ID: <v9ksfhg3qfgu00@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 64707

"Unclaimed Mysteries" <k4doh@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b737nk$1od$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> They have no future except their own graves. Even today these codeless
> stooges are impaling themselves by the thousands upon the gates of true
> ham radio. Their blood flows like a filthy torrent into 27MHz. All
> non-CW activity is a despicable lie, promoted by these congenital
> gangsters who have no sense of true communication. They should be hit
> with shoes. God will grill their bellies in hell, where they will fry in
> their own fat as their souls wail in lamentation.
>
> I'm sorry I must have blacked out there for a minute. Did I say anything?
>
> 73 Corry K4DOH
>
> --
> It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
> http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/
>
> "Here I am, the CEO of a multibillion-dollar company, and I'm having to
> answer about what some weirdo has said on a message board." - Richard
> Scrushy
>
If I was looking in the newsgroups for information on getting a Ham Radio
license and payed attention to all the messages in the newsgroup I would
not want to become a ham radio operator. All the stuff that's being posted
because some people have opted for the no code licenses. The newsgroups
sound more like CB'ers than ham radio operators.
Don't get me wrong I am only upset with the people that put down the people
who get no code licenses. I personally would like to get a ham license
with the morse code but I have trouble learning the code, I find it gets
boring listening to the dih dah sounds after awhile.
If someone could come up with a sure fire easy to learn morse code lessons I
am sure a lot more people would opt for the license classes that use Morse
Code or CW abilities.
It's like they think if you don't take time to learn Morse Code you are
worthless.
At least this is what I get from the anti no-coder messages.
I do know it's not all Ham Radio Operators that think that way.
So I apologize to the Ham Radio Operators who think anyone should have the
ability to get a license.
Just my opinion.

2528. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 08:53:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BABFEF4E.16D0D%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64708

"Bill Sohl" wrote:

> "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote:
>>
>> (snip) they are in fact nothing more than Iraq's
>> military - man and women who became soldiers for
>> the same reasons soldiers all over the world do.
>> They have no more say in their government than
>> soldiers elsewhere do (even less if you believe
>> they were as oppressed as claimed) and their
>> motives are no less honorable then soldiers
>> elsewhere.
>
> (snip) As to your claim that the rest of the Iraq
> military were just the same as other forces...well,
> let's just agree to disagree. In fact, many (most?)
> were conscripted...in stark contrast to the 100%
> volunteer US military.

I did not claim they were "just the same as other forces," Bill. What I said was that they, "became soldiers for the same reasons soldiers all over the world do." You continue to point to their conscription. Do conscripted soldiers have "more say in their government" or are they "less honorable then soldiers elsewhere" because of it? Remember that millions of Americans were conscripted into prior conflicts when answering that.

> (snip) Many of the Iraqi military apparently had no
> problems with acts of torture, etc. but I guess
> they were just following orders.

Most in the Iraqi military were not involved in torture.

> They all could have just surrendered too. No surrender,
> then they faced the consequences.

No kidding? Perhaps they thought the honorable thing to do was defend their country instead - even if they died doing so.

>> Our soldiers are dying there. Again, not something to
>> shout for joy over.
>
> Agreed, and we all are unhappy about that.

Bill, perhaps I missed it, but I haven't heard you utter even a single word of sorrow over the deaths in this conflict. Instead, you seem to be shouting for joy over this bloodbath we call war. Even here you couldn't say even a word of sorrow, only that you were "unhappy" about it. Well, I'm

certainly glad you're not happy about it.

> Have you followed the news at all? Are all the journalists
> falsly reporting?

The journalists are only getting access to very limited slices of this conflict - often events staged solely for their benefit (such as the statue of Saddam torn down by Iraqi civilians - driving the US Marine tank, of course).

> The number of inocent civilians sure isn't of any numebrs
> that have caused the bulk of Iraq to be glad we have
> liberated them.

Bill, all we've seen are looters in the streets, Kurds in the North, and participants of events staged for the cameras (such as the statue above). We have no idea what the "bulk of Iraq" feels.

> Other than the MOAB, what other massive ordinance
> troubles you? Where was it used?

The one, two, and three thousand pound bombs dropped on Baghdad, for example. And we have no idea of how many of these were dropped in other towns, or what other ordinance was used - again the limited press access.

> Probably over 1000 reporters, photogs, etc
> covering the war and you don't think that is
> "seeing"?

You know exactly what I'm talking about - the topic raised in this and previous threads (the thousands of dead and injured, including our own soldiers). Instead, we get nice still pictures of our dead flashed on the television screen, with no pictures of their mangled bodies - the REALITY of war. Again, if America is going to scream for war, it should have the balls to see the results.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2529. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 09:10:21 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7dtt8$8q$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64709

Ginger Eakle wrote:

> If I was looking in the newsgroups for information on getting a Ham Radio
> license and payed attention to all the messages in the newsgroup I would
> not want to become a ham radio operator. All the stuff that's being posted
> because some people have opted for the no code licenses. The newsgroups
> sound more like CB'ers than ham radio operators.
> Don't get me wrong I am only upset with the people that put down the people
> who get no code licenses. I personally would like to get a ham license
> with the morse code but I have trouble learning the code, I find it gets
> boring listening to the dih dah sounds after awhile.
> If someone could come up with a sure fire easy to learn morse code lessons I
> am sure a lot more people would opt for the license classes that use Morse
> Code or CW abilities.
> It's like they think if you don't take time to learn Morse Code you are
> worthless.
> At least this is what I get from the anti no-coder messages.
> I do know it's not all Ham Radio Operators that think that way.
> So I apologize to the Ham Radio Operators who think anyone should have the
> ability to get a license.
> Just my opinion.
>
>

I'm over the limit now.

73 Corry K4DOH

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/

"Max Imo" <not@this.com> wrote in alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf: "I suggest
Corry keep his uninformed opinions to a subject he knows something about
(porno, hacking, terrorism?)."

2530. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 10:00:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304140200.5d42ae81@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64710

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.13.01.05.50.995144.7305@arrl.org>...
> On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 09:22:06 -0400, Brian wrote:
>
> > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.12.03.57.51.355734.11732@arrl.org>...
> >> On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:23:22 -0400, Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304110414.1674d136@posting.google.com>...
> >> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E961F0A.5A1CF86@earthlink.net>...
> >> >> > Brian wrote:
> >> >> >
> >> >> > > Is all free speech patriotic?
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Having witnessed an interview with Scott Ridder on CNN this evening, I'd
> >> >> > have to say, "No".
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Dave K8MN
> >> >>
> >> >> Well there you have it.
> >> >
> >> > Yet Jon still doesn't have an answer.
> >>
> >> First ask an intelligent question.
> >
> > Do you consider the Dixie Chick patriotic?
>
> Do you consider that an intelligent question?

I assumed that you, having asked the question, would be intelligent
enough to have an answer for it. Apparently not.

2531. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 10:07:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304140207.6f81ef18@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64711

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<459B4CC537F1059C.6BB16BE52E576245.7DEF4DDE4021697D@lp.airnews.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0304121743.54273f26@posting.google.com...
> > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:<C2DF6A57CBCA3276.701FDE1AFC9A82D7.D9323447173F2B92@lp.airnews.net>...
> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > news:f45722ac.0304120530.566104f4@posting.google.com...
> > > > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:<pan.2003.04.12.03.56.55.900202.11732@arrl.org>...
> > > > > On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:26:05 -0400, Brian wrote:
> > > > > > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > > > > >> That's your opinion. Others would say that those who protested
> the
> > > > > >> Vietnam war were patriotic.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Others" would be wrong. They could serve pennance by applying
> for
> > > > > > Vietnamese citizenship. Today is not too late, but 1973 would
> have
> been
> > > > > > better.
> > > > >
> > > > > Feel free to go to Vietnam and pick up the battle where it left off
> in
> > > > > 1975. The same folks are still in control and I'm sure they'd be
> willing
> > > > > to fight you. Hey, if it was right then, it's right now.
> > > >
> > > > Why would I go fight them now, 30 years after the battle ended? I
> > > > don't have a duty to do so, and it would be wrong to do so now. Our
> > > > country is no longer at war with anyone in Vietnam.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Give 'em time, give 'em time...
> >
> > Not in your lifetime. Everytime US Forces are sent to do something,
> > the liberal media is ready to call it "another Vietnam." I heard it
> > said about Grenada, Kuwait, Somalia, Haiti, Rwanda, and the Former
> > Yugoslavia (FY for Dave).
> >
> > Vietnam made some good faith gestures allowing us to search for and
> > recover some of the remains of service men KIA over there. I saw the
> > repatriation of some remains while on Guam. The Color Guard rolled

> > out to a C-141 Starlifter and brought them in. Katie Kuerk and
> > Jeraldo weren't there.
> >
> > And no, I didn't get permission from my commander to be there.
> >
>
> I came in late to a media frenzy on Rumsfeld this morning. Something about
> he hoped Syria would not be a haven for war criminals and terrorists. So,
> let's see...Syria may be next like Dan said. Then, oh...let's see, probably
> Iran; next, Libya; next... [not in reference to the Iraq war being another
> Viet Nam (I think those kind of comments are crap), but more in reference to
> the US now becoming and remaining an aggressor on nation after nation.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Makes sense. Why pull our troops out and send them to Korea when we could leave them in place a while longer to mop up? Korea has been festering for half a century, a couple more months shouldn't make a big difference.

2532. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 10:11:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304140211.1ee3ec06@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64712

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030413094701.01650.00001062@mb-fk.aol.com>...
> >I'm just waiting for a couple of gullible no-coders to come along and
> >make a $250 wager. How long do you think that will take
>
> For you it will take alot more than 2 of your CBplusser Buddies. And as far as
> the time frame for you to get Extra, Id say as soon as the FCC starts giving
> them away without testing you might just get one.

Bruce, why can't I take the same easy road to Extra that you took?

You were an Advanced for how long???

What held you back?

2533. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 10:16:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAC002B9.16D11%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64713

"Bill Sohl" wrote:
>
> It means if a government official, elected official,
> or militrary person wants to be critical of certain
> press coverage, that's as much their right as the
> press has a right to report. Just because someone
> is elected or accepts public office, they don't
> lose their rights to opine as to press reporting.

Within constraints, Bill. Lets separate those elected to public office
from those employed by the government.

Those elected to office represent, and are answerable to, only themselves
and those who elected them. They indeed have the right to say whatever they
want within the constraints of that (and, of course, the laws).

Government employees, including military personnel, are also free to say
whatever they want within certain constraints. The main one being they
cannot say anything as an employee or other representative of the agency
they work for unless it is the official position of that agency.

Lets look at an example of this in action. Joe Smith is obviously free to
say whatever he wants. There is nothing here to suggest his words represent
anything other than his own views. However, if Joe Smith identifies himself
as a soldier or is in uniform, he is not so free to speak out. He is no
longer just representing himself, but also his employer. His views may be
given more weight because of his official status or may be interpreted to be
the official position of the agency he is employed by.

So, as you said, government employees, including military personnel,
retain their right of free speech. But there are constraints on that when it
becomes more than just their own speech.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2534. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 10:23:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304140223.64e8922a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64714

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E98CDE8.FAB969AE@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E98307C.1E9B847A@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E979162.7A1E40AC@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E96C2E0.CA11EF28@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E95D3BD.C17A360E@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E94E690.28EA89A3@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9243A1.F66483EF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>...
>
>
> They're
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > certainly not on 2m SSB or CW. Len wouldn't know those things. He
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > isn't even a ham.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > He's on the web, just like yew.
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > That has nothing to do with amateur radio.
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > So you have nothing to do with amatuer radio as well? I haven't
> > > > > > > > > > > > logged you since 1991.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > I haven't logged W1AW in years but I know the station is on the air.
> > > > > > > > > > > It is licensed. I'm licensed. You're licensed. Len isn't licensed.

> > > >
> > > > Yet somehow you are able to communicate with Len. I wonder how that
> > > > can be if he isn't licensed in the amateur radio service?
> > > >
> > > I don't communicate with Len on the 2m ham band.
> > >
> > How do you do it?
> >
> Wires. Len's a big landline man. But you drift. We're talking about
> the absence of the new Techs on 2m, not of Len's internet activity.

No, you redirected the thread to talk of Len Anderson. If you didn't
want to talk about Len Anderson, why did you bring him into this?

> > > > Maybe this isn't ham radio?
> > > >
> > > You've taken a wrong turn somewhere. I stated that Len doesn't know
> > > what goes on 2m FM as he isn't a licensed ham.
> > >
> > 2M is not personal cell phone communications. It can be legally
> > monitored in America. License not required.
> >
> I don't believe that Len is monitoring 2m. I'm sure he isn't doing it
> around Pittsburgh, Columbus or Cincinnati.

How can you be sure?

> > > > > > I'll amend the list to start at 11wpm. Here goes. Try real hard to
> > > > > > decide which is the lowest level of proficiency. Does Morse
> > > > > > proviciency begin at:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > 11wpm
> > > > > > 12wpm
> > > > > > 13wpm
> > > > > > 14wpm
> > > > > > 15wpm
> > > > > > 16wpm
> > > > > > 17wpm
> > > > > > 18wpm
> > > > > > 19wpm
> > > > > > 20wpm
> > > > > > 21wpm
> > > > > > 22wpm
> > > > > > 23wpm
> > > > > > 24wpm
> > > > > > 25wpm
> > > > > > 26wpm
> > > > > > 27wpm
> > > > > > 28wpm
> > > > > > 29wpm
> > > > > > 30wpm

> > > > > > 31wpm
> > > > > > 32wpm
> > > > > > 33wpm
> > > > > > 34wpm
> > > > > > 35wpm
> > > > > > 36wpm
> > > > > > 37wpm
> > > > > > 38wpm
> > > > > > 39wpm
> > > > > > 40wpm?
>
> > > > > No luck needed, Brian. I believe that morse proficiency begins somewhat
> > > > > above the speed of ten words per minute.
>
> > > > That would be 11wpm. I listed it above as one of your choices.
> > >
> > > You just jumped to another wrong conclusion. You also listed speeds of
> > > 12-40 wpm. All of those are somewhat higher than ten wpm.
>
> > You are free to choose. If you cannot make a decision, too bad for
> > you.
>
> You're right. I am free to choose. I have chosen. You still jumped to
> an incorrect conclusion.

You have not chosen. You can make your choice now, if you like.

> All you really need to know is that someone whose maximum morse speed is
> only five words per minute is not proficient (skilled, expert) in the
> use of morse.
>
> Dave K8MN

Ah, yes. The Extra tells the lesser class ham to sit down and shutup.
That's what rrap is all about, isn't it?

2535. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 10:26:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414062619.11494.00000154@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 64715

In article <b7d3j2odm1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030413205906.04143.00000082@mb-fb.aol.com...
>> In article <b79953tdc1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >Add Peter Arrnett to my list of traitors and
>> >pond scum.
>>
>> Bill,
>> Do not judge Arnett too harshly until the full story is out.
>>
>> In today's Phila. Inquirer, there's a story about how CNN and other
>journalists
>> were harrassed, threatened, tortured and killed by SH's regime. They kept
>much
>> of what went on hushed up because of threats and reprisals to those still
>> in-country, as well as translators, sources, crewmen, etc.
>
>Which just shows them and CNN as being hypocrits by only now
>coming to the forfront with this. The CNN management
>caved to the SH regime because CNN didn't want to
>lose their foriegn bureau status in Iraq.

The story said the real reason they stayed was because of threats and violence
against Iraqi staffers.

>How many other despotic
>regimes is CNN manipulating their reporting for so they (CNN)
>don't have to leave that country?

Or because of similar threats? Either way, it's a good point.

> So much for
>journalistic honesty.

I figure they were nuts to be there in the first place.

>By the way, this story broke on Fox News two or three days ago.
>The Philly Inq is a few days late on this...but better late
>than never in this case.
>
The author was one Eason Jordan. Might be on the Inky's website. They gave some
pretty chilling details.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2536. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 10:26:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414062620.11494.00000155@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 64716

In article <d22b54c3.0304131724.2c8bb01f@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030413150828.11628.00000082@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>> In article <20030413122643.15869.00000070@mb-cq.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>> (Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>> >In article <pan.2003.04.12.14.45.15.701519.2786@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
>> ><jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>> >
>> >>Ah, you are reduced to making fun of typos. Not a compelling argument for
>> >>your point of view, Len.
>> >
>> > Jon, go back to standby mode and no transmission.
>>
>> Translation: Len wants you to SHUT UP.
>>
>> > Just like many months before.
>>
>> Translation: Len doesn't have a good counterargument.
>> >
>> > You don't have any solutions for Iraq, just a lot of arrogant
>> > opinions about "peace" and doing nothing.
>>
>> Translation: Len doesn't want to get into details and facts.
>> >
>> > This is an AMATEUR RADIO newsgroup, Jon, NOT a forum of
>> > experts in realpolitik with the wisdom of ages.
>>
>> Translation: "We've always done it this way"
>> >
>> > Make like an amateur RADIO person working for ARRL.
>>
>> Translation: Len wants you to SHUT UP.
>> >
>> > You won't be drafted or have to fight.
>>
>> Neither will Len....
>>
>> > US military doesn't take
>> > artifacts from museums to serve.
>> >
>> No translation necessary...

>> >
>> >
>
>(radio crackles to life) "Hold yer fire, disengage, disengage, he's
>just a rear widget vet from another century! (squelch tail).
>
(radio crackles to life) "Roger that, not worth the ordnance" (squelch tail).

2537. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 11:26:51 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414072651.00629.00000062@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 64717

In article <f45722ac.0304140223.64e8922a@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>The Extra tells the lesser class ham to sit down and shutup.

No one has told you to shut up, Brian.

> That's what rrap is all about, isn't it?

Just the opposite.

2538. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 11:46:58 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.14.11.46.58.227084.24274@arrl.org>
Source record: 64718

On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 03:21:57 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> We're stepping on some major toes in that region. Turkey, an ally for
> almost 50 years, is mad as heck that we're helping the Kurds. The Kurds
> are the most hated people in that region (Turkey, Northern Iraq,
> Northern Iran, and Northern Syria) - an anger fostered over many
> centuries. Given a choice of the US aiding Kurds or its neighbors of
> Iran and Syria, Turkey will side with Iran and Syria.

What do you think the US has been doing in the northern no-fly zone over the past 12 years? Their operations there allowed the Iraqi Kurds to escape the control of the Baghdad government and set up their own semi-autonomous government. This was facilitated by Turkey since much of the air operations over northern Iraq were based in Turkey. The Turks are worried that the presence of a fully autonomous Kurdish state (AKA Kurdistan) in Iraq would cause the Kurds in Turkey to want to secede from Turkey and join that state. The Turks are also concerned about the treatment of the Turkmen population of northern Iraq under Kurdish rule. But that worry is a far cry from siding with Iran or Syria. What Turkey wants is for Iraq to remain unpartitioned, with its Kurdish population sujects of the government in Baghdad and not in a state of armed rebellion. Since that's also what the US wants, the interests of Turkey and the US are aligned in this matter.

> If we turn Turkey into an enemy, Saudi Arabia will likely turn on us
> (strong ties with Turkey). Likewise, probably one or perhaps two of the
> former Soviet satellite states on Turkey's border will side with them
> (again, strong ties). If we start playing around on Russia's borders,
> Russia is not likely to just to sit around doing nothing.

The domino theory redux, eh? That's a huge stretch. For example, Saudi interests are much more tied to the US than to Turkey. And as I've said, there is little reason for Turkey to become our enemy.

> NATO is
> not likely to help if we end up in a conflict with Russia over vague
> issues with Syria (and Russia knows it). Besides, Russia would be
> thrilled to see Turkey walk away from the US. It is not a pretty
> picture, but all of this is possible. We're playing a game of global
> brinkmanship that has a growing chance of getting us all killed.

I think it highly unlikely that their displeasure would take the form of military conflict.

Jon

2539. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 11:59:41 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <Noxma.1889$D12.422@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 64726

After listening to all the LIDS on HF I think Powell should sell off ALL the
Ham Bands to the highest bidder and give whoever is left a free pair of
500mw Cobra FRS radios and a cellphone.

--
>> Remove "zz" from e-mail address to direct reply. <<
"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030413135617.04143.00000056@mb-fb.aol.com...
> In article <f45722ac.0304130444.43023c10@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
> >news:<20030412221432.24176.00000166@mb-fc.aol.com>...
> >> In article <f45722ac.0304041214.5a33ebf8@posting.google.com>,
> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >>
> >> >Which is why we need to remove the code-tape generals, advanced, and
> >> >extras from the rolls of the "proficient" when trying to quantify
> >> >Morse Code as a growth industry.
> >>
> >> Brian:
> >>
> >> Sounds good to me, as long as we're getting rid of the Question Pool
> >> Techs right along with them! Let's clean up our collective acts, and
> >> leave only truly qualified, proficient radio amateurs in our ranks!
Oooops
> >--
> >> sorry about that -- good bye, Brian! I hope you and Kim enjoy your
> >> new hobbies!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >How does that help us quantify Morse Code as a growth industry?
> >
> >Do try to stay on topic.
>
> The "growth" thing must be on his brain. It could be a bad day
> on the bus route or too many cheese sandwiches... :-)

2540. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 12:21:04 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.14.12.21.04.19467.24274@arrl.org>
Source record: 64727

On Sun, 13 Apr 2003 21:06:33 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> It means if a government official, elected official, or militrary person
> wants to be critical of certain press coverage,

One example I gave was of an Administration official being critical of
press coverage. The other examples had nothing to do with press coverage.

> that's
> as much their right as the press has a right to report. Just because
> someone is elected or accepts public office, they don't lose their
> rights to opine as to press reporting.

Who said they did? I was objecting to what they said, not to their right
to say it.

> The French built a nucleur facility, Russian night vision goggles have
> been found, etc.

The French nuclear facility was built in the 1970's. During the 1980's,
the US gave the Iraqis chemical and biological weapons agents. How can
you hold the French to account but not the US?

>> I'd want those contracts to go to the lowest-price qualified bidder.
>> It's mostly our money being spent, after all.
>
> As determined by who? The UN?

As determined by anyone who can read a bid proposal.

>> Bill, that is bunk. It's not our democracy and freedom they hate, it's
>> that we are the torch bearers for what they see as centuries of Western
>> repression. The Crusades are more than dusty history in the Muslim
>> world, and they view Israel and US support for Israel as being more of
>> the same.
>
> The extremists of the OBL cause hate us for exactly the reason I stated.
> Do you realize that Kim W5TIT wouldn't even have a voice in this
> discussion if OBL's mindset held the day.

OBL and crowd do not represent the entire Muslim world any more than Tim
McVeigh represents America.

>> I think they're off-base there, but that's how they see it nonetheless.
>> If the US were a despotic regime but still had exhibited the policies
>> toward the Arab world of the past 50+ years, they would hate us just as
>> much.

>
> BUT, the US is NOT a despotic regime...so your comment makes no sense.

The point is that it's our behavior toward the Middle East that many in the Muslim world hate. Do you see crowds in the streets of Damascus and Cairo demonstrating against the democracies in Sweden, India or Japan, for example? No, because those places don't materially affect the lives of Arabs. The US does.

>> If
>> you don't understand that you simply haven't bothered to find out what
>> they are thinking. The "they hate our freedom" argument is just foolish
>> pandering.
>
> Tell that to the women in Iraq, Syria and several other countries. Tell
> that to the non-Muslims in those countries.

The powerful there don't want certain freedoms in their own countries. That doesn't mean they give a damn about freedom in ours.

Jon

2541. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 12:32:14 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.14.12.32.10.925105.24274@arrl.org>
Source record: 64728

On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 03:53:40 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Very well said, Jon. Both groups (left and right) do this to some
> extent,
> but many Republicans have taken it to the next step - stubbornly blind
> obedience to whatever the Republican leadership says.

I'm not sure the situation is any better on the left. The antiwar crowd glosses over the brutality of the SH regime, ignoring behaviors that they would never ignore if the behaviors were being exhibited by a US ally.

> And, even though I
> consider myself conservative, I can't stand this way of thinking -
> agreement with some conservative views does not bind me to total
> acceptance of everything said by the Republican leadership. Sadly, those
> who blindly follow cannot even understand that way of thinking.

One of the most amazing aspects of recent events is the insistence by many so-called conservatives that we should trust the government with powers that could easily be abused and that it's okay to run huge deficits. A few years ago, this same crowd was loudly arguing that the government can do nothing right and is inherently dangerous to freedom, and that deficits were the number one problem facing the country.

Jon

2542. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 12:53:56 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414085356.05742.00001215@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 64729

>Bruce, why can't I take the same easy road to Extra that you took?

Because you dont have the ability to do anything to get it unless it is just handed to you.

>You were an Advanced for how long???

About 15 Years

>What held you back?

Nothing held me back, I was just waiting for some Dumb ASS CBplussers to come along and give me $250 dollars to take the Test.

2543. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 16:31:00 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304140831.4929e156@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64731

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030413122652.15869.00000076@mb-cq.aol.com>...
> In article <20030412145058.23756.00000165@mb-fj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <20030411201751.15821.00000087@mb-cg.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:

> You don't prove anything other than you are a biased
> morse fanatic.

Only to a biased anti-Morse fanatic like yourself.

> Give it a rest.

Who, me? You have more than a dozen posts dated April 13 to this
thread alone. Looks like obsessive-compulsive behavior......
>
> >>>>>However the fact can then be used
> >>>>>to support advocating Morse.
> >>>
> >>>Is that a bad thing?
> >>
> >> For licensing in US amateur radio it is considered "bad" by many.

Just an opinion.
> >
> >Advocating the USE of Morse is bad?
>
> When there are better modes, more useful modes, YES.

Ah - so it's not just the TEST you are against.

What are these alleged "better modes, more useful modes"?

> The subject sub-thread was LICENSING.

Where?

The thread title is "ARS license numbers"

> Look up above in
> the quote: "For licensing..." LICENSING, not "use."
>
> Hello...? LICENSING involves TESTING.

Not necessarily.

> Capice?

Tui se pazz'
>
> >Who considers it bad besides you and Vipul?
>
> Everyone who isn't a morse code fanatic.

That's simply not true.
>
> The other radio services have given up on morse code for
> anything of use in communications.

So? Almost all maritime users have given up sailing ships. Does that
mean nobody should use sailboats anymore?
>
> >> So much so, they've not bothered to get into US amateur radio.
> >
> >Who are these "many" who have allegedly been turned away?
>
> The ones you dislike.

That's a very, very small group of people.
>
> >> That is biased, incorrect, a mistake, an error.
> >
> >Yes, you and Vipul make many such errors. Try to fix them.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Getting angry are you?

Nope.

Projecting your feelings onto another are you?
>
> Try to practice some tolerance...you would get such returned.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, Len, I've never seen you practice any "tolerance"
towards those who don't agree with you. Instead you respond with
name-calling, insults, factual errors, ethnic/racial/religious slurs,
excessive emoticons and the usual generalized infantile behavior. Etc.

Practice what you preach.
>
> >> There is a dearth of business information in regards to the
> >> "growth" of morse code use.
> >
> >Vibroplex is still in business, MFJ is in business, Ten-Tec, lots of other
> >companies.
>
> Then by all means, promote them. Business trades don't.
>
> Remember that I was the one who pointed out your ERROR
> about amazon.com allegedly not being profitable.

It's not an error.

When I wrote about Amazon's profitability, they were losing money.
Fortunately, that has changed.
>
> >I wouldn't take business advice from somebody who confuses "bankrupt" with
> >"unprofitable", though.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...poor baby, still stung over the correction about
> amazon.com.

What correction?

> Amazon has had over a half year of dividend
> earnings. Mid-way through that period you insisted they were
> "losing money!"

Incorrect. When I posted that Amazon was unprofitable, they were
losing money. That was July-August of last year, and before. That's
before the time period you cite.

The errors are all yours, Len.
>
> Now you want to engage in wordplay to misdirect the subject.

Nope. That's your game.
>
> You MADE A MISTAKE before.

When?

Provide the post, complete with date.

You cannot.

> >For sending Morse code I have a selection of four Vibroplex bugs, a J-37
> >straight key, and a new Mini-Paddle (thanks to the generous ham who gave me
> >the latter).
>
> Enjoy.

I do.

> >If a thing has a use, it is useful. I used Morse code to communicate with
> >three different hams last night on the 40 meter band. Great QSOs.
>
> Call the staff at "60 Minutes." Have them cover the event!
>
> Show the world that the Ancient Radiotelegraphy Society is
> showing them the best, most useful way to communicate.

Gee, are you showing us more "tolerance"??
>
> >Of course Morse code is not useful to someone who doesn't know how to use it,
> >just as a book is not useful to someone who cannot read (except perhaps as

> >fuel or to prop up wobbly furniture).
>
> It's propping up the old men of ARRL. Very useful for that.
>
> >> Of all the US radio services that
> >> existed since the end of WW2, only two retain morse code
> >> modes for any sort of communications purpose.
> >
> >So what?
>
> So, did you just leave the shtetl last week?

I'm not Jewish.
>
> EVERYONE ELSE in the world of radio has either dropped
> morsemanship or never considered it for use in the beginning.

So? Does that mean I must drop it too?
>
> Morse code is dying off in radio.

How do you know? Why are you so fanatical about hating morse USE?

> It is on life-support only
> in amateur radio. AMATEURS.

From the Latin word meaning "to love".
>
> Ancient Radiotelegraphy Society. Beepers.

Ah - look at all that TOLERANCE from Len!
>
>
> >And the other is...amateur radio! And this is...an amateur radio newsgroup!
> >And we're discussing whether Morse code is useful...in amateur radio!
>
> There's a LOT more bandwidth wasted on two other threads
> discussing war and world affairs relative to war...done mostly
> by AMATEURS in an AMATEUR RADIO NEWSGROUP.\

So? Are you the censor from the Lanark Street Ministry of Information?
You have told some of us here to shut up. Is that your idea of
TOLERANCE? Is that how you support the American ideal of free speech?

> >How about that, Captain Obvious? ;-) ;-) ;-)
>
> Kiss my yes, Reverend Jimmie.

Can't you take a little tweak, Len? Seems to me you preach tolerance
and acceptance but don't do it yourself.
>
> >Since Morse code IS used in amateur radio, it IS useful to amateur radio
> >operators.

>
> NOT to ALL of them.

Nobody said "ALL of them".
>
> >Why does that bother you so much?
>
> It doesn't.

More than a dozen posts in one thread in one day.

>The morse code TEST is really the subject.

Only to you.

The subject line is "ARS License Numbers"
>
> >> Morse code mode is slow and error-prone in requiring humans
> >> at each end to be the encoder and decoder.
> >
> >Guess people shouldn't talk to each other then, huh? Humans at each end,
> >encoding, decoding, making mistakes....
>
> That's exactly why the commercial communications carriers did
> away with manual telegraphy, Jimmie.

The question was about voice modes.

> >> Maximum
> >> throughput is, at best, 30 WPM only be very skilled and
> >> experienced morsemen.
> >
> >That is biased, incorrect, a mistake, an error. It is spin,
> >propaganda, self-interest, and a lot of not too good
> >attributes.
> >
> >In short, Len, it's just plain wrong.
> >
> >The *best* skilled ops do at least twice 30 WPM. I can do 40-45 wpm on a good
> >day. Effective throughput is much higher due to the use of abbreviations,
> >prosigns, Q signals, etc.
>
> Sustain that "throughput" for as long as paper is available.

Why?

The point is that the maximum throughput you quoted is way too low.
>
> Teleprinters of 60 years ago could do better than that (60 WPM)
> as long as the paper lasted and was reloaded. Nice printed
> copy, easily legible, same copy at both ends. No bathroom
> breaks, no need to sleep or eat. Not distracted by other humans.

Do the teleprinters have fun?
>
> >> The slowest teleprinters in radio
> >> communications have been 100 WPM for four decades,
> >
> >That is biased, incorrect, a mistake, an error. It is spin,
> >propaganda, self-interest, and a lot of not too good
> >attributes.
> >
> >In short, Len, it's just plain wrong.
> >
> >Lots of 60 wpm teletype in use, though not as much as before. I was using 60
> >wpm machines on the air in the mid-70s. Less than four decades ago.
>
> Yes, your "surplus" variety, teleprinters that were getting old
> when I was in the US military in the 1950s.

So what? They were still in use in radio communications the late '70s.
That disproves your claim that:

"The slowest teleprinters in radio communications have been 100 WPM
for four decades"

Now, be a big machismo man-ums and admit that you made a mistake. You
posted something that just isn't true. An error.

> Phased out in
> favor of the Model 28s and 33s that came in at the end of the
> 1960s. Those models were in industry at the end of the 1960s
> and used as distant computer terminals.

You wrote:

"The slowest teleprinters in radio communications have been 100 WPM
for four decades"

Four decades ago is 1963. If there were slower teleprinters in use in
radio communications after 1963, you are just plain wrong.

> I'm sure you would have used spark transmitters too if they
> weren't outlawed.

Why?
>
> >> do so 24/7 with enough paper to reload, don't need food,
> >> don't need breaks, don't need to go to the bathroom. Data
> >> rates can go to 200+ WPM equivalent and use forward-
> >> error correction codings to improve reliability through
> >> interference.
> >
> >Sure. Very useful. Just like Morse code. Hams use all sorts of modes, Len.
>
> I've already used far more modes than in permissible to US radio
> amateurs.

I don't think you have. List them.

> Not a single manual test for them in US amateur radio.

You're not in amateur radio, Len.
>
> >> Every OTHER US radio service gets along quite fine without
> >> using morse or ever envisioning its use.
> >
> >So? Their needs, goals and resources are different.
>
> No kidding! [see, you can learn to understand the other world
> of radio!]

Then why all the comparisons?

> >On the other hand, no code skill has been required for an amateur radio
> >license
> >giving all privileges above 30 MHz. Been that way for over 12 years. Lots of
> >real, genuine, first-class, fine-and-upstanding hams hold that class of
> >license. All part of the big happy family we call amateur radio.
>
> Yes, I've seen the "big happy family."

Where?

> Class distinction deeply
> rooted.

How?

> Elitism, fractioned opinions.

You're describing yourself, again.

> Olde-tyme thinking hams
> acting like puerile bigots to everything not in the standards and
> practices of the 1930s.

Sounds just like you, Len. Tell us again about the 100 wpm
teleprinters.
>
> >Besides, we're talking about Morse code USE, not the TEST. The test is all
> >but gone.
>
> The TEST is NOT gone.

Poor baby. Can't you read what I wrote?

Do you really think Element 1 is a barrier?

> You keep misdirecting from TEST to "use."

Not at all. I was talking about use, not the test. You just don;t want
to admit that Morse code is used by anybody.

Sounds like an anti-morse fanatic.

> You don't have a valid
> reason for retaining the TEST except for ITU-R S25.5.

Sure I do. Lots of them. You just reject them. Not only that, you
reject the reality that morse is even used.
>
> Remember, LICENSING involves TEST, not "use."

No code test for above 30 MHz.

Is it all about HF to you? Is that what's really bugging you all these
years - you want access to the HF/MF ham bands, not VHF/UHF? Sure
seems like it.

> Can't "use"
> until the TEST is passed. Capice?

tui se pazz'
>
> >But the USE will continue for a long, long time. Live with it.
>
> Once the FCC decides to eliminate the US amateur radio code
> test, it will be GONE, Jimmie. Kaput. Defunct. Tossed out.
> Live with THAT. It will become fact.

What IS your problem, Len? The test will be gone when the FCC drops
it. I've been saying that for over three years now. Big deal. Get over
it. Grow up, for heaven's sake.

Stop being such a one-trick pony. Or part of a pony, anyway. ;-)
>
> Some museum artifacts will still be sitting around vibrating their
> plexes and slapping bugs. In old, quavering voices they will
> sound off about their "prowess" in manual telegraphy by almost
> getting as fast as the teleprinters of WW2. It will be a quaint
> sight. A living museum of long-ago radio.
>
> Enjoy your glass case in the museum. Beep, beep, OM.

Gee, look at all that tolerance......

2544. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 17:06:57 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304140906.536530a7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64732

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.14.12.21.04.19467.24274@arrl.org>...
> On Sun, 13 Apr 2003 21:06:33 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > It means if a government official, elected official, or militrary person
> > wants to be critical of certain press coverage,
>
> One example I gave was of an Administration official being critical of
> press coverage. The other examples had nothing to do with press coverage.

You might want to read what Ron Reagan (son of the former Pres) has to
say about our current President:

http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2003/04/14/ron_reagan/index_np.html
>
> > The French built a nucleur facility, Russian night vision goggles have
> > been found, etc.
>
> The French nuclear facility was built in the 1970's. During the 1980's,
> the US gave the Iraqis chemical and biological weapons agents. How can
> you hold the French to account but not the US?

'Specially since the French did it before SH was in power...
>
> >> I'd want those contracts to go to the lowest-price qualified bidder.
> >> It's mostly our money being spent, after all.
> >
> > As determined by who? The UN?
>
> As determined by anyone who can read a bid proposal.

Which could very well reward countries like France and Germany for not
backing up the coalition.
>
> >> Bill, that is bunk. It's not our democracy and freedom they hate, it's
> >> that we are the torch bearers for what they see as centuries of Western
> >> repression. The Crusades are more than dusty history in the Muslim
> >> world, and they view Israel and US support for Israel as being more of
> >> the same.
> >
> > The extremists of the OBL cause hate us for exactly the reason I stated.
> > Do you realize that Kim wouldn't even have a voice in this
> > discussion if OBL's mindset held the day.
>
> OBL and crowd do not represent the entire Muslim world any more than Tim

> McVeigh represents America.

Or the Spanish Inquisition, the KKK, or Jonestown represent all
Christians.
>
> >> I think they're off-base there, but that's how they see it nonetheless.
> >> If the US were a despotic regime but still had exhibited the policies
> >> toward the Arab world of the past 50+ years, they would hate us just as
> >> much.
> >
> > BUT, the US is NOT a despotic regime...so your comment makes no sense.
>
> The point is that it's our behavior toward the Middle East that many in
> the Muslim world hate. Do you see crowds in the streets of Damascus and
> Cairo demonstrating against the democracies in Sweden, India or Japan, for
> example? No, because those places don't materially affect the lives of
> Arabs. The US does.

Exactly. Those places either have no dealings with them, or just buy
oil, sell their wares, and keep mum about everything else.
>
> >> If
> >> you don't understand that you simply haven't bothered to find out what
> >> they are thinking. The "they hate our freedom" argument is just foolish
> >> pandering.
> >
> > Tell that to the women in Iraq, Syria and several other countries. Tell
> > that to the non-Muslims in those countries.

I know some people (women and men) who live or have lived in Syria and
Kuwait. While some of them don't like every aspect of those societies
and culture, they like it better there than in the USA. They could
leave any time but they choose to stay, in part because they see the
USA as decadent and immoral. Remember that their views are largely
shaped by American TV and movies. Does every American live, talk and
behave like the characters on "Friends", "Will & Grace", etc.?
>
> The powerful there don't want certain freedoms in their own countries.
> That doesn't mean they give a damn about freedom in ours.

They also sometimes have a different definition of freedom vs.
license.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2545. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 17:32:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9AF0B4.41DF3496@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64733

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> >> Heck, even our disabled veterans are largely ignored
> >> and discarded.
> >
> > What are you offering as proof for such a statement?
>
> The many articles over the last twenty to thirty years describing
> treatment of disabled veterans in VA hospitals and so on. The personal
> experiences of both me and my wife (both disabled veterans). Discussions
> with literally thousands of disabled veterans during our many interactions
> with the VA over the years.

While the VA doesn't have unlimited resources, I've not met anyone else
but you who claims that disabled vets are discarded or fogotten. I have
heard complaints that the bureaucracy takes too much time and that the
wait for services can be long.

> > I have plenty of familiarity with its grandpappy,
> > the Daisy Cutter and tell you exactly when such a
> > weapon woud be used. The U.S. has not employed the
> > MOAB in Iraq. The only scenario in which it would
> > be used is out in open terrain if large numbers of
> > Iraqi soldiers massed. That is not likely to
> > happen. (snip)
>
> The deployment of that weapon to Iraq was discussed in a military press
> briefing just a few days ago. Since, at that time, the Iraqi troops in open
> terrain had long been defeated, leaving only troops in towns and cities, the
> ultimate purpose of that deployment remains unexplained.

I just explained the purpose of deployment. If no troops mass in open
terrain, the weapon won't be used. Why do you have a problem with the
weapon being deployed?

Dave K8MN

2546. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 17:37:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9AF1B1.360C8111@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64734

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > Are you telling us that no pattern of predictable
> > behavior by the USG toward defeated enemies can
> > be seen from our past actions?
>
> You mean the USA? No, there is no predictable pattern of helping our
> enemies following our many military involvements. We did not after WWI. We
> did following WWII and Korea (South Korea). We did not following the Bay of
> Pigs (Cuba), Vietnam, Lebanon, Grenada, Panama, Somalia, Serbia, or the
> first US/Iraq war. Heck, there is not even a predictable pattern of helping
> those we sided with after some conflicts (Afghanistan, for example).
>
> > Why, Dwight, that would be providing an answer
> > about what we're likely to do in the future
> > *grin*. You and I aren't likely to participate
> > in making decisions about the next step so such
> > talk would be a waste of time.
>
> You asked for evidence of the future, Dave ("I asked Dwight if he had any
> evidence..."). No, I don't have "evidence" of what we would do in the
> future. And, since you know I cannot possibly have evidence of that,
> ignoring that question is not "ducking the bullet." However, we can discuss
> the next step - a discussion and evidence are two different things.

Play along, Dwight. Re-read what you wrote to Brian K. (I believe)
about predicting the future. Your comment about what we should be doing
followed it.

You can discuss all you like. Do you think anyone in government is
likely to ask your opinion about what the next step to be taken
regarding Iraq?

Dave K8MN

2547. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 17:39:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9AF265.32331AC1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64735

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> We're playing a game of global brinkmanship that has a growing
> chance of getting us all killed.

Oh Puh-leeze, Dwight. Your hand wringing and nail biting is almost more
than I can bear.

Dave K8MN

2548. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 17:45:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9AF432.2C2CE4E0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64736

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > Are you telling us that no pattern of predictable
> > behavior by the USG toward defeated enemies can
> > be seen from our past actions?
>
> You mean the USA? No, there is no predictable pattern of helping our
> enemies following our many military involvements. We did not after WWI. We
> did following WWII and Korea (South Korea).

Did we occupy and set up a puppet government in Germany following WWI?
Did we set out to punish the German people?

> We did not following the Bay of
> Pigs (Cuba), Vietnam, Lebanon, Grenada, Panama, Somalia, Serbia, or > the first US/Iraq
war.

Please refer to my words "defeated enemy". We did not defeat Cuba or
Lebanon or Vietnam. We removed a dictator in Panama. We did not defeat
Somalia. We did not defeat and occupy Serbia and we did not occupy Iraq
after the cease fire in the first Gulf War. What happened after Grenada
in '83?

> Heck, there is not even a predictable pattern of helping
> those we sided with after some conflicts (Afghanistan, for example).

I didn't ask about helping those we sided with. Siding with someone is
in itself helping.

'tis a different world in which you live.

Dave K8MN

2549. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 17:58:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9AF717.123AEDF9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64737

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E98CDE8.FAB969AE@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E98307C.1E9B847A@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E979162.7A1E40AC@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E96C2E0.CA11EF28@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E95D3BD.C17A360E@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E94E690.28EA89A3@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9243A1.F66483EF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E8E6988.C156457E@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > >
> > > They're
> > > > > > > > > > certainly not on 2m SSB or CW. Len wouldn't know those things. He
> > > > > > > > > > isn't even a ham.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > He's on the web, just like yew.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > That has nothing to do with amateur radio.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > So you have nothing to do with amatuer radio as well? I haven't
> > > > > > > > > logged you since 1991.

> > > > > >
> > > > > > I haven't logged W1AW in years but I know the station is on the air.
> > > > > > It is licensed. I'm licensed. You're licensed. Len isn't licensed.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Yet somehow you are able to communicate with Len. I wonder how that
> > > > > > can be if he isn't licensed in the amateur radio service?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I don't communicate with Len on the 2m ham band.
> > > > >
> > > > How do you do it?
> > >
> > Wires. Len's a big landline man. But you drift. We're talking about
> > the absence of the new Techs on 2m, not of Len's internet activity.
>
> No, you redirected the thread to talk of Len Anderson. If you didn't
> want to talk about Len Anderson, why did you bring him into this?

No, I didn't redirect the thread. I mentioned Len Anderson. You
decided that the internet had something to do with 2m.

> > > > > > Maybe this isn't ham radio?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You've taken a wrong turn somewhere. I stated that Len doesn't know
> > > > > > what goes on 2m FM as he isn't a licensed ham.
> > > > >
> > > > > 2M is not personal cell phone communications. It can be legally
> > > > > monitored in America. License not required.
> > >
> > > I don't believe that Len is monitoring 2m. I'm sure he isn't doing it
> > > around Pittsburgh, Columbus or Cincinnati.
>
> How can you be sure?

There'd be that part where he is in California.

> > > > > > You just jumped to another wrong conclusion. You also listed speeds of
> > > > > > 12-40 wpm. All of those are somewhat higher than ten wpm.
> > > >
> > > > > > You are free to choose. If you cannot make a decision, too bad for
> > > > > > you.
> > > >
> > > > You're right. I am free to choose. I have chosen. You still jumped to
> > > > an incorrect conclusion.
>
> You have not chosen. You can make your choice now, if you like.

Certainly I've chosen, Brian. I've just not communicated my choice to
you. That isn't likely to happen. Maybe I'll do so after you've
communicated the answers to those questions posed to you which you told
us are "too hard".

> > All you really need to know is that someone whose maximum morse speed is
> > only five words per minute is not proficient (skilled, expert) in the
> > use of morse.

> Ah, yes. The Extra tells the lesser class ham to sit down and shutup.
> That's what rrap is all about, isn't it?

That doesn't make any sense. Do you post while standing up? I figured
you were already seated and I don't have much hope that you have the
sense to shut up. It isn't really about license class, Brian. It is
about you.

Dave K8MN

2550. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 18:13:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9AFA93.67A5F85E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64738

Vito wrote:

> What irks me is Morse - the requirement, not the mode. I'd be downright
> PO'd if I showed up to see Old Faithful but had to prove I could start a
> fire with flint & steel in, say, 30 seconds befor I was allowed into the
> park.
>
> 73 K3DWW

No license is required to "see" all the ham bands you'd like. I don't need a license to listen to a broadcast station. I'd need one to operate one. I don't need an amateur license to listen to the ham bands, I'd need one to operate in the ham bands. Luckily for you, no test of any kind is required to see Old Faithful.

Since it appears that morse testing will go by the wayside in the course of time, why worry about it?

Dave K8MN

2551. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 18:24:25 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9AFCD9.D8949D40@crosslink.net>
Source record: 64730

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> I read it, and I agree with him. Most 'hams' today are not only freeloaders
> on the work and sweat of those before, they have no concept at all that this
> is not a hobby. Its a service.
>
> We exist because of our demonstrated capabilities in providing emergency
> communications. For little to NO COST to the public.
>
> Thats why were here. Not to chat on 20 about uncle arthur paying you a
> visit last night.
>

Please read <http://www.fema.gov/library/civilpg.shtm> FEMA's guidelines for Radio Amateur Emergency Service (RACES). I am a RACES Operator for two counties. I maintain a packet node/bbs on floated batteries 24/7 for ARES. I have a working repeater that will be installed at a Government site as soon as the memo of understanding gets signed off. Our local ARES group has worked field day out of my motorhome parked at the county EOC for the past two years. Ditto a major Government exercise in an adjacent county. So, I am hardly a freeloader.

That said, let me disagree with the idea that one *must* provide emergency comm's to enjoy the *hobby*. I do it because I like doing it. If you don't, that's fine.

The radio spectrum is public property, just like public lands. Last I looked there were millions of acres of these lands set aside for *recreation*. Thats right, all of those national and state parks and forests are there for us to enjoy. IMHO, the same goes for the Amateur bands. Many of us derive enjoyment from providing comm's services to others - from disaster management org.'s to clubs running Special Olympics - but if your pleasure runs more to rag chewing or contesting - hey, be my guest.

What irks me is Morse - the requirement, not the mode. I'd be downright PO'd if I showed up to see Old Faithful but had to prove I could start a fire with flint & steel in, say, 30 seconds befor I was allowed into the park.

73 K3DWW

2552. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 18:35:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7ev63lfk1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64739

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BABFEF4E.16D0D%stewart@say.net...
> "Bill Sohl" wrote:
>
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote:
> >>
> >> (snip) they are in fact nothing more than Iraq's
> >> military - man and women who became soldiers for
> >> the same reasons soldiers all over the world do.
> >> They have no more say in their government than
> >> soldiers elsewhere do (even less if you believe
> >> they were as oppressed as claimed) and their
> >> motives are no less honorable then soldiers
> >> elsewhere.
> >
> > (snip) As to your claim that the rest of the Iraq
> > military were just the same as other forces...well,
> > let's just agree to disagree. In fact, many (most?)
> > were conscripted...in stark contrast to the 100%
> > volunteer US military.
>
>
> I did not claim they were "just the same as other forces," Bill. What I
> said was that they, "became soldiers for the same reasons soldiers all
over
> the world do." You continue to point to their conscription. Do conscripted
> soldiers have "more say in their government" or are they "less honorable
> then soldiers elsewhere" because of it? Remember that millions of
Americans
> were conscripted into prior conflicts when answering that.

The bottom line is that they (the Iraqi soldiers) are/were on the
wrong side of justice, freedom, etc. They were defending tyranny,
injustice, torture, oppresion, and just about every other
act of evil one can imagine.

> > (snip) Many of the Iraqi military apparently had no
> > problems with acts of torture, etc. but I guess
> > they were just following orders.
>
> Most in the Iraqi military were not involved in torture.

And your source for that fact is?

> > They all could have just surrendered too. No surrender,
> > then they faced the consequences.
>
> No kidding? Perhaps they thought the honorable thing to do was defend
> their country instead - even if they died doing so.

Many apparently saw the light and left rather than defend the
tyranny. Those that didn't often paid the price. There's
nothing good about that, it is just the way things are.
How many Germans, Japanese, Italians died during WW2
defending evil regimes.

> >> Our soldiers are dying there. Again, not something to
> >> shout for joy over.
> >
> > Agreed, and we all are unhappy about that.
>
> Bill, perhaps I missed it, but I haven't heard you utter even a single
> word of sorrow over the deaths in this conflict. Instead, you seem to be
> shouting for joy over this bloodbath we call war. Even here you couldn't
say
> even a word of sorrow, only that you were "unhappy" about it. Well, I'm
> certainly glad you're not happy about it.

What do you want me to do? It is tragic that eveil people
and regimes bring about the deaths of so many people.
I'm unhappy to see that anywhere...beyond that, what do
you want from me or anyone else?

> > Have you followed the news at all? Are all the journalists
> > falsly reporting?
>
> The journalists are only getting access to very limited slices of this
> conflict - often events staged solely for their benefit (such as the
statue
> of Saddam torn down by Iraqi civilians - driving the US Marine tank, of
> course).

Yup, the whole thing was scripted for jouralists.
If that's your mindset, there's no reason to discuss
further.

> > The number of inocent civilians sure isn't of any numebrs
> > that have caused the bulk of Iraq to be glad we have
> > liberated them.
>
> Bill, all we've seen are looters in the streets,

So the looting was staged for the journalists?

> Kurds in the North,

They seem to be doing a good job there.

> and
> participants of events staged for the cameras (such as the statue
> above). We have no idea what the "bulk of Iraq" feels.

You are obvioulsy not watching much of the reporting. Have you
read the "change of heart" story of a minister who went to Iraq
to be a "human shield" and heard first hand from Iraqi's that
they (the Iraqi's) wanted the war to come?

> > Other than the MOAB, what other massive ordinance
> > troubles you? Where was it used?
>
> The one, two, and three thousand pound bombs dropped on Baghdad, for
> example.

So? They were all targeted towards military and gvernment
targets. They were very accurate too...or do you just ignore
that.

> And we have no idea of how many of these were dropped in other
> towns, or what other ordinance was used - again the limited press access.

Bunk again...the cameras were rolling in many places. We all watched
downtown Bagdad get hits. Your claim of limited press
is totally bogus.

> > Probably over 1000 reporters, photogs, etc
> > covering the war and you don't think that is
> > "seeing"?
>
> You know exactly what I'm talking about - the topic raised in this and
> previous threads (the thousands of dead and injured, including our own
> soldiers).

The "thousands" of dead appear to be limited to the Iraqi
military. That's a sad loss of life, but that is the possible fate
any military faces. The alternative, taken by many it seems,
was to abondon their cause. Those that did are alive.

As to our own, we are lucky the numbers are low.
I mourn the loss of any coalition soldiers.

> Instead, we get nice still pictures of our dead flashed on the
> television screen, with no pictures of their mangled
> bodies - the REALITY of war.

Do you think people don't understand the horrors of war?
Must you graphically display it to satisfy your demands for
such coverage?

> Again, if America is going to scream for war, it should have
> the balls to see the results.

You are demanding a level of graphic display that isn't
even done with auto accidents and/or victims

of other incidents. Should the press should have shown the dead bodies of the people that jumped from the Trade Center on 911 so we could all better understand the horror of the terrorists acts?

Bill K2UNK

2553. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 18:43:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7evn9iet1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64740

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hdaz418.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Sun, 13 Apr 2003 21:06:33 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >It means if a government official, elected official, or militrary
> >person wants to be critical of certain press coverage, that's
> >as much their right as the press has a right to report.
> >Just because someone is elected or accepts public office,
> >they don't lose their rights to opine as to press reporting.
>
> Oh, I certainly believe in that, but the reality was that for
> the time that I was with the Feds I certainly was a second-class
> citizen in that regard.

I can somewhat understand that...much the same as
any employee speaking for their company. Elected
officials and many appointed officials are often
expected to interact with the press. Likewise, those
in the military at the top have a direct interaction with the
press.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2554. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 18:44:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7f0eb$v6a$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64801

"No CW Test" <nocwtest@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030414042656.12142.00000128@mb-fr.aol.com...
> In article <b7d1nm$hi3$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Tell that to the non-Muslims in those countries.
>
> Tariq Aziz is/was a Chaldean Christian

An apparent anomaly in the regime. Obvioulsy not
a person that exhibited Christian ethics either.

Bill K2UNK

2555. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 18:50:51 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.14.18.50.51.311159.15263@arrl.org>
Source record: 64742

On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 13:06:57 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>
> You might want to read what Ron Reagan (son of the former Pres) has to
> say about our current President:
>
> http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2003/04/14/ron_reagan/index_np.html

He may not feel that the Bush administration can speak for his Father, but I'm not sure he can, either. The acorn didn't fall particularly close to the tree in the case of Ron Reagan, so I'm not sure how special his insight into his father's Administration is. And he admits he doesn't know W. well at all. There are people close to the Bush administration who also were close the Reagan administration. I suspect their opinions would be more informed, but we'll probably have to wait until W. is out of office to get their unvarnished views.

>> The French nuclear facility was built in the 1970's. During the 1980's,
>> the US gave the Iraqis chemical and biological weapons agents. How can
>> you hold the French to account but not the US?
>
> 'Specially since the French did it before SH was in power...

Good point.

>> >> I'd want those contracts to go to the lowest-price qualified bidder.
>> >> It's mostly our money being spent, after all.
>> >
>> > As determined by who? The UN?
>>
>> As determined by anyone who can read a bid proposal.
>
> Which could very well reward countries like France and Germany for not
> backing up the coalition.

It would possibly reward French and German companies for being more efficient. What, we don't believe in the free market any more? (Not that I'm naive enough to think that we believed in it in the first place.)

>> The powerful there don't want certain freedoms in their own countries.
>> That doesn't mean they give a damn about freedom in ours.
>
> They also sometimes have a different definition of freedom vs. license.

Another good point.

Jon

2556. Re: On a lighter note....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 18:52:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414145213.11221.00000202@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 64744

In article <b7e7j2$d7hfl$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>So... since we never can get away from the code issue, are the Iraqi people
>pro-coders??
>
>Just kidding..... couldn't resist!

:-)

2557. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 18:52:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414145217.11221.00000203@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 64749

In article <b7e7it$d7hfl$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>I would like to see a compiled list of technologies/equipment developed by
>the amateur community that we enjoy today..... (Kinda like the inventions
>we are reminded about during black history month...)

ARRL can rerun a LOT of OLD material on that. Copyright free
so it doesn't cost the membership anything extra. :-)

>I wonder how long that list would be. For example, the MDT's (mobile data
>terminals) in police cars could be an example of such. Basically it is
>packet radio of sorts...

In mobile radio applications, the commercial and civil government
applications were first. Police two-way radio was pioneered
before WW2 and amply demonstrated during WW2 using FM on
VHF in extremely harsh environments.

Both time- and frequency-multiplexing techniques were again
pioneered by commercial and military applications, the telephone
companies seldom mentioned although they were first in using
SSB techniques (both in wireline and radio). Multichannel radio
relay, born in WW2, proved that up to 8 separate voice channels
could exist on the same radio circuit without interference with
one another. That grew to dozens of voice channels (and many
more teleprinter channels) on the new microwave cross-country
radio relay installed just after WW2. Single-channel SSB was
proved first by the US military for the Strategic Air Command.

The "etymology" of various communications techniques is a
history-dig exercise that can only be done over the entirety of
all radio communications services. ALL of radio is in an
on-going evolutionary period now, ever since its birth as a
communications medium in 1896.

As for data terminals in mobile applications, that requires a
James Burke sort of "Connections" viewing, done without bias.
The first widespread application of data over "another" medium
might be the closed-caption text transmission on broadcast
television. That text rides as ASCII digital characters in the
vertical blanking interval, one character group every 1/60th of
a second in the US NTSC system. That wasn't economically
possible until semiconductors had arrived in sufficiently low
prices by the end of the 1960s. The first data-computer
terminals as we recognize them today were also made

possible by semiconductors (and, certainly, integrated circuits). Since such terminals operate at low voltages for everything but the CRT, it was a natural for operation at the low primary power voltages in vehicle electrical systems.* Cathode ray tubes, one of the last still-used vacuum tube types, is still bulky and something of a power hog, not very good for mobile operations...but the LCD screen is very low power and was available in 1970. Plasma display screens were also available but then quite expensive and limited to military applications.

Packet radio was born in the common-carrier area of communications. Research "ALOHA" for one method that was studied extensively (and written up) in the 1970s. Since teleprinters already had four decades of experience over radio, adaptation of higher-rate teleprinting (now known as "data") over radio was a technological shoe-in. The Teletypewriter Exchange system (TWX) already permitted "dial-up" from the teleprinter direct to another teleprinter. Modems were born around 1960 or so and permitted the ARPANET to exist in a computer complex to computer complex net environment. ARPANET itself was an outgrowth of many different comm applications and eventually evolved into today's Internet.

The communications networks of today are highly dependent on both hardware and software of the Information Technology (IT) field of electronics. They have long since outgrown the bulky, noisy teleprinters that ruled written communications by radio-electricity between 1920 and 1970. Radio is merely a carrier of the mobile data terminal signal today and that can be done by dozens of ways, including coexistance with voice communications on the same circuit. See the various WLAN implementations of today for an example of a slightly-different method of communicating digital information interference-free over short distances within the same bandwidth.

Packet radio, as most radio amateurs know it, is an outgrowth of the simple single-channel RTTY circuit done in the 1930s. By 1950 there existed four time-multiplexed TTY circuits on the same RF carrier using tube technology. [SSB of the 1930s could already handle up to 16 TTY channels plus a voice channel simultaneously but was essentially frequency-multiplexed] With the advent of semiconductors, not only were bigger mainframe computers possible but also the small single-user computers, plus modems, plus software easily adaptable to the type of communications carrier mode, higher-rate terminals, larger random-access memory and mass-memory storage, and finally, the personal computer itself. The personal computer made the BBS or Bulletin Board System possible for message exchange and that evolved into BBS networks developed by computer hobbyists. Such BBS networks were

adaptations of already-existing technology (ARPANET again)
and were the predecessor of present-day Internet newsgroups.

As to position-location technology used by some radio amateurs,
that had several origins beginning around 1967. GPSS grew out
of the USN Navstar program that began testing about 1970. GPS
is the heart of every present-day position-locating device used by
civilians and military alike...including the growing "OnStar" service
for certain civilian vehicles.

What seems to be overlooked by so many (overly-proud) radio
amateurs is the trial by a wireline communications medium. An
example is the real-time EKG (or ECG if you prefer) waveform
transmission. That was done first on an ordinary telephone
circuit. It was then adapted to be a subcarrier on an existing
FM mobile-fixed voice radio. Wireline and radio means may be
mixed since the EKG transmission-reception was designed to
do that. The importance there is that remote EKG monitoring
is possible, not in the way it is done.

SSB was born on wireline communications as a means to put
several voice circuits on a single pair of wires on a long-distance
path. That grew into putting several voice channels on a single
radio circuit...along with a dozen-plus teleprinter channels. The
final evolution was the single-user SSB radio for HF voice now
enjoyed by both radio amateurs, private and commercial boat
owners/captains, and long-distance air carriers.

Manual telegraphy was born on wireline communications. 1844
is one year, the first year a city-to-city telegraph circuit was
finished and proven. It didn't begin on radio. Early radio of the
1896 to 1920 era was so primitive that only on-off keying was
possible to send any information whatsoever by a radio means.

The modern radio era is still evolving and many kinds of
communications means with it. That progress and the
implementation of such progress is done by industry and
academia, sponsored sometimes by governments, and
eventually used or discarded by the majority of its users.

2558. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 18:52:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414145218.11221.00000204@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 64750

In article <20030413202818.01663.00000276@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/13/2003 6:58 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030413195848.18724.00000601@mb-fn.aol.com>
>
>>Once in a while someone asks for volunteers for something, but I don't know
>>why they need Hams for that.
>
> Maybe because they need trained radio operators who possess skills and
>assets they don't...???

Are DX-ing and ragchewing "skills and assets" useful in emergency communications? :-)

> Maybe we can just hire a bunch of Waffle House waitresses to "call out"
>the messages through megaphones instead?

Their customers will do... :-)

>>Most Hams use the bands to play. Mostly for contesting, working DX, etc.
Skill
>>building for emergency comm. is usually not discussed.
>
> Once again you "Open Mouth Insert Foot".
>
> Would you care for examples nationwide, or just in your "neighborhood",
>Vipul?

Tsk, tsk, tsk...how about some examples without generalities of Steamy's "emergency comms?"

Is that going to be another "seven hostile actions" claim?

>>The most that will be
>>done is preparation for Field Day. Amateur radio is a playland, in which
you're
>>on your own.
>
> In which you MAY be on your own, if you so choose. Otherwise you amy
>participate in any oen of the dozens of nets, ARES or RACES training or
drills,
>or jsut sit and listen.

Ah, Steamy thinks he is some sort of "gunnery sergeant" in the
ARS again. :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk, more rage in typing again. :-)

>>I know of one repeater club. Unfortunately, I'm too worn out from the other
>>clubs I've been to, to try to sign up. I don't believe it would work out.
>
> Just as well. Your reputation may preceed you.

Yes, Shah doesn't think in your particular "code:" For the corps,
god, and country. In that order.

>>Also, others have made promises, which they then seem to be too busy or
>>something else comes up.
>
> Such as?

Explain why you haven't done more...other than be in lots of
"hostile actions" in here.

>>However, Hams will take a day off just to attend a
>>Hamfest. Its really a matter of priorities.
>
> Such as?

Tsk, tsk, tsk...Steamy has to get another life...the present one is
way too narrow... :-)

>>Skill building clubs do not exist. Help in antenna setup, tuning antennas and
>>receivers, troubleshooting circuits, etc do not exist.
>
> Wrong.

They are in every city, every town, every neighborhood, every block?

:-)

>>Homebrewing clubs do not exist.
>
> Probably wrong, when one considers that the numerous QRP clubs all
promote
>homebrewing (although not thier prime focus). Even more wrong when one
>considers that many high school "clubs" promote education through
"homebrewing"
>and other such projects.
>
> If you want a club for EXCLUSIVE homebrewing topics, quit yer bellyachin'
>and get it done. Your excuses are exhausted.

Kiss our yes. :-)

2559. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 18:52:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414145219.11221.00000205@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 64748

In article <b7e7j1$d7hfl$7@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Lemme see if I have it then..... you guys (drafted or not) were put into a
>bullsh*t war/police action with a ton of crap and tactics and you still
>served proudly, are tramatized to various extents (depending on the person)
>and recieved little to no credit for serving the armed services upon return.
>Is this pretty close? (will try to figure better wording later....)

Ryan, thank you for your support. <salute>

I volunteered and served 8 years in the US Army, 3 of those years
doing HF-VHF-UHF-microwave communications as assigned in
Tokyo just after the Occupation was over. That was not, in any
way "traumatizing" to me, just part of my life experience.

I received little "credit" from the USA due to some idiotic
bureaocracy involved in changing majors ("G.I.Bill" education).
I've received NEGATIVE CREDIT in here from a couple of
NON-VETERANS (never-served total rear-area widgets) for
doing professional HF communications...while all they've done
is amateur radio on HF using an archaic, simplistic, slow-speed
communications mode...and then demand that ALL amateurs
must follow their example of "excellence" in amateurism.

Phrased another way, quite unkindly since that is what their
attitude deserves, those two examples are simply so full of
themselves, their arrogance, their elitism, that it lends a
great deal of negativism about a hobby, a recreational
activity involving radio.

>As I said before here, I may not support or believe in prior wars or police
>actions and the idiot politicians engaging them, but I proudly support those
>that served!

Good on you! As one who actually served IN the military, I'll
give you an e-version of a thank-you handshake. Sincerely.

There's a number of places around the USA where such
veterans cannot possibly shake hands...with anyone. Those
have symbols on the ground where they now rest.

>Since I am currently not involved in the armed services right
>now, but in emergency services domestically, I feel the best I can do is to
>do my job the best I can, and in my free time do EVERYTHING within my
>capabilities to help the families the soldiers have left behind here...

Good spirit! Way to go!

>Support our troops, and thier families!
>
>(and no... this is not an attempt to "kiss ass", it is truly how I feel and
>anyone that knows me locally will back this up)

There are several participants in here who have "all the answers"
for everything...yet have NO experience in "solving problems" on
geopolitics yet they will expound on such as if they were the UN
themselves. In one way it is amusing, but it is also tragic...they
are the same ones who insist that all in a radio hobby do
exactly as they say or be subject to some kind of "censure" for
speaking against them. They are the lawgivers, the "Moses"
come down from the mountain with the tablets (an aspirin
surrogate). :-)

Leonard H. Anderson
ex-RA16408336, US Army 1952-1960

2560. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 18:52:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414145220.11221.00000207@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 64745

In article <d22b54c3.0304131724.2c8bb01f@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> No translation necessary...
>
>(radio crackles to life) "Hold yer fire, disengage, disengage, he's
>just a rear widget vet from another century! (squelch tail).

Another NON-VETERAN heard from...

Polish.

2561. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 18:52:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414145220.11221.00000206@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 64747

In article <20030414062620.11494.00000155@mb-fa.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>>(radio crackles to life) "Hold yer fire, disengage, disengage, he's
>>just a rear widget vet from another century! (squelch tail).
>>
>(radio crackles to life) "Roger that, not worth the ordnance" (squelch tail).

QRM. TWO absolutely NEVER-SERVED "veterans" heard from.

What does Jimmie know of "ordinance?"

What does Kellie know of "ordinance?"

If there ever were "two rear-area widgets" then Kellie and Jimmie
are PRIME EXAMPLES.

Polish.

2562. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 18:52:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414145221.11221.00000209@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 64743

In article <3E9A3E3E.5ADBF83@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Vipul,
>
>Your square-headed, nonsensical posts about amateur radio being
>different from ham radio, about amateur radio being "sometimes referred
>to as a cult and about people who can copy fifteen word per minute morse
>not being able to copy five wpm are beginning to grate on my
>sensibilities.
>
>Dave K8MN

Poor baby. :-)

2563. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 18:52:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414145221.11221.00000208@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 64746

In article <20030413205906.04143.00000082@mb-fb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <b79953tdc1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>>Add Peter Arrnett to my list of traitors and
>>pond scum.
>
>Bill,
>
>Do not judge Arnett too harshly until the full story is out.
>
>In today's Phila. Inquirer, there's a story about how CNN and other
journalists
>were harrassed, threatened, tortured and killed by SH's regime. They kept much
>of what went on hushed up because of threats and reprisals to those still
>in-country, as well as translators, sources, crewmen, etc.

Is Peter Arnett pro-code or anti-code? :-)

2564. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 18:56:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7f0ec$v6a$2@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64802

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.04.14.12.21.04.19467.24274@arrl.org...
> On Sun, 13 Apr 2003 21:06:33 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > It means if a government official, elected official, or militrary person
> > wants to be critical of certain press coverage,
>
> One example I gave was of an Administration official being critical of
> press coverage. The other examples had nothing to do with press coverage.
>
> > that's
> > as much their right as the press has a right to report. Just because
> > someone is elected or accepts public office, they don't lose their
> > rights to opine as to press reporting.
>
> Who said they did? I was objecting to what they said, not to their right
> to say it.

Why then do you object to their opinion?

> > The French built a nucleur facility, Russian night vision goggles have
> > been found, etc.
>
> The French nuclear facility was built in the 1970's. During the 1980's,
> the US gave the Iraqis chemical and biological weapons agents. How can
> you hold the French to account but not the US?
>
> >> I'd want those contracts to go to the lowest-price qualified bidder.
> >> It's mostly our money being spent, after all.
> >
> > As determined by who? The UN?
>
> As determined by anyone who can read a bid proposal.

Fair enough.

> >> Bill, that is bunk. It's not our democracy and freedom they hate, it's
> >> that we are the torch bearers for what they see as centuries of Western
> >> repression. The Crusades are more than dusty history in the Muslim
> >> world, and they view Israel and US support for Israel as being more of
> >> the same.
> >
> > The extremists of the OBL cause hate us for exactly the reason I stated.
> > Do you realize that Kim W5TIT wouldn't even have a voice in this
> > discussion if OBL's mindset held the day.

>
> OBL and crowd do not represent the entire Muslim world any more than Tim
> McVeigh represents America.

I agree...BUT, it is the extremists that are rallying the suicide
bombings. The OBL types are the problem.

> >> I think they're off-base there, but that's how they see it nonetheless.
> >> If the US were a despotic regime but still had exhibited the policies
> >> toward the Arab world of the past 50+ years, they would hate us just as
> >> much.
> >
> > BUT, the US is NOT a despotic regime...so your comment makes no sense.
>
> The point is that it's our behavior toward the Middle East that many in
> the Muslim world hate.

What behavior of ours makes a rational Muslim hate us then?

> Do you see crowds in the streets of Damascus and
> Cairo demonstrating against the democracies in Sweden, India or Japan, for
> example? No, because those places don't materially affect the lives of
> Arabs. The US does.

So let me repeat the question: What do we do that makes
them hate us?

Should we have NOT helped Kuwait 12 years ago?

Should we have not ended the Taliban regime after 911?

> >> If
> >> you don't understand that you simply haven't bothered to find out what
> >> they are thinking. The "they hate our freedom" argument is just foolish
> >> pandering.
> >
> > Tell that to the women in Iraq, Syria and several other countries. Tell
> > that to the non-Muslims in those countries.
>
> The powerful there don't want certain freedoms in their own countries.

And you just accept that?

> That doesn't mean they give a damn about freedom in ours.

Agree completely...and it is a primary objection of those
people, the powerful, to the American way of life, for two reasons...
1. We value individual life, equality and justice...and
2. We have been incredibly successful at implementing it
for over 200 years.

Have we been perfect at it? No, but we've been damn
well better than any other nation at it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2565. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 19:02:22 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuffo@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E9B05BE.8080106@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 64811

Brian wrote:

> Bruce, why can't I take the same easy road to Extra that you took?
>
> You were an Advanced for how long???
>
> What held you back?

He had to wait for the dumbed down test, that was the only way he
could make it.

2566. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 19:05:08 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7f14v$v74$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64803

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030413231824.10704.00000290@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From K4YZ:
>
> > "Amateur Radio" is a radio service regulated by the Federal
Communications
> >Commission with various purposes, those which can be found, but not
limited
> >to,
> >47CFR97.1.
>
> Yes "Amateur Radio" is listed in 47CFR97.1.
>
> Is "Ham Radio" listed in the FCC regs? I believe not. It may (or may not)
say
> something like: as they like to be called. That's not an official term.
>
> There is no <official> term for the word "Ham Radio".
>
> Hams like to dominate the amateur radio service, so they will make the
claim
> that "Ham Radio = Amateur Radio". This will help convert amateur radio to
THEIR
> agenda.

Hams ARE people that hold an FCC license for the Amateur Radio Service.
Do you understand that basic starting point. Ham Radio does equal Amateur
radio. It always did, and always will.

> "Ham" radio is <mostly> amateur radio, but it also is includes a set of
beliefs
> and traditions. Since there often is no logical reason for <some of> these
> traditions or beliefs, it is sometimes referred to as a cult.

Pathetic, really pathetic.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2567. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 19:07:30 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuffo@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E9B06F2.5000406@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 64812

Brian wrote:

>>>
>>
>>I came in late to a media frenzy on Rumsfeld this morning. Something about
>>he hoped Syria would not be a haven for war criminals and terrorists. So,
>>let's see...Syria may be next like Dan said. Then, oh...let's see, probably
>>Iran; next, Libya; next... [not in reference to the Iraq war being another
>>Viet Nam (I think those kind of comments are crap), but more in reference to
>>the US now becoming and remaining an aggressor on nation after nation.
>>
>>Kim W5TIT
>
>
> Makes sense. Why pull our troops out and send them to Korea when we
> could leave them in place a while longer to mop up? Korea has been
> festering for half a century, a couple more months shouldn't make a
> big difference.

After seeing how quickly we moved through Iraq and dispatched
Saddam, these other nations may have second thoughts before making
any careless moves. Korea is now saying they are willing to talk
unilaterally instead of one on one like they have been insisting.

2568. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 19:11:51 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuffo@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E9B07F7.2030605@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 64813

N2EY wrote:

>
> You might want to read what Ron Reagan (son of the former Pres) has to
> say about our current President:

Like who would care or put any stock in what little Ronnie has to say.

2569. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 19:27:22 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414152722.16556.00001016@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 64804

>Because so many have been denied so much, Dave.

No one has been denied, all you had to do was take the test.

2570. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 20:09:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414160925.06237.00000169@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 64805

In article <c2356669.0304140831.4929e156@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030413122652.15869.00000076@mb-cq.aol.com>...
>> In article <20030412145058.23756.00000165@mb-fj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >In article <20030411201751.15821.00000087@mb-cg.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> >(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>> You don't prove anything other than you are a biased
>> morse fanatic.
>
>Only to a biased anti-Morse fanatic like yourself.

You are a biased morse fanatic. QED. :-)

>Who, me? You have more than a dozen posts dated April 13 to this
>thread alone. Looks like obsessive-compulsive behavior......

"Just passing the time of day..." :-)

>Just an opinion.

NO kidding?!? :-)

What are your scribblings in here? Tablets from the mountain?

[acetominophen or acetyl-salicylic acid?]

>Ah - so it's not just the TEST you are against.

...and some hard-nosed arrogant morse fanatics.

>> The subject sub-thread was LICENSING.
>
>Where?
>
>The thread title is "ARS license numbers"

Oh ye of little brains but of many sheepskins... :-)

The NUMBERS can't accumulate if the TESTING isn't done.

>> Hello...? LICENSING involves TESTING.
>

>Not necessarily.

Oh? Check out Part 97 again. :-)

[connect all four synapses and start computing...]

>That's simply not true.

You have that as a macro, don't you? :-)

>So? Almost all maritime users have given up sailing ships. Does that
>mean nobody should use sailboats anymore?

No, they use cheese sandwiches. What else? :-)

>That's a very, very small group of people.

I happen to like cheese sandwiches. Why are you against us
cheese sandwich lovers?

I wouldn't try to design a single circuit with a cheese sandwich.
Maybe you would?

>Projecting your feelings onto another are you?

Nope. You are the one wanting to call a 2N2222 a cheese
sandwich. :-)

Was that what you were taught at that ivy-league academy
many moons ago?

>Tsk, tsk, tsk, Len, I've never seen you practice any "tolerance"
>towards those who don't agree with you. Instead you respond with
>name-calling, insults, factual errors, ethnic/racial/religious slurs,
>excessive emoticons and the usual generalized infantile behavior. Etc.

Waaa...waaa...waaa... :-)

Projecting your feelings on others? :-)

>Practice what you preach.

I don't preach, Reverend Jimmie. No "sermons on the antenna
mount" from me about the glory and majesty of morse.

>> Remember that I was the one who pointed out your ERROR
>> about amazon.com allegedly not being profitable.
>
>It's not an error.

You made an error! You made an error! :-)

>When I wrote about Amazon's profitability, they were losing money.
>Fortunately, that has changed.

It changed over half a year ago. :-)

At the time you wrote it, you were NOT AWARE of what was
happening. :-)

>What correction?

Tsk, tsk, tsk...

>Gee, are you showing us more "tolerance"??

As much as you do... :-)

>I'm not Jewish.

So?

>So? Does that mean I must drop it too?

Drop down and give us ten!

>How do you know? Why are you so fanatical about hating morse USE?

I'm not a "fanatical hater," poor baby. I'm against the morse
TEST.

>> It is on life-support only
>> in amateur radio. AMATEURS.
>
>From the Latin word meaning "to love".

Did your supermarket have a sale on passion fruit this week?

"Amateur" radio: From Part 97 meaning "without pecuniary
interest."

>> Ancient Radiotelegraphy Society. Beepers.
>
>Ah - look at all that TOLERANCE from Len!

Besides beeping, how have I maligned the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
Society? By calling them "ancient" instead of "archaic?"

>So? Are you the censor from the Lanark Street Ministry of Information?
>You have told some of us here to shut up. Is that your idea of
>TOLERANCE? Is that how you support the American ideal of free speech?

The right of free speech is contained in the First Amendment of
the US Constitution. I defend that. Once I took an oath to
defend that Constitution...as the official entrance to US Army
military service.

You never took such an oath. You never served in the US
military.

You neither show nor practice any "tolerance" to those of differing
opinions to yours.

You carry on in here like some ancient noble talking down to
inferiors, one who cannot ever be accused of a single wrong-
doing, mistake, or error.

>Can't you take a little tweak, Len? Seems to me you preach tolerance
>and acceptance but don't do it yourself.

What "little tweak," boy? You into the "noblesse oblige" thing
now?

>> >Since Morse code IS used in amateur radio, it IS useful to amateur radio
>> >operators.
>>
>> NOT to ALL of them.
>
>Nobody said "ALL of them".

Tsk, tsk, tsk...Jimmie can't take a "little tweak!" :-)

>More than a dozen posts in one thread in one day.

Just passing time on a late Sunday morning, boy.

>The subject line is "ARS License Numbers"

Wow! True!

It ain't about Reverend Jimmie preaching to the masses, either.

>The question was about voice modes.

The subject was Reverend Jimmie preaching to the masses on
The Proper Way to Behave. :-)

>Why?

Why not?

>The point is that the maximum throughput you quoted is way too low.

What is your experience as a professional communicator, boy?

Can you sustain throughput at exaggerated rates sending
nothing but five-letter code groups?

How do Q Codes help there?

>Do the teleprinters have fun?

As much as your table lamp does. At times it glows. :-)

>So what? They were still in use in radio communications the late '70s.
>That disproves your claim that:
>
>"The slowest teleprinters in radio communications have been 100 WPM
>for four decades"
>

>Now, be a big machismo man-ums and admit that you made a mistake. You
>posted something that just isn't true. An error.

Kiss my yes, Reverend Jimmie.

I made an error: I tried to post factual information to a radio god,
thinking he might understand a point...which the poor thing did
not and, to get even for being slighted, went after nearly every
sentence with "corrections."

Poor think. Another obsessive-compulsive guru wanna-be.

>You wrote:
>
>"The slowest teleprinters in radio communications have been 100 WPM
>for four decades"
>
>Four decades ago is 1963. If there were slower teleprinters in use in
>radio communications after 1963, you are just plain wrong.

Oh, my yes...WRONG! Advertise that on billboards, write an
article in the National Enquirer!

Each and every post that was ever made is "incorrect!" and
should not be believed!

Forgive me, noble god of (amateur) radio.

>I don't think you have. List them.

Why?

>You're not in amateur radio, Len.

As of this writing I am off-line for an Internet newsgroup.

Where are you?

>Then why all the comparisons?

Why not?

>Where?

When?

>How?

Fried.

>You're describing yourself, again.

No, hungry. Didn't have much lunch. :-)

>Sounds just like you, Len. Tell us again about the 100 wpm
>teleprinters.

Model 28s and 33s made by Teletype Corporation, Chicago?

>Poor baby. Can't you read what I wrote?

I can't understand most of it. :-)

>Do you really think Element 1 is a barrier?

Yes.

>Not at all. I was talking about use, not the test. You just don;t want
>to admit that Morse code is used by anybody.

Watch the haste in typing. You doing this on company time?

You just don't want a single negativism about morse code.

>Sounds like an anti-morse fanatic.

Sounds like you can't keep control in here.

>Sure I do. Lots of them. You just reject them. Not only that, you
>reject the reality that morse is even used.

I reject you as a rational hobbyist and newsgroup participant.

:-)

>No code test for above 30 MHz.

Einstein!!!! :-)

>Is it all about HF to you? Is that what's really bugging you all these
>years - you want access to the HF/MF ham bands, not VHF/UHF? Sure
>seems like it.

Sure seems like Reverend Jimmie keeps spoiling for a FIGHT!

Too bad he didn't enlist in a US military and do REAL
communications.

Too bad he hasn't done any professional radio communications.

Too bad he can't see beyond his own personal interests to that
of others.

Too bad he can't be tolerant of those he perceives as lower class.

The "Gang of Four" title fits. Intolerant, self-righteous worshippers
of morsemanship.

>What IS your problem, Len? The test will be gone when the FCC drops
>it. I've been saying that for over three years now. Big deal. Get over
>it. Grow up, for heaven's sake.

The morse code test is NOT gone, sonny. Still there.

Been there for three years. Been there since 1912.

Morsemen are NOT gods of radio, any radio. Grow up, get
over the fact that you are NOT worshipped for morsemanship.

>Stop being such a one-trick pony. Or part of a pony, anyway. ;-)

Practice TOLERANCE, Reverend Jimmie.

Practice what you demand of others.

Works two ways, boy. Even for morsemen gods.

2571. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 20:18:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414161809.13308.00000189@mb-cj.aol.com>
Source record: 64806

In article <20030414152722.16556.00001016@mb-cd.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>>Because so many have been denied so much, Dave.
>
>No one has been denied, all you had to do was take the test.

...and pay someone $250? :-)

2572. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 20:18:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E9B179D.2030407@psu.edu>
Source record: 64807

N2EY wrote:

>
> Example: If everyone else calls a 2N2222 a transistor, and you insist on
> calling it a cheese sandwich, you're the one who is the cause of confusion.

I know what ya mean Jim! Broke three teeth once bitin' down on one of
the little buggers. 2N2222's are NOT cheese sandwiches!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2573. Re: On a lighter note....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 20:23:29 UTC
From: Hambone the Magnificent <cqcqboooing@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e9b1902@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 64808
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b7e7j2$d7hfl$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> So... since we never can get away from the code issue, are the Iraqi
people
> pro-coders??

YES !!!!

Go Here: http://www.croqueweb.com/
Iraqi Information Minister Mohammed
Saeed Al Sahaf's talking speech and CW
machine !

also see: http://www.croqueweb.com/fan/index.html

(the 75 Meter QRM'ers will have a BALL with this one ho-ho-ho-ho-ho !!!!)

2574. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 20:27:19 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.14.20.27.18.993573.24487@arrl.org>
Source record: 64809

On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 14:56:47 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:pan.2003.04.14.12.21.04.19467.24274@arrl.org...
>> On Sun, 13 Apr 2003 21:06:33 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
>> >
>> > It means if a government official, elected official, or militrary
>> > person wants to be critical of certain press coverage,
>>
>> One example I gave was of an Administration official being critical of
>> press coverage. The other examples had nothing to do with press
>> coverage.
>>
>> > that's
>> > as much their right as the press has a right to report. Just because
>> > someone is elected or accepts public office, they don't lose their
>> > rights to opine as to press reporting.
>>
>> Who said they did? I was objecting to what they said, not to their
>> right to say it.
>
> Why then do you object to their opinion?

Their statements are ad hominem. They are intended to belittle those with whom they disagree rather than argue a case, and I just don't think that's the way public discourse out to be carried out, particularly by those in leadership positions. It has the effect of polarizing the debate, making it harder to reach agreement.

>> OBL and crowd do not represent the entire Muslim world any more than
>> Tim McVeigh represents America.
>
> I agree...BUT, it is the extremists that are rallying the suicide
> bombings. The OBL types are the problem.

Sure. Every society has its problem members.

>> >> I think they're off-base there, but that's how they see it
>> >> nonetheless. If the US were a despotic regime but still had
>> >> exhibited the policies toward the Arab world of the past 50+ years,
>> >> they would hate us just as much.
>> >
>> > BUT, the US is NOT a despotic regime...so your comment makes no
>> > sense.
>>
>> The point is that it's our behavior toward the Middle East that many in

>> the Muslim world hate.
>
> What behavior of ours makes a rational Muslim hate us then?

Our support for Israel is number one on their hit parade. Our support for repressive regimes also garners us no friends -- outside of those regimes themselves. Over the years we have demonstrated a near total lack of concern for the well-being of the inhabitants of the Middle East outside of Israel. The only thing we care about, as far as they can tell, is getting our way -- getting our oil in particular. While their views of the US are somewhat over-the-top (much like our views of them), there is enough truth in them to keep the pot boiling.

The fact is, for all our talk about making the world safe for democracy, what we really mean is making the world safe for America. If in doing so we liberate others, we're happy, of course. But we're perfectly satisfied to leave other peoples in the grip of repressive dictators if it serves our interests to do so. Our words don't always match our deeds, and that's a recipe for generating distrust and hatred.

>> Do you see crowds in the streets of Damascus and Cairo demonstrating
>> against the democracies in Sweden, India or Japan, for example? No,
>> because those places don't materially affect the lives of Arabs. The US
>> does.
>
> So let me repeat the question: What do we do that makes them hate us?
>
> Should we have NOT helped Kuwait 12 years ago?

We should have, but did we do that out of altruism, or did we do it because it was in our own interests? The GHW Bush administration certainly SAID it was a compelling interest of the US.

> Should we have not ended the Taliban regime after 911?

Sure, but again, did we do it for the Afghans or did we do it for our own security? More to the point, if our purpose was to free the Afghanis, why did we wait through years of Taliban repression before acting? In the case of Iraq, why did we wait through 20 years SH before liberating the Iraqi people? Answer: Because it was 20 years before it became in our interest to do so, irrespective of the suffering of the Iraqi people.

>> >> If
>> >> you don't understand that you simply haven't bothered to find out
>> >> what they are thinking. The "they hate our freedom" argument is just
>> >> foolish pandering.
>> >
>> > Tell that to the women in Iraq, Syria and several other countries.
>> > Tell that to the non-Muslims in those countries.
>>
>> The powerful there don't want certain freedoms in their own countries.
>

> And you just accept that?

Define "accept." If you mean am I in favor of overthrowing by force every regime that restricts freedom in any way, no, I'm not. We certainly should encourage more freedom by other means where we can. And in cases where the repression turns exceptionally brutal and where we can intervene by force, I don't have a problem with doing that.

But as Jim said, what's freedom to one person is license to another. We better be very careful about what constitutes freedom worth fighting for. There's no absolute freedom in any society -- ours included -- and what constitutes acceptable limitation of freedom is influenced by culture.

>> That doesn't mean they give a damn about freedom in ours.
>
> Agree completely...

I think you misunderstood me. By "don't give a damn" I meant they don't care one way or the other whether we have freedom in the US, not that they dislike our having freedom in the US.

> and it is a primary objection of those people, the powerful, to the
> American way of life, for two reasons... 1. We value individual life,
> equality and justice...

No, Bill, that's not quite right. The problem is not that we value those things. It's that we value them for us but all too often, not for others. At least, not when valuing them for others is inconvenient for us.

> and 2. We have been incredibly
> successful at implementing it for over 200 years.

I remind you that for its first 89 years the US allowed human slavery. For the next 100 we had legal discrimination against people on the basis of race. Yes, we're getting better at living up to our principles, but we ought not to be looking down our nose at the entire would.

> Have we been perfect at it? No, but we've been damn well better than
> any other nation at it.

Really? The British Empire abolished slavery in 1833 (in the home islands it became illegal in the 1770's). The US didn't abolish it until 1865, and then only after a bloody civil war. Which society was "damn well better" at implementing equality and justice?

As for modern times, can you be explicit as to how we implement our values of life, equality and justice better than, oh, say, Sweden?

Jon

2575. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 20:47:17 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414164717.27755.00000737@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 64810

> ...and pay someone $250? :-)

Your just Mad because you dont even have a License. I think your upset that I made $250. off of Clowns like you who wont even take the test.

2576. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 21:27:09 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.14.21.27.09.402142.6607@arrl.org>
Source record: 64814

On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 14:44:56 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> "No CW Test" <nocwtest@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030414042656.12142.00000128@mb-fr.aol.com...
>> Tariq Aziz is/was a Chaldean Christian
>
> An apparent anomaly in the regime. Obvioulsy not
> a person that exhibited Christian ethics either.

Do you think the others in the regime exhibited Muslim ethics?

Jon

2577. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 21:30:52 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414173052.23282.00000629@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 64815

>He had to wait for the dumbed down test, that was the only way he
>could make it.
>

No, I had to wait till I found a couple Losser CBplussers like Brian to pay me $250.00 to take it. But dont worry I still have not used the EXTRA License and probably never will.

2578. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 21:47:38 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9B2C7A.402EA183@crosslink.net>
Source record: 64741

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> No license is required to "see" all the ham bands you'd like.

Sorry Dave. It never occurred to me that anybody would use that to dodge my meaning but Barnum was right: one should always write to the lowest common denominator. I should have used camping or some other "use" as an example.

> Luckily for you, no test of any kind is required to see Old Faithful.

Why is it lucky Dave? I can start a fire without a bic. I keep the tools in my "possibles" bag. I can also hold 5 out of 5 .45ACP rounds in the 10 ring. These are far more useful skills than Morse, especially since my laptop decodes it faster than you can send it ... if you have a decent fist of course.

>
> Since it appears that morse testing will go by the wayside in the course
> of time, why worry about it?
>
Because so many have been denied so much, Dave.

2579. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 21:53:00 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7faougdq1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64816

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.04.14.21.27.09.402142.6607@arrl.org...
> On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 14:44:56 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "No CW Test" <nocwtest@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030414042656.12142.00000128@mb-fr.aol.com...
> >> Tariq Aziz is/was a Chaldean Christian
> >
> > An apparent anomaly in the regime. Obvioulsy not
> > a person that exhibited Christian ethics either.
>
> Do you think the others in the regime exhibited Muslim ethics?

Nope. That's the irony of Saddam...he was not a religious
fanatic...but he endorsed and supported the extremists.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2580. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 22:06:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7fbbv$5e7$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64817

"JJ" <radiobuffo@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:3E9B06F2.5000406@mailcity.moc...
>
>
> Brian wrote:
>
> >>>
> >>
> >>I came in late to a media frenzy on Rumsfeld this morning. Something
about
> >>he hoped Syria would not be a haven for war criminals and terrorists.
So,
> >>let's see...Syria may be next like Dan said. Then, oh...let's see,
probably
> >>Iran; next, Libya; next... [not in reference to the Iraq war being
another
> >>Viet Nam (I think those kind of comments are crap), but more in
reference to
> >>the US now becoming and remaining an aggressor on nation after nation.
> >>
> >>Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> > Makes sense. Why pull our troops out and send them to Korea when we
> > could leave them in place a while longer to mop up? Korea has been
> > festering for half a century, a couple more months shouldn't make a
> > big difference.
>
> After seeing how quickly we moved through Iraq and dispatched
> Saddam, these other nations may have second thoughts before making
> any careless moves. Korea is now saying they are willing to talk
> unilaterally instead of one on one like they have been insisting.
>
>

Ain't it amazing how a little kick in the 'ass' gets a bully's attention?
Of course they are all wide eyed as a deer in a spotlight. Who would of
thought the great 'paper tiger' would actually fight? Keep up the terrorism
and they aint seen nothing yet.

We are going to have to have a standing army in IRAQ for at least 2 years.
That in itself should be sufficient 'incentive' for Iran and Syria and
Palestine and Saudi Arabia, and ISREAL to get their crap together. If
not....well they KNOW the answer to that one now.

Dan/W4NTI

2581. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 22:07:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7fbdqqhk1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64818

"JJ" <radiobuffo@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:3E9B07F7.2030605@mailcity.moc...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >
> > You might want to read what Ron Reagan (son of the former Pres) has to
> > say about our current President:
>
>
> Like who would care or put any stock in what little Ronnie has to say.
>
Yeah really....then they want you to subscirbe or waste time reading an add
just to finish it up...Gesh.

Dan/W4NTI

2582. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 22:08:43 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7fbg3hnp1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64819

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b7faougdq1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:pan.2003.04.14.21.27.09.402142.6607@arrl.org...
> > On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 14:44:56 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > "No CW Test" <nocwtest@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20030414042656.12142.00000128@mb-fr.aol.com...
> > >> Tariq Aziz is/was a Chaldean Christian
> > >
> > > An apparent anomaly in the regime. Obvioulsy not
> > > a person that exhibited Christian ethics either.
> >
> > Do you think the others in the regime exhibited Muslim ethics?
>
> Nope. That's the irony of Saddam...he was not a religious
> fanatic...but he endorsed and supported the extremists.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

Not until after he figured it was of use to him.

Dan/W4NTI

2583. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 22:14:08 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7fc0geep1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64820

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.04.14.20.27.18.993573.24487@arrl.org...
> On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 14:56:47 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > news:pan.2003.04.14.12.21.04.19467.24274@arrl.org...
> >> On Sun, 13 Apr 2003 21:06:33 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >> >
> >> > It means if a government official, elected official, or militrary
> >> > person wants to be critical of certain press coverage,
> >>
> >> One example I gave was of an Administration official being critical of
> >> press coverage. The other examples had nothing to do with press
> >> coverage.
> >>
> >> > that's
> >> > as much their right as the press has a right to report. Just because
> >> > someone is elected or accepts public office, they don't lose their
> >> > rights to opine as to press reporting.
> >>
> >> Who said they did? I was objecting to what they said, not to their
> >> right to say it.
> >
> > Why then do you object to their opinion?
>
> Their statements are ad hominem. They are intended to belittle those with
> whom they disagree rather than argue a case, and I just don't think that's
> the way public discourse out to be carried out, particularly by those in
> leadership positions. It has the effect of polarizing the debate, making
> it harder to reach agreement.

Frankly, I don't see the press being part of any effort
to reach agreements. They report and that's it.
Your mileage may vary.

> >> OBL and crowd do not represent the entire Muslim world any more than
> >> Tim McVeigh represents America.
> >
> > I agree...BUT, it is the extremists that are rallying the suicide
> > bombings. The OBL types are the problem.
>
> Sure. Every society has its problem members.

I think OBL is a pretty extreme example of a problem
member. OBL isn't just some McVeigh or other serial
killer...OBL fosters suicide bombing on a global basis.

Who else has taken that stance?

> >> >> I think they're off-base there, but that's how they see it
> >> >> nonetheless. If the US were a despotic regime but still had
> >> >> exhibited the policies toward the Arab world of the past 50+ years,
> >> >> they would hate us just as much.
> >> >
> >> > BUT, the US is NOT a despotic regime...so your comment makes no
> >> > sense.
> >>
> >> The point is that it's our behavior toward the Middle East that many in
> >> the Muslim world hate.
> >
> > What behavior of ours makes a rational Muslim hate us then?
>
> Our support for Israel is number one on their hit parade.

So we should NOT support Israel?

> Our support for
> repressive regimes also garners us no friends -- outside of those regimes
> themselves.

That's a point I totally agree with. We are post cold war and we shouldn't
catet to regimes of that ilk any more than CNN should.

> Over the years we have demonstrated a near total lack of
> concern for the well-being of the inhabitants of the Middle East outside
> of Israel.

I think that's an extreme statement and one in which I
don't agree to the extent you indicate.

> The only thing we care about, as far as they can tell, is
> getting our way -- getting our oil in particular. While their views of the
> US are somewhat over-the-top (much like our views of them), there is
> enough truth in them to keep the pot boiling.
>
> The fact is, for all our talk about making the world safe for democracy,
> what we really mean is making the world safe for America. If in doing so
> we liberate others, we're happy, of course. But we're perfectly satisfied
> to leave other peoples in the grip of repressive dictators if it serves
> our interests to do so.

Repeat of my agreement as to not supporting such repressive regimes
at all.

> Our words don't always match our deeds, and that's
> a recipe for generating distrust and hatred.

I agree we have room to improve and this is a good time
to do it.

> >> Do you see crowds in the streets of Damascus and Cairo demonstrating
> >> against the democracies in Sweden, India or Japan, for example? No,
> >> because those places don't materially affect the lives of Arabs. The US
> >> does.
> >
> > So let me repeat the question: What do we do that makes them hate us?
> >
> > Should we have NOT helped Kuwait 12 years ago?
>
> We should have, but did we do that out of altruism, or did we do it
> because it was in our own interests?

What difference does the motive make? Indeed, we can speculate
till hell freezes over and never understand all motives or know
what any of them contributed to all the decisions.

> The GHW Bush administration certainly
> SAID it was a compelling interest of the US.

A point I have no problem with.

> > Should we have not ended the Taliban regime after 911?
>
> Sure, but again, did we do it for the Afghans or did we do it for our own
> security? More to the point, if our purpose was to free the Afghanis, why
> did we wait through years of Taliban repression before acting? In the case
> of Iraq, why did we wait through 20 years SH before liberating the Iraqi
> people? Answer: Because it was 20 years before it became in our interest
> to do so, irrespective of the suffering of the Iraqi people.

So we have two choices then:
Take on all regimes immediately...or never
take them on. If we don't take on a regime
today we forfeit doing so in the future?

> >> >> If
> >> >> you don't understand that you simply haven't bothered to find out
> >> >> what they are thinking. The "they hate our freedom" argument is just
> >> >> foolish pandering.
> >> >
> >> > Tell that to the women in Iraq, Syria and several other countries.
> >> > Tell that to the non-Muslims in those countries.
> >>
> >> The powerful there don't want certain freedoms in their own countries.
> >
> > And you just accept that?
>
> Define "accept." If you mean am I in favor of overthrowing by force every
> regime that restricts freedom in any way, no, I'm not. We certainly should
> encourage more freedom by other means where we can. And in cases where the
> repression turns exceptionally brutal and where we can intervene by force,
> I don't have a problem with doing that.

Works for me...would you not agree that the SH regime was, as you state:
"exceptionally brutal?"

> But as Jim said, what's freedom to one person is license to another. We
> better be very careful about what constitutes freedom worth fighting for.
> There's no absolute freedom in any society -- ours included -- and what
> constitutes acceptable limitation of freedom is influenced by culture.

How far do you let culture influence limitations to individual
freedoms?

> >> That doesn't mean they give a damn about freedom in ours.
> >
> > Agree completely...
>
> I think you misunderstood me. By "don't give a damn" I meant they don't
> care one way or the other whether we have freedom in the US, not that they
> dislike our having freedom in the US.

I disagree. I think many of the extremists absolutely hate
that American women have the rights that they do.
I think they hate the freedoms of expression we allow.

> > and it is a primary objection of those people, the powerful, to the
> > American way of life, for two reasons... 1. We value individual life,
> > equality and justice...
>
> No, Bill, that's not quite right. The problem is not that we value those
> things. It's that we value them for us but all too often, not for others.
> At least, not when valuing them for others is inconvenient for us.

You lost me here. How about an example to make your point.

> > and 2. We have been incredibly
> > successful at implementing it for over 200 years.
>
> I remind you that for its first 89 years the US allowed human slavery. For
> the next 100 we had legal discrimination against people on the basis of
> race. Yes, we're getting better at living up to our principles, but we
> ought not to be looking down our nose at the entire would.
>
> > Have we been perfect at it? No, but we've been damn well better than
> > any other nation at it.
>
> Really? The British Empire abolished slavery in 1833 (in the home islands
> it became illegal in the 1770's). The US didn't abolish it until 1865, and
> then only after a bloody civil war. Which society was "damn well better"
> at implementing equality and justice?

If your only measure you use is slavery, perhaps you're right.
There's much more than racial equality involved.

> As for modern times, can you be explicit as to how we implement our values
> of life, equality and justice better than, oh, say, Sweden?

I see the standard of living, the American justice system, etc.
If Sweden or any other country was better then why do so
many people leave those countries and come to the US?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2584. When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 22:21:39 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414182139.25918.00001330@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 64821

N2EY wrote:
> Example: If everyone else calls a 2N2222 a transistor, and you insist on
> calling it a cheese sandwich, you're the one who is the cause of confusion.

Apparently, there is some confusion here on what is a 2N2222 transistor, compared to a cheese sandwich.

There are those that believe in relative definition. Following this logic, if everyone believed there is no gravity, then gravity would no longer exist. Others believe in scientific proof.

Often words are redefined in a specific setting. The goal of this redefinition is often to control others or to increase their importance. Note that it is not just one person "redefining" words, it is a group. They new definition is often widely accepted, but its still not correct. If everyone jumped off a bridge, would you? Often the people that created the new definition will start to believe their new definition

One example is calling the lowest of tasks an "Engineer". A Component "Engineer" is someone that sorts components in a database, orders them, and (if they are lucky) - updates them with new components. It is a lowly task. Yet, with the word "Engineer" after it, it makes it sound important.

When politicians say that an irrelevant test, such as the MCAS, increases "standards", they only do so to look like they stand for better education. Not knowing what the test is, they may honestly believe the test increases "standards". In reality, it does not increase standards because the information tested is not relevant.

One example is linking the buying of an HF transceiver to "advancement of the radio art", when the <real> goal is to get people to use Morse code. Soon people will forget the original purchase and start to believe that Morse code is "radio art".

Another <overused > example is "no code = no ham, know code = know ham". This is redefining a Ham as someone that knows code. Amateurs that chose not to are not Hams.

Another example is saying when something is "in use", it is useful. Contesters occupy as many bands as possible, and claim that each band is useful. Simply contacting someone and exchanging callsign information is not useful. Maybe useful to that person, but not to the amateur radio hobby.

Redefinition works fine for those with an agenda. Honesty works better for the hobby. So, one should not call cheese sandwiches 2N2222's. It may work fine for a while. Eventually it will be bad for everyone involved. If you are told to do so, you should politely refuse.

2585. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 22:41:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414184121.11012.00000129@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 64822

In article <b7e7j0$d7hfl$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>
>Actually the human brain is much more capable that we as a species are
>utilizing it. Studies estimate at only up to 10 percent usage of the total
>capacity of the brain capabilities by even our most intelligent.

Urban legend. No truth to it. See:

http://www.snopes.com/science/stats/10percnt.htm

73 de Jim, N2EY

2586. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 23:44:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414194409.12142.00000140@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 64823

In article <20030414182139.25918.00001330@mb-fd.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Example: If everyone else calls a 2N2222 a transistor, and you insist on
>> calling it a cheese sandwich, you're the one who is the cause of confusion.
>
>Apparently, there is some confusion here on what is a 2N2222 transistor,
>compared to a cheese sandwich.

Yes, Vipul, you appear to be very confused.
>
>There are those that believe in relative definition. Following this logic, if
>everyone believed there is no gravity, then gravity would no longer exist.

Subjectivism vs. objectivism.

>Others believe in scientific proof.

You're off base again, Vipul.

The existence of things is provable given a few basic assumptions. What humans choose to call these things is purely subjective.

Once upon a time, transistors were called "crystal triodes". Typical bipolar transistors are just that. But that name never caught on, and "transistor" is the term used for about the past 50+ years.
>
>Often words are redefined in a specific setting. The goal of this
>redefinition is often to control others or to increase their importance.

It's for clarity.

>Note that it is
>not
>just one person "redefining" words, it is a group. They new definition is
>often
>widely accepted, but its still not correct.

If a big enough group defines a word a certain way, then that's the definition.

Get used to it, Vipul - that's how languages work.

Would you call yourself a Professional Engineer?

>If everyone jumped off a bridge,
>would you?

Depends on how high the bridge is and how much I'm being paid.

>Often the people that created the new definition will start to
>believe their new definition
>
If a big enough group defines a word a certain way, then that's the definition.

>One example is calling the lowest of tasks an "Engineer". A Component
>"Engineer" is someone that sorts components in a database, orders them, and
>(if
>they are lucky) - updates them with new components. It is a lowly task. Yet,
>with the word "Engineer" after it, it makes it sound important.

Maybe where you work. I'm not a components engineer.
>
>When politicians say that an irrelevant test, such as the MCAS, increases
>"standards", they only do so to look like they stand for better education.
>Not
>knowing what the test is, they may honestly believe the test increases
>"standards". In reality, it does not increase standards because the
>information
>tested is not relevant.

It's called "accountability".
>
>One example is linking the buying of an HF transceiver to "advancement of the
>radio art", when the <real> goal is to get people to use Morse code. Soon
>people will forget the original purchase and start to believe that Morse code
>is "radio art".

You're not making any sense.
>
>Another example is saying when something is "in use", it is useful.

Why? If something has a use, it is useful.

>Contesters
>occupy as many bands as possible, and claim that each band is useful.

If they are not useful, why keep them?

>Simply
>contacting someone and exchanging callsign information is not useful.

Sure it is.

>Maybe
>useful to that person, but not to the amateur radio hobby.

Would you outlaw contests?
>
>Redefinition works fine for those with an agenda.

Your agenda seems to be redefinition of common terms.

>Honesty works better for the
>hobby.

> So, one should not call cheese sandwiches 2N2222's.

I agree!

And one should not claim that there is any difference between "ham radio" and "amateur radio".

One should not claim that "amateur radio" does not require a license.

>It may work fine
>for
>a while. Eventually it will be bad for everyone involved. If you are told to
>do
>so, you should politely refuse.

I politely refuse your attempt to redefine the term "amateur radio".

73 de Jim, N2EY

2587. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 00:26:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414202604.12142.00000141@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 64824

In article <b7f14v$v74$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Hams ARE people that hold an FCC license for the Amateur Radio Service.
>Do you understand that basic starting point. Ham Radio does equal Amateur
>radio. It always did, and always will.

Bill,

I've told him, Steve's told him, Dee's told him, now you've told him. Doesn't
seem to make any difference.
>
>> "Ham" radio is <mostly> amateur radio, but it also is includes a set of
>beliefs
>> and traditions. Since there often is no logical reason for <some of> these
>> traditions or beliefs, it is sometimes referred to as a cult.
>
>Pathetic, really pathetic.

Maybe if we sent it at 5 wpm?
>
>No cheers,

It takes a LOT to wear out 'UNK's patience, lemme tellya!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2588. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 00:26:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414202605.12142.00000142@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 64825

In article <pan.2003.04.14.18.50.51.311159.15263@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 13:06:57 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>>
>> You might want to read what Ron Reagan (son of the former Pres) has to
>> say about our current President:
>>
>> http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2003/04/14/ron_reagan/index_np.html
>
>He may not feel that the Bush administration can speak for his Father, but
>I'm not sure he can, either.

Exactly!

My point was simply that all kinds of folks are making all kinds of statements
about the president. Justified or not.

>The acorn didn't fall particularly close to
>the tree in the case of Ron Reagan, so I'm not sure how special his
>insight into his father's Administration is. And he admits he doesn't know
>W. well at all.

But he gets his 15 seconds of fame...

>here are people close to the Bush administration who also
>were close the Reagan administration. I suspect their opinions would be
>more informed, but we'll probably have to wait until W. is out of office
>to get their unvarnished views.

No president is perfect.
>
>>> The French nuclear facility was built in the 1970's. During the 1980's,
>>> the US gave the Iraqis chemical and biological weapons agents. How can
>>> you hold the French to account but not the US?
>>
>> 'Specially since the French did it before SH was in power...
>
>Good point.
>
>>> >> I'd want those contracts to go to the lowest-price qualified bidder.
>>> >> It's mostly our money being spent, after all.
>>> >
>>> > As determined by who? The UN?
>>>
>>> As determined by anyone who can read a bid proposal.

>>
>> Which could very well reward countries like France and Germany for not
>> backing up the coalition.
>
>It would possibly reward French and German companies for being more
>efficient. What, we don't believe in the free market any more? (Not that
>I'm naive enough to think that we believed in it in the first place.)

The French and German companies don't have to pay the taxes that fund the war, so they can bid lower.

I am suddenly reminded of the story of Henny Penny, who sowed the seed, watered, weeded, harvested and ground the grain, made the dough and baked the bread, all while her "friends" refused to help. But when it came time to eat the bread.....

Heard an interesting editorial on NPR on the way home today. The main point was that what Iraq needs now is aid and infrastructure - water, power, communications, security, etc. And they need it now, not when the UN gets done defining a committee to name the panel that will study the problems of how to address the transitional agency that will direct the effort to figure out how to set up the decision process that will lead to a synergy of resources to determine when to begin rebuilding......

(and that's just a paraphrase)

>>> The powerful there don't want certain freedoms in their own countries.
>>> That doesn't mean they give a damn about freedom in ours.
>>
>> They also sometimes have a different definition of freedom vs. license.
>
>Another good point.

I'm not saying I agree with them...
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

2589. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 00:36:46 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuffo@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E9B541E.9070500@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 64833

WA8ULX wrote:
>>He had to wait for the dumbed down test, that was the only way he
>>could make it.
>>
>
>
> No, I had to wait till I found a couple Losser CBplussers like Brian to pay me
> $250.00 to take it.

Yea right.

2590. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 00:41:39 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.15.00.41.39.359560.18630@arrl.org>
Source record: 64826

On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 18:14:08 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:pan.2003.04.14.20.27.18.993573.24487@arrl.org...
>> On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 14:56:47 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
>> > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
>> > news:pan.2003.04.14.12.21.04.19467.24274@arrl.org...
>>
>> Their statements are ad hominem. They are intended to belittle those
>> with whom they disagree rather than argue a case, and I just don't
>> think that's the way public discourse out to be carried out,
>> particularly by those in leadership positions. It has the effect of
>> polarizing the debate, making it harder to reach agreement.
>
> Frankly, I don't see the press being part of any effort to reach
> agreements. They report and that's it. Your mileage may vary.

Why do you persist in thinking this is about the press? I'm talking about how the Administration talks about their political opponents and other nations.

>> Sure. Every society has its problem members.
>
> I think OBL is a pretty extreme example of a problem member. OBL isn't
> just some McVeigh or other serial killer...OBL fosters suicide bombing
> on a global basis. Who else has taken that stance?

I don't see any moral difference between OBL and McVeigh. Both attacked what their warped minds saw as their enemies.

>> > What behavior of ours makes a rational Muslim hate us then?
>>
>> Our support for Israel is number one on their hit parade.
>
> So we should NOT support Israel?

Remember what the topic is here, Bill. I'm trying to explain my view that it's what we do in the Middle East that they hate, not our freedom. So whether we SHOULD support Israel is beside the point. Let me ask you this: Do you think if we decided to support the Palestinians over Israel the Muslim world would remain just as angry at us? I don't. I think it's what we DO that matters to them.

>> Our support for
>> repressive regimes also garners us no friends -- outside of those
>> regimes themselves.
>

> That's a point I totally agree with. We are post cold war and we
> shouldn't catet to regimes of that ilk any more than CNN should.

CNN? Wow, you really DO have a press fixation! Turn the channel dial off Fox once in while, will you? Even if it's just to go to ESPN. Fox is a self-marketing and propaganda machine that nobody with any sense can take seriously.

>> Over the years we have demonstrated a near total lack of concern for
>> the well-being of the inhabitants of the Middle East outside of Israel.
>
> I think that's an extreme statement and one in which I don't agree to
> the extent you indicate.

Then you should learn more about the history of US relations with countries in the Middle East. For example, in 1953 the CIA and British SIS set up a military coup to topple the legitimate government of Iran, which was at the time led by Premier Mohammad Mossadeq. The resulting government ran a nasty secret police called SAVAK which controlled the population using the usual secret-police methods for years. The Shah's Iran was an ally of the US -- of course! Naturally, Iranians associated the US with the repressive regime and with SAVAK. And in 1979, when the Iranians revolted, Americans asked plaintively, "Why are they mad at us?" Why, indeed.

The US motive for all this? Well, it was Britain that came up with the idea. See, Mossadeq was thinking of nationalizing the oil industry, which was controlled by the British. Naturally, the Brits weren't crazy about THAT! The US was worried that Iran might go Commie (this was 1953, after all, and here was a guy nationalizing an industry), so it wholeheartedly supported and participated in the idea. The CIA was knee-deep in the coup. Where was our concern for the well-being of the Iranian people? Nowhere to be found.

It's not just in the Middle East that the US is viewed as a bully out to serve only itself, either. Ask around in, say, Central and South America. See what folks there think about the history of their relations with the US. You'll find several well documented instances of the US toppling legitimate governments that didn't toe the US line.

I'd like to think we're past that sort of thing now. But I can't say I'm absolutely certain of it. And I think it's perfectly understandable that a lot of people are deeply suspicious of US intentions and fearful of our newly stated willingness to attack countries that we think MIGHT pose a threat to us. Will we attack only brutal regimes that violate human rights or that actually threaten us? Or, once on the slippery slope, will we find it ever easier to justify attacking regimes we see as not serving US interests?

>> Our words don't always match our deeds, and that's a recipe for
>> generating distrust and hatred.
>

> I agree we have room to improve and this is a good time to do it.

Ah, but will we? And just as important, will we do so in a measured way, making sure to use force only where it's necessary?

>> > Should we have NOT helped Kuwait 12 years ago?
>>
>> We should have, but did we do that out of altruism, or did we do it
>> because it was in our own interests?
>
> What difference does the motive make? Indeed, we can speculate till
> hell freezes over and never understand all motives or know what any of
> them contributed to all the decisions.

The point is that historically, we can only be counted on when self-interest is our motive. Which is the way of the world, I'm afraid.

>> The GHW Bush administration certainly SAID it was a compelling interest
>> of the US.
>
> A point I have no problem with.

Good. Then can we agree that when the US goes to war it is for our own benefit? Can we also agree to can the holier-than-thou trashing of other countries who pursue THEIR own interests?

>> > Should we have not ended the Taliban regime after 911?
>>
>> Sure, but again, did we do it for the Afghans or did we do it for our
>> own security? More to the point, if our purpose was to free the
>> Afghanis, why did we wait through years of Taliban repression before
>> acting? In the case of Iraq, why did we wait through 20 years SH before
>> liberating the Iraqi people? Answer: Because it was 20 years before it
>> became in our interest to do so, irrespective of the suffering of the
>> Iraqi people.
>
> So we have two choices then:
> Take on all regimes immediately...or never take them on. If we don't
> take on a regime today we forfeit doing so in the future?

No, of course not. But if we knowingly allow a repressive regime to fester unopposed -- or even aided! -- for years we do forfeit any justification for saying we're attacking it to eliminate repression. And we also forfeit any justification for criticizing other countries for NOT supporting the attack when the attack is not in their interest.

>> Define "accept." If you mean am I in favor of overthrowing by force
>> every regime that restricts freedom in any way, no, I'm not. We
>> certainly should encourage more freedom by other means where we can.
>> And in cases where the repression turns exceptionally brutal and where
>> we can intervene by force, I don't have a problem with doing that.
>
> Works for me...would you not agree that the SH regime was, as you state:

> "exceptionally brutal?"

Sure would. Which is why, as I've said, I support taking out his regime by force.

>> But as Jim said, what's freedom to one person is license to another. We
>> better be very careful about what constitutes freedom worth fighting
>> for. There's no absolute freedom in any society -- ours included -- and
>> what constitutes acceptable limitation of freedom is influenced by
>> culture.
>
> How far do you let culture influence limitations to individual freedoms?

I don't think there's any easy answer to that. I do think it's important to recognize that there are cultural differences and that one culture's point of view is not necessarily better than another's.

>> >> That doesn't mean they give a damn about freedom in ours.
>> >
>> > Agree completely...
>>
>> I think you misunderstood me. By "don't give a damn" I meant they don't
>> care one way or the other whether we have freedom in the US, not that
>> they dislike our having freedom in the US.
>
> I disagree. I think many of the extremists absolutely hate that
> American women have the rights that they do. I think they hate the
> freedoms of expression we allow.

Do they hate that Swedish, French and German women have the freedoms they do? Do they hate that Japan, Mexico and Iceland allow freedom of expression?

>> > and it is a primary objection of those people, the powerful, to the
>> > American way of life, for two reasons... 1. We value individual life,
>> > equality and justice...
>>
>> No, Bill, that's not quite right. The problem is not that we value
>> those things. It's that we value them for us but all too often, not for
>> others. At least, not when valuing them for others is inconvenient for
>> us.
>
> You lost me here. How about an example to make your point.

Iraq is a perfect example. We were happy to help Saddam gas Iranians when we were pissed off at the Iranians (despite the fact that we knew perfectly well he was brutalizing his own people). Then he made the mistake of interfering with one of our oil suppliers. Tell me, what was the moral difference between Saddam's attack on the Iranians and his attack on the Kuwaitis? Why did we help him with one and attack him for the other? The answer, in case it isn't obvious, is that in each case we were pursuing our self-interest. In the case of Iran, it wasn't important

to us that hundreds of thousands of Iranians were killed and maimed. But when we went to Kuwait's aid the press was filled with stories of the suffering of Kuwaitis. (Which was real enough, let me add.) Moral relativism of the worst sort.

And then when we decided Saddam had to go, we were shocked! Shocked to find that he had been killing and torturing his own people! Shocked to find that he had WMD (which we helped him get)!

>> Really? The British Empire abolished slavery in 1833 (in the home
>> islands it became illegal in the 1770's). The US didn't abolish it
>> until 1865, and then only after a bloody civil war. Which society was
>> "damn well better" at implementing equality and justice?
>
> If your only measure you use is slavery, perhaps you're right. There's
> much more than racial equality involved.

Sure, and there are plenty of positive things one can cite. But the jingoistic "we're better than everybody else" refrain is just not supportable. We have our warts.

>> As for modern times, can you be explicit as to how we implement our
>> values of life, equality and justice better than, oh, say, Sweden?
>
> I see the standard of living, the American justice system, etc.

That would be the system that has about 3% of our population in jail, on parole or on probation, right? Want to hazard a guess what the percentage is in European countries? What to compare crime rates with theirs?

And, oh yeah, that would be the justice system that now allows the government to imprision an American citizen without charge for as long as they want.

> If
> Sweden or any other country was better then why do so many people leave
> those countries and come to the US?

Not many of them have left Western Europe for the US lately, Bill. It's certainly true that the US led the way to democracy. But some countries that came to democracy and freedom later than the US are at least as good in most respects and arguably better in some. The US is a good country. I wouldn't want to live anywhere else. But while acting like we're the best of everything may make us feel good, it's hubris with a capital H.

Jon

2591. The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 01:04:13 UTC
From: "A.Melon" <juicy@melontraffickers.com>
Message-ID: <7ecd39bdd709e4b54f100312a1dabf68@melontraffickers.com>
Source record: 64836

No CW, no problemo ...

For WRC 2006 (or 2007), It is suggested that CW
becomes forbidden for hams below 500 GHz and
with CW power limited to 1 microwatt in oder to
limit the pollution to others qso in other countries.

But military administrations are allowed to
authorize old farts CW coders on the military
bands to practice freely CW. Nobody cares what
happens on military bands ...

It is also suggested that the major manufacturers
YAESU, KENWOOD and ICOM, stop to sell HF
transceivers allowing the CW mode considering
than only about 1 per cent of rig owners use the
CW mode.

Only some weeks now to wait for the suppress
of mandatory CW at ITU ...

2592. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 01:04:29 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.15.01.04.29.226862.31882@arrl.org>
Source record: 64827

On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 20:26:05 -0400, N2EY wrote:
> In article <pan.2003.04.14.18.50.51.311159.15263@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>
>>The acorn didn't fall particularly close to the tree in the case of Ron
>>Reagan, so I'm not sure how special his insight into his father's
>>Administration is. And he admits he doesn't know W. well at all.
>
> But he gets his 15 seconds of fame...

Geez, wasn't his 15 seconds up in about 1982?

> The French and German companies don't have to pay the taxes that fund
> the war, so they can bid lower.

What taxes to fund the war?

> I am suddenly reminded of the story of Henny Penny, who sowed the seed,
> watered, weeded, harvested and ground the grain, made the dough and
> baked the bread, all while her "friends" refused to help. But when it
> came time to eat the bread.....

It'd be a better analogy if Henny had first laid waste to the field.

> Heard an interesting editorial on NPR on the way home today. The main
> point was that what Iraq needs now is aid and infrastructure - water,
> power, communications, security, etc. And they need it now, not when the
> UN gets done defining a committee to name the panel that will study the
> problems of how to address the transitional agency that will direct the
> effort to figure out how to set up the decision process that will lead
> to a synergy of resources to determine when to begin rebuilding......

It's certainly the case that immediate aid can be most effectively
delivered by those already on the ground. But I think that editorial
doesn't do justice to the UN. If there is delay, it'll be the politicos
that cause it. One thing the UN knows how to do is manage relief programs.
They've certainly had enough practice over the past 50+ years.

>>>> The powerful there don't want certain freedoms in their own
>>>> countries. That doesn't mean they give a damn about freedom in ours.
>>>
>>> They also sometimes have a different definition of freedom vs.
>>> license.
>>
>>Another good point.
>
> I'm not saying I agree with them...

Understood. Me, I take it case-by-case.

Jon

2593. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 01:53:08 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414215308.24070.00000442@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 64828

From N2EY:

>>Often words are redefined in a specific setting. The goal of this
>>redefinition is often to control others or to increase their importance.
>
>It's for clarity.

The redefinition of "Engineer" to more an more lower tasks may have had more to do with unions than for clarity. The Engineers are non-union. By including more and more tasks as "Engineering" tasks, the union can be reduced.

In some cases, ENTIRE jobs are redefined as "Engineer" jobs. One can ask for a BSEE for a "manufacturing Engineers" or "product Engineers", rather than let union people do these non-technical tasks. These jobs are often very low skilled. A shop person can have more than enough qualifications to do the job.

Internal job descriptions are VERY exaggerated. You will NEVER do the advanced electronics items in the job description - and they have NO intention of letting you. They don't represent the actual work you will be doing.

The job description also is NEGOTIATED between union and management- it has NOTHING to do with "clarity".

>If a big enough group defines a word a certain way, then that's the
>definition.
>
>Get used to it, Vipul - that's how languages work.

No, that's how politics work. Outside that group, the MAJORITY of people will disagree with those RE-definitions. The language has not changed - its application in this situation has.

>Would you call yourself a Professional Engineer?

No, I would not. Here's why. In reality, I am a professional Engineer, in that I am in the EE profession. In industry, its APPLICATION is negative. You get disrespected for having the title of "Professional Engineer".

>>If everyone jumped off a bridge,
>>would you?
>
>Depends on how high the bridge is and how much I'm being paid.

That's where I'm different. I had a chance to "sell out" for significantly higher pay. I did not take it. Now, I regret it.

>In reality, it does not increase standards because the
>>information

>>tested is not relevant.
>
>It's called "accountability".

It makes them look "accountable". Testing for irrelevant skill does the exact opposite. Sort of like Morse code testing. Inserted before the General class license, its very irresponsible and embarrassing to the hobby. Even code lovers should be embarrassed about that.

>>Another example is saying when something is "in use", it is useful.
>
>Why? If something has a use, it is useful.

You can use a toothpick(Morse) as a fork(communications mode). Its not ideal. If many people did that it(Morse) would be used, but not useful.

Do you still eat with your hands? Maybe if you ate a cheese sandwich.

Contesting is spectrum squatting. Eventually, commercial interests will petition to the regulators. If the ARRL's response is "we use it for contests", the result will not be good.

>>Maybe
>>useful to that person, but not to the amateur radio hobby.
>
>Would you outlaw contests?

No. Contests do have some use. Its just not compelling enough if that all there is.

>Your agenda seems to be redefinition of common terms.

I like to experiment, homebrew. Most Hams <in my circles> do not like that.

>And one should not claim that there is any difference between "ham radio" and
>"amateur radio".

Ham radio is traditions, history, beliefs. Amateur radio is the license.

>One should not claim that "amateur radio" does not require a license.

I never claimed that. I just gave one example, which happened to not require a license.

>I politely refuse your attempt to redefine the term "amateur radio".

I have not redefined amateur radio. I <basically> agree with the definition given in the ARRL handbook.

Its the APPLICATION that makes it "Ham" radio. That's not necessarily bad, its just a different emphasis - one not shared by most EEs.

"Ham" radio was redefined, I mean CLARIFIED, perhaps.

>73 de Jim, N2EY

```
Codewords "73", "de" used.
```

2594. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 02:11:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030414221120.15625.00000244@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 64829

In article <20030413075017.18293.00000621@mb-ff.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From Larry Roll K3LT:
>
>>Sounds good to me, as long as we're getting rid of the Question Pool
>>Techs right along with them! Let's clean up our collective acts, and
>>leave only truly qualified, proficient radio amateurs in our ranks!
>
>There we have it - the establishment Morse coders want to participate in
>"cleansing".

Right, Vipul -- why don't you start by taking a bite out of a bar of Ivory soap!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2595. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 02:11:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030414221120.15625.00000245@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 64830

In article <f45722ac.0304130444.43023c10@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Brian:
>>
>> Sounds good to me, as long as we're getting rid of the Question Pool
>> Techs right along with them! Let's clean up our collective acts, and
>> leave only truly qualified, proficient radio amateurs in our ranks! Oooops
>--
>> sorry about that -- good bye, Brian! I hope you and Kim enjoy your
>> new hobbies!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>How does that help us quantify Morse Code as a growth industry?
>
>Do try to stay on topic.

Well, who said that Morse Code was a growth industry? Granted, there
seem to be more products for helping people learn the Morse Code now
than at any other time in history. As another poster observed, the
interest in QRP caused by new, off-the-shelf QRP rigs like the Yaesu
FT-817 is making CW more popular than ever. And now that we're on
the downside of the current solar cycle, using these rigs will be more
dependant on CW than ever. Maybe you're right -- Morse Code *is*
a growth industry! Perhaps I should take a break from digital modes
and dust off my Bencher paddles!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2596. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 02:11:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030414221121.15625.00000246@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 64831

In article <pan.2003.04.13.13.34.17.777431.20145@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 22:14:33 -0400, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I have been reading the thread. If NON-despotic governments and their
>> peoples don't have the stomach to get rid of a brutal tyrant like SH,
>> then I most certainly DO NOT care what they think. The salvation of my
>> own soul depends on my definitely NOT tolerating a regime that brutally
>> tortures, rapes, and murders it's subjects, merely for me to gain
>> whatever political advantage I can by doing so. Fortunately, we now
>> have a President who is thinking along those lines, and has the moral
>> courage to put an end to the barbarism of the Saddam Hussein regime.
>
>That raises a number of questions. Since you feel the US should eliminate
>by force any despotic regime that it can eliminate by force, I wonder if
>you think the US should first attempt to eliminate such despotic regimes
>without force?

Jon:

I certainly think that the attempt should be made. And, in the case of Iraq,
the "attempt" went on for 12 years! How many innocent Iraqi citizens died
at the hands of Saddam Hussein and his bloodthirsty sons during that time?

> If so, do you feel that the US should attempt to elicit
>allies in these efforts?

Of course, whenever possible, and as long as these "allies" don't intend to
impede the process in order to preserve their own economic interests.

>If so, do you think the US should dictate to
>those potential allies the specifics of the efforts to be made, ignoring
>any potential ally that doesn't agree in every particular with the US
>view?

Naturally, that would depend on how this particular "ally" is behaving
at the time. If they are willing to make a significant sacrifice of their
own resources and the lives of their military personnel in order to assist
us in achieving the goals of freedom, justice, and democracy for an
oppressed people, then I would work with them very closely indeed,
and be more than willing to address any of their legitimate concerns.
OTOH, if they are stonewalling, exercising their veto power in the
UNSC, and otherwise covering their own economic interests rather
than standing up for the human rights of an oppressed people, then they
get a brush off, and at least a generation's worth of marginalized
credibility. Moreover, when we (America) are finished doing the

fighting, dying, and sacrificing, they don't get a role in the aftermath, other than perhaps doling out sacks of grain in some UN-managed humanitarian aid operation.

The United States of America is the most powerful nation on Planet Earth. We use our power for purposes which create and support peace, freedom, and democracy everywhere else on this planet -- and we do it at great expense of our own wealth, both human and material. We respect the cultures of other nations, and we generally don't interfere -- except when human rights are being violated and OUR national security is threatened. I am just glad I am living in an era when we have a President who understands and upholds these concepts. God Bless America!

73 de Larry, K3LT
MSgt, USAF (Retired)
Loyal American who Supports Our President, Our Troops, and the War in Iraq

2597. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 02:39:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414223901.19651.00000190@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 64834

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 4/14/2003 2:05 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <b7f14v$v74$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>

>> "Ham" radio is <mostly> amateur radio, but it also is includes a set of
>beliefs
>> and traditions. Since there often is no logical reason for <some of> these
>> traditions or beliefs, it is sometimes referred to as a cult.
>
>Pathetic, really pathetic.
>
>No cheers

WHOA! Now I >>KNOW<< Bill is serious!

And yes, he really is pathetic.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2598. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 02:40:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414224052.19651.00000191@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 64835

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 4/14/2003 7:26 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030414202604.12142.00000141@mb-fr.aol.com>

>I've told him, Steve's told him, Dee's told him, now you've told him. Doesn't
>seem to make any difference.

And why should it??? He'll just make up his own new definitions as he goes
along anyway.

>It takes a LOT to wear out 'UNK's patience, lemme tellya!

That's what I meant when I said "I KNOW Bill is serious" ! ! !

2599. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 02:52:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414225241.19651.00000192@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 64837

>Subject: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/14/2003 5:21 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030414182139.25918.00001330@mb-fd.aol.com>

>Apparently, there is some confusion here on what is a 2N2222 transistor,
>compared to a cheese sandwich.

NO, there's not...Unless we are talking about you, in which case I agree
there's confusion. And ONLY because YOU insist on trying to invent new
definitions for universally accepted terms and phraseology.

>Often words are redefined in a specific setting. The goal of this
>redefinition
>is often to control others or to increase their importance. Note that it is
>not
>just one person "redefining" words, it is a group.

In this case it's JUST you, Vipul. Everyone here agrees that Amateur
Radio and "Ham" Radio are one-in-the-same. You do not. You are the anomaly.

>They new definition is often
>widely accepted, but its still not correct. If everyone jumped off a bridge,
>would you? Often the people that created the new definition will start to
>believe their new definition.

WHAT in the WORLD are you trying to say?

>One example is linking the buying of an HF transceiver to "advancement of the
>radio art", when the <real> goal is to get people to use Morse code. Soon
>people will forget the original purchase and start to believe that Morse code
>is "radio art".

Proficiency in Morse Code communications IS part of the radio art, Vipul.

By yor own admission you are not trained or proficient in Morse Code
communications, ergo you cannot appreciate the skill and rhythm of a competent
Morse operator...Especially one using a properly adjusted and operated Bug.

>Redefinition works fine for those with an agenda. Honesty works better for
>the
>hobby. So, one should not call cheese sandwiches 2N2222's. It may work fine
>for
>a while. Eventually it will be bad for everyone involved. If you are told to
>do
>so, you should politely refuse.

OK...so for the purpose of our analogies in the future we will call 2N2222's "hockey pucks". There...that make you feel any better...???

Steve

2600. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 03:04:01 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414230401.05560.00001312@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 64838

>Yea right.

Does not matter if you believe it. By the way are you still a CBplusser??

2601. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 03:08:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030414230850.19651.00000193@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 64839

>Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/14/2003 8:53 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030414215308.24070.00000442@mb-ck.aol.com>

>In some cases, ENTIRE jobs are redefined as "Engineer" jobs. One can ask for
>a
>BSEE for a "manufacturing Engineers" or "product Engineers", rather than let
>union people do these non-technical tasks. These jobs are often very low
>skilled. A shop person can have more than enough qualifications to do the
>job.

It seems to me your beef is with the National Labor Relations Board or your
shop steward.

>Internal job descriptions are VERY exaggerated. You will NEVER do the
>advanced
>electronics items in the job description - and they have NO intention of
>letting you. They don't represent the actual work you will be doing.

Then it's a contractural issue.

>The job description also is NEGOTIATED between union and management- it has
>NOTHING to do with "clarity".

It has EVERYTHING to do with clarity. Unions make absolutely sure that
they know what's expected of them, and what to expect from the corporation. If
they didn't, there'd be nothing to "negotiate" at contract times.

>No, that's how politics work. Outside that group, the MAJORITY of people will
>disagree with those RE-definitions. The language has not changed - its
>application in this situation has.

And in the application of the words "radio amateur" within THIS peergroup,
it is understood we are talking about a person who is licensed in the Amateur
Radio Service.

>No, I would not. Here's why. In reality, I am a professional Engineer, in
>that
>I am in the EE profession. In industry, its APPLICATION is negative. You get
>disrespected for having the title of "Professional Engineer".

BBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! !

DISRESPECTED FOR BEING A "PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER"..?!?!

WHAT an IDIOT!

>It makes them look "accountable". Testing for irrelevant skill does the exact
>opposite. Sort of like Morse code testing. Inserted before the General class
>license, its very irresponsible and embarrassing to the hobby. Even code
>lovers
>should be embarrassed about that.

Embarrassed that I can do something you can't and do it well?

I don't think so ! ! !

>Contesting is spectrum squatting. Eventually, commercial interests will
>petition to the regulators. If the ARRL's response is "we use it for
>contests",
>the result will not be good.

That's why the American Radio Relay League sponsors and promotes the
emergency services programs it does, and makes darn sure those who need to know
about it do!

>No. Contests do have some use. Its just not compelling enough if that all
>there
>is.

Thankfully that's NOT all there is, but it seems to me you are not aware of
what the "other" things are, hence the flailing and floundering in
"redefinitions".

>I like to experiment, homebrew. Most Hams <in my circles> do not like that.

Then perhaps you need to quit going around in circles and set out on your
own course, Vippy. But of course the sudden change of vector will initially
cause some vertigo and disorientation, but you'll compensate eventually. Not
soon, but eventually.

>>And one should not claim that there is any difference between "ham radio"
>and
>>"amateur radio".
>
>Ham radio is traditions, history, beliefs. Amateur radio is the license.

Wrong...again.

>"Ham" radio was redefined, I mean CLARIFIED, perhaps.

You have "CLARIFIED" nothing, Vipul. You HAVE stirred the muck however.

>Codewords "73", "de" used

They are not "codewords". They are procedural signals.

73 de K4YZ

2602. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 03:15:42 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <yPKma.2709$Mo5.991@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 64840

Jim,

I duzn't offen disagree with yous, but this obsuleet stuff has got to go.
Duz you no that in kollege, the perfesser kept wantin to speek in codes?
Heck, secont koorter phisics he wuz tryin to explane the energy spent by a
spring. Dang if he weren't using code! This guy goes and draws some dum
squiggly line. I objected and he sent me back to math class. That durned
guy went and starts explaining with all this obsolete code. Kin you believe
they actually use *Greek*! Delta he calls it. Looks like a little triangle
to me. Hoo boy! Heck, I went back to the phisics class and tolt him so! I
asked him what this stuff was about grams and kilograms. Ever one nos that
you measure in feet and pounds. He sez ok and asked me what a slug was - so
I slugged him. Danged if they didn't ship me off to Vietnam after that!
LOL

Please forgive the little 'humor' I had to slip into this thread.
Obviously, each profession has its' own set of 'codes'. :)

--... ...-- (I can't resist :) from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA
ps - don't take this as a hard core endorsement of Morse either (please)
...

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.471 / Virus Database: 269 - Release Date: 4/10/03

2603. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 03:26:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9B7C57.E79306CC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64841

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E9A3E3E.5ADBF83@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Vipul,
> >
> >Your square-headed, nonsensical posts about amateur radio being
> >different from ham radio, about amateur radio being "sometimes referred
> >to as a cult and about people who can copy fifteen word per minute morse
> >not being able to copy five wpm are beginning to grate on my
> >sensibilities.

> Poor baby. :-)

Yes, he is but English isn't Vipul's first language. What's your
excuse?

Dave K8MN

2604. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 03:33:24 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <84Lma.509$qa5.541750@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64832

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030414215308.24070.00000442@mb-ck.aol.com...
>
> No, I would not. Here's why. In reality, I am a professional Engineer, in
that
> I am in the EE profession. In industry, its APPLICATION is negative. You
get
> disrespected for having the title of "Professional Engineer".

That is the silliest and most inane statement I've ever heard. Those who
have elected to seek and achieved the title of "Professional Engineer" are
respected.

> It makes them look "accountable". Testing for irrelevant skill does the
exact
> opposite. Sort of like Morse code testing. Inserted before the General
class
> license, its very irresponsible and embarrassing to the hobby. Even code
lovers
> should be embarrassed about that.

That is YOUR opinion. Many have a different opinion. Lately the HF bands
have been rather poor and the activity has been the best in the Morse
portion of the bands.

>
>
> I like to experiment, homebrew. Most Hams <in my circles> do not like
that.
>

So what? Lots of EEs don't like to homebrew either. That doesn't make them
any less a EE than one who does.

>
> Ham radio is traditions, history, beliefs. Amateur radio is the license.
>

But to get the license, one of the things you are tested on is "good amateur
practice". This good amateur practice is the traditions, beliefs, and
history of ham radio, which is synonymous with amateur radio.

You are defining everything that you personally don't like as "ham radio"
and what you personally do like as amateur radio. Well the amateur radio
community doesn't agree with your definitions.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2605. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 03:44:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9B800C.37DB6F69@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64842

Vito wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > No license is required to "see" all the ham bands you'd like.
>
> Sorry Dave. It never occurred to me that anybody would use that to dodge
> my meaning but Barnum was right: one should always write to the lowest
> common denominator. I should have used camping or some other "use" as an
> example.

There's a camping test? Does it consist of written and practical
skills?

> > Luckily for you, no test of any kind is required to see Old Faithful.
>
> Why is it lucky Dave?

To save you all of the whining about the inequity of it all.

I can start a fire without a bic. I keep the tools
> in my "possibles" bag. I can also hold 5 out of 5 .45ACP rounds in the
> 10 ring.

Bully for you. I'd imagine it'd be easier starting a fire without a
cheap pen. The shooting skills are probably handy on a visit to Old
Faithful or when camping.

> These are far more useful skills than Morse,

...not in amateur radio unless you're trying to shoot down a dipole of
set fire to the shack.

> especially since
> my laptop decodes it faster than you can send it ... if you have a
> decent fist of course.

Let's give your laptop a try. How about if we meet on 160m in July?
I'm betting my aural decoding skills can beat your computer--if it has a
decent fist.

> > Since it appears that morse testing will go by the wayside in the course
> > of time, why worry about it?
> >
> Because so many have been denied so much, Dave.

I've just observed a moment of silence for all of the victims of morse
testing.

Dave K8MN

2606. Re: On a lighter note....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 03:55:35 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b7huii$16ad2$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 64796
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Dammit, I knew they were evil for at least one reason..... :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Hambone the Magnificent" <cqcqboooing@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3e9b1902@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b7e7j2$d7hfl$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> > So... since we never can get away from the code issue, are the Iraqi
> people
> > pro-coders??
>
>
> YES !!!!
>
> Go Here: http://www.croqueweb.com/
> Iraqi Information Minister Mohammed
> Saeed Al Sahaf's talking speech and CW
> machine !
>
> also see: http://www.croqueweb.com/fan/index.html
>
> (the 75 Meter QRM'ers will have a BALL with this one ho-ho-ho-ho-ho !!!!)
>
>

2607. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 04:00:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9B8428.36F4BE9A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64843

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > Example: If everyone else calls a 2N2222 a transistor, and you insist on
> > calling it a cheese sandwich, you're the one who is the cause of confusion.
>
> Apparently, there is some confusion here on what is a 2N2222 transistor,
> compared to a cheese sandwich.
>
> There are those that believe in relative definition. Following this logic, if
> everyone believed there is no gravity, then gravity would no longer exist.
> Others believe in scientific proof.

You are the fellow touting "relative definition". I've not observed you
following any logic at all. We aren't in an "if everyone believed there
is no gravity" situation. We're in a "We all call it gravity; you call
it talcum powder" situation.

> Often words are redefined in a specific setting. The goal of this redefinition
> is often to control others or to increase their importance. Note that it is not
> just one person "redefining" words, it is a group. They new definition is often
> widely accepted, but its still not correct. If everyone jumped off a bridge,
> would you? Often the people that created the new definition will start to
> believe their new definition

When you begin to lose an argument, you really go out in a blaze of
nonsensical glory.

> One example is calling the lowest of tasks an "Engineer". A Component
> "Engineer" is someone that sorts components in a database, orders them, and (if
> they are lucky) - updates them with new components. It is a lowly task. Yet,
> with the word "Engineer" after it, it makes it sound important.

I'm sure we're all familiar with the "updates components in a database,
orders them and updates them Engineer". You really need to have a big
office door or have the words painted in very small letters for that
one.

> When politicians say that an irrelevant test, such as the MCAS, increases
> "standards", they only do so to look like they stand for better education. Not
> knowing what the test is, they may honestly believe the test increases
> "standards". In reality, it does not increase standards because the information
> tested is not relevant.
>
> One example is linking the buying of an HF transceiver to "advancement of the
> radio art", when the <real> goal is to get people to use Morse code.

Why those devious bastards! Imagine them selling transceivers when
their real goal is the insidious growth of morse code.

> Soon
> people will forget the original purchase and start to believe that Morse code
> is "radio art".

It's the mind control LSI chips built into those new transceivers which
makes mind control possible, Vipul.

> Another example is saying when something is "in use", it is useful.

If that's your example, it's a bad one.

> Contesters
> occupy as many bands as possible, and claim that each band is useful.

Tell us please, which bands aren't useful. You'll save us a lot of
wasted time and effort if we can just manage to avoid those useless
bands.

> Simply
> contacting someone and exchanging callsign information is not useful.

I don't know of any contest where the callsign is the exchange. I'll
assume that you goofed because you know nothing more about contesting
than you do about someone knowing ten word per minute morse forgetting
how to receive morse at 5 wpm. Whatever information exchanged by a
contester is quite useful in achieving a higher score in a contest.

> Maybe
> useful to that person, but not to the amateur radio hobby.

Not everything I do on the air need be useful to all of amateur radio.

> Redefinition works fine for those with an agenda. Honesty works better for the
> hobby. So, one should not call cheese sandwiches 2N2222's. It may work fine for
> a while. Eventually it will be bad for everyone involved. If you are told to do
> so, you should politely refuse.

Great. Take your own advice and quit attempting to redefine amateur
radio by making believe that "ham radio" is something different. It is
dishonest of you.

Dave K8MN

2608. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 04:03:31 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b7huij$16ad2$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 64797

Well, basically like I said, I support your actions as a soldier over there,
but do not necessarily agree with the idiots that sent all of the soldiers
out there..... Fortunately that is a right that I have to say that, and
that is part of what you guys were fighting for.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
God Bless Our Soldiers!

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030414145219.11221.00000205@mb-fp.aol.com...
> In article <b7e7j1$d7hfl$7@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan Lughermo,
KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Lemme see if I have it then..... you guys (drafted or not) were put into
a
> >bullsh*t war/police action with a ton of crap and tactics and you still
> >served proudly, are tramatized to various extents (depending on the
person)
> >and recieved little to no credit for serving the armed services upon
return.
> >Is this pretty close? (will try to figure better wording later....)
>
> Ryan, thank you for your support. <salute>
>
> I volunteered and served 8 years in the US Army, 3 of those years
> doing HF-VHF-UHF-microwave communications as assigned in
> Tokyo just after the Occupation was over. That was not, in any
> way "traumatizing" to me, just part of my life experience.
>
> I received little "credit" from the USA due to some idiotic
> bureaocracy involved in changing majors ("G.I.Bill" education).
> I've received NEGATIVE CREDIT in here from a couple of
> NON-VETERANS (never-served total rear-area widgets) for
> doing professional HF communications...while all they've done
> is amateur radio on HF using an archaic, simplistic, slow-speed
> communications mode...and then demand that ALL amateurs
> must follow their example of "excellence" in amateurism.
>
> Phrased another way, quite unkindly since that is what their
> attitude deserves, those two examples are simply so full of
> themselves, their arrogance, their elitism, that it lends a

> great deal of negativism about a hobby, a recreational
> activity involving radio.
>
> >As I said before here, I may not support or believe in prior wars or
police
> >actions and the idiot politicians engaging them, but I proudly support
those
> >that served!
>
> Good on you! As one who actually served IN the military, I'll
> give you an e-version of a thank-you handshake. Sincerely.
>
> There's a number of places around the USA where such
> veterans cannot possibly shake hands...with anyone. Those
> have symbols on the ground where they now rest.
>
> >Since I am currently not involved in the armed services right
> >now, but in emergency services domestically, I feel the best I can do is
to
> >do my job the best I can, and in my free time do EVERYTHING within my
> >capabilities to help the families the soldiers have left behind here...
>
> Good spirit! Way to go!
>
> >Support our troops, and thier families!
> >
> >(and no... this is not an attempt to "kiss ass", it is truly how I feel
and
> >anyone that knows me locally will back this up)
>
> There are several participants in here who have "all the answers"
> for everything...yet have NO experience in "solving problems" on
> geopolitics yet they will expound on such as if they were the UN
> themselves. In one way it is amusing, but it is also tragic...they
> are the same ones who insist that all in a radio hobby do
> exactly as they say or be subject to some kind of "censure" for
> speaking against them. They are the lawgivers, the "Moses"
> come down from the mountain with the tablets (an aspirin
> surrogate). :-)
>
> Leonard H. Anderson
> ex-RA16408336, US Army 1952-1960

2609. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 04:05:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9B8558.B1F1D3D2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64844

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <20030414182139.25918.00001330@mb-fd.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
> (Vshah101) writes:

> >If everyone jumped off a bridge,
> >would you?
>
> Depends on how high the bridge is and how much I'm being paid.

When I was a kid trying to leverage my dad into buying me something, I'd
often try the old, "but all the kids have one" ploy. Dad's response
was, "If all the kids ate horse manure sandwiches, would you want one?"

Dave K8MN

2610. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 04:16:16 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuffo@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E9B8790.5050500@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 64751

WA8ULX wrote:
>>Yea right.
>
>
> Does not matter if you believe it. By the way are you still a CBplusser??

Nope, unlike you I never was a CBplusser.

2611. Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 04:20:40 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415002040.24070.00000444@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 64845

>From: A.Melon juicy@melontraffickers.com

>The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM

Technically, this is impossible.

>No CW, no problemo ...

Actually, CW is an abbreviation for "Continuous Wave".

In non-amateur, non-Ham applications, CW means "an unmodulated sin wave". In amateur radio, it means "Morse code".

2612. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 04:23:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9B8981.6CF69B6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64846

Vshah101 wrote:

> It makes them look "accountable". Testing for irrelevant skill does the exact
> opposite. Sort of like Morse code testing. Inserted before the General class
> license, its very irresponsible and embarrassing to the hobby. Even code lovers
> should be embarrassed about that.

You're a very foolish boy making very foolish statements, Vipul. After
all of your time here, you can't even properly quote someone else's
comments. Even you should be embarrassed about that.

> Contesting is spectrum squatting.

Then almost all radio is spectrum squatting.

> Eventually, commercial interests will
> petition to the regulators. If the ARRL's response is "we use it for contests",
> the result will not be good.

How do you rate the likelihood that anyone's response to the FCC would
be, "We use it for contesting"?

> >Would you outlaw contests?
>
> No. Contests do have some use. Its just not compelling enough if that all there
> is.

"It" isn't all there is.

> >Your agenda seems to be redefinition of common terms.
>
> I like to experiment, homebrew. Most Hams <in my circles> do not like that.

That's nice. It does not, however, explain your attempt to redefine
common terms.

> >And one should not claim that there is any difference between "ham radio" and
> >"amateur radio".
>
> Ham radio is traditions, history, beliefs. Amateur radio is the license.

You are just flat wrong.

> I have not redefined amateur radio. I <basically> agree with the definition
> given in the ARRL handbook.
>
> Its the APPLICATION that makes it "Ham" radio. That's not necessarily bad, its
> just a different emphasis - one not shared by most EEs.

In this one too, you are wrong.

> "Ham" radio was redefined, I mean CLARIFIED, perhaps.

It hasn't been clarified by you.

Dave K8MN

2613. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 04:25:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9B8A35.A96B3D60@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64848

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
> >From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >Date: 4/14/2003 2:05 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <b7f14v$v74$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
>
> >> "Ham" radio is <mostly> amateur radio, but it also is includes a set of
> >beliefs
> >> and traditions. Since there often is no logical reason for <some of> these
> >> traditions or beliefs, it is sometimes referred to as a cult.
> >
> >Pathetic, really pathetic.
> >
> >No cheers
>
> WHOA! Now I >>KNOW<< Bill is serious!
>
> And yes, he really is pathetic.

We might think about starting a kitty toward a plate glass window to be
installed in Vipul's abdomen. That way, he could see where he's going.

Dave K8MN

2614. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 04:26:35 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415002635.24070.00000445@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 64847

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>Those who
>have elected to seek and achieved the title of "Professional Engineer" are
>respected.

"Professional Engineer" has nothing to do with EE profession. Its for Civil
Engineers.

>Inserted before the General
>class
>> license, its very irresponsible and embarrassing to the hobby. Even code
>lovers
>> should be embarrassed about that.
>
>That is YOUR opinion.

Its also the FCC's opinion.

>Lots of EEs don't like to homebrew either. That doesn't make them
>any less a EE than one who does.

EE's that don't like to homebrew are probably in it just for the money. I truly
enjoy building circuits outside of work.

>You are defining everything that you personally don't like as "ham radio".

Thats not true. Hams like to set up antennas for their stations. I participated
in some of those. Ham radio includes antenna setups, which IS technical.

2615. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 04:40:15 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415004015.24070.00000446@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 64849

From K4YZ:

>>The job description also is NEGOTIATED between union and management- it has
>>NOTHING to do with "clarity".
>
> It has EVERYTHING to do with clarity. Unions make absolutely sure that
>they know what's expected of them, and what to expect from the corporation.
>If
>they didn't, there'd be nothing to "negotiate" at contract times.

The only things that are expected are things like the pay scales, hours, and
overtime issues.

The job description is meaningless. It is rationalization, probably by BOTH
sides. Go complain about a job description to a steward and they will not do
anything about it. If something to do with your hours, they will help you.

> And in the application of the words "radio amateur" within THIS peergroup,
>it is understood we are talking about a person who is licensed in the Amateur
>Radio Service.

Yes, but not "Ham" radio.

>BBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !
>!

Thats mature.

>Even code
>>lovers
>>should be embarrassed about that.
>
> Embarrassed that I can do something you can't and do it well?
>
> I don't think so ! ! !

No, I'm embarrassed code lovers brag about such a skill and claim superiority
because of it. I can do it. I'm smart enough to chose not to.

>Contests do have some use. Its just not compelling enough if that all
>>there
>>is.
>
> Thankfully that's NOT all there is, but it seems to me you are not aware
>of
>what the "other" things are

Thats good to know.

>Codewords "73", "de" used
>
> They are not "codewords". They are procedural signals.

Do you talk to people in "procedural signals". For example, when leaning a room, do you say "73"?

2616. Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 04:54:13 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E9B9075.BB737C08@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 64850

What a really lame troll.....

2617. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 10:07:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415060718.24116.00000832@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 64752

>Nope, unlike you I never was a CBplusser.
>

Unlike you, I never was a CBer or a CBplusser

2618. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 10:32:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304150232.60f335e0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64753

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030414085356.05742.00001215@mb-fo.aol.com>...
> >Bruce, why can't I take the same easy road to Extra that you took?
>
> Because you dont have the ability to do anything to get it unless it is just
> handed to you.

Yet I have to take the same road you took. That would make you a lazy moron.

> >You were an Advanced for how long???
>
> About 15 Years
>
> >What held you back?
>
> Nothing held me back, I was just waiting for some Dumb ASS CBplussers to come
> along and give me $250 dollars to take the Test.

Riiight!

Nobody believes that.

2619. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 10:46:58 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304150246.e5331b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64754

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b7fbbv$5e7$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "JJ" <radiobuffo@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:3E9B06F2.5000406@mailcity.moc...
> >
> >
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > >>>
> > > >>
> > > >>I came in late to a media frenzy on Rumsfeld this morning. Something
> about
> > > >>he hoped Syria would not be a haven for war criminals and terrorists.
> So,
> > > >>let's see...Syria may be next like Dan said. Then, oh...let's see,
> probably
> > > >>Iran; next, Libya; next... [not in reference to the Iraq war being
> another
> > > >>Viet Nam (I think those kind of comments are crap), but more in
> reference to
> > > >>the US now becoming and remaining an aggressor on nation after nation.
> > > >>
> > > >>Kim W5TIT
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Makes sense. Why pull our troops out and send them to Korea when we
> > > > could leave them in place a while longer to mop up? Korea has been
> > > > festering for half a century, a couple more months shouldn't make a
> > > > big difference.
> >
> > After seeing how quickly we moved through Iraq and dispatched
> > Saddam, these other nations may have second thoughts before making
> > any careless moves. Korea is now saying they are willing to talk
> > unilaterally instead of one on one like they have been insisting.
> >
> >
>
> Ain't it amazing how a little kick in the 'ass' gets a bully's attention?
> Of course they are all wide eyed as a deer in a spotlight. Who would of
> thought the great 'paper tiger' would actually fight? Keep up the terrorism
> and they aint seen nothing yet.
>
> We are going to have to have a standing army in IRAQ for at least 2 years.
> That in itself should be sufficient 'incentive' for Iran and Syria and

> Palestine and Saudi Arabia, and ISREAL to get their crap together. If
> not....well they KNOW the answer to that one now.
>
>
> Dan/W4NTI

The only problem is that we've got to get it all done before Bush leaves office.

2620. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 12:26:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415082607.04143.00000092@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64757

In article <20030414160925.06237.00000169@mb-ca.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0304140831.4929e156@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20030413122652.15869.00000076@mb-cq.aol.com>...
>>> In article <20030412145058.23756.00000165@mb-fj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>> writes:
>>>
>>> >In article <20030411201751.15821.00000087@mb-cg.aol.com>,
>>lenover21@aol.com
>>> >(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>> You don't prove anything other than you are a biased
>>> morse fanatic.
>>
>>Only to a biased anti-Morse fanatic like yourself.
>
> You are a biased morse fanatic. QED. :-)

Only according to a biased anti-Morse fanatic like yourself. QED. :-) :-)

>>Ah - so it's not just the TEST you are against.
>
> ...and some hard-nosed arrogant morse fanatics.

Hard nosed with facts.
>
>>> The subject sub-thread was LICENSING.
>>
>>Where?
>>
>>The thread title is "ARS license numbers"
>
> Oh ye of little brains but of many sheepskins... :-)
>
> The NUMBERS can't accumulate if the TESTING isn't done.

Sure they can.
>
>>> Hello...? LICENSING involves TESTING.
>>
>>Not necessarily.

>
> Oh? Check out Part 97 again. :-)

There are FCC radio licenses that require no tests. GMRS, CBRS. You have one of
those, don't you, Len? ;-) ;-)
>
>>That's simply not true.
>
> You have that as a macro, don't you? :-)

You make so many false statements that it saves me some typing :-) :-) :-)

>>That's a very, very small group of people.
>
> I happen to like cheese sandwiches. Why are you against us
> cheese sandwich lovers?

Is that why you buy your cheese from Mouser? :-) :-) :-) :-)

>>Projecting your feelings onto another are you?
>
> Nope. You are the one wanting to call a 2N2222 a cheese
> sandwich. :-)

Not me. You are confused. As usual.
>
> Was that what you were taught at that ivy-league academy
> many moons ago?

Nope.
>
>>Tsk, tsk, tsk, Len, I've never seen you practice any "tolerance"
>>towards those who don't agree with you. Instead you respond with
>>name-calling, insults, factual errors, ethnic/racial/religious slurs,
>>excessive emoticons and the usual generalized infantile behavior. Etc.
>
> Waaa...waaa...waaa... :-)

Yes, you sure do wail al lot in here, Len. Can't you take a little tweak?
>
> Projecting your feelings on others? :-)
>
>>Practice what you preach.
>
> I don't preach, Reverend Jimmie.

HAW! I know - you pontificate.
>
>>> Remember that I was the one who pointed out your ERROR
>>> about amazon.com allegedly not being profitable.
>>
>>It's not an error.
>

> You made an error! You made an error! :-)

Where?
>
>>When I wrote about Amazon's profitability, they were losing money.
>>Fortunately, that has changed.
>
> It changed over half a year ago. :-)

I worte about the unprofitable status of Amazon eight months ago. Based on
quarterly financials.
>
> At the time you wrote it, you were NOT AWARE of what was
> happening. :-)

Sure I was - based on quarterly financials.
>
>>Gee, are you showing us more "tolerance"??
>
> As much as you do... :-)

Practice what you preach.

>>So? Does that mean I must drop it too?
>
> Drop down and give us ten!

I'll give you one. And I don't have to drop to do it :-)
>
>>How do you know? Why are you so fanatical about hating morse USE?
>
> I'm not a "fanatical hater," poor baby.

Your posts here tell a different story.

> I'm against the morse TEST.
>
And anything positive that is said about the mode.

>>> It is on life-support only
>>> in amateur radio. AMATEURS.
>>
>>From the Latin word meaning "to love".
>
> Did your supermarket have a sale on passion fruit this week?
>
> "Amateur" radio: From Part 97 meaning "without pecuniary
> interest."

Tell it to Vipul.
>
>>> Ancient Radiotelegraphy Society. Beepers.
>>

>>Ah - look at all that TOLERANCE from Len!
>
> Besides beeping, how have I maligned the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
> Society? By calling them "ancient" instead of "archaic?"

By practically every post you make here. By your repeated insults, ridicule,
name-calling, factual errors, ethnic/racial/gender slurs, excessive emoticons
and/or general infantile behavior.

And by your intolerance of those who disagree with you.
>
>>So? Are you the censor from the Lanark Street Ministry of Information?
>>You have told some of us here to shut up. Is that your idea of
>>TOLERANCE? Is that how you support the American ideal of free speech?
>
> The right of free speech is contained in the First Amendment of
> the US Constitution. I defend that.

No, you don't. You give it lip service.

> Once I took an oath to
> defend that Constitution...as the official entrance to US Army
> military service.

Doesn't mean you live up to it now.
>
> You never took such an oath. You never served in the US
> military.
>
> You neither show nor practice any "tolerance" to those of differing
> opinions to yours.

Do you see me telling others to shut up, the way you do?
>
> You carry on in here like some ancient noble talking down to
> inferiors, one who cannot ever be accused of a single wrong-
> doing, mistake, or error.

Here, let me hold that mirror for you, Len.
>
>>Can't you take a little tweak, Len? Seems to me you preach tolerance
>>and acceptance but don't do it yourself.
>
> What "little tweak," boy? You into the "noblesse oblige" thing
> now?

>>So what? They were still in use in radio communications the late '70s.
>>That disproves your claim that:
>>
>>"The slowest teleprinters in radio communications have been 100 WPM
>>for four decades"
>>
>>Now, be a big machismo man-ums and admit that you made a mistake. You

>>posted something that just isn't true. An error.
>
> Kiss my yes, Reverend Jimmie.

Ah, look at all the tolerance from Len!

Look at how well he accepts a correction when he makes a mistake!
>
> I made an error:

Yes, you sure did. Many times.

> I tried to post factual information to a radio god,
> thinking he might understand a point...which the poor thing did
> not and, to get even for being slighted, went after nearly every
> sentence with "corrections."

Just like you. Live with it. Or can't you take strong oppostion?

>>You wrote:
>>
>>"The slowest teleprinters in radio communications have been 100 WPM
>>for four decades"
>>
>>Four decades ago is 1963. If there were slower teleprinters in use in
>>radio communications after 1963, you are just plain wrong.
>
> Oh, my yes...WRONG!

Yep.

>>I don't think you have. List them.
>
> Why?

Because nobody believes you.

>>Sounds just like you, Len. Tell us again about the 100 wpm
>>teleprinters.
>
> Model 28s and 33s made by Teletype Corporation, Chicago?

None of them did less than 100 wpm after 1963, huh?

>>Do you really think Element 1 is a barrier?
>
> Yes.
>
Well, you're wrong. It's a TEST.
>
>>Not at all. I was talking about use, not the test. You just don;t want
>>to admit that Morse code is used by anybody.

>>Is it all about HF to you? Is that what's really bugging you all these
>>years - you want access to the HF/MF ham bands, not VHF/UHF? Sure
>>seems like it.
>
> Sure seems like Reverend Jimmie keeps spoiling for a FIGHT!

How? By asking simple questions?
>
> Too bad he didn't enlist in a US military and do REAL
> communications.

So nonmilitary communications are not REAL?

> Too bad he hasn't done any professional radio communications.

You are mistaken.
>
> Too bad he can't see beyond his own personal interests to that
> of others.

Sure I can. Can you?
>
> Too bad he can't be tolerant of those he perceives as lower class.

I don't perceive anyone as "lower class".
>
> The "Gang of Four" title fits. Intolerant, self-righteous worshippers
> of morsemanship.

Ah, just feel that tolerance!

Tell ya what, Len, be careful up on that pedestal.
>
>>What IS your problem, Len? The test will be gone when the FCC drops
>>it. I've been saying that for over three years now. Big deal. Get over
>>it. Grow up, for heaven's sake.
>
> The morse code test is NOT gone, sonny. Still there.

> Been there for three years. Been there since 1912.
>
> Morsemen are NOT gods of radio, any radio. Grow up, get
> over the fact that you are NOT worshipped for morsemanship.

You're not a god of anything, Len. Grow up, get over the fact that you are NOT
worshipped. For anything.
>
>>Stop being such a one-trick pony. Or part of a pony, anyway. ;-)
>
> Practice TOLERANCE, Reverend Jimmie.

Show us how it's done, oh master of your own domain!
>
> Practice what you demand of others.

Why? You sure don't.
>
> Works two ways, boy. Even for morsemen gods.
>
I and others have tried being civil to you but the response from you has always been repeated insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic/racial/gender slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general infantile behavior.

So show us how this tolerance thing is done, Len. Practice what you preach rather than the behaviors listed above. I don't think you can.

2621. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 12:26:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415082608.04143.00000093@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64755

In article <pan.2003.04.15.01.04.29.226862.31882@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 20:26:05 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>> In article <pan.2003.04.14.18.50.51.311159.15263@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
>> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>>
>>>The acorn didn't fall particularly close to the tree in the case of Ron
>>>Reagan, so I'm not sure how special his insight into his father's
>>>Administration is. And he admits he doesn't know W. well at all.
>>
>> But he gets his 15 seconds of fame...
>
>Geez, wasn't his 15 seconds up in about 1982?

1983......

Then there's Patty Davis...
>
>> The French and German companies don't have to pay the taxes that fund
>> the war, so they can bid lower.
>
>What taxes to fund the war?

HAW! That's a GOOD one, Jon!

How much of the federal budget, and the GDP is spent on defense in the USA?
France? Germany? Japan?

Yes, those countries have high taxes. They spend their tax money on other
things, and then let the USA pay for their defense.
>
>> I am suddenly reminded of the story of Henny Penny, who sowed the seed,
>> watered, weeded, harvested and ground the grain, made the dough and
>> baked the bread, all while her "friends" refused to help. But when it
>> came time to eat the bread.....
>
>It'd be a better analogy if Henny had first laid waste to the field.

Henny Penny first went out and slew the Big Bad Wolf who had terrorized the
area for 20+ years so that the filed would be safe.
>
>> Heard an interesting editorial on NPR on the way home today. The main
>> point was that what Iraq needs now is aid and infrastructure - water,
>> power, communications, security, etc. And they need it now, not when the
>> UN gets done defining a committee to name the panel that will study the

>> problems of how to address the transitional agency that will direct the
>> effort to figure out how to set up the decision process that will lead
>> to a synergy of resources to determine when to begin rebuilding......
>
>It's certainly the case that immediate aid can be most effectively
>delivered by those already on the ground. But I think that editorial
>doesn't do justice to the UN. If there is delay, it'll be the politicos
>that cause it. One thing the UN knows how to do is manage relief programs.
>They've certainly had enough practice over the past 50+ years.

Sure - but what Iraq really needs is not relief but rebuilding. Of course the
Iraqis are making the job tougher by looting and vandalism.
>
>>>>> The powerful there don't want certain freedoms in their own
>>>>> countries. That doesn't mean they give a damn about freedom in ours.
>>>>
>>>> They also sometimes have a different definition of freedom vs.
>>>> license.
>>>
>>>Another good point.
>>
>> I'm not saying I agree with them...
>
>Understood. Me, I take it case-by-case.
>
'zactly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2622. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 12:26:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415082609.04143.00000094@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 64756

In article <3E9B8558.B1F1D3D2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <20030414182139.25918.00001330@mb-fd.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
>> (Vshah101) writes:
>
>> >If everyone jumped off a bridge,
>> >would you?
>>
>> Depends on how high the bridge is and how much I'm being paid.
>
>When I was a kid trying to leverage my dad into buying me something, I'd
>often try the old, "but all the kids have one" ploy. Dad's response
>was, "If all the kids ate horse manure sandwiches, would you want one?"
>
HAW!

Did your Dad know the Utah Phillips story about the pie?

73 de Jim, N2EY

"it's good, though"

2623. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 12:35:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415083521.28437.00001066@mb-fv.aol.com>
Source record: 64758

>Yet I have to take the same road you took. That would make you a lazy moron.

No theres no way you could take the same road. First you would have to know something about the material, which you will never know. The Lazy Moron comment is really about you. To lazy or to Dumb to get a General untill the FCC decided to give you a Welfare General. Now your to Lazy or to dumb to get an EXTRA, waiting for your next FREE handout arent you?

>Riiight!
>
>Nobody believes that.
>

I could care less what you believe. By the way are you still on WELFARE?

2624. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 14:21:05 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E9C1551.7040104@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 64767

WA8ULX wrote:

>>
>
>
> I could care less what you believe. By the way are you still on WELFARE?

The proper phrase is "I couldn't (as in could not) care less what
you believe." You still trying to graduate from grammar school?

2625. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 14:24:09 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E9C1609.5030307@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 64768

WA8ULX wrote:
>>I do. I'd believe that WA8ULX took $250 to take a CBr's test for him.
>>Lucky they didn't get caught .... yet
>
>
> No dufus boy that was not the case at all. Just for your info, a couple of
> Cbers who were going to take there CBplusser Test, bet me I couldnt pass the
> EXTRA. Not only did I pass it with 100% score, with no studying, I also got to
> collect the money from the Cbers. But the best part was I got to see both of
> the Fools fail the NoCode CB Plusser Test.

Actually I think he paid a CBer $250 to take the test for him.

2626. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 15:22:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9C2399.46AA3529@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64762

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3E9B8558.B1F1D3D2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <20030414182139.25918.00001330@mb-fd.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
> >> (Vshah101) writes:
> > >
> >> >If everyone jumped off a bridge,
> >> >would you?
> >>
> >> Depends on how high the bridge is and how much I'm being paid.
> > >
> >>When I was a kid trying to leverage my dad into buying me something, I'd
> >>often try the old, "but all the kids have one" ploy. Dad's response
> >>was, "If all the kids ate horse manure sandwiches, would you want one?"
> > >
> HAW!
>
> Did your Dad know the Utah Phillips story about the pie?

> "it's good, though"

If he knew it, he never passed it along to me.

Dave K8MN

2627. Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 15:36:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7h8t9$h7e$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64763

If your CW is as good as your English then I understand your problem.

Dan/W4NTI

"A.Melon" <juicy@melontraffickers.com> wrote in message
news:7ecd39bdd709e4b54f100312a1dabf68@melontraffickers.com...
>
> No CW, no problemo ...
>
> For WRC 2006 (or 2007), It is suggested that CW
> becomes forbidden for hams below 500 GHz and
> with CW power limited to 1 microwatt in oder to
> limit the pollution to others qso in other countries.
>
> But military administrations are allowed to
> authorize old farts CW coders on the military
> bands to practice freely CW. Nobody cares what
> happens on military bands ...
>
> It is also suggested that the major manufacturers
> YAESU, KENWOOD and ICOM, stop to sell HF
> transceivers allowing the CW mode considering
> than only about 1 per cent of rig owners use the
> CW mode.
>
> Only some weeks now to wait for the suppress
> of mandatory CW at ITU ...
>
>
>
>
>
>

2628. Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 15:37:43 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7h8v0tqf1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64764

I know....but at least he isnt running the streets without adult
supervision....hi.

Dan/W4NTI

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3E9B9075.BB737C08@ix.netcom.com...
> What a really lame troll.....
>

2629. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 15:47:07 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9C297B.849697F2@crosslink.net>
Source record: 64759

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> No one has been denied, all you had to do was take the test.

Really!? Jeeze, the blankety-blanks made me PASS it too! And that took practice. Had to waste hours gaining an impractical skill I never use. So, I have a better idea. Since our goal is to keep people out of Amateur Radio, let's make everybody shoot center fire pistol at the NRA sharpshooter level to gain access to the HF bands and at the expert level to use Morse. That'll *really* reduce QRM and it makes at least as much sense as requiring Morse to use SSB, right? And think of all the great call's that'd become available for FCC to sell. Quick, right your congressman ....

73, K3DWW

2630. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 16:01:11 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9C2CC7.8ADBF2C8@crosslink.net>
Source record: 64760

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Let's give your laptop a try. How about if we meet on 160m in July?
> I'm betting my aural decoding skills can beat your computer--if it has a
> decent fist.

Might be fun to have one computer sent *perfect* morse at increasing speeds til you, or a receiving computer begins missing characters. Has anybody tried this before? What are the practical maximum human and computer speeds given a perfect fist?

73, K3DWW

2631. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 16:04:25 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9C2D89.6B90D5E8@crosslink.net>
Source record: 64761

Brian wrote:
>
> wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote
> >
> > Nothing held me back, I was just waiting for some Dumb ASS CBplussers to come
> > along and give me $250 dollars to take the Test.
>
> Riiight!
>
> Nobody believes that.

I do. I'd believe that WA8ULX took $250 to take a CBr's test for him.
Lucky they didn't get caught .... yet.

2632. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 16:05:32 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415120532.14532.00001196@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 64765

>Really!? Jeeze, the blankety-blanks made me PASS it too!

Isnt that Pitty

>So, I have a better idea. Since our goal is to keep people out of
>Amateur Radio, let's make everybody shoot center fire pistol at the NRA
>sharpshooter level to gain access to the HF bands and at the expert
>level to use Morse.

Might not be a bad Idea, except shooting a gun has no value for Ham Radio
testing.

2633. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 16:10:15 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415121015.14532.00001197@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 64766

>I do. I'd believe that WA8ULX took $250 to take a CBr's test for him.
>Lucky they didn't get caught .... yet

No dufus boy that was not the case at all. Just for your info, a couple of Cbers who were going to take there CBplusser Test, bet me I couldnt pass the EXTRA. Not only did I pass it with 100% score, with no studying, I also got to collect the money from the Cbers. But the best part was I got to see both of the Fools fail the NoCode CB Plusser Test.

2634. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 16:34:50 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304150834.4fff836b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64769

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<yPKma.2709$Mo5.991@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>...
> Jim,
>
> I duzn't offen disagree with yous,

Dats "youse" - rimes wit "lose"

> but this obsuleet stuff has got to go.
> Duz you no that in kollege, the perfesser kept wantin to speek in codes?
> Heck, secont koorter phisics he wuz tryin to explane the energy spent by a
> spring. Dang if he weren't using code! This guy goes and draws some dum
> squiggly line. I objected and he sent me back to math class. That durned
> guy went and starts explaining with all this obsolete code. Kin you believe
> they actually use *Greek*! Delta he calls it.

All dem fraternity boyz hav doze funny letters, too. I remember too
frats from my kollitch days: Aye Tappa Kee and Aye Phelta Thi

> Looks like a little triangle
> to me. Hoo boy! Heck, I went back to the phisics class and tolt him so! I
> asked him what this stuff was about grams and kilograms. Ever one nos that
> you measure in feet and pounds. He sez ok and asked me what a slug was - so
> I slugged him. Danged if they didn't ship me off to Vietnam after that!
> LOL

Ain it da troot. Here's a pome 'bout dat (tanks, Hanz):

THE SPELLING CHEQUER

or poet tree without mist takes)

Eye have a spelling chequer
It came with my pea sea
It plainly marks four my revue
Miss steaks eye cannot see

Each thyme when I have struct the quays
Eye weight four it two say
If watt eye rote is wrong or rite
It shows me strait a weigh

As soon as a mist ache is maid
It nose bee fore too late
And eye can put the error rite
Eye really fined it grate

I've run this poem threw it
I'm sure your policed to no
It's letter perfect in its weigh
My chequer tolled me sew

- Anon
>
> Please forgive the little 'humor' I had to slip into this thread.

Nothing to forgive, Jim, funny as heck.

> Obviously, each profession has its' own set of 'codes'. :)
>
> --... ...-- (I can't resist :) from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
> ps - don't take this as a hard core endorsement of Morse either (please)
> ...
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

2635. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 16:43:18 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304150843.36a2b789@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64770

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.13.18.06.39.331305.14016@arrl.org>...
> On Sun, 13 Apr 2003 12:34:15 -0400, Brian Kelly wrote:
> > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > news:<pan.2003.04.12.17.08.48.5332.2786@arrl.org>...
> >

> > aid and the reconstruction of Iraq alone. Even before the fighting has
> > stopped. And that's just first pass emergency funding.
>
> Let's hope it's well spent. It's not just about the amount of dollars.
> Some of the resources going into Afghanistan have been spent in ways that
> are questionable, supporting regional warlords at the expense of the
> central government.

Any tool works in a jam, ROTC and common sense 101.

> While it's understandable to try to get the warloads
> to help us chase down OBL and crew, one wonders what the longer term
> ramifications will be if the government in Kabul remains too weak to
> assert sovereignty over the whole country.

That's a very likely scenario. We didn't go in to "reconstruct"
Afghanistan, we went in to dig out OBL and to do that we also took on
the Taliban as a somewhat lesser objective. Since the Taliban were the
goverment we have the responsiblity to at least try to help the
Afghans put together a replacement government. There are limits on how
much in the way of assets we'll put into this effort, there is only
so much we can or should do to help others help themselves. Including
Iraq.

> Fortunately, Iraq is not Afghanistan. I think it will be easier to put
> dollars to work to good effect there.

That better be the way it goes or we're really gonna have a BIG
problem.

> > Conjurs up visions of some backwater entity calling Rumsfeld and
> > hollering "Invade us, invade us!"
>
> "The Mouse that Roared" -- funny, funny book and movie.

Giggled for days after I saw the thing. Has anybody done a "Pig Farm"
movie?

>
> > The Japs pledged $200 million for Afghanistan, last I saw they'd forked

> > over only $32 million so far.
>
> If I'm not mistaken, the pledged amount was to be provided over a 5-year
> period. If you have more details, I'd be interestsd in them.

I have no idea where I read that at this point, some article somewhere
maybe a month ago. Some pundit beasting on the lack of funding for
Afghanistan.

> > . . . When was the last time any of 'em cleared
> > out a despotic regime and worked to establish a democracy in it's place?
>
> NATO did just that in the Balkans a few years ago.

With who doing the heavy lifting in the air which paved the way?
Remember the F-16 jock who ate bugs for a week to survive in the woods
after he got shot down? When was the last time NATO did anything which
we didn't lead? France kicked NATO out of Paris years ago and quit the
organization.

> In Gulf War I, the
> French had forces involved. Maybe the Germans, too, I don't remember for
> sure.

I think their contingent in Afghanistan is the first German
out-of-country deployment since The War. And today we have Japs in the
Gulf. Poland put forces into the current fray too. I haven't seen
"The Bloc" bitching about them jumping in. Odd.

> The French even took a few casualties. (Funny, you don't hear much
> about that these days.) There are German forces working alongside US
> forces in Afghanistan right now. (Another thing you probably won't see on
> Fox.)

Last time I watched TV I think was the 2002 World Series. TV drives me
nuts. I hang out in Reuters, API, the WashPost, the Saudi Arab News
and some others.

Good archived series on the origins of the Muslim faith (lengthy read)
and a source for the view from the other side of the coin.

http://www.arabnews.com

> French forces are also involved right now in trying to stabilize a
> highly volatile situation in the Ivory Coast. And they recently deployed
> troops to the Central African Republic to protect foreign nationals there.

Those are "French internal affairs", having to inject themselves into
those squabbles are paybacks for their days as the colonial masters of
those countries.

> The concern that much of the world has is that when there is one power
> that is overwhelmingly superior militarily, the rest of the world is at
> the mercy of that power. That scares them. Now, most Americans react to

> that with disbelief. After all, we're the good guys, aren't we? We'd never
> use our military power to force others to do things just to serve our
> interests, right?

To protect our security yes, we damned well better kick butt. To loot
& pillage, no. And don't bother with the Spanish-American war
nonsense.

> Except that we HAVE done just that in the past. Consider
> the Mexican War. The Spanish-American War. The Panama Canal. Invasion of
> the Dominican Republic (multiple times).

C'mon, gimmee a break Jon, most of those go back well over a century
ago. Ya forgot Haiti multiple times, Grenada, Noriega, Pablo Escobar
and a number of others. You don't support the Monroe Doctrine? You'd
rather Sweden & Belarus had a UN mandate to patrol our back porch?

> During the cold war, there was a
> power balance, and to most of the world there was one side that was
> clearly preferable -- the US.

There never was an actual balance of powers, ask Gorbachev, Lockheed &
the CIA. Soviet military power was largely propaganda, never in this
world would they have fired the first shot.

> But now that there is but one superpower,
> what prevents us from doing whatever the hell we want? (Some of that
> superpower's citizens have been arguing on this forum that we should do
> exactly that.) Not only with regard to perceived threats to our safety,
> but also with perceived threats to our econonic interests. It's not
> exactly unknown to use military power to advance economic interests, you
> know.

You're saying is that you have no faith in the leaders we freely
elected and the checks and balances and assorted admonitions in the
U.S. Constitution to prevent the U.S. from running amok with our
military. Summarily rejected concept.

> Taking all that into account, it's clear that what France, Germany and
> Russia are trying to do is to form a bloc that will oppose what they view
> as some of the more dangerous behaviors of the US.
> That doesn't mean that
> they will oppose the US in all things or even most things. But I think
> they believe that the more the US uses its military, the easier it will be
> for it to resort to military action instead of exhausting peaceful means.
> When all you have is a hammer....

Based in their own sordid thousand year history of periodically
mauling each other. We don't have that genetic flaw. How long has it
been since we attempted to conquer and occupy Mexico or Canada? How
many times have various Euros invaded their neighbors in just the past
hundred years? They're a bunch of hypocrites. They can't past their
own history and are trying to "Euopeanize" us via rhetoric at the UN

and in other channels. The Kyoto Treaty debacle comes to mind here. To hell with 'em, let 'em sink in their own socialist PC swamps. Come the days when the UN and NATO fall apart we'll still be what we were the day after 4 July 1776. I do hope they remember who has the big stick when they start their crap again.

> All I'm asking is that you try to put yourself in the other fellow's
> shoes. If you're unwilling to do that, you're certain to never understand
> his point of view.

Been there, done that. I did look at it from both sides. Going into the diplomatic upheaval which preceeded the invasion I was 100% neutral WRT to whether we should or should not go in without a mandate. I'm not a hawk or a hardcore conservative. It was the behavior of the "bloc" during those last days before we went in which put me squarely in the pro-war camp.

> > Premature conclusions. Doesn't really matter anyway at this point, the
> > deed is done. Tomorrow is all that matters, we can catch up with the
> > rest in the history books.
>
> That's true, but we write history books so we can draw lessons from them.

More lessons will be drawn from this uproar than either of us can imagine.

> I object to terms like "romp" to describe the Iraq war. There are 115
> (last I looked) American families that haven't found it to be a romp at
> all. To them the Iraq war was a terribly painful experience, and I think
> we owe it to them to respect that.

Semantics. From Websters: "Romp: an easy winning pace; also : RUNAWAY". The speed of the advance from Kuwait to Bagdhad which will rewrite military tactics and logististics texts. There are a couple other "official definitions" of "romp" which have nothing to do with the context I used and neither of them have anything even remotely to do with battle casualities.

> > All of it within the past two days. Sharon is also reversing course and
> > is completely uncharacteristically tossing olive branches at the
> > Palestinians.
>
> I saw that. Maybe he thinks the US is serious. Do you suppose he could
> have been made to think that without a war?

In so many words he publicly stated that the war has changed the politik of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. I haven't seen much about it so far but I have a hunch that the way we knocked out SH is giving Israel's neighboring enemies the willies which in turn might be giving Sharon an opportunity to tone down his level of beligerence. Simultaneously respected Palestinian moderates are trying to squeeze Arafat out to political pasture. Maybe the time has finally come to settle the the conflict which triggered the destruction of the WTC and

installed our troops in Bagdhad. That would not be a bad output from
our efforts of the past three weeks eh?

. . . .

> > They folded their tents and shaddup after it became clear that they made
> > ineffectual idiots of themselves.
>
> I'm talking about the polling data, Brian. No tents or loud talk involved.
> Most of those in the US who wanted a UN resolution supported the war once
> the President declared diplomacy at an end. Clearly, they didn't feel the
> UN's permission was required. Equally clearly, they didn't feel it was
> unimportant.

OK, I was thinking the protesters in Berkley, etc. They have too much
time on their hands, they need heavier rosters . .

As far as the polls are concerned as of yesterday 70% of the U.S. is
opposed to any more "premptive strikes" against anybody including
Syria. Dubya is not going to invade Syria. Period.

>
> Jon

w3rv

2636. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 16:59:12 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304150859.147b21fe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64771

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030415002635.24070.00000445@mb-ck.aol.com>...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
> >Those who
> >have elected to seek and achieved the title of "Professional Engineer" are
> >respected.

That has been my experience, too, Dee. Some jobs require a PE, others
reward holding or earning a PE with raises, bonuses, etc.
>
> "Professional Engineer" has nothing to do with EE profession. Its for Civil
> Engineers.

WRONG!

Professional Engineering licenses are available in many engineering
disciplines. Electrical Engineering is one of them.
>
> >Inserted before the General
> >class
> >> license, its very irresponsible and embarrassing to the hobby. Even code
> lovers
> >> should be embarrassed about that.
> >
> >That is YOUR opinion.
>
> Its also the FCC's opinion.

No, it isn't.

FCC set up the structure that way, not hams. FCC could have done the
license lots of other ways, but they didn't. For example, some folks
think there should be only one class of license, with all privileges.
FCC could have done that, and merely required 5 wpm for HF/MF.
>
> >Lots of EEs don't like to homebrew either.

Busman's holiday.

> >That doesn't make them
> >any less a EE than one who does.
>
> EE's that don't like to homebrew are probably in it just for the money.

Nope. Untrue.

Some EEs don't have the time
Some EEs work in areas other than radio
Some EEs would rather spend their time on the air
Some EEs leave their work AT work.

Here's why there isn't more homebrewing in amateur radio: Economics - of both time and money. For the kind of rigs most hams want, it costs MORE to homebrew one than to buy its equivalent ready-made or assemble a kit, even if you have EE-level knowledge and skills. Also, except in unusual circumstances, a homebrew unit has very low resale value.

Where homebrewing "wins" is in situations where:

A ham wants to build something that is "off the beaten path"
A ham has parts sources other than Digi-Key, Mouser, etc.
The cost of the thing being built is dominated by hand labor

Which is why you see lots of hams homebrewing antennas, linear amplifiers, etc.

> I truly
> enjoy building circuits outside of work.

That's good! How many amateur radio stations have you built? I've built-from-scratch about eight complete HF stations. That doesn't include kits, converted military surplus, restored/modified manufactured rigs, test equipment or other projects.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2637. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 17:22:34 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415132234.16848.00000988@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 64773

>You still trying to graduate from grammar school?
>

No, I have already grauated from College, but thats not the Question, the
Question was are you still on Welfare?

2638. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 17:25:33 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415132533.16848.00000989@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 64774

>Actually I think he paid a CBer $250 to take the test for him.
>

It would probably cost alot more if a CBer was taking the Test. First you would have to pay someone to take it for the CBer.

2639. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 17:35:09 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415133509.16848.00000991@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 64775

>It'd keep the number of hams small, even better than Morse does, and
>that's the whole purpose is it not?
>

I dont know who told you that. The present testing system is a JOKE. No knowledge needed to pass the writtens. Even the ARRL realizes it, they even offer courses now to teach the material after you have taken and passed the test. Isnt that a great testing system.
My question is why even have testing at this point. The Morse Test is history, the written might as well be.
Thank God I got rid of all my "Ham CB Gear".

2640. YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 18:25:45 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.19065f03e14e815d9896b8@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 64776

DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15, 2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or British military personnel

provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding officer.

"There is precedent for this," Mills said, citing an operation during the 1991 Gulf War. "These operators will need written authorization to operate from their commanding officers

until an interim Iraqi government is in place," Mills said. After that point, operators would need documented permission from Iraqi authorities. The Daily DX has reported that several hams with the US military in Iraq have been showing up on the air in recent days. Mark Smith, NG5L, of North Carolina, has been active from near Nasiriya as YI/NG5L on SSB, usually around 0500 UTC near 14.195 MHz. He's also been spotted in Europe and North America on other 20-meter frequencies and at other times of the day. Jim Dunkerton, YI/KT4CK, has been active on 15-meter SSB between 1430 and 1600 UTC. Bob Furzer, 9K2ZZ/K4CY, has apparently crossed into Iraq from Kuwait and has been on the air as K4CY/p or K4CY/m.

2641. Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 19:24:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415152423.08944.00000469@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 64777

>Subject: Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/14/2003 11:20 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030415002040.24070.00000444@mb-ck.aol.com>

>In non-amateur, non-Ham applications, CW means "an unmodulated sin wave". In
>amateur radio, it means "Morse code".

It's a "sine wave", Mr. Engineer.

Steve, K4YZ

2642. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 19:36:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E9C5F5B.1070909@psu.edu>
Source record: 64778

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please
>>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>>Date: 4/12/2003 4:57 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <eZ%la.862$7F2.478690@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
>
>
>>It's an inherent ability of the
>>human brain....(SNIP)
>
>
> The operative word there being "human", Dee...

Brain too!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2643. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 19:39:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E9C5FE8.4030904@psu.edu>
Source record: 64779

Vshah101 wrote:
> From K4YZ:
>
>
>>>I know its hard to imagine. It seems counter-intuitive, but it does occur.
>>>I, myself have had that condition <on occasion>.
>>
>> Oh? What's the name of this condition, Vipul?
>
>
> Alien time-dependent programming.
>
> Actually its called motor memory. That's when you can encode fairly fast, but
> go lower than a certain speed and you are unable to encode at that speed.

Motor memory operates at an unconscious level. One has to work at a
conscious level to do Morse Code.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2644. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 19:43:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415154351.03495.00000730@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 64780

>Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/14/2003 11:26 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030415002635.24070.00000445@mb-ck.aol.com>

>>Inserted before the General
>>class
>>> license, its very irresponsible and embarrassing to the hobby. Even code
>>lovers
>>> should be embarrassed about that.
>>
>>That is YOUR opinion.
>
>Its also the FCC's opinion.

The FCC says Morse Code is "embarrassing"..???

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! !

I Suppose your can PROVE that with a quote somewhere...?!?!

>EE's that don't like to homebrew are probably in it just for the money. I
>truly
>enjoy building circuits outside of work.

Then why aren't you whining to your colleagues about THEIR lack of
interest in "homebrewing", since they are getting PAID for it?

>>You are defining everything that you personally don't like as "ham radio".
>
>Thats not true.

That's EXACTLY true. Anyone who has to wade through your drivvel knows
this to be true. Anything "good" ia "Amateur" radiod, anything "not good" is
"Ham" Radio.

>Hams like to set up antennas for their stations. I participated
>in some of those. Ham radio includes antenna setups, which IS technical.

When I read this, I am reminded of the bigot who says he's NOT a bigot
"Because some of my best friends are [enter ethnicity here]".

Steve, K4YZ

2645. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 19:50:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415155039.04182.00000177@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 64783

In article <3E9B8428.36F4BE9A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:
>>
>> N2EY wrote:

>> Apparently, there is some confusion here on what is a 2N2222 transistor,
>> compared to a cheese sandwich.
>>
>> There are those that believe in relative definition. Following this logic,
if
>> everyone believed there is no gravity, then gravity would no longer exist.
>> Others believe in scientific proof.
>
>You are the fellow touting "relative definition". I've not observed you
>following any logic at all. We aren't in an "if everyone believed there
>is no gravity" situation. We're in a "We all call it gravity; you call
>it talcum powder" situation.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...new confusion! Talcum powder v. gravity!

>When you begin to lose an argument, you really go out in a blaze of
>nonsensical glory.

No one else has confused talcum powder and gravity...only
Heil. Strange!

>Why those devious bastards! Imagine them selling transceivers when
>their real goal is the insidious growth of morse code.

Trouble in da Hood?

The Gang of Four arguing over the "growth of morse code?!?"

>It's the mind control LSI chips built into those new transceivers which
>makes mind control possible, Vipul.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...Heil needs his V-Chip updated! :-)

>Tell us please, which bands aren't useful. You'll save us a lot of
>wasted time and effort if we can just manage to avoid those useless
>bands.

Anything above 30 cm is "useless" to Real Hams.

Real Hams work DX on HF with CW.

>I don't know of any contest where the callsign is the exchange. I'll
>assume that you goofed because you know nothing more about contesting
>than you do about someone knowing ten word per minute morse forgetting
>how to receive morse at 5 wpm. Whatever information exchanged by a
>contester is quite useful in achieving a higher score in a contest.

"Anything goes?" :-)

>Not everything I do on the air need be useful to all of amateur radio.

You exist, therefore you rule!

>Great. Take your own advice and quit attempting to redefine amateur
>radio by making believe that "ham radio" is something different. It is
>dishonest of you.

[mental picture of stern taskmaster wagging finger... :-)]

Chewing out on cheese sandwiches?

New local paper advertisement today:

Complete HAM Dinner....$39.99...serves 8 to 10 people.

Old Fashioned Bone-In HAM...$1.99 a pound.

On the dinner, I'd suppose a photocopy of a ham license is
sufficient proof for purchase... :-)

Lots of old-fashioned hams already in here, confusing transistors
and cheese sandwiches, talcum powder and gravity. They seem
to have a bone to pick with everyone not old fashioned...or have
too much bone in their cranial cavity. :-)

2646. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 19:50:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415155039.04182.00000178@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 64784

In article <3E9B179D.2030407@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> Example: If everyone else calls a 2N2222 a transistor, and you insist on
>> calling it a cheese sandwich, you're the one who is the cause of confusion.
>
> I know what ya mean Jim! Broke three teeth once bitin' down on one of
>the little buggers. 2N2222's are NOT cheese sandwiches!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike, you seem to be introducing another type of sandwich:

Ham on wry.

:-)

2647. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 19:50:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415155040.04182.00000179@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 64787

In article <3E9C2CC7.8ADBF2C8@crosslink.net>, Vito <vito@crosslink.net> writes:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>> Let's give your laptop a try. How about if we meet on 160m in July?
>> I'm betting my aural decoding skills can beat your computer--if it has a
>> decent fist.
>
>Might be fun to have one computer sent *perfect* morse at increasing
>speeds til you, or a receiving computer begins missing characters. Has
>anybody tried this before? What are the practical maximum human and
>computer speeds given a perfect fist?
>
>73, K3DWW

Trying to speak seriously around here (if that's possible), I'd offer
these comments:

The late Eugene Hubbell, W7DI (formerly W9ERU) had won a
code cognition contest at a 55 WPM rate, copying on a non-
electric typewriter. His business cards and Illinois QSLs
mentioned that. Gene had a unique ability to totally
concentrate when receiving CW, seeming to enter an
almost trance state when doing so.

In written correspondence with a long-time radiotelegrapher
and amateur extra back around 1980, he mentioned another
"speed freak" buddy down near San Diego (he was in the
San Francisco Bay area). Those two regularly went at it
at "70 to 80 WPM" (claimed). I can't vouch for that. :-)

The US Army Signal Corps "coder, burst keyer" accessory
of the 1960s was designed to send 300 WPM from a pre-
recorded message in an effort to thwart interception. Since
recording apparatus existed on all sides during WW2 days,
it wasn't good for any "encryption" through high rates. The
intent seemed to be for absolutely minimum time on the air
for IDing and DFing. No human has been found to be able
to "read" 300 WPM of any on-off coding rate.

From those two examples I'd judge the "upper limit" on
on-off keying cognition as being just under 100 WPM
equivalent. Others' mileage will vary...and others motors
will no doubt overheat in dragging out replies... :-)

2648. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 19:50:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415155041.04182.00000180@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 64782

>> Did your Dad know the Utah Phillips story about the pie?
>
>> "it's good, though"
>
>If he knew it, he never passed it along to me.

That still doesn't answer why you ate it... ?

2649. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 19:50:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415155041.04182.00000181@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 64786

In article <3E9B8558.B1F1D3D2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>When I was a kid trying to leverage my dad into buying me something, I'd
>often try the old, "but all the kids have one" ploy. Dad's response
>was, "If all the kids ate horse manure sandwiches, would you want one?"
>
>Dave K8MN

Shouldn't the question on everyone's mind be: "Why did you?"

Bon apetit! :-)

2650. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 19:50:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415155042.04182.00000183@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 64788

In article <20030414225241.19651.00000192@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/14/2003 5:21 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030414182139.25918.00001330@mb-fd.aol.com>
>
>>Apparently, there is some confusion here on what is a 2N2222 transistor,
>>compared to a cheese sandwich.
>
> NO, there's not...Unless we are talking about you, in which case I agree
>there's confusion. And ONLY because YOU insist on trying to invent new
>definitions for universally accepted terms and phraseology.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...all you radio gods don't seem to know the
difference between transistors and sandwiches. :-)

> In this case it's JUST you, Vipul. Everyone here agrees that Amateur
>Radio and "Ham" Radio are one-in-the-same. You do not. You are the anomaly.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...the "enforcer" of the Gang of Four has Laid Down
Da Rulez!

> WHAT in the WORLD are you trying to say?

All the other readers have been wondering what YOU were saying.

:-)

> Proficiency in Morse Code communications IS part of the radio art,
>Vipul.

Forever and ever, amen. :-)

> By yor own admission you are not trained or proficient in Morse Code
>communications, ergo you cannot appreciate the skill and rhythm of a
>competent
>Morse operator...Especially one using a properly adjusted and operated Bug.

Yes, "ordinary mundanes" in every other US radio service
just don't appreciate the glory, the majesty, of morse code.

That's why they've either dropped it or never considered it.

You don't get no respect.

You are Rodney Dangerfield without humor. :-)

> OK...so for the purpose of our analogies in the future we will call
>2N2222's "hockey pucks". There...that make you feel any better...???

A hockey puck calling a transistor a hockey puck.

Poor guy, now he thinks he is Don Rickles... :-)

2651. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 19:50:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415155042.04182.00000182@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 64789

In article <3E9B8428.36F4BE9A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Redefinition works fine for those with an agenda. Honesty works better for
the
>> hobby. So, one should not call cheese sandwiches 2N2222's. It may work fine
for
>> a while. Eventually it will be bad for everyone involved. If you are told to
do
>> so, you should politely refuse.
>
>Great. Take your own advice and quit attempting to redefine amateur
>radio by making believe that "ham radio" is something different. It is
>dishonest of you.

Der colonel has spoken.

From now on all hams will call transistors "sandwiches."

If not, they will be chewed out.

2652. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 19:50:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415155044.04182.00000185@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 64781

In article <20030414221120.15625.00000244@mb-ch.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>>There we have it - the establishment Morse coders want to participate in
>>"cleansing".
>
>Right, Vipul -- why don't you start by taking a bite out of a bar of Ivory
>soap!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

How did it taste?
:-)

2653. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 19:50:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415155044.04182.00000184@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 64785

In article <20030414194409.12142.00000140@mb-fr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030414182139.25918.00001330@mb-fd.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
>(Vshah101) writes:
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>> Example: If everyone else calls a 2N2222 a transistor, and you insist on
>>> calling it a cheese sandwich, you're the one who is the cause of
>confusion.
>>
>>Apparently, there is some confusion here on what is a 2N2222 transistor,
>>compared to a cheese sandwich.
>
>Yes, Vipul, you appear to be very confused.

Does your boss know you can't tell the difference between
a transistor and a cheese sandwich?

>>Others believe in scientific proof.
>
>You're off base again, Vipul.

Amateur radio physics isn't based on science?!?

>The existence of things is provable given a few basic assumptions. What
>humans choose to call these things is purely subjective.

Have you been studying to change jobs to the purchasing
department?

[those Purchase Orders are going to look silly...]

>Once upon a time, transistors were called "crystal triodes". Typical bipolar
>transistors are just that. But that name never caught on, and "transistor" is
>the term used for about the past 50+ years.

Jimmie seems confused...as if he was hearing things 2+
years before he was born...

>>Often words are redefined in a specific setting. The goal of this
>>redefinition is often to control others or to increase their importance.
>
>It's for clarity.

So...why do you want to change the EIA registered part numbers
of a transistor to "cheese sandwich?"

2N2222 is only six characters. "Cheese sandwich" requires 13.

>If a big enough group defines a word a certain way, then that's the
>definition.

I get the sneaky feeling you are going to call a Field Effect
Transistor (FET) as a "picnic sandwich." :-)

[picnics are held in open fields...]

>Get used to it, Vipul - that's how languages work.

Okay...when delicatessens and coffee shops start putting
EIA registry numbers for semiconductors on their menus,
we can begin to talk... :-)

>>If everyone jumped off a bridge,
>>would you?
>
>Depends on how high the bridge is and how much I'm being paid.

Amateur radio is "...not for pecuniary reasons."

It's gotta be the "religious aspect," then, a "belief system."

>If a big enough group defines a word a certain way, then that's the
>definition.

So far, the delis, coffee shops, restaurants, and cook book
publishers aren't calling sandwiches by EIA registry numbers.

>Maybe where you work. I'm not a components engineer.

Very few know what you do at work. You are afraid to explain
anything.

From your concentration on sandwiches, I'd come to the
conclusion you work in the company cafeteria...

>It's called "accountability".

Which is it, purchasing department, accounting, or cafeteria?

>You're not making any sense.

You are the one mixing up "cheese sandwiches" and transistors.

Offhand, I'd say you aren't making any sense at all.

>Why? If something has a use, it is useful.

...therefore there MUST be a license test for it?

>>Contesters
>>occupy as many bands as possible, and claim that each band is useful.
>
>If they are not useful, why keep them?

Political pressure from cafeterias and puchasing departments.

>Would you outlaw contests?

Do you contest outlaws?

>Your agenda seems to be redefinition of common terms.

Your agenda seems to be making everyone else eat
their words... :-)

>And one should not claim that there is any difference between "ham radio" and
>"amateur radio".

FCC hasn't used the terms "ham radio" as synonymous with
"amateur radio."

Perhaps the FCC building cafeteria doesn't have cheese
sandwiches on its menu? :-)

>One should not claim that "amateur radio" does not require a license.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, there were dozens of hams (amateur radio operators)
before 1912.

Not only was there no radio regulating agency but the "hams"
picked out their own "callsigns!"

>I politely refuse your attempt to redefine the term "amateur radio".

No problem. I politely refuse to consider you fully rational or
a radio god. :-)

2654. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 19:55:28 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.15.19.55.18.46259.8488@arrl.org>
Source record: 64790

On Tue, 15 Apr 2003 12:43:18 -0400, Brian Kelly wrote:
> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:<pan.2003.04.13.18.06.39.331305.14016@arrl.org>...
>> While it's understandable to try to get the warloads to help us chase
>> down OBL and crew, one wonders what the longer term ramifications will
>> be if the government in Kabul remains too weak to assert sovereignty
>> over the whole country.
>
> That's a very likely scenario. We didn't go in to "reconstruct"
> Afghanistan, we went in to dig out OBL and to do that we also took on
> the Taliban as a somewhat lesser objective. Since the Taliban were the
> goverment we have the responsiblity to at least try to help the Afghans
> put together a replacement government. There are limits on how much in
> the way of assets we'll put into this effort, there is only so much we
> can or should do to help others help themselves. Including Iraq.

But if there's not a moderate goverment in Kabul that's capable of
controlling the country, what's to prevent the Taliban from regaining
control? Or if not that, what prevents a regional warlord from hosting the
Taliban and al Qaeda types in some corner of the country? If that happens,
sure, we could go dig them out again, but how much better would it be not
to have to do so?

>> NATO did just that in the Balkans a few years ago.
>
> With who doing the heavy lifting in the air which paved the way?
> Remember the F-16 jock who ate bugs for a week to survive in the woods
> after he got shot down? When was the last time NATO did anything which
> we didn't lead? France kicked NATO out of Paris years ago and quit the
> organization.

Wasn't your complaint that they wouldn't participate?

>> In Gulf War I, the
>> French had forces involved. Maybe the Germans, too, I don't remember
>> for sure.
>
> I think their contingent in Afghanistan is the first German
> out-of-country deployment since The War. And today we have Japs in the
> Gulf. Poland put forces into the current fray too. I haven't seen "The
> Bloc" bitching about them jumping in. Odd.

Come on, Brian. You, I and the French all know that whether or not Poland
participated wouldn't have affected the decision to go to war one bit.
Those who criticize the war are going to level their criticisms where they
count. Just as those who criticize the French for not supporting the war

don't waste their breath criticizing Angola for not supporting it.

>> The French even took a few casualties. (Funny, you don't hear much
>> about that these days.) There are German forces working alongside US
>> forces in Afghanistan right now. (Another thing you probably won't see
>> on Fox.)
>
> Last time I watched TV I think was the 2002 World Series.

You missed a lot of good college basketball.

>> French forces are also involved right now in trying to stabilize a
>> highly volatile situation in the Ivory Coast. And they recently
>> deployed troops to the Central African Republic to protect foreign
>> nationals there.
>
> Those are "French internal affairs", having to inject themselves into
> those squabbles are paybacks for their days as the colonial masters of
> those countries.

They don't *have* to. They could easily walk away from those problems and
they deserve at least a little credit for not doing so.

>> Except that we HAVE done just that in the past. Consider the Mexican
>> War. The Spanish-American War. The Panama Canal. Invasion of the
>> Dominican Republic (multiple times).
>
> C'mon, gimmee a break Jon, most of those go back well over a century
> ago.

Is there a statute of limitations? More to the point, what reason is there
to think that things have changed?

> Ya forgot Haiti multiple times, Grenada, Noriega, Pablo Escobar and a
> number of others.

Not forgotten, they're just not as well known.

> You don't support the Monroe Doctrine?

But, Brian, that was well over a century ago.

> You'd rather
> Sweden & Belarus had a UN mandate to patrol our back porch?

Why should anyone be patrolling it? Why did we need to foster a coup to
eliminate the democratically elected government of Chile in 1973, for
example?

>> During the cold war, there was a
>> power balance, and to most of the world there was one side that was
>> clearly preferable -- the US.
>
> There never was an actual balance of powers, ask Gorbachev, Lockheed &

> the CIA. Soviet military power was largely propaganda, never in this
> world would they have fired the first shot.

There was not a balance of conventional forces, but there was certainly a "mutually assured destruction" level of nuclear forces, which is all the balance that was required.

>> But now that there is but one superpower, what prevents us from doing
>> whatever the hell we want? (Some of that superpower's citizens have
>> been arguing on this forum that we should do exactly that.) Not only
>> with regard to perceived threats to our safety, but also with perceived
>> threats to our econonic interests. It's not exactly unknown to use
>> military power to advance economic interests, you know.
>
> You're saying is that you have no faith in the leaders we freely elected
> and the checks and balances and assorted admonitions in the U.S.
> Constitution to prevent the U.S. from running amok with our military.
> Summarily rejected concept.

Reject what you will, but that international adventurism of the past -- including the not-so-distant past -- was all performed under the aegis of leaders we freely elected and with the same checks and balances in place. Some times it was done with the knowledge and support of the Americn people, some times it was not.

> Based in their own sordid thousand year history of periodically mauling
> each other. We don't have that genetic flaw. How long has it been since
> we attempted to conquer and occupy Mexico or Canada?

Substantially less than a thousand years. For that matter, how long as it been since we attempted (with success) to conquer and occupy the Indian nations?

> How many times have
> various Euros invaded their neighbors in just the past hundred years?

Are any of the European states that tried to invade one another operating today under the same form of government as they were at the time? Specifically, did any of them invade one another when their governments were democratic?

> They're a bunch of hypocrites. They can't past their own history and are
> trying to "Euopeanize" us via rhetoric at the UN and in other channels.

To this extent you're right: They're saying, "We KNOW what the end result of militarism is. We lived it in the 20th century. The US should learn from the European experience." You don't have to agree with them to recognize that their concern is based on experiences we've never had.

> The Kyoto Treaty debacle comes to mind here. To hell with 'em, let 'em
> sink in their own socialist PC swamps.

They seem to be doing quite well in their "swamps."

> Come the days when the UN and
> NATO fall apart we'll still be what we were the day after 4 July 1776. I
> do hope they remember who has the big stick when they start their crap
> again.

Fortunately, we're not what we were the day after 4 July 1776. We now do a
much better job of living up to the principles agreed to in the
Declaration. There's still room for improvement, though.

>> All I'm asking is that you try to put yourself in the other fellow's
>> shoes. If you're unwilling to do that, you're certain to never
>> understand his point of view.
>
> Been there, done that. I did look at it from both sides. Going into the
> diplomatic upheaval which preceeded the invasion I was 100% neutral WRT
> to whether we should or should not go in without a mandate. I'm not a
> hawk or a hardcore conservative. It was the behavior of the "bloc"
> during those last days before we went in which put me squarely in the
> pro-war camp.

I don't understand that, Brian. If you were ambivalent about the war, wh
would their opposition make you FOR the war? On the surface, it sounds
like petulance.

>> > All of it within the past two days. Sharon is also reversing course
>> > and is completely uncharacteristically tossing olive branches at the
>> > Palestinians.
>>
>> I saw that. Maybe he thinks the US is serious. Do you suppose he could
>> have been made to think that without a war?
>
> In so many words he publicly stated that the war has changed the politik
> of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

That wasn't my question. Was war the ONLY way that could have been
accomplished?

> I haven't seen much about it so
> far but I have a hunch that the way we knocked out SH is giving Israel's
> neighboring enemies the willies

"Shock and awe," did someone say? :-)

> which in turn might be giving Sharon an opportunity to tone down his
> level of beligerence. Simultaneously respected Palestinian moderates are
> trying to squeeze Arafat out to political pasture.

That last part was happening before Iraq. I think Phil Kane has it right
that probably having both Sharon and Arafat out of the picture would make
it easier to find a solution (I'm paraphrasing). I'd settle for just
having Arafat gone, though.

> Maybe the time has finally come to settle the the conflict which
> triggered the destruction of the WTC and installed our troops in

> Bagdhad. That would not be a bad output from our efforts of the past
> three weeks eh?

I'm skeptical. In the history of the Israeli-Palestinian problem the light at the end of the tunnel has appeared often, only to reveal itself repeatedly as the proverbial oncoming train. It will be interesting to see what the "road map" looks like when/if it gets revealed.

> As far as the polls are concerned as of yesterday 70% of the U.S. is
> opposed to any more "premptive strikes" against anybody including
> Syria. Dubya is not going to invade Syria. Period.

Not today, sure. If he decides he needs to there will have to be a period of propaganda, ah, I mean explaining it to the American people to reverse those poll numbers. (Although, of COURSE the President doesn't make decisions based on polling data.)

Jon

2655. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 20:01:24 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9C6514.AA11A1A5@crosslink.net>
Source record: 64772

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> Might not be a bad Idea, except shooting a gun has no value for Ham Radio
> testing.
>

It'd keep the number of hams small, even better than Morse does, and
that's the whole purpose is it not?

2656. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 20:04:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415160432.03495.00000731@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 64791

>Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/14/2003 11:40 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030415004015.24070.00000446@mb-ck.aol.com>

>> It has EVERYTHING to do with clarity. Unions make absolutely sure that
>>they know what's expected of them, and what to expect from the corporation.
>>If
>>they didn't, there'd be nothing to "negotiate" at contract times.
>
>The only things that are expected are things like the pay scales, hours, and
>overtime issues.

I have been proceeding on the assumption that you are an educated person,
Vipul.

It's apparent am wrong in that regard.

While those items ARE of great importance, theya re far from being the
ONLY issues facing modern organized labor, including safety issues, health
care, education and training.

If thos items are the ONLY issues some union you are affiliated with is
interested in, then you are being grossly shortchanged.

>The job description is meaningless. It is rationalization, probably by BOTH
>sides. Go complain about a job description to a steward and they will not do
>anything about it. If something to do with your hours, they will help you.

Unions are SUPPOSED to be democratic bodies, that body made up of the
membership of the union. If your shop steward is not getting the results you
think you deserve, the represented members need to get rid of him.

>> And in the application of the words "radio amateur" within THIS peergroup,
>>it is understood we are talking about a person who is licensed in the
>Amateur
>>Radio Service.
>
>Yes, but not "Ham" radio.

Yes...HAM RADIO is understood to be persons who are licensed in the
Amateur Radio service.

I again challenge you to put "Ham Radio" in a search engine and then come
up with a reult OTHER than Amateur Radio.

>>BBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !
>>!

>
>Thats mature

I am sorry, Vipul, but I DO break out into open laughter when I read much of your stuff. You just don't realize what a fool you make of yourself in a public forum. You are the newsgroup equivilent of the guy slipping on the banana peel. The problem is you AIM for the banana peel!

>> Embarrassed that I can do something you can't and do it well?
>>
>> I don't think so ! ! !
>
>No, I'm embarrassed code lovers brag about such a skill and claim superiority
>because of it. I can do it. I'm smart enough to chose not to.

I've been a licensed Amateur Radio operator since 1972, Vipul, and have yet to meet ONE person who "claim(s) superiority" as a result of their proficency in Morse Code.

Not a one.

Are there people who are proud of it? Sure there are. Why not? But there are also people who are proud of being able to fly remote control airplanes, bake those large three-tier wedding cakes, or drive a Formula 1 car. So what?

As far as you being "smart enough to chose not to", all I can say is that YOU have conciously elected to NOT go any farther that No Code Technician (for now, anyway), and that if VHF and above is all you want, then you have succeeded in getting what you want.

Now, WHY are YOU conciously acting to denigrate and demean those who have chose to get what THEY want by applying themselves to the task at hand and meeting the requirements of the law to get there?

>Do you talk to people in "procedural signals". For example, when leaning a
>room, do you say "73"?

We are not "talking", Vipul. This is a digital domain. Yes, I would print "73 de K4YZ" if this were teletype, AMTOR, PSK 31, etc.

And I "lean" in a lot of rooms if I am tired enough. What does leaning have to do with what I say?

73 de K4YZ

2657. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 20:10:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415161028.03495.00000732@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 64792

>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>From: Vito vito@crosslink.net
>Date: 4/15/2003 10:47 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3E9C297B.849697F2@crosslink.net>

>So, I have a better idea. Since our goal is to keep people out of
>Amateur Radio, let's make everybody shoot center fire pistol at the NRA
>sharpshooter level to gain access to the HF bands and at the expert
>level to use Morse

Works for me....USMC Rifle and Pistol Expert....More than once!

Steve, K4YZ

2658. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 20:13:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415161330.03495.00000733@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 64793

>Subject: YI approved with written permission
>From: Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv) kf2ti@arrl.net
>Date: 4/15/2003 1:25 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <MPG.19065f03e14e815d9896b8@news.mindspring.com>
>
>DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
>2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
>League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
>British military personnel

HEY BURKIE! Hurry up and get your bags packed! Maybe you can GET IT
RIGHT this time!

Steve, K4YZ

2659. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 20:31:30 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304151231.13536f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64794

Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9C2CC7.8ADBF2C8@crosslink.net>...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Let's give your laptop a try. How about if we meet on 160m in July?

Heh. Cute.

> > I'm betting my aural decoding skills can beat your computer--if it has a
> > decent fist.
>
> Might be fun to have one computer sent *perfect* morse at increasing
> speeds til you, or a receiving computer begins missing characters. Has
> anybody tried this before? What are the practical maximum human and
> computer speeds given a perfect fist?

Some code tape machine manufacturer used to run ads in QST which
included a claim that a particular professional op could copy 73 wpm,
McElroy . . ? A ham buddy of mine was clocked at 70+ wpm at the Dayton
hamfest a number of years ago.

> 73, K3DWW

w3rv

2660. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 20:55:40 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.04.15.20.55.39.611338.25870@arrl.org>
Source record: 64795

On Tue, 15 Apr 2003 16:31:30 -0400, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Some code tape machine manufacturer used to run ads in QST which
> included a claim that a particular professional op could copy 73 wpm,
> McElroy . . ? A ham buddy of mine was clocked at 70+ wpm at the Dayton
> hamfest a number of years ago.

Ted McElroy:
http://fohnix.metronet.com/~nmcewen/mcelroy.html

Jon

2661. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 22:51:44 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304151451.6c450b33@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64798

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030414215308.24070.00000442@mb-ck.aol.com>...
> From N2EY:
>
> >>Often words are redefined in a specific setting. The goal of this
> >>redefinition is often to control others or to increase their importance.
> > >
> > >It's for clarity.
> >
> > The redefinition of "Engineer" to more an

"and"

> more lower tasks may have had more to
> do with unions than for clarity.

Maybe where you are. Not in the entire field of engineering. Union
labor as a percentage of the workforce keeps dropping.

> The Engineers are non-union. By including more
> and more tasks as "Engineering" tasks, the union can be reduced.

Get the most out of a resource for the least $$. Management 101.
>
> In some cases, ENTIRE jobs are redefined as "Engineer" jobs. One can ask for a
> BSEE for a "manufacturing Engineers" or "product Engineers", rather than let
> union people do these non-technical tasks. These jobs are often very low
> skilled. A shop person can have more than enough qualifications to do the job.

Are you in a union or non-union job?
>
> Internal job descriptions are VERY exaggerated. You will NEVER do the advanced
> electronics items in the job description - and they have NO intention of
> letting you. They don't represent the actual work you will be doing.

So go find another job.
>
> The job description also is NEGOTIATED between union and management- it has
> NOTHING to do with "clarity".

Welcome to the real world.

I think I know what happend to you. It's a common enough occurrence
these days.

You went to EE school, took all the techno courses that appealed to
you and endured the other requirements. Learned how to analyze

circuits, did some projects, etc. Thought you'd be doing that sort of stuff every day.

Then you got an entry-level job and discovered that it's not like that in every "engineering" job, particularly the entry-level ones in a slow economy right after the dot-com and telecom balloons busted. Sorry, that's the way things are right now.

> >If a big enough group defines a word a certain way, then that's the
> >definition.
> >
> >Get used to it, Vipul - that's how languages work.
>
> No, that's how politics work.

It's how languages work. Particularly English. Definitions change and evolve over time, like the spam example I gave.

> Outside that group, the MAJORITY of people will
> disagree with those RE-definitions. The language has not changed - its
> application in this situation has.

Let's cut through all your BS and get right to the point:

Everyone except you defines "ham radio" and "amateur radio" as meaning exactly the same thing. No difference. Equivalent.

You want to define the two terms to mean different things. In addition, neither of your definitions for the two terms matches the definitions used by everyone else.

The cheese sandwich/2N2222 analogy went right over your head, too.
>
> >Would you call yourself a Professional Engineer?
>
> No, I would not.

That's good, because without that PE license, you ain't one.

> Here's why. In reality, I am a professional Engineer, in that
> I am in the EE profession.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts may beg to differ on that.

> In industry, its APPLICATION is negative. You get
> disrespected for having the title of "Professional Engineer".

What industry are you IN, anyway?
>
> >>If everyone jumped off a bridge,
> >>would you?
> >
> >Depends on how high the bridge is and how much I'm being paid.
>

> That's where I'm different. I had a chance to "sell out" for significantly
> higher pay. I did not take it. Now, I regret it.

What ARE you talking about? "Sell out"??

> >>Another example is saying when something is "in use", it is useful.
> >
> >Why? If something has a use, it is useful.

By definition.
>
> You can use a toothpick(Morse) as a fork(communications mode). Its not ideal.

No communications mode is "ideal". Just like no eating implement is
ideal. A toothpick can be very useful for eating certain things that
would crumble under a fork.

> If many people did that it(Morse) would be used, but not useful.

Many people use Morse on the ham bands. It is useful.

Or are you going to redefine "useful"?

Last night I had a nice QSO on 80 meter CW with a ham in WPA. I was
running my homebrew rig and he was using a 3 watt kit rig from Small
Wonder. Great signals, lots of fun. Very useful.
>
> Do you still eat with your hands?

Sure.

>Maybe if you ate a cheese sandwich.

Or roasted chicken pieces in olive oil with garlic, rosemary and black
pepper. Or lots of other foods best eaten by hand.
>
> Contesting is spectrum squatting.

What is "spectrum squatting"?

> Eventually, commercial interests will
> petition to the regulators. If the ARRL's response is "we use it for contests",
> the result will not be good.

Is there something wrong with having fun? Do you get mad every
Patriot's Day when the Boston Marathon is run, shutting down roads and
causing traffic jams so people can use a very old form of
transportation?
>
> >>Maybe
> >>useful to that person, but not to the amateur radio hobby.
> >
> >Would you outlaw contests?
>
> No. Contests do have some use. Its just not compelling enough if that all there

> is.

Contests are not all there is.

btw, contests do serve a technical purpose, particularly the big ones.
They serve as testing environments for equipment and antennas. All of
the weaknesses in a station will be exposed by a contest - which is
why some folks don't like them.
>
> >Your agenda seems to be redefinition of common terms.
>
> I like to experiment, homebrew. Most Hams <in my circles> do not like that.

Then get into different circles. There are newsgroups and reflectors
devoted to homebrewing and experimenting.

Do you know what a Tayloe detector is?
>
> >And one should not claim that there is any difference between "ham radio" and
> >"amateur radio".
>
> Ham radio is traditions, history, beliefs. Amateur radio is the license.

Only to you. Everyone else thinks differently. Which means you are
just like the person who calls a cheese sandwich a 2N2222
>
> >One should not claim that "amateur radio" does not require a license.
>
> I never claimed that.

Yes, you did.

> I just gave one example, which happened to not require a
> license.
>
Then it's not amateur radio.

> >I politely refuse your attempt to redefine the term "amateur radio".
>
> I have not redefined amateur radio. I <basically> agree with the definition
> given in the ARRL handbook.

No, you don't.
>
> Its the APPLICATION that makes it "Ham" radio. That's not necessarily bad, its
> just a different emphasis - one not shared by most EEs.

This EE says you are way off base.
>
> "Ham" radio was redefined, I mean CLARIFIED, perhaps.

Not by you!
>
> >73 de Jim, N2EY

>
> Codewords "73", "de" used.

Yep. Live with it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

Here's a poem by Mason Williams (best known for "Classical Gas").
Quite appropriate:

The Prince's Panties

Once there was a prince
Who acted strangely
In that he thought life was stupid
And it was, for him

So he made up a world
In which he liked the things we like
Except that he had different reasons
Why he liked them

He liked butter
For its color
He would order
"Toast and color"

Waitresses, confused,
Would utter:
"Sir, I've never heard of
Toast and color"

He'd get angry and
Begin to choke them
The law would come and
They'd arrest and book him

So his life was a mess of trouble
Still, he kept it up.

He had dogs
A hundred cocker spaniels
He called them "panties"
'Cause they did that lovely

He did not care that they
Would bark and fetch sticks
Run and jump, roll over
And play dead tricks

No he liked them only
For their panting
So he would
Run them ragged

But one day they got fed up
And chased the prince right up against a fence

And the prince was eaten by his "panties".

2662. Re: "No Matches Found"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 23:03:00 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304152302450.869@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 64799

On Mon, 14 Apr 2003, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> QUOTE FROM WWW.FCC.GOV/WTB/ULS SEARCH ENGINE
>
> Specified Search
>
> Radio Service = CM, RR

Did you mean to search for an AMATEUR license (after all, this is an amateur newsgroup)? You need to use services HA and HV.

> Licensee Name like LEONARD H ANDERSON
> State = California
>
>
> No matches found To try again, you can perform a new search or refine your
> existing search.
>
> UNQUOTE
>
> Truly, VERY truly, UNlicnesed.
>
> So sayeth the FCC.
>
> Steve
>
>
>
>
>

2663. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 23:06:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdeh611.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 64800

On 15 Apr 2003 04:26:35 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:

>"Professional Engineer" has nothing to do with EE profession. Its for Civil
>Engineers.

Tell that to the several states in which I am registered as a
Professional Engineer with an EE specialty. If you are in
California I refer you to the Business and Professions Code
that defines over a dozen specialties which require a PE license
to practice or to use the title.

In my wife's company, sorting and ordering of compenents, etc
is done by non-college-graduate technician-level personnel
called design assistants. Is that what you do?

Your statements show you to be a buffoon who has demonstrated a
profound lack of knowledge about EEs, CEs, and PEs and the
engineering profession in general.

Were you sleeping in the introductory college seminar on what
the engineering profession is all about or did you just play
hooky?

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2664. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 23:06:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdegj80.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 64901

On 15 Apr 2003 01:53:08 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:

>No, I would not. Here's why. In reality, I am a professional
>Engineer, in that I am in the EE profession. In industry, its
>APPLICATION is negative. You get disrespected for having the
>title of "Professional Engineer".

If you want to work for the company that I represent and sign
bids, plans and documents to be submitted to clients or to
governmental agencies, you had -better- be licensed as a
Professional Engineer or you won't get to do it. "Risk
management" a.k.a. lawsuit protection.

Ditto for my wife's company, the largest environmental
engineering company in the world.

That, my friend, is hardly -disrespect- .

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
Registered P. E. since 1961

2665. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 23:06:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdehm42.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 64903

On 15 Apr 2003 20:04:32 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>If your shop steward is not getting the results you
>think you deserve, the represented members need to get rid of him.

Especially if they expect the shop steward to make chicken stew
out of chicken feathers.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2666. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 23:06:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdehv13.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 64902

On Tue, 15 Apr 2003 18:25:45 -0000, Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv) wrote:

>DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
>2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
>League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
>British military personnel
>
>provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
>officer.

I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
to standing procedures binding upon the military.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2667. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 23:40:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9C984F.C703F3F8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64904

"Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" wrote:
>
> DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> 2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> British military personnel
>
> provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
> officer.
>
> "There is precedent for this," Mills said, citing an operation during
> the 1991 Gulf War. "These operators will need written authorization to
> operate from their commanding officers

I'm sitting here grinning from ear to ear. All of this, of course,
reminds me of lengthy tale of an alleged operation from Somalia.

Dave K8MN

2668. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 23:46:59 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415194659.06680.00000346@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 64905

From(N2EY)

>FCC set up the structure that way, not hams.

Refer to statements from FCC stating learning Morse code does not necesarily make you a better operator.

>Which is why you see lots of hams homebrewing antennas, linear
>amplifiers, etc.

True, I've seen several Hams homebrewing amplifiers as well as antenna at a CT Hamfest.

2669. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 23:55:27 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415195527.06680.00000347@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 64906

From K4YZ:

>I again challenge you to put "Ham Radio" in a search engine and then come
>up with a reult OTHER than Amateur Radio.

Won't find it. Searching periodical CD's such as QST, 73, etc will get more relavant results. However, no mention of cult will be found.

>You are the newsgroup equivilent of the guy slipping on the
>banana peel. The problem is you AIM for the banana peel!

You must invite a non-Ham to a Hamfest and ask what his/her impressions are.

>And I "lean" in a lot of rooms if I am tired enough. What does leaning
>have to do with what I say?

Sorry, I meant say '73' after LEAVING (not leaning) a room.

2670. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-15 23:56:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9C9C2D.3B988493@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64907

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From(N2EY)
>
> >FCC set up the structure that way, not hams.
>
> Refer to statements from FCC stating learning Morse code does not necesarily
> make you a better operator.

You'll have to trust me on this one, Vipul. Learning morse really makes
one a better operator if the mode is CW.

> >Which is why you see lots of hams homebrewing antennas, linear
> >amplifiers, etc.
>
> True, I've seen several Hams homebrewing amplifiers as well as antenna at a CT
> Hamfest.

Then why do you keep telling us that hams don't like homebrewing?

Dave K8MN

2671. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 00:00:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7i6d6$uo8$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64908

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E9C984F.C703F3F8@earthlink.net...
> "Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" wrote:
> >
> > DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> > 2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> > League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> > British military personnel
> >
> > provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
> > officer.
> >
> > "There is precedent for this," Mills said, citing an operation during
> > the 1991 Gulf War. "These operators will need written authorization to
> > operate from their commanding officers
>
> I'm sitting here grinning from ear to ear. All of this, of course,
> reminds me of lengthy tale of an alleged operation from Somalia.
>
> Dave K8MN

Not trying to be a smart alec here...but...since there is no actual
government....and the only authority seems to be the US Military....I see no
particular problem if the ham in question has a valid FCC license and the
commander gives him the authority. Isnt the CO the defacto licensing
authority in this case???

Dan/W4NTI

2672. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 00:06:48 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415200648.11012.00000139@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 64911

In article <20030414152722.16556.00001016@mb-cd.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>>Because so many have been denied so much, Dave.
>
>No one has been denied, all you had to do was take the test.

Actually, people have to PASS the test.....

2673. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 00:06:49 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415200649.11012.00000140@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 64910

In article <3E9C5FE8.4030904@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:
>> From K4YZ:
>>
>>
>>>>I know its hard to imagine. It seems counter-intuitive, but it does occur.
>
>>>>I, myself have had that condition <on occasion>.
>>>
>>> Oh? What's the name of this condition, Vipul?
>>
>>
>> Alien time-dependent programming.

ALIENS!

Was this on the X-Files?
>>
>> Actually its called motor memory.

I remember a cute little 2 horsepower 2 phase squirrel cage induction motor
from my childhood. I called it "Rosebud"....

>> That's when you can encode fairly fast, but
>> go lower than a certain speed and you are unable to encode at that speed.

Ummm....isn't the morse code test about decoding, not encoding?
>
>Motor memory operates at an unconscious level.

I remember how Rosebud used to hum when started. And how warm Rosebud would get
under load.......

>One has to work at a conscious level to do Morse Code.

Maybe that's the problem.......

2674. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 00:06:50 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415200650.11012.00000142@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 64909

In article <20030415155041.04182.00000180@mb-fg.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>> Did your Dad know the Utah Phillips story about the pie?
>>
>>> "it's good, though"
>>
>>If he knew it, he never passed it along to me.
>
> That still doesn't answer why you ate it... ?

Tell us how it tasted, Len. And why you went back for seconds.....;-)

Back in my early days with the Rural Electrification Authority down in New Mexico, I had the job of bringing electricity to some of the larger Navajo outhouses and privies. They said it was the first time anyone had wired a head for a reservation.....

2675. Re: Infidel no-coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 00:06:50 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415200650.11012.00000141@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 64912

In article <f45722ac.0304130506.135f700@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
>news:<20030412141935.19789.00000161@mb-cc.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Infidel no-coders
>> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>> >Date: 4/12/2003 6:18 AM Central Daylight Time
>> >Message-id: <20030412071818.26171.00001063@mb-fd.aol.com>
>
>> >So now you want EVERYONE to learn Morse code, even non-amateurs?
>>
>> Sure...Why not. If Morse Code was taught from grade school, it would
>be
>> exceedingly easy to learn and become a part of our normal activities of
>daily
>> living. In ONE GENERATION, we could reduce the ened for electromagnetic
>> spectrum by at LEAST 90%.
>
>Why not? Because Morse isn't even a part of "normal activities" for
>professional communicators.

That's right! Amateurs must do only what professionals do!

>In ONE GENERATION you could throw back
>throughput by many magnitudes and increase the need for
>electromagnetic spectrum by at LEAST 90%.

That's right! Once all those people learn Morse, they won't want to use any
other mode!

>Imagine having HDTV
>transmitted at screaming 40wpm.

The mind reels.....

> People wouldn't buy it.

Yes, they would!

>People quit
>buying Morse in by the 60's, so why this retro idea now?

That's right! Nobody has used Morse since the 1960s! Tell us all about it,
Brian!

2676. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 00:09:10 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415200910.06680.00000348@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 64913

From (N2EY):

>Are you in a union or non-union job?

Been on both sides of the fence. Non-union now.

>You went to EE school, took all the techno courses that appealed to
>you and endured the other requirements. Learned how to analyze
>circuits, did some projects, etc. Thought you'd be doing that sort of
>stuff every day.

That's probably right.

>> That's where I'm different. I had a chance to "sell out" for significantly
>> higher pay. I did not take it. Now, I regret it.
>
>What ARE you talking about? "Sell out"??

Switch over into the IT field, for significantly higher pay. I chose not to
because I wanted to work with EE stuff. Now, I regret it.

>> >Why? If something has a use, it is useful.
>
>By definition.

Incorrect.

>Last night I had a nice QSO on 80 meter CW with a ham in WPA. I was
>running my homebrew rig and he was using a 3 watt kit rig from Small
>Wonder. Great signals, lots of fun. Very useful.

That's because the two Ham operators choosed that mode. If you had not choosed
that mode, it would not be in use.

>What is "spectrum squatting"?

Occupying the bands by contests and then claiming Hams have a use for those
freqs since there is a lot of activity on those freqs.

>contests do serve a technical purpose, particularly the big ones.
>They serve as testing environments for equipment and antennas.

Sure.

>Do you know what a Tayloe detector is?

No.

Your story does not make sense.

2677. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 00:10:26 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415201026.06680.00000349@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 64914

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Did your Dad know the Utah Phillips story about the pie?

I don't know that story. What is it?

2678. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 00:13:46 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415201346.16848.00001024@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 64915

>Actually, people have to PASS the test.....

Well the questions are simple it really doesnt make much difference

2679. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 00:14:22 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415201422.06680.00000350@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 64916

From: Mike Coslo mjc5
>Motor memory operates at an unconscious level. One has to work at a
>conscious level to do Morse Code.
>

Thanks.

2680. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 00:17:23 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415201723.06680.00000351@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 64917

From: Jon Bloom jbloom@arrl.or

>QST which
>> included a claim that a particular professional op could copy 73 wpm

Any studies of coders getting carpo tunnel symptoms.

>A ham buddy of mine was clocked at 70+ wpm at the Dayton
>> hamfest a number of years ago.

Did he get a ticket?

2681. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 00:41:21 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415204121.06680.00000355@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 64918

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>Your square-headed, nonsensical posts about amateur radio being
>different from ham radio, about amateur radio being "sometimes referred
>to as a cult and about people who can copy fifteen word per minute morse
>not being able to copy five wpm are beginning to grate on my
>sensibilities.
>

Your claim that I said "you lose your 5 wpm skill after learning 15 wpm" is
incorrect.

I acknowledged, that one does not lose your 5 wpm skill after learning 15 wpm.

I know this kind of thing does happen. It is a known condition. I (and others)
were shown to have had that condition, on occasion. However, I do not know
Morse code at 5 wpm or 15 wpm.

I assumed it also applied to Morse code. Others have told me it did not happen
to them. This could be because of their abilities, or because it does not
happen in the Morse code encoding scheme.

So, I concluded that I was wrong in my assumption that you lose your 5 wpm
skill after learning 15 wpm.

Both Ham radio and amateur radio are good.

For example, many Hams like to setup antenna, and are quite good at it. Antenna
setups can get technical.

I never said Ham radio is bad.

Amateur radio is somtimes referred to as a cult. When I mentioned I belonged to
Ham radio club to some non-Hams, they asked me if Ham radio is a cult.

"Usually, the spread of HAM radio, say the enthusiasts, is more through word of
mouth and passes on from one member of a family to the other. At times from one
good friend to another. This anyway makes the hobby prone to be called a cult."
*

*Delhi slice of Ham

2682. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 00:57:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E9CAA87.2030406@psu.edu>
Source record: 64925

Dave Heil wrote:

> Vshah101 wrote:

>
>> Contesters occupy as many bands as possible, and claim that each
>> band is useful.
>
>
> Tell us please, which bands aren't useful. You'll save us a lot of
> wasted time and effort if we can just manage to avoid those useless
> bands.

Here is one of those statements that makes me wonder if this dude knows anything about rf at all! While working contests, I've worked people down the bands as the contest progresses. The different bands are all useful sometimes, and not so useful at others. Methinks Vipul might do well to take some time away from trolling rrap, and study a little propagation!

>> Simply contacting someone and exchanging callsign information is
>> not useful.
>
>
> I don't know of any contest where the callsign is the exchange. I'll
> assume that you goofed because you know nothing more about
> contesting than you do about someone knowing ten word per minute
> morse forgetting how to receive morse at 5 wpm. Whatever information
> exchanged by a contester is quite useful in achieving a higher score
> in a contest.

Agreed, Dave. Not knowing the similarities between contesting and emergency ops just shows ignorance of both.

Just so ya know Vipul:

Contesting gets people to dust off the rigs and make sure the antenna is up and working.

Contesting gets people to communicate across the country/world.

In pursuit of the score, it hones your operating skills, that is, you work stations that may be weak and hard to read. Good practice for real emergencies.

In real emergencies, people exchange information, just like in a contest. THe information is certainly more in depth, but so what? If you

don't get the information correct in the exchange, you don't get the score. In some contests, they subtract points. Accuracy is important in both cases.

So yeah, it is a game. But its practice for emergency ops too. And it's fun. So what? How many people would participate if it wasn't? In a real emergency, the person may be operating from a half charged car battery, be sick with dysentery or injury or worse, and have lots of other problems. But that doesn't matter.

Since we don't know where the next emergency is going to happen, if we have lots of people who are trained all over the country, there is a good chance someone will be able to help if disaster strikes.

As Linus said to Charlie Brown in "A Charlie Brown Christmas" "And that Vshah, is the true meaning of contesting!" (apologies to Charles Schultz)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2683. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 00:58:40 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <b7i9s0$2jl7$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 64923

N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>In article <pan.2003.04.15.01.04.29.226862.31882@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
><jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>>On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 20:26:05 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>>> The French and German companies don't have to pay the taxes that fund
>>> the war, so they can bid lower.
>>
>>What taxes to fund the war?
>
>HAW! That's a GOOD one, Jon!

It doesn't seem that funny. We're having the war now, but taxes are
simultaneously going down even while spending on things other than
the war isn't. No US companies seem to be paying for this particular
war currently, it seems like that will be left for your grandchildren.

>How much of the federal budget, and the GDP is spent on defense in the USA?
>France? Germany? Japan?

In terms of GDP the US spends 3.2% on the military, France 2.6%, Germany
1.4% and Japan 1.0%. See, e.g.,

http://www.bartleby.com/151/a122.html

These don't seem like significantly high enough numbers to have much impact
on tax rates.

Do you know the corresponding numbers for foreign aid (speaking of some
government spending which *has* gone down a bit)?

>Yes, those countries have high taxes. They spend their tax money on other
>things, and then let the USA pay for their defense.

I can't figure out how France is having its defense paid for by the US
when it spends for its own defense only 20% less of its GDP than the
US apparently spends, by your assertion, to defend not only itself but
a bunch of other countries. As for the other two countries you mention, I
can't help but notice that these both have constitutions which were
established while under US military occupation and whose construction was
greatly influenced by the US, which prevent them from making large military
expenditures. It hence isn't surprising that their military expenditures
are smaller, but the suggestion that they chose to "let the US pay for their
defense" is kind of revisionist. At the time those countries weren't the
ones with the choices, the US was.

And as a case in point, note that it was only recently that the US
complained to its European allies about their lack of pulling their own

military weight, in particular with respect to the Balkans. In response the EU proposed immediately establishing an independent 65,000-troop "quick response force" from among its members to respond to combat situations which arose, along with a longer term goal of increasing and unifying their own capabilities with respect to missles and precision-guided munitions. The US reacted to this with a certain amount of horror since what they really wanted was for Europeans to devote themselves to peace keeping, post-conflict policing and logistics, dividing the labor to have the US do the combat while leaving support and the long-term cleanup of places like Kosovo to the Europeans. I don't think the US finds it in its own interest to have the EU, which collectively has both a GDP and a technological base which rivals the US, pooling its resources to reproduce the US military, so I think it is a bit unfair to turn around and critize those countries for not having reproduced the US military.

Dennis Ferguson

2684. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 01:01:05 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415210105.06680.00000356@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 64924

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net

>The FCC has NOT said anything about it being irresponsible or embarrassing.
>They are merely questioning the need to keep it a requirement. That is an
>entirely different thing.

True, thats what FCC said.

I meant having the test as a requirement is embarrassing to the hobby.
When ads for Hamfests have Morse code keyers in it, and a non-Ham asks what
those are, it does not look good for Ham radio.

>Some of the EE's love the elegant mathematics but have no interest in
>working directly with hardware.

Even elegent math is hands on. That's what my Comm Theory Prof endorses.
Programs such as Mathcad assist in this.

>Vipul, it is quite obvious that you know nothing about your own field of
>study.

Seems like you will try to find reasons for EEs NOT to homebrew.

2685. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 01:03:02 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E9CABC6.1010907@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 64937

WA8ULX wrote:
>>You still trying to graduate from grammar school?
>>
>
>
> No, I have already grauated from College, but thats not the Question, the
> Question was are you still on Welfare?

Yea right, and with a college degree you still can't spell
graduated. What did you get a degree in, basket weaving?

Unlike you I never needed to be on welfare, I am very comfortable
with an over 50k/year retirement and no debts.

2686. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 01:04:36 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E9CAC24.6050101@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 64938

WA8ULX wrote:
>>Actually, people have to PASS the test.....
>
>
> Well the questions are simple it really doesnt make much difference

Otherwise, you would have never made it to extra.

2687. Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 01:17:26 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0304151717.4ee59fab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64926

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030415002040.24070.00000444@mb-ck.aol.com>...

> CW means "an unmodulated sin wave".

Sinning without modulation? I'm aghast.

2688. Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 01:18:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E9CAF79.9020808@psu.edu>
Source record: 64927

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/14/2003 11:20 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030415002040.24070.00000444@mb-ck.aol.com>
>
>
>
>>In non-amateur, non-Ham applications, CW means "an unmodulated sin wave". In
>>amateur radio, it means "Morse code".
>
>
> It's a "sine wave", Mr. Engineer.

Darn, and I thought the thread was finally going to get interesting.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2689. Re: "No Matches Found"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 01:26:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030415212608.12217.00000206@mb-fq.aol.com>
Source record: 64928

In that case, use a lighter!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2690. Re: On a lighter note....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 01:26:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030415212608.12217.00000205@mb-fq.aol.com>
Source record: 64931

In article <b7e7j2$d7hfl$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>So... since we never can get away from the code issue, are the Iraqi people >pro-coders??

My guess is that they would be quite proficient users of Morse Code, particularly the variation known as "prison tap code." You see, under the brutal regime of the late ex-dictator Saddam Hussein and his late bloodthirsty sons, many innocent Iraqi citizens most likely tapped out their final good-byes on prison walls just prior to being mercilessly slaughtered in some gruesome manner for the slightest perceived act of disloyalty, true or not. Somehow, I don't think Iraqis would be the kind of people to whine about learning something useful like the Morse Code.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2691. Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 01:26:09 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030415212609.12217.00000207@mb-fq.aol.com>
Source record: 64929

In article <3E9B9075.BB737C08@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>
>What a really lame troll.....
>

Bob:

I'm still waiting for Hansl to relay the reaction of the Armenian judges.
I suspect there's gonna be some more wear and tear on those poor
balilaikas...

73 de Larry, K3LT

2692. Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 01:26:09 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030415212609.12217.00000208@mb-fq.aol.com>
Source record: 64930

In article <20030415152423.08944.00000469@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>In non-amateur, non-Ham applications, CW means "an unmodulated sin wave". In
>>amateur radio, it means "Morse code".
>
> It's a "sine wave", Mr. Engineer.
>
>Steve, K4YZ

Steve:

Maybe Vipuke got it right, from his point of view. Wouldn't a no-coder consider a CW signal to be a "sin wave?"

73 de Larry, K3LT

2693. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 01:38:38 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <yu2na.1052$qa5.891401@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64919

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030415002635.24070.00000445@mb-ck.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
> >Those who
> >have elected to seek and achieved the title of "Professional Engineer"
are
> >respected.
>
> "Professional Engineer" has nothing to do with EE profession. Its for
Civil
> Engineers.

You have just shown your overwhelming ignorance. You can be a licensed Professional Engineer in any field of engineering. It is more common for Civil Engineers to take this step but one can be a licensed Professional Engineer in EE, Mechanical Engineering, Aerospace Engineering and so on. It's just not done as often in the other fields.

>
> >Inserted before the General
> >class
> >> license, its very irresponsible and embarrassing to the hobby. Even
code
> >lovers
> >> should be embarrassed about that.
> >
> >That is YOUR opinion.
>
> Its also the FCC's opinion.

The FCC has NOT said anything about it being irresponsible or embarrassing. They are merely questioning the need to keep it a requirement. That is an entirely different thing.

>
> >Lots of EEs don't like to homebrew either. That doesn't make them
> >any less a EE than one who does.
>
> EE's that don't like to homebrew are probably in it just for the money. I
truly
> enjoy building circuits outside of work.

Some of the EE's love the elegant mathematics but have no interest in working directly with hardware. Fast Fourier Transforms really turn them on. That doesn't mean they are in it just for the money.

Vipul, it is quite obvious that you know nothing about your own field of study.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2694. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 01:42:39 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <jy2na.1060$qa5.893238@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64920

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030415004015.24070.00000446@mb-ck.aol.com...
> Codewords "73", "de" used
> >
> > They are not "codewords". They are procedural signals.
>
> Do you talk to people in "procedural signals". For example, when leaning a
> room, do you say "73"?

Actually is not uncommon for amateur radio operators to do so. In every specialized activity, a specialized vocabulary is developed. The participants in that activity will often carry those terms into every day speech especially when engaged in ordinary daily social activities involving other members of the group.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2695. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 01:53:19 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <jl2na.1064$qa5.897160@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64921

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030415195527.06680.00000347@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From K4YZ:
>
> >I again challenge you to put "Ham Radio" in a search engine and then come
> >up with a reult OTHER than Amateur Radio.
>
> Won't find it. Searching periodical CD's such as QST, 73, etc will get
more
> relavant results. However, no mention of cult will be found.
>

They don't mention cult because it isn't. Only YOU have attempted to define
it as a cult.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2696. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 01:56:24 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7iddamek1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64932

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.04.15.00.41.39.359560.18630@arrl.org...
> On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 18:14:08 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > news:pan.2003.04.14.20.27.18.993573.24487@arrl.org...
> >> On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 14:56:47 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >> > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> >> > news:pan.2003.04.14.12.21.04.19467.24274@arrl.org...
> >>
> >> Their statements are ad hominem. They are intended to belittle those
> >> with whom they disagree rather than argue a case, and I just don't
> >> think that's the way public discourse out to be carried out,
> >> particularly by those in leadership positions. It has the effect of
> >> polarizing the debate, making it harder to reach agreement.
> >
> > Frankly, I don't see the press being part of any effort to reach
> > agreements. They report and that's it. Your mileage may vary.
>
> Why do you persist in thinking this is about the press? I'm talking about
> how the Administration talks about their political opponents and other
> nations.

What's the problem then? Does the administration have
to play kissy/huggy with those that oppose us, undermine our efforts, etc.?

> >> Sure. Every society has its problem members.
> >
> > I think OBL is a pretty extreme example of a problem member. OBL isn't
> > just some McVeigh or other serial killer...OBL fosters suicide bombing
> > on a global basis. Who else has taken that stance?
>
> I don't see any moral difference between OBL and McVeigh. Both attacked
> what their warped minds saw as their enemies.

But McVeigh was pretty much a lone wolf operation with only
a handful of accomplices. OBL takes things to a global
organization basis. Morally they are both evil scum, but OBL
is by far the worse and greter threat than a McVeigh type.

> >> > What behavior of ours makes a rational Muslim hate us then?
> >>
> >> Our support for Israel is number one on their hit parade.
> >
> > So we should NOT support Israel?
>

> Remember what the topic is here, Bill. I'm trying to explain my view that
> it's what we do in the Middle East that they hate, not our freedom. So
> whether we SHOULD support Israel is beside the point. Let me ask you this:
> Do you think if we decided to support the Palestinians over Israel the
> Muslim world would remain just as angry at us? I don't. I think it's what
> we DO that matters to them.

You are avoiding the realities. then. Either you believe we should support
Israel or you don't. The fact that our support of Israel leads some
to hate us doesn't change the reality of what you point to.

> >> Our support for
> >> repressive regimes also garners us no friends -- outside of those
> >> regimes themselves.
> >
> > That's a point I totally agree with. We are post cold war and we
> > shouldn't catet to regimes of that ilk any more than CNN should.
>
> CNN? Wow, you really DO have a press fixation! Turn the channel dial off
> Fox once in while, will you? Even if it's just to go to ESPN. Fox is a
> self-marketing and propaganda machine that nobody with any sense can take
> seriously.

We will obviously disagree then. As for CNN, we heard more about their
journalistic dishonesty today.

> >> Over the years we have demonstrated a near total lack of concern for
> >> the well-being of the inhabitants of the Middle East outside of Israel.
> >
> > I think that's an extreme statement and one in which I don't agree to
> > the extent you indicate.
>
> Then you should learn more about the history of US relations with
> countries in the Middle East. For example, in 1953 the CIA and British SIS
> set up a military coup to topple the legitimate government of Iran, which
> was at the time led by Premier Mohammad Mossadeq. The resulting government
> ran a nasty secret police called SAVAK which controlled the population
> using the usual secret-police methods for years. The Shah's Iran was an
> ally of the US -- of course! Naturally, Iranians associated the US with
> the repressive regime and with SAVAK. And in 1979, when the Iranians
> revolted, Americans asked plaintively, "Why are they mad at us?" Why,
> indeed.

Amazing that we apparently have to accept a 50 year old act
as causing people to hate us. There have been errors in judgement
by administrations (both Rep and Democratic). Some of that
explains some of the hate...but not all of it...and the reality
of many today (as is OBL) is that they hate
the USA's freedom and success.

> The US motive for all this? Well, it was Britain that came up with the
> idea. See, Mossadeq was thinking of nationalizing the oil industry, which

> was controlled by the British. Naturally, the Brits weren't crazy about
> THAT! The US was worried that Iran might go Commie (this was 1953, after
> all, and here was a guy nationalizing an industry), so it wholeheartedly
> supported and participated in the idea. The CIA was knee-deep in the coup.
> Where was our concern for the well-being of the Iranian people? Nowhere to
> be found.
>
> It's not just in the Middle East that the US is viewed as a bully out to
> serve only itself, either. Ask around in, say, Central and South America.
> See what folks there think about the history of their relations with the
> US. You'll find several well documented instances of the US toppling
> legitimate governments that didn't toe the US line.
>
> I'd like to think we're past that sort of thing now. But I can't say I'm
> absolutely certain of it. And I think it's perfectly understandable that a
> lot of people are deeply suspicious of US intentions and fearful of our
> newly stated willingness to attack countries that we think MIGHT pose a
> threat to us.

What countries have we taken over in the last 20/30 years and
permanently occupied?

> Will we attack only brutal regimes that violate human rights
> or that actually threaten us? Or, once on the slippery slope, will we find
> it ever easier to justify attacking regimes we see as not serving US
> interests?

Whatever happens will still require congressional approval.
The administration can't operate unilaterally.

> >> Our words don't always match our deeds, and that's a recipe for
> >> generating distrust and hatred.
> >
> > I agree we have room to improve and this is a good time to do it.
>
> Ah, but will we? And just as important, will we do so in a measured way,
> making sure to use force only where it's necessary?

Have you seen excessive force used so far?

> >> > Should we have NOT helped Kuwait 12 years ago?
> >>
> >> We should have, but did we do that out of altruism, or did we do it
> >> because it was in our own interests?
> >
> > What difference does the motive make? Indeed, we can speculate till
> > hell freezes over and never understand all motives or know what any of
> > them contributed to all the decisions.
>
> The point is that historically, we can only be counted on when
> self-interest is our motive. Which is the way of the world, I'm afraid.

Maybe so...time will tell.

> >> The GHW Bush administration certainly SAID it was a compelling interest
> >> of the US.
> >
> > A point I have no problem with.
>
> Good. Then can we agree that when the US goes to war it is for our own
> benefit? Can we also agree to can the holier-than-thou trashing of other
> countries who pursue THEIR own interests?

Depends on how they manifest that interest. This is still
America and I have as much right to trash (your word) another
country as some of the Hollywood celebs have to trash Bush.
The difference is that I can accept you or anyone else labeling
me anything you want (war monger, Bush lover, whatever).
I don't play the victim gambit because others don't like my
opinions.

> >> > Should we have not ended the Taliban regime after 911?
> >>
> >> Sure, but again, did we do it for the Afghans or did we do it for our
> >> own security? More to the point, if our purpose was to free the
> >> Afghanis, why did we wait through years of Taliban repression before
> >> acting? In the case of Iraq, why did we wait through 20 years SH before
> >> liberating the Iraqi people? Answer: Because it was 20 years before it
> >> became in our interest to do so, irrespective of the suffering of the
> >> Iraqi people.
> >
> > So we have two choices then:
> > Take on all regimes immediately...or never take them on. If we don't
> > take on a regime today we forfeit doing so in the future?
>
> No, of course not. But if we knowingly allow a repressive regime to fester
> unopposed -- or even aided! -- for years we do forfeit any justification
> for saying we're attacking it to eliminate repression. And we also forfeit
> any justification for criticizing other countries for NOT supporting the
> attack when the attack is not in their interest.

Fair enough, and I see far less US support of repressive/despotic regimes
now and in the future.

> >> Define "accept." If you mean am I in favor of overthrowing by force
> >> every regime that restricts freedom in any way, no, I'm not. We
> >> certainly should encourage more freedom by other means where we can.
> >> And in cases where the repression turns exceptionally brutal and where
> >> we can intervene by force, I don't have a problem with doing that.
> >
> > Works for me...would you not agree that the SH regime was, as you state:
> > "exceptionally brutal?"
>
> Sure would. Which is why, as I've said, I support taking out his regime by
> force.

Great, glad we agree.

> >> But as Jim said, what's freedom to one person is license to another. We
> >> better be very careful about what constitutes freedom worth fighting
> >> for. There's no absolute freedom in any society -- ours included -- and
> >> what constitutes acceptable limitation of freedom is influenced by
> >> culture.
> >
> > How far do you let culture influence limitations to individual freedoms?
>
> I don't think there's any easy answer to that. I do think it's important
> to recognize that there are cultural differences and that one culture's
> point of view is not necessarily better than another's.

Let me give you an example of a cultural difference I can't accept.
Oppression of woman in many cultures is a gross human rights
violation. I personally won't accept that. I may have no say
in the matter, but I'm not afraid to tell anyone who would claim
oppression of women is a cultural thing that I shouldn't question
in some country.

> >> >> That doesn't mean they give a damn about freedom in ours.
> >> >
> >> > Agree completely...
> >>
> >> I think you misunderstood me. By "don't give a damn" I meant they don't
> >> care one way or the other whether we have freedom in the US, not that
> >> they dislike our having freedom in the US.
> >
> > I disagree. I think many of the extremists absolutely hate that
> > American women have the rights that they do. I think they hate the
> > freedoms of expression we allow.
>
> Do they hate that Swedish, French and German women have the freedoms they
> do? Do they hate that Japan, Mexico and Iceland allow freedom of
> expression?

Probably they do, but since we are the super power, we are
the focus of the anti-western society.

> >> > and it is a primary objection of those people, the powerful, to the
> >> > American way of life, for two reasons... 1. We value individual life,
> >> > equality and justice...
> >>
> >> No, Bill, that's not quite right. The problem is not that we value
> >> those things. It's that we value them for us but all too often, not for
> >> others. At least, not when valuing them for others is inconvenient for
> >> us.
> >
> > You lost me here. How about an example to make your point.
>
> Iraq is a perfect example. We were happy to help Saddam gas Iranians when
> we were pissed off at the Iranians (despite the fact that we knew

> perfectly well he was brutalizing his own people). Then he made the
> mistake of interfering with one of our oil suppliers. Tell me, what was
> the moral difference between Saddam's attack on the Iranians and his
> attack on the Kuwaitis? Why did we help him with one and attack him for
> the other? The answer, in case it isn't obvious, is that in each case we
> were pursuing our self-interest. In the case of Iran, it wasn't important
> to us that hundreds of thousands of Iranians were killed and maimed. But
> when we went to Kuwait's aid the press was filled with stories of the
> suffering of Kuwaitis. (Which was real enough, let me add.) Moral
> relativism of the worst sort.
>
> And then when we decided Saddam had to go, we were shocked! Shocked to
> find that he had been killing and torturing his own people! Shocked to
> find that he had WMD (which we helped him get)!

Without debating any points, I belive we know there were
mistakes made. Hopefully, with the major anti-communist
cold war behind us, we won't see such errors in judgements.

> >> Really? The British Empire abolished slavery in 1833 (in the home
> >> islands it became illegal in the 1770's). The US didn't abolish it
> >> until 1865, and then only after a bloody civil war. Which society was
> >> "damn well better" at implementing equality and justice?
> > >
> > > If your only measure you use is slavery, perhaps you're right. There's
> > > much more than racial equality involved.
>
> Sure, and there are plenty of positive things one can cite. But the
> jingoistic "we're better than everybody else" refrain is just not
> supportable. We have our warts.

I never said we were perfect.

> >> As for modern times, can you be explicit as to how we implement our
> >> values of life, equality and justice better than, oh, say, Sweden?
> > >
> > > I see the standard of living, the American justice system, etc.
>
> That would be the system that has about 3% of our population in jail, on
> parole or on probation, right? Want to hazard a guess what the percentage
> is in European countries? What to compare crime rates with theirs?

I'm sure there are other differences where Europe wins via some
metric.

> And, oh yeah, that would be the justice system that now allows the
> government to imprision an American citizen without charge for as long as
> they want.

Who?

> > If
> > Sweden or any other country was better then why do so many people leave

> > those countries and come to the US?
>
> Not many of them have left Western Europe for the US lately, Bill.

One reason why is the immigration quotas. I have a friend from the
UK that took over a year to finally be able to move hear.

> It's
> certainly true that the US led the way to democracy. But some countries
> that came to democracy and freedom later than the US are at least as good
> in most respects and arguably better in some. The US is a good country. I
> wouldn't want to live anywhere else. But while acting like we're the best
> of everything may make us feel good, it's hubris with a capital H.

Again, I never said we were perfect. I do, however, belive that on a broad
brush basis we enjoy the freeist and best economic system in the world.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2697. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 01:56:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <tL2na.1065$qa5.898703@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64922

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030415201723.06680.00000351@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: Jon Bloom jbloom@arrl.or
>
> >QST which
> >> included a claim that a particular professional op could copy 73 wpm
>
> Any studies of coders getting carpo tunnel symptoms.
>

At that speed, he is almost certainly doing head copy. It's impossible to
write that fast and not too many can type that fast.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2698. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 02:26:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415222622.00629.00000068@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 64934

In article <b7i9s0$2jl7$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) writes:

>N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>>In article <pan.2003.04.15.01.04.29.226862.31882@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
>><jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>>>On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 20:26:05 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>>>> The French and German companies don't have to pay the taxes that fund
>>>> the war, so they can bid lower.
>>>
>>>What taxes to fund the war?
>>
>>HAW! That's a GOOD one, Jon!
>
>It doesn't seem that funny.

It's dark humor. Meaning it's not funny at all.

>We're having the war now, but taxes are
>simultaneously going down even while spending on things other than
>the war isn't. No US companies seem to be paying for this particular
>war currently, it seems like that will be left for your grandchildren.
>
Exactly - just as the enormous national debt continues to grow.

>>How much of the federal budget, and the GDP is spent on defense in the USA?
>>France? Germany? Japan?
>
>In terms of GDP the US spends 3.2% on the military, France 2.6%, Germany
>1.4% and Japan 1.0%. See, e.g.,
>
> http://www.bartleby.com/151/a122.html

Thank you.

But that only answers the GDP part. I wonder how much of the federal budget in other countries goes to their militaries?
>
>These don't seem like significantly high enough numbers to have much impact
>on tax rates.

Not right away. But the debt continues to pile up.
>
>Do you know the corresponding numbers for foreign aid (speaking of some
>government spending which *has* gone down a bit)?

I don't know the numbers, but I bet they are but a small fraction of what is spent on the military.
>
>>Yes, those countries have high taxes. They spend their tax money on other
>>things, and then let the USA pay for their defense.
>
>I can't figure out how France is having its defense paid for by the US
>when it spends for its own defense only 20% less of its GDP than the
>US apparently spends, by your assertion, to defend not only itself but
>a bunch of other countries.

What does France spend in terms of its Federal budget?

> As for the other two countries you mention, I
>can't help but notice that these both have constitutions which were
>established while under US military occupation and whose construction was
>greatly influenced by the US, which prevent them from making large military
>expenditures.

I suppose that the experience of what those countries did when they made large expenditures on their militaries had something to do with that....

>It hence isn't surprising that their military expenditures
>are smaller, but the suggestion that they chose to "let the US pay for their
>defense" is kind of revisionist. At the time those countries weren't the
>ones with the choices, the US was.

Very true.
>
>And as a case in point, note that it was only recently that the US
>complained to its European allies about their lack of pulling their own
>military weight, in particular with respect to the Balkans. In response
>the EU proposed immediately establishing an independent 65,000-troop "quick
>response force" from among its members to respond to combat situations which
>arose, along with a longer term goal of increasing and unifying their own
>capabilities with respect to missles and precision-guided munitions. The
>US reacted to this with a certain amount of horror since what they really
>wanted was for Europeans to devote themselves to peace keeping,
>post-conflict policing and logistics, dividing the labor to have the US
>do the combat while leaving support and the long-term cleanup of places
>like Kosovo to the Europeans.

Well, that sounds just plain dumb to me. I hadn't heard about that idea, and you make a very good point. Why should American troops have to be on the leading edge of combat all the time?

>I don't think the US finds it in its own
>interest to have the EU, which collectively has both a GDP and a
>technological base which rivals the US, pooling its resources to reproduce
>the US military, so I think it is a bit unfair to turn around and critize
>those countries for not having reproduced the US military.
>
I don't see why it's not in the interests of the USA for EU to have a sizable

military. It's not like Europe is going to attack the USA!

Frankly, I'm beginning to agree with you, Dennis. Maybe it's time for a United States of Europe in more ways than the Chunnel and eurodollars.

Thanks for the info.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2699. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 02:26:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415222623.00629.00000069@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 64933

In article <20030415201026.06680.00000349@mb-cv.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>Did your Dad know the Utah Phillips story about the pie?
>
>I don't know that story.

It's about....no, I can't. It's just TOO EASY!

>What is it?
>
Look it up, Vipul.

Use any search engine to find the Utah Phillips website. There's a recording of him telling the story. The key word is "moose".

If you think your job isn't the best, just remember that there are far worse ones.

73 de Jim, N2EY

"it's good, though!"

2700. Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 02:58:35 UTC
From: Your name here <public@e.mail>
Message-ID: <vF3na.229601$Zo.42073@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 64935

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in
news:20030415152423.08944.00000469@mb-cc.aol.com:

>>Subject: Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/14/2003 11:20 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030415002040.24070.00000444@mb-ck.aol.com>
>
>
>>In non-amateur, non-Ham applications, CW means "an unmodulated sin
>>wave". In amateur radio, it means "Morse code".
>
> It's a "sine wave", Mr. Engineer.
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

Steve, Some people think CW is a 'sin'

2701. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 03:04:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAC24063.16F1B%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64936

"Jon Bloom" wrote:
>
> What do you think the US has been doing in the
> northern no-fly zone over the past 12 years?
> Their operations there allowed the Iraqi Kurds
> to escape the control of the Baghdad government
> and set up their own semi-autonomous government.
> This was facilitated by Turkey since much of
> the air operations over northern Iraq were
> based in Turkey.

Yes. And those air operations are causing a growing rift in relations with Turkey. Turkey is right on the edge of walking away from us. An invasion of Syria could be that last straw. Continued aid to the Kurds could do it. Heck, at this point, even the wrong words by the President could do it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2702. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 03:07:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9CC8CC.364D78AF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64939

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E9C984F.C703F3F8@earthlink.net...
> > "Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" wrote:
> > >
> > > DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> > > 2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> > > League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> > > British military personnel
> > >
> > > provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
> > > officer.
> > >
> > > "There is precedent for this," Mills said, citing an operation during
> > > the 1991 Gulf War. "These operators will need written authorization to
> > > operate from their commanding officers
> >
> > I'm sitting here grinning from ear to ear. All of this, of course,
> > reminds me of lengthy tale of an alleged operation from Somalia.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Not trying to be a smart alec here...but...since there is no actual
> government....and the only authority seems to be the US Military....I see no
> particular problem if the ham in question has a valid FCC license and the
> commander gives him the authority. Isnt the CO the defacto licensing
> authority in this case???

That's the usual case, Dan. In N0IMD's case, he didn't think it
important to have the permission in writing for operating from Somalia.
He says he operated on a verbal OK.

Dave K8MN

2703. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 03:18:30 UTC
From: Geoff <geoff@yirantzi.com>
Message-ID: <b7ii06$k88$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 64940

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hdehv13.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Tue, 15 Apr 2003 18:25:45 -0000, Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ
FN20qv) wrote:
>
> >DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> >2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> >League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> >British military personnel
> >
> >provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
> >officer.
>
> I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
> to standing procedures binding upon the military.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
The FCC has no jurisdiction in this matter. And the
ARRL? Ha! Got a news flash for you. The U.S.
Military right now IS the authority in Iraq. Meaning, the
military command can authorize anything.

Geoff

2704. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 03:23:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9CCC97.5B824E5A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64941

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030415201723.06680.00000351@mb-cv.aol.com...
> > From: Jon Bloom jbloom@arrl.or
> >
> > >QST which
> > >> included a claim that a particular professional op could copy 73 wpm
> >
> > Any studies of coders getting carpo tunnel symptoms.
> >
>
> At that speed, he is almost certainly doing head copy. It's impossible to
> write that fast and not too many can type that fast.

Let's see--there was Groucho, Chico, Zeppo and Carpo.

Dave K8MN

2705. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 03:32:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9CCE87.91A8CE92@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64942

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E9B8428.36F4BE9A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Redefinition works fine for those with an agenda. Honesty works better for
> the
> >> hobby. So, one should not call cheese sandwiches 2N2222's. It may work fine
> for
> >> a while. Eventually it will be bad for everyone involved. If you are told to
> do
> >> so, you should politely refuse.
> >
> >Great. Take your own advice and quit attempting to redefine amateur
> >radio by making believe that "ham radio" is something different. It is
> >dishonest of you.
>
> Der colonel has spoken.
>
> From now on all hams will call transistors "sandwiches."
>
> If not, they will be chewed out.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2706. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 03:37:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9CCFA0.D8F2BDD5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64943

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E9B8558.B1F1D3D2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >When I was a kid trying to leverage my dad into buying me something, I'd
> >often try the old, "but all the kids have one" ploy. Dad's response
> >was, "If all the kids ate horse manure sandwiches, would you want one?"

> Shouldn't the question on everyone's mind be: "Why did you?"

No, I don't think that should be the question on everyone's mind. That
doesn't make any sense.

> Bon apetit! :-)

"Appetit", Len. Your version looks like some sort of simian mammary
gland.

Dave K8MN

2707. Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 03:44:42 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415234442.20782.00000376@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 64945

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>>In non-amateur, non-Ham applications, CW means "an unmodulated sin wave".
>In
>>>amateur radio, it means "Morse code".
>>
>> It's a "sine wave", Mr. Engineer.
>>
>>Steve, K4YZ
>
>Steve:
>
>Maybe Vipuke got it right, from his point of view. Wouldn't a no-coder
>consider a CW signal to be a "sin wave?"
>

Sorry, that was an <unintentional> spelling mistake. I did not do that on purpose.

2708. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 03:44:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9CD170.C82F9A1C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64944

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E9B8428.36F4BE9A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Vshah101 wrote:
> >>
> >> N2EY wrote:
>
> >> Apparently, there is some confusion here on what is a 2N2222 transistor,
> >> compared to a cheese sandwich.
> >>
> >> There are those that believe in relative definition. Following this logic,
> if
> >> everyone believed there is no gravity, then gravity would no longer exist.
> >> Others believe in scientific proof.
> >>
> >You are the fellow touting "relative definition". I've not observed you
> >following any logic at all. We aren't in an "if everyone believed there
> >is no gravity" situation. We're in a "We all call it gravity; you call
> >it talcum powder" situation.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...new confusion! Talcum powder v. gravity!

Sorry you're confused, Len. Others seem to be following along--with the
possible exception of Vipul Shah.

> >When you begin to lose an argument, you really go out in a blaze of
> >nonsensical glory.
>
> No one else has confused talcum powder and gravity...only
> Heil. Strange!

Why that simply doesn't make sense, Leonard. I wrote of Vipul's
confusion, not my own.

> >Why those devious bastards! Imagine them selling transceivers when
> >their real goal is the insidious growth of morse code.
>
> Trouble in da Hood?
>
> The Gang of Four arguing over the "growth of morse code?!?"

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >It's the mind control LSI chips built into those new transceivers which
> >makes mind control possible, Vipul.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...Heil needs his V-Chip updated! :-)

We're not discussing broadcast TV, VCR's and the like, Len. :-) :-) :-)
:-) :-) :-)

> >Tell us please, which bands aren't useful. You'll save us a lot of
> >wasted time and effort if we can just manage to avoid those useless
> >bands.
>
> Anything above 30 cm is "useless" to Real Hams.
>
> Real Hams work DX on HF with CW.

You seem to be the only individual making such statements and you aren't
even a ham.

> >I don't know of any contest where the callsign is the exchange. I'll
> >assume that you goofed because you know nothing more about contesting
> >than you do about someone knowing ten word per minute morse forgetting
> >how to receive morse at 5 wpm. Whatever information exchanged by a
> >contester is quite useful in achieving a higher score in a contest.
>
> "Anything goes?" :-)

Don't worry about it, Len. We're discussing amateur radio.

> >Not everything I do on the air need be useful to all of amateur radio.
>
> You exist, therefore you rule!

My statement had nothing to do with ruling. Did you misunderstand it?

> >Great. Take your own advice and quit attempting to redefine amateur
> >radio by making believe that "ham radio" is something different. It is
> >dishonest of you.
>
> [mental picture of stern taskmaster wagging finger... :-)]
>
> Chewing out on cheese sandwiches?
>
> -----------------
>
> New local paper advertisement today:
>
> Complete HAM Dinner....$39.99...serves 8 to 10 people.

>
> Old Fashioned Bone-In HAM...$1.99 a pound.
>
> On the dinner, I'd suppose a photocopy of a ham license is
> sufficient proof for purchase... :-)
>
> Lots of old-fashioned hams already in here, confusing transistors
> and cheese sandwiches, talcum powder and gravity. They seem
> to have a bone to pick with everyone not old fashioned...or have
> too much bone in their cranial cavity. :-)

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2709. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 03:48:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9CD258.934D5807@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64946

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Jon Bloom" wrote:
> >
> > What do you think the US has been doing in the
> > northern no-fly zone over the past 12 years?
> > Their operations there allowed the Iraqi Kurds
> > to escape the control of the Baghdad government
> > and set up their own semi-autonomous government.
> > This was facilitated by Turkey since much of
> > the air operations over northern Iraq were
> > based in Turkey.
>
> Yes. And those air operations are causing a growing rift in relations with
> Turkey. Turkey is right on the edge of walking away from us.

Really? That hasn't made the news.

> An invasion of
> Syria could be that last straw. Continued aid to the Kurds could do it.
> Heck, at this point, even the wrong words by the President could do it.

It was announced that Northern No-fly zone patrols ended today.
Still wringing your hands, Dwight?

Dave K8MN

2710. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 03:52:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAC24BCA.16F1D%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64947

"Jon Bloom" wrote:
>
> One of the most amazing aspects of recent events
> is the insistence by many so-called conservatives
> that we should trust the government with powers
> that could easily be abused

It is amazing, isn't it? These people supported the Patriot Act, saying they "trust" the current Republican leadership. Even if one accepts total benevolence on the part of today's Republican leaders (very dangerous thinking), what about future leaders, both conservative and liberal? They will also have the powers granted in the Patriot Act - powers that could be used to crush opposition to any future government decision.

They also supported the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, saying they "trust" Secretary Tom Ridge. Again, even if you believe Tom Ridge is an angel sent by God (some conservatives seem to think that), what about future heads of this agency? We have no way of know who will be appointed to this position in the future or how that person will use the powers of this department.

> and that it's okay to run huge deficits. A few
> years ago, this same crowd was loudly arguing"
> that the government can do nothing right and is
> inherently dangerous to freedom, and that
> deficits were the number one problem facing the
> country.

Conservatives also spent decades screaming about the evils of big government, only to cheer loudly as a massive new government department was created with a mandate to collect, and use, information about Americans. Most supporters believe the department will be used only to go after "those" people, with no visible awareness that this department can just as easily go after anyone - including those very supporters when the department is in the hands of their opposition.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2711. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 03:52:57 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030415235257.20782.00000377@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 64948

>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>Contesting gets people to dust off the rigs and make sure the antenna
>is up and working.
>
> Contesting gets people to communicate across the country/world.
>
> In pursuit of the score, it hones your operating skills, that is, you
>work stations that may be weak and hard to read. Good practice for real
>emergencies.
>
> In real emergencies, people exchange information, just like in a
>contest. THe information is certainly more in depth, but so what? If you
>don't get the information correct in the exchange, you don't get the
>score. In some contests, they subtract points. Accuracy is important in
>both cases.
>
>
> So yeah, it is a game. But its practice for emergency ops too. And it's

>fun. So what? How many people would participate if it wasn't? In a real
>emergency, the person may be operating from a half charged car battery,
>be sick with dysentery or injury or worse, and have lots of other
>problems. But that doesn't matter.
>
> Since we don't know where the next emergency is going to happen, if we
>have lots of people who are trained all over the country, there is a
>good chance someone will be able to help if disaster strikes.

Thats interesting, honest, and compelling. Thanks.

2712. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 03:58:23 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAC24D1E.16F1F%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64949

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> I just explained the purpose of deployment.
> If no troops mass in open terrain, the weapon
> won't be used. Why do you have a problem with
> the weapon being deployed?

Already answered that twice, Dave - because the weapon was deployed after
it was clear no troops were still massed in open terrain.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2713. Re: Honest code elimination question...no flames please

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 04:08:08 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416000808.20782.00000378@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 64851

From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>Motor memory operates at an unconscious level. One has to work at a
>conscious level to do Morse Code.

By the way, if you are unconscious, how could you experience motor memory?

2714. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 04:08:48 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAC24F90.16F21%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64950

"Dave Heil" wrote:

> Please refer to my words "defeated enemy".

I did so when I mentioned WWI and WWII. I then commented on those other conflicts because they were far more recent incidents (and therefore perhaps a better gauge of how we might treat a previous enemy today).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2715. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 04:15:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416001518.16556.00001171@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 64852

> I am very comfortable
>with an over 50k/year retirement and no debts.

YEA RIGHT

2716. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 04:17:38 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416001738.16556.00001172@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 64854

>Otherwise, you would have never made it to extra.
>

I already admitted the EXTRA was the dumbest test I ever took. I couldnt believe it was the TOP of THE LINE TEST for HAMS. What a JOKE

2717. Re: On a lighter note....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 04:18:02 UTC
From: cheesecutter@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <fef386d5.0304152018.3fab438b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64853
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b7huii$16ad2$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...
> Dammit, I knew they were evil for at least one reason..... :)
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> "Hambone the Magnificent" <cqcqboooing@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:3e9b1902@snipnews.snip.net...
> >
> > "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:b7e7j2$d7hfl$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> > > So... since we never can get away from the code issue, are the Iraqi
> people
> > > pro-coders??
> >
> >
> > YES !!!!
> >
> > Go Here: http://www.croqueweb.com/
> > Iraqi Information Minister Mohammed
> > Saeed Al Sahaf's talking speech and CW
> > machine !
> >
> > also see: http://www.croqueweb.com/fan/index.html
> >
> > (the 75 Meter QRM'ers will have a BALL with this one ho-ho-ho-ho-ho !!!!)
> >
> >

look twistie.....hammies
are invading rec.radio.cb.....what are we to do?????

2718. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 04:31:12 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E9CDC90.7050504@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 64862

WA8ULX wrote:
>>I am very comfortable
>>with an over 50k/year retirement and no debts.
>
>
> YEA RIGHT

Yep, right. Let me put it this way, the year (1992) I retired
early at age 53, I only worked six months that year and paid $28k
in taxes, which is probably more than you ever made in a year.

2719. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 04:47:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAC2589E.16F23%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64855

"Bill Sohl" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
>> I did not claim they were (snip)
>
> The bottom line is that they (the Iraqi soldiers) are/were
> on the wrong side of justice, freedom, etc.

Since when did justice and freedom become the goal? I thought this war was about WMD, with justice and freedom just waved around to justify an invasion to find those WMD, Dave.

>> Most in the Iraqi military were not involved
>> in torture.
>
> And your source for that fact is?

And your source to dispute it is?

> Yup, the whole thing was scripted for jouralists.

Do you honestly believe journalists riding around on armored vehicles, accompanied by military public affairs personnel, is the way to get the whole unbiased story? Do you honestly believe created media events (such as a tank pulling down a statue) is full coverage of a conflict?

>> Bill, all we've seen are looters in the streets,
>
> So the looting was staged for the journalists?

Don't twist my words, Bill. You claimed the bulk of Iraqis are glad we liberated them. I respond that we had not seen or heard from the bulk of the Iraqis, only from a limited number, such as looters in the streets, Kurds in the North, and the participants of staged events.

> So? They were all targeted towards military
> and gvernment targets. They were very accurate
> too...or do you just ignore that.

How do you know that, Bill? Again, we've saw only a small number of bomb targets. Reporters are not yet free to roam around Baghdad, or other cities, to view the other targets. Indeed, the military could have leveled entire cities without any of us outside the military knowing about it at this point (or ever knowing about it if the military is successful at keeping it off the evening news).

> Do you think people don't understand the
> horrors of war? (snip)

Most Americans have never personally witnessed the "horrors of war."

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2720. Re: On a lighter note....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 04:48:40 UTC
From: cuttin the cheese <suezcanal3@juno.com>
Message-ID: <3e9ce144@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 64856
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"chessecutter" <cheesecutter@webhideout.com> wrote in message
news:fef386d5.0304152018.3fab438b@posting.google.com...
>
> look twistie.....hammies
> are invading rec.radio.cb.....what are we to do?????

Slide down into ther 10 Meter Band with some
"Breaker Breakers" and roger beeps and
echo mics for a weekend or two. That's a
sure bet to get their BVD's in a knot for the next Year or two.....

2721. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 04:52:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9CE1BB.A9995F3C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64857

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > I just explained the purpose of deployment.
> > If no troops mass in open terrain, the weapon
> > won't be used. Why do you have a problem with
> > the weapon being deployed?
>
> Already answered that twice, Dave - because the weapon was deployed after
> it was clear no troops were still massed in open terrain.

Do you have any concept of how our military operates?

Dave K8MN

2722. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 04:58:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9CE329.2F62A58C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64858

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> > Please refer to my words "defeated enemy".
>
> I did so when I mentioned WWI and WWII. I then commented on those other
> conflicts because they were far more recent incidents (and therefore perhaps
> a better gauge of how we might treat a previous enemy today).

It'd be hard to treat an enemy any particular way if we aren't in its country, Dwight. I can't agree with your thinking on this issue or any other in the thread. I think you claimed earlier to believe yourself a pretty conservative fellow. Your posts don't support that statement. I'm having trouble finding points on which we can agree.

Dave K8MN

2723. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 05:02:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9CE401.3933477E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64859

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Bill Sohl" wrote:
> >
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> >> I did not claim they were (snip)
> >
> > The bottom line is that they (the Iraqi soldiers) are/were
> > on the wrong side of justice, freedom, etc.
>
> Since when did justice and freedom become the goal? I thought this war was
> about WMD, with justice and freedom just waved around to justify an invasion
> to find those WMD, Dave.

Bill, not Dave. Bill.

Dave K8MN

2724. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 06:16:44 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304152216.6924c4e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64860

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<tL2na.1065$qa5.898703@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030415201723.06680.00000351@mb-cv.aol.com...
> > From: Jon Bloom jbloom@arrl.or
> >
> > >QST which
> > >> included a claim that a particular professional op could copy 73 wpm
> >
> > Any studies of coders getting carpo tunnel symptoms.
> >
>
> At that speed, he is almost certainly doing head copy. It's impossible to
> write that fast and not too many can type that fast.

If ya don't get it down on paper it don't count.

My Mom was on her high school typing team in the late 1920s and could
pound her manual mill at well over 100 wpm, 110 or 120 wpm, I forget
which.

>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE

w3rv

2725. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 06:19:59 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304152219.19218f04@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64861

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.15.20.55.39.611338.25870@arrl.org>...
> On Tue, 15 Apr 2003 16:31:30 -0400, Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > Some code tape machine manufacturer used to run ads in QST which
> > included a claim that a particular professional op could copy 73 wpm,
> > McElroy . . ? A ham buddy of mine was clocked at 70+ wpm at the Dayton
> > hamfest a number of years ago.
>
> Ted McElroy:
> http://fohnix.metronet.com/~nmcewen/mcelroy.html

Nice link, tnx.

>
> Jon

w3rv

2726. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 06:37:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416023708.17921.00000414@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64863

>Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/15/2003 7:09 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030415200910.06680.00000348@mb-cv.aol.com>

>>What ARE you talking about? "Sell out"??
>
>Switch over into the IT field, for significantly higher pay. I chose not to
>because I wanted to work with EE stuff. Now, I regret it.

I can't think of too many things in life that are a "do it once now or
forget about it forever" situation.

If you want to do it, DO IT...Otherwise stop whining because it is them
apparent that all you are interested in IS whining.

>>Last night I had a nice QSO on 80 meter CW with a ham in WPA. I was
>>running my homebrew rig and he was using a 3 watt kit rig from Small
>>Wonder. Great signals, lots of fun. Very useful.
>
>That's because the two Ham operators choosed that mode. If you had not
>choosed
>that mode, it would not be in use.

But they DID choose it, and it WAS useful.

Nothing unreal exists, Vipul.

Steve, K4YZ

2727. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 06:42:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416024220.17921.00000415@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64864

>Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/15/2003 6:55 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030415195527.06680.00000347@mb-cv.aol.com>

>From K4YZ:
>
>>I again challenge you to put "Ham Radio" in a search engine and then come
>>up with a reult OTHER than Amateur Radio.
>
>Won't find it. Searching periodical CD's such as QST, 73, etc will get more
>relavant results. However, no mention of cult will be found.

In OTHER words, you KNOW I am right, ergo you refuse to do it.

I can live with that.

>>You are the newsgroup equivilent of the guy slipping on the
>>banana peel. The problem is you AIM for the banana peel!
>
>You must invite a non-Ham to a Hamfest and ask what his/her impressions are

To watch you slip on a banana peel, Vipul? I am a nurse...I don't dwell
on other people's suffering...I try to ease it.

>>And I "lean" in a lot of rooms if I am tired enough. What does leaning
>>have to do with what I say?
>
>Sorry, I meant say '73' after LEAVING (not leaning) a room.

If it's a roomful of Hams, yes, I might say "73". I would also say "Vaya
con Dios" leaving a roomful of Spanish speaking people, and I might say "break
a leg" if I were in a roomful of actors. So what?

Steve, K4YZ

2728. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 06:44:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416024439.17921.00000416@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64865

>Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/15/2003 8:01 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030415210105.06680.00000356@mb-cv.aol.com>

>>Vipul, it is quite obvious that you know nothing about your own field of
>>study.
>
>Seems like you will try to find reasons for EEs NOT to homebrew.

What does YOUR lack of knowledge of your own occupational field hve to do
with EE's hombrewing?

Steve

2729. Re: "No Matches Found"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 06:51:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416025100.17921.00000417@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64866

>Subject: Re: "No Matches Found"
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>Date: 4/15/2003 6:03 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304152302450.869@kd6lvw.ampr.org>

>On Mon, 14 Apr 2003, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>> QUOTE FROM WWW.FCC.GOV/WTB/ULS SEARCH ENGINE
>>
>> Specified Search
>>
>> Radio Service = CM, RR
>
>Did you mean to search for an AMATEUR license (after all, this is an amateur
>newsgroup)? You need to use services HA and HV.

Nope. I meant CM/RR. Those are the codes for the "commercial operator"
and "restricted radiotelephone" licenses. Our resident antagonist often makes
(non-germane) reference to his GROL.

Seems the FCC doesn't have him on file.

I also tried "AL", for "all", and of course we already knew the only
"Leonard H Anderson" in the Amateur database has allowed his license to expire.
Judging by the date of birth of the licensee, however, it was probably because
HE expired. (RIP)

73

Steve, K4YZ

2730. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 06:53:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416025332.17921.00000418@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64867

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 4/15/2003 6:06 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdehv13.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>

>I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
> to standing procedures binding upon the military.

Do you really want to deny access to a basically benign form of recreation
to 75,000 men with rifles and a lot of adrenalline reserves?

=)

73

Steve, K4YZ

2731. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 06:58:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416025817.17921.00000419@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64868

>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/15/2003 7:17 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030415201723.06680.00000351@mb-cv.aol.com>

>>A ham buddy of mine was clocked at 70+ wpm at the Dayton
>>> hamfest a number of years ago.
>
>Did he get a ticket?

Put THIS day on the calendar! Vippy made a funny without embarrassing
himself!

Steve

2732. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 07:03:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416030331.17921.00000420@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64869

>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/15/2003 7:17 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030415201723.06680.00000351@mb-cv.aol.com>

>Any studies of coders getting carpo tunnel symptoms.

"carpo tunnel"...???

Did you mean "carpool tunnel symptoms"...??? A form of paranoia when in an unlit tunnel with strange people in the car with you?

Or did you mean "carpal tunnel", a medical condition of the ligaments and connective tissue of the hands?

Steve

2733. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 07:10:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416031024.17921.00000421@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64870

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/15/2003 7:41 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030415204121.06680.00000355@mb-cv.aol.com>

>I never said Ham radio is bad.

Yes, you have. You have called it "embarrassing" and "a cult".

>Amateur radio is somtimes referred to as a cult.

Not by anyone other than you.

>When I mentioned I belonged to
>Ham radio club to some non-Hams, they asked me if Ham radio is a cult.

To ask if something is a cult is one thing. To assert it as fact is
another.

Amateur (Ham) Radio is NOT a cult. Not by any measure of the definitions
in ANY standard dictionary or reference.

>"Usually, the spread of HAM radio, say the enthusiasts, is more through word
>of
>mouth and passes on from one member of a family to the other. At times from
>one
>good friend to another. This anyway makes the hobby prone to be called a
>cult."

"Prone to be called a cult"...?!?! By who? In what popular or
professional journal or technical reference is it called a "cult"...?!?!?

Personally, I think you have taken your role model's lead and just keep
repeating the same lie over and over hoping it will eventually be accepted as
truth.

It won't.

Steve, K4YZ

2734. Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 07:12:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416031259.17921.00000422@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64871

>Subject: Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 4/15/2003 8:26 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030415212609.12217.00000208@mb-fq.aol.com>

>Steve:
>
>Maybe Vipuke got it right, from his point of view. Wouldn't a no-coder
>consider a CW signal to be a "sin wave?"

I guess as long as you "wasted your time" to learn it.

Actually, I thought "sin wave" was what those girls walking along
Hollywood and Vine made...!

73 de K4YZ

2735. Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 07:14:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416031427.17921.00000423@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 64872

>Subject: Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM
>From: Your name here public@e.mail
>Date: 4/15/2003 9:58 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <vF3na.229601$Zo.42073@sccrnsc03>

>Steve, Some people think CW is a 'sin'

It's only a sin if you do it badly...but then that can also be said of
sex, flying, race car driving, baking, etc etc etc.

Steve

2736. Re: "No Matches Found"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 11:24:54 UTC
From: Duane Allen <computeruser@sprintmail.com>
Message-ID: <3E9D4081.30702@sprintmail.com>
Source record: 64873

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
<...>
>
> Nope. I meant CM/RR. Those are the codes for the "commercial operator"
> and "restricted radiotelephone" licenses. Our resident antagonist often makes
> (non-germane) reference to his GROL.
>
> Seems the FCC doesn't have him on file.
>
<...>

The FCC Advance license search yields a Anderson, Leonard holding a CM
license with a Ship Radar Endorsement.

Duane Allen, N6JPO

2737. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 12:03:18 UTC
From: Col Davis ret <davis48@aoloexaux.net>
Message-ID: <b7jgo8$k7o$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 64875

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hdehv13.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>
> I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
> to standing procedures binding upon the military.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>

HA HA HA, I would love to see you tell this to
Gen. Tommy Franks! Obviously, you have no idea
of what a forward hot combat zone is all about. One
thing is for sure, There are no tin horn bureaucrats to
be found anywhere close to a hot combat zone.

Get a reality check!

Col. F.H. Davis ret.
Forward Recon, Special Forces
Korea
Grenada
Viet Nam (6 tours)

2738. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 13:10:33 UTC
From: Duane Allen <computeruser@sprintmail.com>
Message-ID: <3E9D5958.4070102@sprintmail.com>
Source record: 64876

Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX wrote:
> I personally have not seen the exact text, but recently in the magazine
> World Radio there was an article by James Wades, WB8SIW referencing amateur
> radio and public service. In this article from my understanding he makes a
> comment in regards to the idea that only 2% of hams participate in public
> service activities and the rest are "freeloaders."
>
> I hope to locate the text to get a better "read" on the article, but was
> wondering what your comments are? I see some of the point of this article
> possibly, in reference to the public service/emergency service
> communications are the "justification" of our vast allocations that we are
> afforded.
>
<...>

Public service/emergengy service communications are not the only
justification of the amateur radio service.

47CFR97.1 Basis and purpose provides five rationales for the existance
of the amateur radio service: (1) a voluntary noncommercial
communication service, (2) advancement of the radio art, (3) advancing
skills in communications and technology, (4) expansion of the national
reservoir of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts,
and (5) enhancing international goodwill.

If there are "freeloaders," it is the public service organizations that
routinely use hams for communications and fail to use the techniques
that sustain volunteer groups. Simple techniques such as a Thank You
and Certificates of Appreciation are too often forgotten by the
organizers. Repeated failure leads to a lack of volunteers.

Duane Allen N6JPO

2739. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 13:29:14 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416092914.18806.00000005@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 64877

>advancement of the radio art, (3) advancing
>skills in communications and technology,

This part is a JOKE

>expansion of the national
>reservoir of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts,

Experts, you got to be kidding, maybe the FCC should re-evaluate, or strike those words

2740. OT Sea Stories (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 14:50:54 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9D6DCE.6A8AE38@crosslink.net>
Source record: 64874

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> Works for me....USMC Rifle and Pistol Expert....More than once!
>

Good on ya Steve!

You heard about the sailor who was asked why some Americans had very short hair by some exotic young ladies he called LBFMs? He told them it was because the MDs gave them a buz cut whenever they caught an STD cuz that grew out by the time they were safe to sleep with again. Well, that wasn't me. It was the swab who used to tell Marine shooters that the Air Force Team was cheating to give them a nice adrenaline boost going into a match.

73, K3DWW

2741. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 16:44:31 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304160844.4512d9e7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64878

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030415210105.06680.00000356@mb-cv.aol.com>...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
> >The FCC has NOT said anything about it being irresponsible or embarrassing.
> >They are merely questioning the need to keep it a requirement. That is an
> >entirely different thing.
>
> True, thats what FCC said.

Then you misquoted the FCC.
>
> I meant having the test as a requirement is embarrassing to the hobby.

FCC doesn't think so.

Y'know what's really embarrassing? When folks who consider themselves
"professionals" claim that a simple one-time 5 wpm code receiving test
is any sort of "barrier" to a license. Particularly considering the
accomodations available.

> When ads for Hamfests have Morse code keyers in it, and a non-Ham asks what
> those are, it does not look good for Ham radio.

Why not?

>
> >Some of the EE's love the elegant mathematics but have no interest in
> >working directly with hardware.
>
> Even elegent math is hands on. That's what my Comm Theory Prof endorses.
> Programs such as Mathcad assist in this.

All the theory and math in the world doesn't get a thing done without
hardware.

There's an old saying, usually attributed to Von Braun, about this.
(btw, he is reputed to have hated the term "rocket scientist":

"Scientists dream of doing great things. Engineers do them."
>
> >Vipul, it is quite obvious that you know nothing about your own field of
> >study.
>
> Seems like you will try to find reasons for EEs NOT to homebrew.

I knew someone who said that homebrewing is "embarrassing to the hobby". This radio amateur claimed that most homebrew equipment looked crude, had a low level of workmanship and was usually far behind the 'state-of-the-art' for the application. This person also said that homebrew was embarrassing to the hobby because it made hams look like they could not afford manufactured equipment.

I disagreed with him, of course.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2742. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 17:01:08 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304160901.1dcfb032@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64879

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of April 15, 2003:

Novice - 34,822 (decrease of 14,507)
Tech - 253,394 (increase of 48,000)
Tech Plus - 69,835 (decrease of 59,025)
General - 140,662 (increase of 27,985)
Advanced - 83,771 (decrease of 16,011)
Extra - 103,814 (increase of 25,064)
Total - 686,298 (increase of 11,506)

Please note that:

- New Novice, Technician Plus and Advanced class licenses are no
longer being issued.

- Existing Technician Plus licenses are being renewed as Technician.

- Novices who pass Element 2 (Tech written) are upgraded to
Technician.

- Technicians who pass Element 1 (5 wpm code) receive a CSCE for
Element 1, and Tech/Novice HF privileges. However, their license class
does not change. Also, the CSCE expires after 365 days but they retain
their HF privileges.

- Anyone who can show that they once held a Novice class license
receives credit for Element 1, regardless of when the Novice license
was issued.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2743. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 20:54:34 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304161254.27e2dfef@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64880

Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9AFCD9.D8949D40@crosslink.net>...

> What irks me is Morse - the requirement, not the mode.

Do you really think that Element 1 is a big problem?

> I'd be downright
> PO'd if I showed up to see Old Faithful but had to prove I could start a
> fire with flint & steel in, say, 30 seconds befor I was allowed into the
> park.

Not a very good analogy. Try this one:

Should all driver's license tests include a test of ability to drive a
stick-shift car across an empty parking lot at not less than 5 mph?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2744. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:12:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416181216.18769.00000004@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 64889

In article <c2356669.0304160844.4512d9e7@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
>news:<20030415210105.06680.00000356@mb-cv.aol.com>...
>> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>>
>> >The FCC has NOT said anything about it being irresponsible or
>embarrassing.
>> >They are merely questioning the need to keep it a requirement. That is an
>> >entirely different thing.
>>
>> True, thats what FCC said.
>
>Then you misquoted the FCC.

No problem. You've done the same thing whenever I brought up the fact that the FCC said, in 1990 and 1999, that the morse code test didn't prove anything to the FCC insofar as amateur licensing.

You had to step around that, avoid it, and make a big thing about the "treaty requirements." Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>> I meant having the test as a requirement is embarrassing to the hobby.
>
>FCC doesn't think so.

FCC doesn't outright state that US amateur radio IS a hobby. :-)

It IS, but you have to glorify it beyond rational bounds.

>> Even elegent math is hands on. That's what my Comm Theory Prof endorses.
>> Programs such as Mathcad assist in this.
>
>All the theory and math in the world doesn't get a thing done without
>hardware.
>
>There's an old saying, usually attributed to Von Braun, about this.
>(btw, he is reputed to have hated the term "rocket scientist":
>
>"Scientists dream of doing great things. Engineers do them."

Tell us of the great "rocket things" you've done. :-)

Do you have a granted patent in radio? I have. Just one.
[the bear shooter has only one, but not about radio...]

>I knew someone who said that homebrewing is "embarrassing to the
>hobby". This radio amateur claimed that most homebrew equipment looked
>crude, had a low level of workmanship and was usually far behind the
>'state-of-the-art' for the application. This person also said that
>homebrew was embarrassing to the hobby because it made hams look like
>they could not afford manufactured equipment.
>
>I disagreed with him, of course.

You do a lot of disagreeable things, Jimmie.

But, you've built a KIT recently as your "homebrew" thing...

:-)

How DO you wire up a cheese sandwich in a circuit?

2745. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:12:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416181217.18769.00000005@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 64882

In article <20030416024439.17921.00000416@mb-fy.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Seems like you will try to find reasons for EEs NOT to homebrew.
>
> What does YOUR lack of knowledge of your own occupational field hve to
>do with EE's hombrewing?

How in the hell can YOU know about "being an EE," nursie?

The farthest into engineering you ever got was as a purchasing agent in a local electronics company...and then for less than a year.

You can't even describe carpal tunnel syndrome correctly and you expect to "correct others?"

2746. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:12:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416181218.18769.00000006@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 64890

In article <3E9CAA87.2030406@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

Mike, tsk, tsk, tsk...you should have stayed with "wry" instead
of hitting the rye:

> Contesting gets people to dust off the rigs and make sure the antenna
>is up and working.

One has to do contesting to find that out?!?!?

> Contesting gets people to communicate across the country/world.

True, but do they need contests to do that? I don't think so.

> In pursuit of the score, it hones your operating skills, that is, you
>work stations that may be weak and hard to read. Good practice for real
>emergencies.

WHAT "real emergencies" need low-level operating skills?

Be specific there. Use ARRL newsletters for a reference.

> In real emergencies, people exchange information, just like in a
>contest. THe information is certainly more in depth, but so what?

"So what?!?" Real emergencies involve Loss of Life or
Possible Loss of Life.

Contesting doesn't have any mortal danger, despite the
peculiar fantasies of some contesters.

>If you
>don't get the information correct in the exchange, you don't get the
>score. In some contests, they subtract points. Accuracy is important in
>both cases.

If you are going to "equate" contesting with Real Emergencies
in such a flippant manner, then it's time for some psychological
counseling for you.

> So yeah, it is a game. But its practice for emergency ops too.

No, contesting is certainly NOT any "practice" for "emergency
ops."

Games have rules. Real Emergencies don't come with "rules,"
aren't announced ahead of time, and you may have to work with
a lot of OTHER agencies who DO plan, drill, practice for all kinds
of contingencies NOT in any game rule book.

>And it's
>fun. So what? How many people would participate if it wasn't?

Are Real Emergencies "fun" in your estimation? Have you ever
been IN one? Or do you get your Real Emergency news from
good old ARRL along with all the self-serving self-promotional
emotional pumping they do?

>In a real
>emergency, the person may be operating from a half charged car battery,
>be sick with dysentery or injury or worse, and have lots of other
>problems. But that doesn't matter.

"It doesn't matter?!?"

That's a weird as hell comment, Mike.

> Since we don't know where the next emergency is going to happen, if we
>have lots of people who are trained all over the country, there is a
>good chance someone will be able to help if disaster strikes.

MOST of the Real Emergencies that happen in the USA and most
of its possessions involve LOCAL communications, distances
within line of sight range.

Real Emergencies need liason with local authorities: Medics,
firemen, policemen, aid agencies. Real Emergencies don't have
rules or "point scorers." Real Emergencies need all involved to
work with other agencies for as many possible contingencies as
one can think of, and to be prepared for those that nobody could
foresee. Real Emergencies do NOT need expert, trained
morsemen to interface with other emergency agencies in a
local area. Real Emergency organizations don't give a damn
if you've appeared in three successive sweepstakes in the top
ten for three years running or have file cabinets full of QSL
cards. Real Emergencies don't have preplanned events and
you don't "score points" by thinking you are better than all the
other agency professionals...unless you train, plan, practice
WITH them.

Now quit all the fantasizing about contesting being the "same"
as emergency ops. It isn't. No points for you.

2747. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:12:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416181219.18769.00000007@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 64888

In article <20030415210105.06680.00000356@mb-cv.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
(Vshah101) writes:

>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
>>The FCC has NOT said anything about it being irresponsible or embarrassing.
>>They are merely questioning the need to keep it a requirement. That is an
>>entirely different thing.
>
>True, thats what FCC said.

Some licensees are VERY uptight about their amateurism.

It's best to humor some of them.

>I meant having the test as a requirement is embarrassing to the hobby.
>When ads for Hamfests have Morse code keyers in it, and a non-Ham asks what
>those are, it does not look good for Ham radio.

Those uptighters ought to inform the public that they think
US ham radio is all about "working DX on HF with CW."

>>Some of the EE's love the elegant mathematics but have no interest in
>>working directly with hardware.
>
>Even elegent math is hands on. That's what my Comm Theory Prof endorses.
>Programs such as Mathcad assist in this.

I get the sneaky feeling Dee does little but operate an 026 punch.

:-)

Some of the uptighters who don't know a transistor from a sandwich
probably think that engineers still use slide rules or "design" by
laborious mathematics all day at a desk, just pushing paper.

The same ones also seem to think that ALL the radio knowledge
needed by anyone is already in ARRL's Handbook. :-)

>>Vipul, it is quite obvious that you know nothing about your own field of
>>study.
>
>Seems like you will try to find reasons for EEs NOT to homebrew.

Go easy on the uptight, Shah. They get very upset when their
beloved morsemanship is slighted. :-)

2748. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:12:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416181220.18769.00000008@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 64886

In article <20030415200650.11012.00000142@mb-fm.aol.com>, nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) writes:

>In article <20030415155041.04182.00000180@mb-fg.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>>> Did your Dad know the Utah Phillips story about the pie?
>>>
>>>> "it's good, though"
>>>
>>>If he knew it, he never passed it along to me.
>>
>> That still doesn't answer why you ate it... ?
>
>Tell us how it tasted, Len. And why you went back for seconds.....;-)

Why should I tell any PLAGIARIST anything?

"No CW Test" was a screen name I used some years ago on America Online and for messaging in here. I haven't used that screen name for at least two years. AOL only reserves old screen names for six months. After six months anyone can use it.

You've used it here without any respect whatsoever, trying to ape the original screen name user. No supplementary ID at all. Just blatant COPYING of what another has done. In the media that is PLAGIARISM, boy.

You are without honor, without respect for acts of plagiarism.

>Back in my early days with the Rural Electrification Authority down in New
>Mexico, I had the job of bringing electricity to some of the larger Navajo
>outhouses and privies. They said it was the first time anyone had wired a
>head for a reservation.....

You are also a racial bigot. No respect earned there, either.

If you wish to audition for the Comedy Store doing stand-up acts, I can tell Mitzi Shore you are coming. Neither she nor the audience cares for plagiarists who copy others' material.

2749. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:12:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416181223.18769.00000009@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 64891

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hdeh611.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 15 Apr 2003 04:26:35 GMT, Vshah101 wrote:
>
>>"Professional Engineer" has nothing to do with EE profession. Its for Civil
>>Engineers.
>
> Tell that to the several states in which I am registered as a
> Professional Engineer with an EE specialty. If you are in
> California I refer you to the Business and Professions Code
> that defines over a dozen specialties which require a PE license
> to practice or to use the title.

Shah isn't in California. If you check the California state law
of Professional Engineers and their licensing and titling, you
will find that corporations can very well, legally and honestly
call electronics engineers as engineers.

You and others were confusing "profession" with Licensed
Professional Engineers...or deliberately misdirecting the thread
in order to win message points in here. "Professions" are
applied to work done for pecuniary reasons. This whole
newsgroup is about AMATEUR radio, defined by federal
regulation as an activity without pecuniary compensation.

I'm not a Licensed Professional Engineer in any state.
Never been one. Didn't need to be. Several large national
corporations have titled me as an "engineer" quite legally
and honestly. Such "engineers" AND the Licensed
Professional Engineers get "respect" from other engineers
based on the work they do and how well they've done it.
The pecuniary compensation is okay as far as I'm concerned
but Licensed Professional Engineers need the protection
from state laws so that they can overcharge corporations
and afford the legal fees involved when they screw up on a
job (such as in the medical field and malpractice insurance).
All done legally and "honestly," of course.

Interesting that such Licensing laws were written by attorneys
at law for politicians. Attorneys at law also bill their clients
at rather high rates, don't they? Attorneys at law also like to
play lots of word games about law.

> Your statements show you to be a buffoon who has demonstrated a
> profound lack of knowledge about EEs, CEs, and PEs and the

> engineering profession in general.

Is this a newsgroup about Licensed Professional Engineers?

I thought it was about AMATEUR RADIO POLICY.

Unless there's been an overnight change in Part 97 or elsewhere
in Title 47, amateur radio is a radio activity carried out without
pecuniary reasons.

Amateur radio licensing is done as a regulatory tool by a federal
radio regulating agency. The FCC doesn't award "respect" by
amateur radio license grants. That's a fantasy self-promotion
by individual amateurs. License grants are regulatory tools,
not certificates of achievement.

Amateurs of any kind who confuse cheese sandwiches with
EIA registered transistor identifying numbers don't deserve any
"respect." Neither do those who confuse "talcum powder" with
"gravity."

Strange bunch of regulars in here who can't seem to focus on
the newsgroup general subject.

2750. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:12:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416181224.18769.00000011@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 64883

In article <3E9CE1BB.A9995F3C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Already answered that twice, Dave - because the weapon was deployed after
>> it was clear no troops were still massed in open terrain.
>
>Do you have any concept of how our military operates?

Do you, Herr Robust? :-)

Do you have a record of "seven hostile actions," too?!?

2751. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:12:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416181224.18769.00000010@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 64884

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hdehm42.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 15 Apr 2003 20:04:32 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
>>If your shop steward is not getting the results you
>>think you deserve, the represented members need to get rid of him.
>
> Especially if they expect the shop steward to make chicken stew
> out of chicken feathers.

Ex purchasing agents never had any "shop stewards."

USMC didn't have "shop stewards."

Do hospital nurses have "shop stewards?"

Isn't there a separate newsgroup for the marine corps,
nursing and service-support individuals?

2752. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:12:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416181225.18769.00000013@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 64881

In article <20030416025817.17921.00000419@mb-fy.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Did he get a ticket?
>
> Put THIS day on the calendar! Vippy made a funny without embarrassing
>himself!

Tsk, tsk, tsk, yet another day goes by while Steamy Stalker continues to try humiliating others by nasty comments about them.

The Tennessee Talibanian keeps on making himself the fool.

2753. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:12:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416181225.18769.00000012@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 64887

In article <20030416030331.17921.00000420@mb-fy.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Any studies of coders getting carpo tunnel symptoms.
>
> "carpo tunnel"...???
>
> Did you mean "carpool tunnel symptoms"...??? A form of paranoia when in
>an unlit tunnel with strange people in the car with you?
>
> Or did you mean "carpal tunnel", a medical condition of the ligaments
>and connective tissue of the hands?

Doctor Killgore ought to try for additional medical formal training.
If he managed some college night classes he could complete
a pre-med degree within 15 years...then do the requisite
residency and maybe pass a state medical board to become
a real, honest Medical Doctor instead of playing out fantasies
of being an amateur "medical expert."

In case you haven't seen it, this newsgroup is about radio,
specifically about amateur radio policy. You are only licensed
as an amateur radio person, not a degreed Medical Doctor.

The "carpal tunnel" referred to is in the WRIST, not the hands.
That syndrome involves inflammation of the wrist area that
causes pressure on the nerve tissue also going through the
wrist area. You need to study your "Gray's" a bit closer
before spouting off like a medical guru.

Remember, this is rec.radio.amateur.policy, not guru.medical.
amateur.knowitall-extra.

2754. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:12:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416181226.18769.00000014@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 64885

In article <d22b54c3.0304152216.6924c4e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> At that speed, he is almost certainly doing head copy. It's impossible to
>> write that fast and not too many can type that fast.
>
>If ya don't get it down on paper it don't count.
>
>My Mom was on her high school typing team in the late 1920s and could
>pound her manual mill at well over 100 wpm, 110 or 120 wpm, I forget
>which.

No problem, Speedy. I can cruise at 60 WPM still, burst-type at 80 WPM with accuracy. [better accuracy than those in here who continue to spell "amatuer" or "thier"...:-)]

My computer can do it at T-1 data rates, better than 200,000 WPM...also store it all on a hard disk. :-)

Do you have an emergency "manual mill" (typewriter) to take down such "copy" on paper for emergency communications by morse? Can YOU hack 60 WPM on a "mill"?

"If you don't get it down on paper it don't count..." :-)

2755. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:16:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E9DD62E.171F08E8@att.net>
Source record: 64892

Jon Bloom wrote:

> They're saying, "We KNOW what the end result
> of militarism is. We lived it in the 20th century. The US should learn
> from the European experience." You don't have to agree with them to
> recognize that their concern is based on experiences we've never had.

That's load of nonsense, Jon. It wasn't "militarism" that caused those problems, it was dictatorial radicalism of the same Saddam mold. It TOOK a large dose of militarism to stamp it out. Militarism is no vice, rather a complete
necessity, as we learned by the middle of the 20th century. Be thankful that Hitler et al didn't have today's capabilities in 1940, when those Americans

like you joined their European counteparts in a vain effort to talk WW2 out of happening.

So just where do you think we'd be today if the Demos had been successful in totally downsizing out military in the past couple decades, as was done following WW1? Not a pleasant question to contemplate.

2756. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:27:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416182706.18775.00000010@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 64894

In article <c2356669.0304161254.27e2dfef@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Not a very good analogy. Try this one:
>
>Should all driver's license tests include a test of ability to drive a
>stick-shift car across an empty parking lot at not less than 5 mph?

A very silly analogy.

Driving an automobile or even any vehicle has NOTHING to do
with amateur radio licensing.

2757. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:27:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416182734.18775.00000011@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 64893

In article <c2356669.0304161254.27e2dfef@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Not a very good analogy. Try this one:
>
>Should all driver's license tests include a test of ability to drive a
>stick-shift car across an empty parking lot at not less than 5 mph?

A very silly analogy.

Driving an automobile or even any vehicle has NOTHING to do
with amateur radio licensing.

2758. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:35:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9DDB1F.8E5FD8E0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64895

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030416024439.17921.00000416@mb-fy.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
> >>Seems like you will try to find reasons for EEs NOT to homebrew.
> >
> > What does YOUR lack of knowledge of your own occupational field hve to
> >do with EE's hombrewing?
>
> How in the hell can YOU know about "being an EE," nursie?

I'm sure he knows at least as much about being an electrical engineer as
you do about being a ham, Leonard.

Dave K8MN

2759. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:41:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9DDC6D.CF4D5E13@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64896

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030415210105.06680.00000356@mb-cv.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
> (Vshah101) writes:
.
>
> >I meant having the test as a requirement is embarrassing to the hobby.
> >When ads for Hamfests have Morse code keyers in it, and a non-Ham asks what
> >those are, it does not look good for Ham radio.
>
> Those uptighters ought to inform the public that they think
> US ham radio is all about "working DX on HF with CW."

I've been informing the public that YOU believe that amateur radio is
all about working DX on HF with CW. A number of them want to know what
DX is, what HF is and what CW is. When I told some hams what you
believe, they all wondered who Leonard H. Anderson is.

Dave K8MN

2760. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:47:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9DDDEF.500716DE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64897

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E9CE1BB.A9995F3C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Already answered that twice, Dave - because the weapon was deployed after
> >> it was clear no troops were still massed in open terrain.
> >
> >Do you have any concept of how our military operates?
>
> Do you, Herr Robust? :-)

Why, yes, Leonard. I do. :-)

> Do you have a record of "seven hostile actions," too?!?

Watch it, Bub. During my war time service, I was at least stationed in
the country where the conflict was taking place. I wasn't leaning on an
equipment rack in a different country. I was drawing combat pay.

Dave K8MN

2761. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:53:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9DDF4F.736EC45C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64898

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <d22b54c3.0304152216.6924c4e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> At that speed, he is almost certainly doing head copy. It's impossible to
> >> write that fast and not too many can type that fast.
> >
> >If ya don't get it down on paper it don't count.
> >
> >My Mom was on her high school typing team in the late 1920s and could
> >pound her manual mill at well over 100 wpm, 110 or 120 wpm, I forget
> >which.
>
> No problem, Speedy. I can cruise at 60 WPM still, burst-type
> at 80 WPM with accuracy. [better accuracy than those in
> here who continue to spell "amatuer" or "thier"...:-)]

That's very "immagure" of you, Leonard.

> My computer can do it at T-1 data rates, better than 200,000
> WPM...also store it all on a hard disk. :-)

Communication at near the speed of light and still you have nothing to
say. :-) :-) :-(

Dave K8MN

2762. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:54:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9DDF86.6E07CA07@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64899

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0304161254.27e2dfef@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >Not a very good analogy. Try this one:
> >
> >Should all driver's license tests include a test of ability to drive a
> >stick-shift car across an empty parking lot at not less than 5 mph?
>
> A very silly analogy.
>
> Driving an automobile or even any vehicle has NOTHING to do
> with amateur radio licensing.

Come to think of it, neither do you.

Dave K8MN

2763. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 22:54:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9DDFBD.C90F4E03@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64900

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0304161254.27e2dfef@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >Not a very good analogy. Try this one:
> >
> >Should all driver's license tests include a test of ability to drive a
> >stick-shift car across an empty parking lot at not less than 5 mph?
>
> A very silly analogy.
>
> Driving an automobile or even any vehicle has NOTHING to do
> with amateur radio licensing.

Come to think of it, neither do you.

(We know, you meant to post it twice. It was a clever trap.)

Dave K8MN

2764. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 23:50:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7kq6p$4gh$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 64951

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E9DDDEF.500716DE@earthlink.net...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3E9CE1BB.A9995F3C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
<k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >> Already answered that twice, Dave - because the weapon was deployed
after
> > >> it was clear no troops were still massed in open terrain.
> > >
> > >Do you have any concept of how our military operates?
> >
> > Do you, Herr Robust? :-)
>
> Why, yes, Leonard. I do. :-)
>
> > Do you have a record of "seven hostile actions," too?!?
>
> Watch it, Bub. During my war time service, I was at least stationed in
> the country where the conflict was taking place. I wasn't leaning on an
> equipment rack in a different country. I was drawing combat pay.
>
> Dave K8MN

I like the way you put that Dave.

Dan/W4NTI

2765. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 23:53:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416195345.18769.00000006@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 64952

In article <20030415201723.06680.00000351@mb-cv.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: Jon Bloom jbloom@arrl.or
>
>>QST which
>>> included a claim that a particular professional op could copy 73 wpm
>
>Any studies of coders getting carpo tunnel symptoms.

The term is "carpal tunnel syndrome".

Back when straight keys were in general use, "telegrapher's arm" or "glass arm" did afflict some telegraphers who used straight keys imporperly. (The right way wi with the wrist well off the table, and the whole hand flexing at the wrist. The wrong way is with the wrist down near the table and the fingers flexing.)

Horace Martin and others discovered that the condition could be alleviated or avoided by using a key that moves side-to-side rather than up and down. That's why sideswipers, bugs and keyer paddles are constructed that way.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2766. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 23:53:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416195345.18769.00000005@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 64953

In article <3E9C2CC7.8ADBF2C8@crosslink.net>, Vito <vito@crosslink.net> writes:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>> Let's give your laptop a try. How about if we meet on 160m in July?
>> I'm betting my aural decoding skills can beat your computer--if it has a
>> decent fist.
>
>Might be fun to have one computer sent *perfect* morse at increasing
>speeds til you, or a receiving computer begins missing characters. Has
>anybody tried this before?

Many times. The Germans were using burst keyers in WW2 to communicate with their U-boats. Some hams today use very fast computer generated and decoded Morse for meteor scatter work.

>What are the practical maximum human and
>computer speeds given a perfect fist?

Ted McElroy could typewriter-copy well over 70 wpm, and he was not alone. How fast he could head copy is unknown, but probably beyond 80 wpm. I knwo several ops who zip along beyond 50 wpm.

The practical limitation in computer Morse is the performance of the hardware and software. With dedicated hardware, almost any speed is possible.

In practice, however, there's the factor of radio conditions. Which is why even the early Baudot RTTY systems usually used FSK.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2767. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 23:53:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416195346.18769.00000007@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 64955

In article <3E9C984F.C703F3F8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>"Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" wrote:
>>
>> DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
>> 2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
>> League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
>> British military personnel
>>
>> provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
>> officer.
>>
>> "There is precedent for this," Mills said, citing an operation during
>> the 1991 Gulf War. "These operators will need written authorization to
>> operate from their commanding officers
>
>I'm sitting here grinning from ear to ear. All of this, of course,
>reminds me of lengthy tale of an alleged operation from Somalia.
>
Me, too. Note the requirement for WRITTEN authorization.

It's interesting that the person who claimed the /T5 operation has not yet
answered these simple questions:

What callsign was used?
What rigs and antennas were used?
Who did the equipment belong to?
What amateur bands and modes were used?
What countries and continents were worked?
How were the QSLs delivered?

Betcha the folks operating/YI will remember the answers to these questions.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2768. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-16 23:53:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416195347.18769.00000008@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 64954

In article <f45722ac.0304060909.767290fc@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> >Also, Kelley
>>
>> Who is "Kelley"? Jim Kelley, AC6XG, hasn't posted here in ages. I wonder
>how
>> he's doing. It was fun working him on the air, both times I did.
>
>Cool. What was the funnest part of the experience?

Hard to say. So many fun parts - the rrap net on 7037, with amateurs from all over the country checking in, that Field Day when the multi-club group used my call (which is how AC6XG found us), W3RV working 20 meters and filling up the log sheets after the band was pronounced "dead" by others, and coming across AC6XG in the process.

>
>> >was bitching in another thread about all the
>> >non-proficient hams who somehow passed 13 or 20wpm exams and never
>> >used the code, and cannot be considered proficient.
>>
>> That's his beef. Argue with him.
>
>Why argue?

Your the one who keeps arguing. Why?
>
>> >Make an
>> >estimation and I'll deduct them as well.
>> >
>> Why?
>>
>> >We'll keep working the numbers until we can show Morse Code as a
>> >growth industry as one "great" DXer would like it to be.
>> >
>> "Growth industry"? Amateur Radio is "not for pecuniary interest", so it
>>can't
>> be an industry. Manufacturing and selling Amateur Radio hardware and
>>software
>> can be an industry, though.
>
>No kidding?

No kidding.
>

>> And if we look at the number of manufacturers making and selling Morse Code
>> related hardware and software today, as compared to 10, 20, 30 years ago,
>>it's
>> clear that part of the industry is growing. With or without a test.
>
>Speaking of tests, what kind of code test does Part 97 specify?

Look it up.

>I'll bet there is no mention of Farnsworth.

Don't know any code called Farnsworth. Just a spacing modification to Morse
that is used at speeds below about 20 wpm.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

2769. Re: The best CW speed for hams is 0 WPM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 00:53:53 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416205353.18878.00000061@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 64956

From K4YZ:
>>Steve, Some people think CW is a 'sin'
>
> It's only a sin if you do it badly.

Wuoff Hong cult also believes CW done badly is also a sin.

In fact, some CW operator sent some poor CW transmission and the person that received it believed the operator was sending the letters "W O U F F H O N G".

2770. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 00:59:01 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416205901.18878.00000062@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 64957

From K4YZ:
>What does YOUR lack of knowledge of your own occupational field hve to do
>with EE's hombrewing?

Firstly, a "Professional Engineer" is not relevant to what I want to do with EE degree.

Secondly, Dee has came up with several reasons why many EEs don't homebrew. Seems like endorsing that EEs should not homebrew.

2771. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 01:05:28 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416210528.18771.00000010@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 64958

In article <20030416181220.18769.00000008@mb-m20.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030415200650.11012.00000142@mb-fm.aol.com>, nocwtest@aol.com
>(No
>CW Test) writes:
>
>>In article <20030415155041.04182.00000180@mb-fg.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>>>> Did your Dad know the Utah Phillips story about the pie?
>>>>
>>>>> "it's good, though"
>>>>
>>>>If he knew it, he never passed it along to me.
>>>
>>> That still doesn't answer why you ate it... ?
>>
>>Tell us how it tasted, Len. And why you went back for seconds.....;-)
>
> Why should I tell any PLAGIARIST anything?

LOL!!

Who is a PLAGIARIST?

>
> "No CW Test" was a screen name I used some years ago on
> America Online and for messaging in here.

What a coincidence! :-O

I have read that you used
other screen names here.
Several of them. ;-)

> I haven't used that
> screen name for at least two years. AOL only reserves old
> screen names for six months. After six months anyone can
> use it.

So what's the problem?
You gave up the screen
name. Somebody else
picked it up. Why does
it bother you so much?

I'm not claiming to be you.

> You've used it here without any respect whatsoever, trying to
> ape the original screen name user.

They say imitation is the
sincerest form of flattery, Leonard ;-)

Why does it bother you if
someone models their posting
style after yours? Is it copyrighted?
Patented?

Don't you want to be treated the
way you treat others?

I'd think you'd be flattered.

> No supplementary ID at
> all.

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Many of your posts that I have read
do not contain any supplementary ID.

There is no supplementary ID in your
post to which I am replying now.

> Just blatant COPYING of what another has done.

ROFLMBFAO!!!

I did not try to pass off any of your
original work as my own, Leonard.

I did not copy anything you or
anyone else wrote without attribution.

No one who reads my posts thinks that
I am you or you are me.

I do not think newgroup postings are
copyrighted.

> In the media that is PLAGIARISM, boy.

"BOY"?
That is a racial SLUR to many people.

It is also inaccurate in a literal sense. I am
not a boy.

If you met me in person, you might hesitate
to call me "BOY".

I would never call a stranger "boy". Why do
you?
>
> You are without honor, without respect for acts of plagiarism.

Where is your honor, Leonard? Why should
anyone respect you? You rarely, if ever,
show respect for others in your postings here.

You have not shown me any respect at all.

Poor baby....do you expect to get what you
do not give and have not earned?

>>Back in my early days with the Rural Electrification Authority down in New
>>Mexico, I had the job of bringing electricity to some of the larger Navajo
>>outhouses and privies. They said it was the first time anyone had wired a
>>head for a reservation.....
>
> You are also a racial bigot.

How do you get that from the joke?
I heard it from Mr. Phillips. Is he a
racial bigot?

I do not think the joke is racially
offensive to anyone. If someone
of Navajo or Native American
ethnicity is offended, I sincerely
apologize.

I'm not the one calling unseen
strangers "BOY", Leonard. You
are. In just the past few weeks
I have read you making fun of
the jobs, educations, military
services, nationalities and
many other features of people
who post here. You even make
fun of their names.

> No respect earned there, either.

That is correct. You have not earned
any respect from me. I am showing
you respect that you have not
earned. Maybe that is what bothers
you.
>
> If you wish to audition for the Comedy Store doing stand-up acts,
> I can tell Mitzi Shore you are coming. Neither she nor the
> audience cares for plagiarists who copy others' material.
>
You seem to be very upset by all this,

Leonard. Poor baby...tsk, tsk, tsk. ;-) ;-) ;-)

Just to show you I am a nice person,
Leonard, I'll just stop using this screen
name. After seeing how you treat
other people, I would not want anyone
to think I was you. :-P

What other screen names should I
avoid? Someone wrote that you
have used 'LenOf21', 'averyfine',
'averyfineman', 'MegHz', and
others. List all the screen names
that you have ever used so I won't
accidentally pick one of them.

Please try to be a nicer person,
Leonard. People might be nice to
you in return.

Bye-bye now. Say hi to Mitzi
and the gang for me.

2772. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 01:05:52 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416210552.18878.00000067@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 64959

From N2EY:
>> When ads for Hamfests have Morse code keyers in it, and a non-Ham asks what
>> those are, it does not look good for Ham radio.
>
>Why not?

It looks like a bunch of grown up kids playing with their baby keyer toys.

The non-Ham does know that Morse code is old, something unfortunately, a large group of Hams does not know.

>There's an old saying, usually attributed to Von Braun, about this.
>(btw, he is reputed to have hated the term "rocket scientist"

I hate that term too.

>"Scientists dream of doing great things. Engineers do them."

The math can be more difficult for a scientist. I prefer to design things.

>"Scientists dream of doing great things. Engineers do them."

The math can be more difficult for a scientist. I prefer to design things.

2773. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 01:08:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304161708.7f07c1ae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64960

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9DDF4F.736EC45C@earthlink.net>...

> Communication at near the speed of light and still you have nothing to
> say. :-) :-) :-(
>
> Dave K8MN

Yet you keep posting and posting and posting....

2774. Re: "No Matches Found"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 01:10:02 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304161710.390dd313@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64961

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030416025100.17921.00000417@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: "No Matches Found"
> >From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
> >Date: 4/15/2003 6:03 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304152302450.869@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
> > >On Mon, 14 Apr 2003, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >> QUOTE FROM WWW.FCC.GOV/WTB/ULS SEARCH ENGINE
> >>
> >> Specified Search
> >>
> >> Radio Service = CM, RR
> >
> >Did you mean to search for an AMATEUR license (after all, this is an amateur
> >newsgroup)? You need to use services HA and HV.
>
> Nope. I meant CM/RR. Those are the codes for the "commercial operator"
> and "restricted radiotelephone" licenses. Our resident antagonist often makes
> (non-germane) reference to his GROL.
>
> Seems the FCC doesn't have him on file.

I dimly recall that Putzo stated a couple years ago that he'd even
given up his GROL. If so he's now completely license-free and without
any credentials at all.

> I also tried "AL", for "all", and of course we already knew the only
> "Leonard H Anderson" in the Amateur database has allowed his license to expire.
> Judging by the date of birth of the licensee, however, it was probably because
> HE expired. (RIP)
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

w3rv

2775. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 01:14:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304161714.634cbccb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64962

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304140200.5d42ae81@posting.google.com>...
> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.13.01.05.50.995144.7305@arrl.org>...
> > On Sat, 12 Apr 2003 09:22:06 -0400, Brian wrote:
> >
> > > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.12.03.57.51.355734.11732@arrl.org>...
> > >> On Fri, 11 Apr 2003 22:23:22 -0400, Brian wrote:
> > >>
> > >> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304110414.1674d136@posting.google.com>...
> > >> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E961F0A.5A1CF86@earthlink.net>...
> > >> >> > Brian wrote:
> > >> >> >
> > >> >> > > Is all free speech patriotic?
> > >> >> >
> > >> >> > Having witnessed an interview with Scott Ridder on CNN this evening, I'd
> > >> >> > have to say, "No".
> > >> >> >
> > >> >> > Dave K8MN
> > >> >>
> > >> >> Well there you have it.
> > >> >
> > >> > Yet Jon still doesn't have an answer.
> > >>
> > >> First ask an intelligent question.
> > >
> > > Do you consider the Dixie Chick patriotic?
> >
> > Do you consider that an intelligent question?
>
> I assumed that you, having asked the question, would be intelligent
> enough to have an answer for it. Apparently not.

That's what I thought.

2776. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 01:25:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304161725.30284d29@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64963

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304131724.2c8bb01f@posting.google.com>...

> (radio crackles to life) "Hold yer fire, disengage, disengage, he's
> just a rear widget vet from another century! (squelch tail).
>
> w3rv

Brian Kelly is some lame-assed civilian claiming military
"experience," who wouldn't make an errant piece of C-Rat TP on Private
Ryan's sphincter.

Am I clear?

2777. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 01:26:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304161726.59d8a027@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64964

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<B2721BD3DD214D6B.FA3BC933600ED5E6.F79774153C9FD206@lp.airnews.net>...
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> news:3E939DB3.28C419E@att.net...
> >
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > > Jon Bloom wrote:
> > >
> > > > Why is it that countries
> > > > that have been our close allies for many years are on the other side
> of
> > > > the fence from us now? In significant part, it's because we've told
> them
> > > > in so many words that we don't give a damn what anyone else thinks.
> > >
> > > Why Jon, I'm surprised you haven't heard. Don't you read the news?
> > > France, Germany and Russia hold over half the Iraqi debt, which is quite
> large
> > > since the sanctions of '91.
> > > . Who you suppose will pay off if Saddam goes?
> > >
> > > Dick
> >
> > Oh, by the way, we DON'T give a damn what they think. And that happens
> > to be a *very* widely held opinion. They sell weapons and war technology
> to
> > Saddam and Al Queda and don't give a damn what WE think about that, so why
> should
> > we ever again care what they think? All they're good for is stymieing
> anything and
> > everything constructive in the UN. And protecting *their* interests
> regardless of
> > any others.
> >
>
> There ya go painting that broad paintbrush again, Dick. You forget that we
> the peons are at the mercies of what our governments do. The people of
> France and Germany have no more control over what their government does than
> we do of ours--just like the Iraqi people not having much control over what
> their government did/does. Criticize where criticism is due. I do not
> fault the French or German, or any other, people in general. Nor should
> anyone.

>
> Kim W5TIT

Are they still eating cake?

2778. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 01:31:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304161731.3df517ca@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64965

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9DDC6D.CF4D5E13@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <20030415210105.06680.00000356@mb-cv.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
> > (Vshah101) writes:
> .
> >
> > >I meant having the test as a requirement is embarrassing to the hobby.
> > >When ads for Hamfests have Morse code keyers in it, and a non-Ham asks what
> > >those are, it does not look good for Ham radio.
> >
> > Those uptighters ought to inform the public that they think
> > US ham radio is all about "working DX on HF with CW."
>
> I've been informing the public that YOU believe that amateur radio is
> all about working DX on HF with CW. A number of them want to know what
> DX is, what HF is and what CW is. When I told some hams what you
> believe, they all wondered who Leonard H. Anderson is.
>
> Dave K8MN

And who Heil/K8MN is.

I told them that you showed up in my logs a couple of times, but I was
working so many at the time that I realy couldn't recall.

2779. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 01:52:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304161752.28395836@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64966

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030415161330.03495.00000733@mb-fm.aol.com>...
> >Subject: YI approved with written permission
> >From: Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv) kf2ti@arrl.net
> >Date: 4/15/2003 1:25 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <MPG.19065f03e14e815d9896b8@news.mindspring.com>
> >
> >DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> >2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> >League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> >British military personnel
>
> HEY BURKIE! Hurry up and get your bags packed! Maybe you can GET IT
> RIGHT this time!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, I'd would have been proud to have served in Iraq. That would
make the 3rd SWA service medal for me.

How many do you have? Would you consider it a hostile environment?
List your hostile envirnments, and don't BS us with your Buckeye
wives.

2780. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 01:56:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304161756.41ab512a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 64967

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdehv13.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On Tue, 15 Apr 2003 18:25:45 -0000, Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv) wrote:
>
> >DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> >2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> >League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> >British military personnel
> >
> >provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
> >officer.
>
> I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
> to standing procedures binding upon the military.

It's nice to see an amateur atempting to squash the spirit of amateur radio.

Probably an attorney.

2781. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 02:20:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E9E0F53.8EC0E3AE@att.net>
Source record: 64968

Brian wrote:

>
> Am I clear?

Sure 'nuff. One can see in one of your ears, right on through and out the other.

2782. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 02:23:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E9E102F.7DD47EA0@att.net>
Source record: 64969

Brian wrote:

>
> Marvy. What can you tell us about Morse as a growth industry?

Far as anyone here can determine it's impossible to tell you anything.

2783. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 03:12:11 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416231211.18878.00000077@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 64971

From K4YZ:

>I can't think of too many things in life that are a "do it once now or
>forget about it forever" situation.

Thats how the EE field /IT phenom works in this country. I cannot go back in time and get that IT job that I don't like (I like EE stuff).

>But they DID choose it, and it WAS useful.

Those Hams chose Morse code, because the hobby pressures them to do so. Outside of Ham radio, Morse code is not useful.

2784. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 03:14:32 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416231432.18878.00000078@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 64972

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>Should all driver's license tests include a test of ability to drive a
>>stick-shift car across an empty parking lot at not less than 5 mph?
>
> A very silly analogy.
>
> Driving an automobile or even any vehicle has NOTHING to do
> with amateur radio licensing.

N2EY keeps endorsing removal of Morse code testing (from this analogy). Then if you ask him about it, he denies it.

2785. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 03:23:23 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416232323.18878.00000079@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 64974

From: Duane Allen computeruser@sprintmail.com

>
>47CFR97.1 Basis and purpose provides five rationales for the existance
>of the amateur radio service:

(4) expansion of the national
>reservoir of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts,
>and

Amateur radio is lacking in this aspect. More troubleshooting, tuning, skill building activity needed.

>If there are "freeloaders," it is the public service organizations that
>routinely use hams for communications and fail to use the techniques
>that sustain volunteer groups.

Its because they know Hams will get fooled every time. Hams then brag about how THEY volunteered.

>Simple techniques such as a Thank You
>and Certificates of Appreciation are too often forgotten by the
>organizers.

How come these people come to Ham meetings asking for volunteers. The same groups come several times a year. Then, when I look in the paper to see the Ham volunteers mentioned, there is NO mention of Hams in articles about these events?

2786. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 03:24:43 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416232443.18878.00000080@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 64975

>From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)

>>advancement of the radio art, (3) advancing
>>skills in communications and technology,
>
>This part is a JOKE
>
>>expansion of the national
>>reservoir of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts,
>
>Experts, you got to be kidding, maybe the FCC should re-evaluate, or strike
>those words

What you said happens to be correct.

2787. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 03:41:40 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416234140.18878.00000083@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 64977

From K4YZ:

>>I never said Ham radio is bad.
>
> Yes, you have. You have called it "embarrassing" and "a cult".

Morse code <testing> is embarrassing. <Part of> Ham radio can be a cult.

>>Amateur radio is somtimes referred to as a cult.
>
> Not by anyone other than you.

My friends at asked if "Ham radio, is that some kind of cult?". The paper I cited, said "This anyway makes Ham radio prone to be called a cult". This means alot of people believe Ham radio is a cult.

Apparently it is some kind of cult where physical activity is limited, beer and pizza are common, strange language is spoken, key tapping is common, anti-social people common, strange activites are held, and females are not present.

>Personally, I think you have taken your role model's lead and just keep
>repeating the same lie over and over hoping it will eventually be accepted as
>truth.

I see you have not invited a non-Ham to a Hamfest and obtained his/her impressions of the hobby.

2788. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 03:45:08 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416234508.18878.00000084@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 64978

>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)

>Marvy. What can you tell us about Morse as a growth industry?

To show that Morse code is a growth industry, N2EY should post the Morse code numbers along with the ARS License Numbers.

2789. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 03:55:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9E2624.150C8E47@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64979

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E9DDDEF.500716DE@earthlink.net...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3E9CE1BB.A9995F3C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >> Already answered that twice, Dave - because the weapon was deployed
> after
> > > >> it was clear no troops were still massed in open terrain.
> > > >
> > > >Do you have any concept of how our military operates?
> > >
> > > Do you, Herr Robust? :-)
> >
> > Why, yes, Leonard. I do. :-)
> >
> > > Do you have a record of "seven hostile actions," too?!?
> >
> > Watch it, Bub. During my war time service, I was at least stationed in
> > the country where the conflict was taking place. I wasn't leaning on an
> > equipment rack in a different country. I was drawing combat pay.
> >

> I like the way you put that Dave.

Leonard is quick to dismiss the military experiences of others,
preferring to draw on his own rear echelon experiences of fifty years
ago. Leonard doesn't play well with others.

Dave K8MN

2790. Re: "No Matches Found"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 03:58:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030416235846.18971.00000127@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 64980

>Subject: Re: "No Matches Found"
>From: Duane Allen computeruser@sprintmail.com
>Date: 4/16/2003 6:24 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3E9D4081.30702@sprintmail.com>

>The FCC Advance license search yields a Anderson, Leonard holding a CM
>license with a Ship Radar Endorsement.

Hmmmm.....Could be. But he SWORE he let his GROL "expire" in Oct 2000.
And we KNOW he wouldn't lie to US... ! ! !

Steve, K4YZ

2791. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 04:02:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9E27D6.F7086B4E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64981

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9DDF4F.736EC45C@earthlink.net>...
>
> > Communication at near the speed of light and still you have nothing to
> > say. :-) :-) :-(
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Yet you keep posting and posting and posting....

With your record, I'd have thought you'd have had enough sense to keep
mum on this one.

Dave K8MN

2792. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 04:06:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417000614.18971.00000131@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 64982

>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/16/2003 10:23 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030416232323.18878.00000079@mb-m18.aol.com>

>(4) expansion of the national
>>reservoir of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts,
>>and
>
>Amateur radio is lacking in this aspect. More troubleshooting, tuning, skill
>building activity needed.

"...in my opinion" is how that sentence should have concluded, Vippy.

>>If there are "freeloaders," it is the public service organizations that
>>routinely use hams for communications and fail to use the techniques
>>that sustain volunteer groups.
>
>Its because they know Hams will get fooled every time. Hams then brag about
>how
>THEY volunteered.

So...You can show me where an Amateur was forced at gunpoint to do
something...?!?!

>How come these people come to Ham meetings asking for volunteers. The same
>groups come several times a year. Then, when I look in the paper to see the
>Ham
>volunteers mentioned, there is NO mention of Hams in articles about these
>events?

If it's glory and fame you seek, Grasshopper, join the Marines, then jump
on a grenade to save your buddies life. You'll be forever eulogized and your
picture will adorn the wall in the Medal of Honor Museum.

Personally, I'm just happy to ahve the chance to do something with fun
radios and good people. Anything else is gravy.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2793. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 04:06:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9E28D1.2997FC7D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 64983

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9DDC6D.CF4D5E13@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <20030415210105.06680.00000356@mb-cv.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
> > > (Vshah101) writes:
> > .
> > >
> > > >I meant having the test as a requirement is embarrassing to the hobby.
> > > >When ads for Hamfests have Morse code keyers in it, and a non-Ham asks what
> > > >those are, it does not look good for Ham radio.
> > >
> > > Those uptighters ought to inform the public that they think
> > > US ham radio is all about "working DX on HF with CW."
> >
> > I've been informing the public that YOU believe that amateur radio is
> > all about working DX on HF with CW. A number of them want to know what
> > DX is, what HF is and what CW is. When I told some hams what you
> > believe, they all wondered who Leonard H. Anderson is.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> And who Heil/K8MN is.

That'd be silly. The hams hereabouts all know who I am.

> I told them that you showed up in my logs a couple of times, but I was
> working so many at the time that I realy couldn't recall.

Was that during your alleged DXpedition to Somalia, Brian?

Dave K8MN

2794. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 04:08:20 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <UMpna.173$Hy1.181395@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64970

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030415210105.06680.00000356@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
> >The FCC has NOT said anything about it being irresponsible or
embarrassing.
> >They are merely questioning the need to keep it a requirement. That is
an
> >entirely different thing.
>
> True, thats what FCC said.
>
> I meant having the test as a requirement is embarrassing to the hobby.
> When ads for Hamfests have Morse code keyers in it, and a non-Ham asks
what
> those are, it does not look good for Ham radio.

No, you are the only person that has that point of view. Morse code and keyers are and always will be part of the hobby no matter what direction future regulations may take. It is no more embarrassing advertising these items than it is the radios or other amateur radio accessories and paraphenalia.

>
> >Some of the EE's love the elegant mathematics but have no interest in
> >working directly with hardware.
>
> Even elegent math is hands on. That's what my Comm Theory Prof endorses.
> Programs such as Mathcad assist in this.
>
> >Vipul, it is quite obvious that you know nothing about your own field of
> >study.
>
> Seems like you will try to find reasons for EEs NOT to homebrew.

No I don't. It's simply that homebrew is not for everyone. EE, like any other activity or career, has many facets and to attempt to limit it by what you prefer is silly.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2795. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 04:14:54 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b7m4dl$2cllo$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 65056

True.... I (my opinion only) think there is a "lethargy" in amatuer radio as a whole. 650,000 licenses out there?? ALL bands should be hopping, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Every single one of us, no one excluded can do better to improve this hobby.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> Public service/emergengy service communications are not the only
> justification of the amateur radio service.
>
> 47CFR97.1 Basis and purpose provides five rationales for the existance
> of the amateur radio service: (1) a voluntary noncommercial
> communication service, (2) advancement of the radio art, (3) advancing
> skills in communications and technology, (4) expansion of the national
> reservoir of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts,
> and (5) enhancing international goodwill.
>
> If there are "freeloaders," it is the public service organizations that
> routinely use hams for communications and fail to use the techniques
> that sustain volunteer groups. Simple techniques such as a Thank You
> and Certificates of Appreciation are too often forgotten by the
> organizers. Repeated failure leads to a lack of volunteers.
>
> Duane Allen N6JPO
>
>
>
>
>

2796. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 04:19:04 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <XWpna.176$Hy1.186490@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64973

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030416205901.18878.00000062@mb-m18.aol.com...
> From K4YZ:
> >What does YOUR lack of knowledge of your own occupational field hve to do
> >with EE's hombrewing?
>
> Firstly, a "Professional Engineer" is not relevant to what I want to do
with EE
> degree.
>
> Secondly, Dee has came up with several reasons why many EEs don't
homebrew.
> Seems like endorsing that EEs should not homebrew.

No that is not endorsing homebrewing or the lack of it. EE is a very broad field with room for people to pursue a variety of aspects. Some will homebrew and some will not. You are trying to force all EEs to homebrew, thus limiting them to your perception of EE.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2797. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 04:19:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417001940.18971.00000136@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 64984

>Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/16/2003 10:12 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030416231211.18878.00000077@mb-m18.aol.com>

>From K4YZ:
>
>>I can't think of too many things in life that are a "do it once now or
>>forget about it forever" situation.
>
>Thats how the EE field /IT phenom works in this country. I cannot go back in
>time and get that IT job that I don't like (I like EE stuff).

Vippy, if you want to work in IT, I can safely promise you that there will
be more opportunities if yo just keep your eyes open.

>>But they DID choose it, and it WAS useful.
>
>Those Hams chose Morse code, because the hobby pressures them to do so.

BBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! !
! ! ! !

Ya didit again, Vippy! Salved my tired soul with more irreverent and
ill-concieved humor! Thanks!

>Outside of Ham radio, Morse code is not useful.

Since this is an Amateur Radio newsgroup and we are (supposedly, but not
really) discussing things germane to Amateur Radio, who CARES if Morse Code is
useful outside of Amateur Radio or not?

I don't.

73 de K4YZ

2798. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 04:21:37 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <lZpna.177$Hy1.187580@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 64976

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030416210552.18878.00000067@mb-m18.aol.com...
> From N2EY:
> >> When ads for Hamfests have Morse code keyers in it, and a non-Ham asks
what
> >> those are, it does not look good for Ham radio.
> >
> >Why not?
>
> It looks like a bunch of grown up kids playing with their baby keyer toys.
>
> The non-Ham does know that Morse code is old, something unfortunately, a
large
> group of Hams does not know.
>

Almost all hobbies look like a bunch of grown up kids playing with their toys. Try fourwheeling, fishing, auto racing, almost anything you can name looks silly to somebody.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2799. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 04:29:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417002910.18971.00000138@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 64985

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/16/2003 10:41 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030416234140.18878.00000083@mb-m18.aol.com>

>From K4YZ:
>
>>>I never said Ham radio is bad.
>>
>> Yes, you have. You have called it "embarrassing" and "a cult".
>
>Morse code <testing> is embarrassing. <Part of> Ham radio can be a cult.

The fact REMAINS, Vippy, that YOU have called Amateur Radio "embarrassing",
and you have called it a cult.

You have also stated that you support Amateur Radio in non-ARS forums.
Yet you have stated that you were "embarrassed" to identify yourself as an
Amateur licensee, and you have gone into the "rec.radio.cb" newsgroup on
several occassions and denigrated and demeaned Amateur Radio to members of
another radio service.

>>>Amateur radio is somtimes referred to as a cult.
>>
>> Not by anyone other than you.
>
>My friends at asked if "Ham radio, is that some kind of cult?". The paper I
>cited, said "This anyway makes Ham radio prone to be called a cult". This
>means
>alot of people believe Ham radio is a cult.

What "paper"...? There is NO SUCH BEAST, Vipul.

>Apparently it is some kind of cult where physical activity is limited, beer
>and
>pizza are common, strange language is spoken, key tapping is common,
>anti-social people common, strange activites are held, and females are not
>present.

Apparently YOU have not been to the same events I have been to over the
last 30 years. Pity you.

>>Personally, I think you have taken your role model's lead and just keep
>>repeating the same lie over and over hoping it will eventually be accepted
>as
>>truth.
>

>I see you have not invited a non-Ham to a Hamfest and obtained his/her
>impressions of the hobby.

I lost count years ago, Vippy, on the numbers of folks I have mentored into Amatuer Radio. Many as cadets from Civil Air Patrol, some from the Armed Forces. Several from social clubs I beleonged to while in Southern California. Several from a church group in Atlanta that used us to help with a walk-a-thon. Many of them are still licensed. I chat with several of them frequently

If you started "mentoring" two people a WEEK into an Amateur Radio license, Vipul, you might catch up to me in a couple years.

Might.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2800. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 04:34:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417003425.18971.00000139@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 64986

>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/16/2003 5:12 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030416181225.18769.00000012@mb-m20.aol.com>

Thanks to "Anonymous Poster" (known to me but not repeated here) for the heads up on this one.

>The "carpal tunnel" referred to is in the WRIST, not the hands.
> That syndrome involves inflammation of the wrist area that
> causes pressure on the nerve tissue also going through the
> wrist area. You need to study your "Gray's" a bit closer
> before spouting off like a medical guru.

Uh huh. Inflammation of the connective tissue, Lennie, just like said, you scumbag.

And carpal tunnel DOES affect the hands. Perhaps a bit of REAL research on your part might enlighten you? Severe carpal tunnel can completely deny the patient even cursory use of the hands due to pain and inflammation.

Naaaaaah. Too easy to just spout off.

Typical Putz. Typical liar. Typical Leonard H. Anderson.

Steve, K4YZ

2801. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 04:35:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417003519.18863.00000072@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 64987

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/16/2003 10:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030416234508.18878.00000084@mb-m18.aol.com>

>To show that Morse code is a growth industry, N2EY should post the Morse code
>numbers along with the ARS License Numbers.

"Morse code numbers"...?!?!

Steve

2802. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 05:23:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAC3B28D.17101%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64988

"Dave Heil" wrote:

> It was announced that Northern No-fly zone

The topic was Syria.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2803. Re: "No Matches Found"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 05:30:43 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304170530050.1218@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 64989

On Thu, 17 Apr 2003, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >Subject: Re: "No Matches Found"
> >From: Duane Allen computeruser@sprintmail.com
> >Date: 4/16/2003 6:24 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3E9D4081.30702@sprintmail.com>
>
> >The FCC Advance license search yields a Anderson, Leonard holding a CM
> >license with a Ship Radar Endorsement.
>
> Hmmmm.....Could be. But he SWORE he let his GROL "expire" in Oct 2000.
> And we KNOW he wouldn't lie to US... ! ! !

When the FCC revised the roles, didn't they make GROL's lifetime? Therefore,
he might have a GROL document that has an expiration date, but in reality, it
didn't actually expire.

2804. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 05:43:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAC3B759.17103%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64990

"Dave Heil" wrote:

> Do you have any concept of how our military operates?

Your concept obviously differs from mine. Dave. You said that weapon (MOAB) was deployed to Iraq to attack troops massed in open terrain. I pointed out that, according to the military itself, there were no troops still massed in open terrain when that weapon was deployed - only isolated pockets in towns and cities. You responded to that with the above.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2805. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 05:55:23 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAC3BA0A.17105%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 64991

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> (snip) I think you claimed earlier to believe
> yourself a pretty conservative fellow. Your
> posts don't support that statement. I'm having
> trouble finding points on which we can agree.

That's because my conservative views don't extend to supporting endless wars. I'm fed up with wars. I've seen them my whole life (just about every five years or so). Enough is enough.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2806. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 06:22:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417022253.18769.00000022@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 64993

In article <f45722ac.0304161742.62d5c0ef@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Len, haven't you heard? Morse is a growth industry.

I heard it from someone who claimed amazon.com wasn't
profitable...because one could get ARRL publications
through them without paying shipping charges. :-)

>There are now more Morse Coders than there were when Morse was a Profession.

I'm sure. Manual telegraphy kind of fell into the
"downsizing" area beginning around 1918 and all
those beepers had to DO something...so they
started up those myths among the hams...or
become one with them.

>I don't know how or why that can be, but that is what the PCTA are claiming.

That's VERY important to their self-esteem. So important
they don't give a snit about newcomers or the future.

>They must be right. After all, they are the Extras.

They are GODS of radio!

2807. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 06:22:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417022254.18769.00000024@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 64992

In article <3E9DDF86.6E07CA07@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Driving an automobile or even any vehicle has NOTHING to do
>> with amateur radio licensing.
>
>Come to think of it, neither do you.

Poor baby. Did I "upset your sensibilities" also?

Tsk, tsk, tsk, the in-country combat vet offended by not being
able to shoot others down with words...

2808. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 06:22:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417022254.18769.00000023@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 64997

In article <20030417000614.18971.00000131@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> If it's glory and fame you seek, Grasshopper, join the Marines, then jump >on a grenade to save your buddies life. You'll be forever eulogized and your >picture will adorn the wall in the Medal of Honor Museum.

YOU did that?

> Personally, I'm just happy to ahve the chance to do something with fun >radios and good people. Anything else is gravy.

Get started on your mental counseling yet, Steamy?

2809. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 06:22:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417022255.18769.00000026@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 64995

In article <20030417001940.18971.00000136@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> Since this is an Amateur Radio newsgroup and we are (supposedly, but not >really) discussing things germane to Amateur Radio, who CARES if Morse Code >is useful outside of Amateur Radio or not?
>
> I don't.

Not a problem. Steamy Stalker hasn't known anything about radio outside of amateur radio since he pounded his first beep in the crib.

2810. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 06:22:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417022255.18769.00000025@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 64998

In article <f45722ac.0304161752.28395836@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> HEY BURKIE! Hurry up and get your bags packed! Maybe you can GET IT
>> RIGHT this time!
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Steve, I'd would have been proud to have served in Iraq. That would
>make the 3rd SWA service medal for me.
>
>How many do you have? Would you consider it a hostile environment?
>List your hostile envirnments, and don't BS us with your Buckeye
>wives.

Steamy the one-man schmuck can't detail his "hostile actions"
since he has no reference for them. He is a blowhard braggart
who didn't get out of the USMC with an Honorable Discharge.

2811. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 06:22:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417022256.18769.00000028@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 64996

In article <3E9E0F53.8EC0E3AE@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>Brian wrote:
>
>> Am I clear?
>
>Sure 'nuff. One can see in one of your ears, right on through and out the
>other.

Tell us where YOU served, mighty warrior...who went to TV and
Radio production at Fort Monmouth.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...not enough content to warrant a position in the
Gang of Four.

2812. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 06:22:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417022256.18769.00000027@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 64999

>> > Watch it, Bub. During my war time service, I was at least stationed in
>> > the country where the conflict was taking place. I wasn't leaning on an
>> > equipment rack in a different country. I was drawing combat pay.
>
>> I like the way you put that Dave.
>
>Leonard is quick to dismiss the military experiences of others,
>preferring to draw on his own rear echelon experiences of fifty years
>ago. Leonard doesn't play well with others.

I don't play with those who EXAGGERATE either their
"combat experiences" or toss off a lot of bullshit about
their own "importance."

Poor baby. Can't take any negativism whatsoever when he
is shown to be wrong about his illustrious State Department
experience in the cashew nut capital of Africa.

Now he has become a HE-Row of Vietnam?

Hooo-WAH!

2813. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 06:22:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417022257.18769.00000029@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 64994

In article <3E9DDDEF.500716DE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Do you have a record of "seven hostile actions," too?!?
>
>Watch it, Bub. During my war time service, I was at least stationed in
>the country where the conflict was taking place. I wasn't leaning on an
>equipment rack in a different country. I was drawing combat pay.

You were a counterfeiter in a combat zone?

Or did you just draw little pictures on paper money?

Tell us all about your "combat experience," mighty warrior.

Did you save an entire brigade of troops with your trusty
AN/PRC-25? Or was that someone else?

Were you "behind enemy lines" sending intel via CW?

How far "in-country" were you? Did you ever meet Jane
Fonda?

Can you scan your medals and make them available at
e-images?

2814. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 06:22:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417022258.18769.00000030@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65051

In article <20030417003425.18971.00000139@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/16/2003 5:12 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030416181225.18769.00000012@mb-m20.aol.com>
>
> Thanks to "Anonymous Poster" (known to me but not repeated here) for the
>heads up on this one.
>
>>The "carpal tunnel" referred to is in the WRIST, not the hands.
>> That syndrome involves inflammation of the wrist area that
>> causes pressure on the nerve tissue also going through the
>> wrist area. You need to study your "Gray's" a bit closer
>> before spouting off like a medical guru.
>
> Uh huh. Inflammation of the connective tissue, Lennie, just like said,
>you scumbag.
>
> And carpal tunnel DOES affect the hands.

That's an INDIRECT effect.

Grab your "Gray's" (common textbook on human anatomy known
by the short form of the title "Gray's Anatomy"). Research where
the carpal tunnel exists.

Everything except the outer skin layers goes through the "carpal
tunnel"...nerves, bone, ligaments, blood vessels.

>Perhaps a bit of REAL research on your part might enlighten you?

Two REAL Medical Doctors explained it to me, my regular
primary physician plus another doctor who was there and
handed over a text on it...with illustrations...not a Gray's.

I've never had that. Asked at the end of a routine visit since
a friend had that happen to her.

>Severe carpal tunnel can completely deny the
>patient even cursory use of the hands due to pain and inflammation.

Severe mental disturbance can make you imagine you are the
supreme god of information on everything. Stuff it, little man,
remember your professional level. You can't write "M.D." in
front or behind your name nor practice medicine in the manner

of a REAL physician.

Carpal tunnel syndrome is not a fatal disease. Nearly every
case can be cured by therapy and/or medicines. Some types
of mental aberrations are not curable.

> Naaaaaah. Too easy to just spout off.
>
> Typical Putz. Typical liar. Typical Leonard H. Anderson.

No lies. Anyone can get such information from REAL doctors.

Anyone can hurl insults as misdirection to avoid saying they've
been wrong. Robeson does that routinely in here.

2815. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 06:23:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417022300.18769.00000031@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65000

In article <20030416195345.18769.00000005@mb-m24.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>The practical limitation in computer Morse is the performance of the hardware
>and software. With dedicated hardware, almost any speed is possible.
>
>In practice, however, there's the factor of radio conditions. Which is why
even
>the early Baudot RTTY systems usually used FSK.

No, not at all, Jimmie.

Early RTTY systems of the 1930s era used FSK because that was the easiest way to get some kind of very fast keying on transmitters that couldn't do such fast on-off keying. The conventional HF transmitter used a separate "exciter" similar to an early ham separate VFO...although most commercial and military exciters used crystal control.

The early TTYs were mechanical marvels but all were designed for wired applications..."Baudot" or not. 5-level early TTY code is not strictly "Baudot." In wired applications the loop current can be 30 to 60 mA, bipolar (Mark in one direction, Space in the other). Polar relays were common then (SPDT contacts, center off). Contacts were not heavy-duty nor high voltage (typically a loop supply was 150 VDC at most).

FSK was fine and dandy, even with the wide spread (frequency difference of Mark to Space) of 850 Hz. No real hardware changes to those old CW transmitters, just the addition of an exciter, a low-power RF source.

Reception was no problem with an outboard FSK to TTY loop current converter. Better receive converters had AFC loops using mechanical servo tuning...some had separate Mark and Space loops to make certain neither was lost if the other end shifted their spread and/or drifted off frequency slightly.

One of the first-ever time-division multiplexers was through a USN contract input-output converter operating digitally but with small 7-pin miniature thyratron tubes as memory elements. Existing FSK exciters and receiving converters could handle switching rates about 4 1/2 times normal TTY switching rates of 60 WPM machines. The polar relays had to be exchanged for vacuum tube equivalents; not really a problem since the polar relays were big enough and plug-in, plug-out so that

adapters could be made to replace them. That time-MUX
was operational about 1952 with the US military.

Commercial and military SSB already had frequency multiplexing
through adapted wireline "carrier" equipment in the first (Dutch)
SSB circuit on HF. Such TTY had tone pairs and used AFSK.
Not a problem since the carrier bays had already been used on
wireline circuits and were proven. Up to 12 TTY circuits could
exist in a 6 KHz half of the 12 KHz bandwidth. That would be
halved when pairing of tone pairs was used to overcome the HF
phenomenon of "selective fading," one of the earliest methods
of error correction and not possible with single-circuit "morse"
telegraphy.

By 1960 the conversion had already begun to change from pre-
WW2 60 WPM machines to the newer 100 WPM machines,
both military and commercial. Newer machines used a 7-level
or 8-level coding (USA had 8-level, ten "bits" in all). The most
common USA 8-level coding scheme became known as
ASCII (American Standard Code for Information Interchange).
The FSK spread would narrow down to 170 Hz between
Mark and Space. FSK was kept with just a few channels of
TTY on an HF radio circuit.

"Early RTTY" used FSK for hardware reasons in the then-old
transmitters which had been designed for CW-only operation.
AFSK was used on TTY over SSB because the wireline carrier
equipment had already been proven and adapted easily to early
SSB.

Modern-day MODEMs can exist on a single PCB structure and
transceive at 56 KBPS rates over a bandwidth of about 2.8
KHz (easily fits on a POTS wireline circuit). 56 KPBS translates
to roughly 4800 characters per second of text (the remainder
are varied signals, may include FEC of various forms, housekeeping
bits, etc.). 4800 characters per second, taking 6 characters per
word is 800 words per second...or 48,000 WPM equivalent rate.

Coder-burst keyers for CW telegraphy typically did 300 WPM but
absolutely had to use some kind of recording device to hold the
received signal. No human can head-copy 300 WPM, let alone
"get it on paper."

I've actually operated what I described above. How is your
experience with "early Baudot RTTY?"

2816. Re: "No Matches Found"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 11:26:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417072639.18889.00000080@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65052

>Subject: Re: "No Matches Found"
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>Date: 4/17/2003 12:30 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304170530050.1218@kd6lvw.ampr.org>

>When the FCC revised the roles, didn't they make GROL's lifetime? Therefore,
>he might have a GROL document that has an expiration date, but in reality, it
>didn't actually expire.

Hi Dieter...That's the point. Lennie should have known better but
insisted his GROL "expired". Of course it didn't. I just didn't see him at
ALL in the database, but as pointed out by another, I obviously didn't dig deep
enough. I don't know why it should have taken anymore to search than what it
did, however. The FCC engine was given all the parameters it needed.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2817. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 11:36:28 UTC
From: Korean Veteran <korvet@korvetescomsk.net>
Message-ID: <b7m3huokg0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 65053

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
> I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
> to standing procedures binding upon the military.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>

Did you also participate in any of the anti-war
demonstrations too?

Bob
Korean War Vet

2818. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 11:45:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417074512.18889.00000081@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65055

>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/17/2003 1:22 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030417022258.18769.00000030@mb-m24.aol.com>

>> And carpal tunnel DOES affect the hands.
>
> That's an INDIRECT effect.

No, Lennie...It's direct. The aforementione process in the wrists does not cause dysfunction in the feet.

>Two REAL Medical Doctors explained it to me, my regular
> primary physician plus another doctor who was there and
> handed over a text on it...with illustrations...not a Gray's.

Uh huh.

>I've never had that. Asked at the end of a routine visit since
> a friend had that happen to her.

I DO have carpal tunnel, Lennie...A result of having to lift Tater when she was still with me. It's not fun. You awaken in the middle of the night with painfully numbing cramps in your hands. Wrist splints are required to help unless a carpal tunnel release is performed.

>>Severe carpal tunnel can completely deny the
>>patient even cursory use of the hands due to pain and inflammation.
>
> Severe mental disturbance can make you imagine you are the
> supreme god of information on everything. Stuff it, little man,
> remember your professional level. You can't write "M.D." in
> front or behind your name nor practice medicine in the manner
> of a REAL physician.

I see. And YOU can...?!?!

BWWWHHHAAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !

I am not the one claiming knowledge in a field or disclipline inwhich I have no documented experience or training.

I do not need to have "MD" in front of, at the end of OR the middle of my name, Lennie.

Why is it you feel YOU are qualified to discuss it, but a person who DOES help real physicians treat it and who himself has it is not?

I think it's just one more example of your inability to accept that someone who has, what YOU consider less training, knows more about ANYTHING than you do, Your Putziness.

>Carpal tunnel syndrome is not a fatal disease. Nearly every
> case can be cured by therapy and/or medicines. Some types
> of mental aberrations are not curable.

You do have a very practical experience with mental aberrations, Lennie, so I will defer to you in that regard.

As far as carpal tunnel goes, anti-inflammatories including steriods are the prefered choice of therapy. A carpal tunnel release is the invase procedure, is the last resort, but has a very high satisfaction/success rate.

>> Typical Putz. Typical liar. Typical Leonard H. Anderson.
>
> No lies. Anyone can get such information from REAL doctors.

Your lies are more subtle. Your putziness is not.

>Anyone can hurl insults as misdirection to avoid saying they've
> been wrong. Robeson does that routinely in here.

In this case, I am not wrong. Nothing I stated vis-a-vis carpal tunnel was incorrect. That you did not consider it "complete" (my choice to not delve into explict answers so as to appear as rubbing one's nose in my knowledge) is obvious.

Unlike you I do not need to jump on everyone else's "incomplete" or "misdirected" answers so as to appear as to be all-knowing or all-seeing.

Continue your putziness, Your Putziness. Back in the basket you go.

Steve

2819. At The End Of The Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 12:33:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417083326.19114.00000070@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65058

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/17/2003 1:22 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030417022255.18769.00000025@mb-m24.aol.com>

>He is a blowhard braggart
> who didn't get out of the USMC with an Honorable Discharge.

Why does Leonard H. Anderson find it necessary to make such brazen and obviously dishonest pronouncements in the face of facts to the contrary?

Could it be his penchant for pathological lying?

I think it is. But there's more...

I think it's because Lennie is a loser. Period. I have called him putz, His Lyingness, etc, but the very bottom line is, that despite whatever he THINKS he did in electronics, at the end of the day he's accomplished nothing, is appreciated by no one, and has no one "thanking" him for whatever he THINKS he accomplished.

I may never have a patent of my own or a house in the middle of one of the most heavily taxed regions of the United States, but then I don't care to have them. What I DO care about is that I made a positive impact on other's lives, and that I HAVE done.

People stop me in Kroger and tell me how well they or a family member are doing as a result of something I did or said, and they appreciate it. At the end of the day my kids say "I love you Daddy", and that makes it all worth it.

It's not bragging to say I am an Honorably Discharged United States Marine. It is a fact, one that can be verified via the VA. Lennie knows this but yet he persists in trying to perpetuate yet another of his blatantly false stories in order to glorify himself. Yet another attempt to embellish his own meager military service at the cost of others. Lennie has made a habit of embellishing his lackluster service at the expense of others, including a cowardly attempt to "polish his brass" behind the tombstones of US Army KIA's from the Korean Conflict.

And it's not bragging to say that I am a licensed aviator, nurse AND radio operator with over 30 years experience in PRACTICAL radio skills...Not only in "morsemanship", but in realtime, on-the-air operations. These are all facts. Facts that Lennie cannot stand.

Lennie can not claim any of that. Oh yes, he can cut-and-paste from a great many websites, including ones on medical and nursing topics, but at the end of the day, he's DONE none of it.

During his "career" in electronics, Lennie caused RF to be generated, but what did he do with it? Obviously making friends was low on the priority list.

So yes...at the end of the day when it's all said and done, Lennie is just a loser, and losers are a dime a dozen.

What a pity.

Steve, K4YZ

2820. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 12:36:02 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417083602.18876.00000096@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65059

>If your hearing is impaired, yes. It's akin to putting up obsticals to
>keep cripples out of rest rooms to make more room for healthy people.

Makes as much sense as the Brain Dead Challenged not being able to pass the written. One Question if your hearing so Impared, what makes you think you will be able to hear a SSB QSO with no problem?

2821. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 12:45:27 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417084527.18876.00000097@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65060

>Appliance hams don't need to know how to draw a Hartly or Colpits
>oscillator to write checks for new radios. Old timers may not like that
>but that's reality.

Oh I see, we dont need written testing either then. Well if thats the case Hell lets just Call it what is just plain old CB.

>So, the need for a large pool of electronics experts who're proficient
>in Morse has evaporated into history; gone the way of the blacksmith and
>the well-digge

Lets just change it to CB and be done with it, are new testing procedure will be, who has enough money to buy the Junk is all thats reguired.

>ecreation and much of our public land is devoted to it, not to mention
>all the ball diamonds and soccer fields and swimming pools and rec
>centers; why not part of our spectrum?

Its already there for your pleasure, its called CB, FS, 2 Meter FM .

>Wanna provide a public service? Get your club to set up a VHF station in
>an old folks home and train up some no-code techs to use it.
>
>73, K3DWW

Yea right

2822. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 13:33:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9EADAE.A2E45C7C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65062

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> > It was announced that Northern No-fly zone
>
> The topic was Syria.

Sure it was, Dwight. The material you snipped indicates otherwise as
evidenced below.

Jon Bloom wrote:

"What do you think the US has been doing in the
northern no-fly zone over the past 12 years?
Their operations there allowed the Iraqi Kurds
to escape the control of the Baghdad government
and set up their own semi-autonomous government.
This was facilitated by Turkey since much of
the air operations over northern Iraq were
based in Turkey."

You replied:

"Yes. And those air operations are causing a growing rift in relations
with Turkey. Turkey is right on the edge of walking away from us. An
invasion of Syria could be that last straw. Continued aid to the Kurds
could do it. Heck, at this point, even the wrong words by the President
could do it."

Jon talks about the no-fly zones; you respond about the operations in
the no-fly zone and TURKEY. You might want to line up those ducks.

Dave K8MN

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
> ----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2823. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 13:40:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9EAF3C.BE18F4AA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65063

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> > Do you have any concept of how our military operates?
>
> Your concept obviously differs from mine. Dave.

I'd call that an understatement.

> You said that weapon
> (MOAB) was deployed to Iraq to attack troops massed in open terrain.

I wrote that because it is fact.

> I pointed out that, according to the military itself, there were no
> troops still massed in open terrain when that weapon was deployed -
> only isolated pockets in towns and cities. You responded to that with > the above.

I understand what a contingency is and I understand that the weapon was
not used in towns and cities. I asked you if you had a problem with the
weapon being deployed.

I'm trying to understand your hand wringing, Dwight but I find it
difficult. It looks to me as if you're grasping at straws.

Dave K8MN

2824. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 13:49:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9EB17C.DFE99A94@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65064

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) I think you claimed earlier to believe
> > yourself a pretty conservative fellow. Your
> > posts don't support that statement. I'm having
> > trouble finding points on which we can agree.
>
> That's because my conservative views don't extend to supporting
> endless wars.

Endless wars? I haven't seen any endless wars. The current war, called bogged down and stalled by "experts" was over in a few weeks.

>I'm fed up with wars. I've seen them my whole life (just about every >five years or so). Enough is enough.

I'm 54 and I've only seen part of one. I've read about some and I've seen TV coverage. I understand the necessity for war when diplomatic negotiations fail. Saddam Hussein thumbed his nose at the entire world for twelve years. U.N. pressure failed. U.S. pressure failed. Weapons inspections failed. Now Saddam Hussein's regime has failed.

Dave K8MN

2825. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 13:55:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9EB2E2.CB03D72E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65065

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E9DDF86.6E07CA07@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Driving an automobile or even any vehicle has NOTHING to do
> >> with amateur radio licensing.
> > >
> > >Come to think of it, neither do you.
> >
> > Poor baby. Did I "upset your sensibilities" also?

It is apparent from your response, poor baby, that I upset yours.

> Tsk, tsk, tsk, the in-country combat vet offended by not being
> able to shoot others down with words...

I'm not "the" in-country combat vet, I'm an in-country combat vet who addressed one who is not an in-country combat vet. I'd think you'd be used to being shot down with words by now.

Dave K8MN

2826. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 13:57:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9EB331.ACEEC53D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65066

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030417001940.18971.00000136@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
> > Since this is an Amateur Radio newsgroup and we are (supposedly, but not
> >really) discussing things germane to Amateur Radio, who CARES if Morse Code
> >is useful outside of Amateur Radio or not?
> >
> > I don't.
>
> Not a problem. Steamy Stalker hasn't known anything about
> radio outside of amateur radio since he pounded his first beep
> in the crib.

N2EY:

"No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
infantile
behavior."

Dave K8MN

2827. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 13:57:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9EB36A.3C409C86@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65067

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0304161752.28395836@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> HEY BURKIE! Hurry up and get your bags packed! Maybe you can GET IT
> >> RIGHT this time!
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Steve, I'd would have been proud to have served in Iraq. That would
> >make the 3rd SWA service medal for me.
> >
> >How many do you have? Would you consider it a hostile environment?
> >List your hostile envirnments, and don't BS us with your Buckeye
> >wives.
>
> Steamy the one-man schmuck can't detail his "hostile actions"
> since he has no reference for them. He is a blowhard braggart
> who didn't get out of the USMC with an Honorable Discharge.

N2EY:

"No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2828. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 13:58:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9EB397.6E9FD82@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65068

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E9E0F53.8EC0E3AE@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >
> >> Am I clear?
> >
> >Sure 'nuff. One can see in one of your ears, right on through and out the
> >other.
>
> Tell us where YOU served, mighty warrior...who went to TV and
> Radio production at Fort Monmouth.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...not enough content to warrant a position in the
> Gang of Four.

N2EY:

"No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2829. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 14:02:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9EB46C.4C0CCB75@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65069

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> >> > Watch it, Bub. During my war time service, I was at least stationed in
> >> > the country where the conflict was taking place. I wasn't leaning on an
> >> > equipment rack in a different country. I was drawing combat pay.
> >
> >> I like the way you put that Dave.
> >
> >Leonard is quick to dismiss the military experiences of others,
> >preferring to draw on his own rear echelon experiences of fifty years
> >ago. Leonard doesn't play well with others.
>
> I don't play with those who EXAGGERATE either their
> "combat experiences" or toss off a lot of bullshit about
> their own "importance."

You ARE one who exaggerates his own military experiences and who tosses
off a lot of BS about your own importance.

> Poor baby. Can't take any negativism whatsoever when he
> is shown to be wrong about his illustrious State Department
> experience in the cashew nut capital of Africa.

I don't have to "take any negativism whatsoever" from a rear echelon
type of fifty years ago who lives in the nut capital of America.

> Now he has become a HE-Row of Vietnam?

I served in Vietnam.

> Hooo-WAH!

"No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2830. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 14:03:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9EB4CA.D3009530@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65070

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E9DDDEF.500716DE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Do you have a record of "seven hostile actions," too?!?
> > >
> > >Watch it, Bub. During my war time service, I was at least stationed in
> > >the country where the conflict was taking place. I wasn't leaning on an
> > >equipment rack in a different country. I was drawing combat pay.
>
> You were a counterfeiter in a combat zone?
>
> Or did you just draw little pictures on paper money?
>
> Tell us all about your "combat experience," mighty warrior.
>
> Did you save an entire brigade of troops with your trusty
> AN/PRC-25? Or was that someone else?
>
> Were you "behind enemy lines" sending intel via CW?
>
> How far "in-country" were you? Did you ever meet Jane
> Fonda?
>
> Can you scan your medals and make them available at
> e-images?

N2EY:

"No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2831. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 14:06:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9EB55C.A264FE82@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65071

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Severe mental disturbance can make you imagine you are the
> supreme god of information on everything. Stuff it, little man,
> remember your professional level. You can't write "M.D." in
> front or behind your name nor practice medicine in the manner
> of a REAL physician.
>
> Carpal tunnel syndrome is not a fatal disease. Nearly every
> case can be cured by therapy and/or medicines. Some types
> of mental aberrations are not curable.

> Anyone can hurl insults as misdirection to avoid saying they've
> been wrong. Robeson does that routinely in here.

...and you've been a master at doing that.

N2EY:

"No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2832. Re: Military Ops (was We apologize...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 14:19:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9EB7F3.BFFC531@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65072

Vito wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > >Do you have any concept of how our military operates?
>
> With all due respect, no past experience provides any expertise in how
> our military does or should operate because of the changes (OK,
> advancements) in weaponry and coordination. For example, a 'Nam Vet
> might hesitate to call in a B52 strike anywhere near his position
> because B52 fire control was designed to get nukes within a mile or so
> of the target. Now his equivalent can put a target in his crosshairs and
> punch a button; the designated GPS position is radioed to a B52 orbiting
> miles overhead and in seconds down comes a suitable bomb, selected based
> on target range, to strike within feet of the designated target. Pinned
> down by a bunker? Push a button and it goes away! Or imagine replacing a
> human Kamakazi pilot with "the terminator": a mindless machine that,
> shown a picture of a window in a building, flies his aircraft into it
> then detonates his bombs. Would y'all WW2, Korean, Nam, etc., make any
> op's changes if you'd have had these capabilities? The real problem is
> adapting fast enough.

Any of us watching television over the course of the past several weeks are well aware of the technological changes which have taken place. The discussion, if you remember, was about deployment of the MOAB, a Daisy Cutter on steroids. It was deployed for use in the event a large number of Iraqi forces massed in an area. Our military is ready for all situations. Deployment of a weapon does not mean that the weapon will necessarily be used.

Dave K8MN

2833. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 14:37:30 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9EBC2A.79A1A2AC@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65054

N2EY wrote:
>
> Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9AFCD9.D8949D40@crosslink.net>...
>
> > What irks me is Morse - the requirement, not the mode.
>
> Do you really think that Element 1 is a big problem?

If your hearing is impaired, yes. It's akin to putting up obsticals to
keep cripples out of rest rooms to make more room for healthy people.
>
> > I'd be downright
> > PO'd if I showed up to see Old Faithful but had to prove I could start a
> > fire with flint & steel in, say, 30 seconds befor I was allowed into the
> > park.
>
> Not a very good analogy. Try this one:
>
> Should all driver's license tests include a test of ability to drive a
> stick-shift car across an empty parking lot at not less than 5 mph?
>
No. Besides I like mine better.

73, K3DWW

2834. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 15:26:59 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9EC7C3.AE3915CF@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65057

Vshah101 wrote:
> >wa8ulx wrote
> > > everybody wrote
>
> >>advancement of the radio art, (3) advancing
> >>skills in communications and technology,
> >This part is a JOKE
> >
> >>expansion of the national
> >>reservoir of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts,
> >Experts, you got to be kidding, maybe the FCC should re-evaluate, or strike
> >those words

These reasons have been OBE for some time. EE was the hot lick when I left Hi School. Colleges turned out 1000s but that wasn't enough. Then came LSI and with it "Lego Engineering", with a tiny few designing the Legos. EEs who didn't (90%) became programmers. The same technology made us Appliance Hams. I'm not going to spend $1000+ to build a rig that's almost as good as a Swan 350 when I can buy an IC706Mk2G for $725! Appliance hams don't need to know how to draw a Hartly or Colpits oscillator to write checks for new radios. Old timers may not like that but that's reality.

Same goes for operating. Morse proficiency was de rigure when turning a spark on and off was the only way to communicate and it remained a good idea when it was just the most efficient way; but now there are dozens of better ways including SSB and PSK31 and ....???

So, the need for a large pool of electronics experts who're proficient in Morse has evaporated into history; gone the way of the blacksmith and the well-digger.

Even our opportunities to provide EMCOMMs is disappearing. We provided backup for 'normal' communications, which often failed or were non existant. But now those 'normal' comms are at once more available and more reliable. People lost in the woods are more likely to whip out a cell phone than need a ham and police, fire and rescue comm's are so reliable that ARES/RACES teams have become like the proverbial appliance repairman on TV.

Get rid of the "service"? Naw, what's wrong with recreation?! My XYL derives a great deal of pleasure unwinding from a hard day programming the weapons you see on TV by chatting on her favorite nets and chasing DX. So do all the folks she chats with. If Disney can make big bucks off recreation and much of our public land is devoted to it, not to mention all the ball diamonds and soccer fields and swimming pools and rec

centers; why not part of our spectrum? IMHO, having fun is reason enough to do something - and the more people having fun the greater the reason to keep something. Speaking of fun ....

Wanna provide a public service? Get your club to set up a VHF station in an old folks home and train up some no-code techs to use it.

73, K3DWW

2835. Re: Military Ops (was We apologize...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 15:53:44 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9ECE08.3D5BE3D6@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65061

Dave Heil wrote:
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >Do you have any concept of how our military operates?

With all due respect, no past experience provides any expertise in how our military does or should operate because of the changes (OK, advancements) in weaponry and coordination. For example, a 'Nam Vet might hesitate to call in a B52 strike anywhere near his position because B52 fire control was designed to get nukes within a mile or so of the target. Now his equivalent can put a target in his crosshairs and punch a button; the designated GPS position is radioed to a B52 orbiting miles overhead and in seconds down comes a suitable bomb, selected based on target range, to strike within feet of the designated target. Pinned down by a bunker? Push a button and it goes away! Or imagine replacing a human Kamakazi pilot with "the terminator": a mindless machine that, shown a picture of a window in a building, flies his aircraft into it then detonates his bombs. Would y'all WW2, Korean, Nam, etc., make any op's changes if you'd have had these capabilities? The real problem is adapting fast enough.

73, K3DWW

2836. Re: Military Ops (was We apologize...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 16:07:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7mjdt$o7o$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65073

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3E9ECE08.3D5BE3D6@crosslink.net...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > >Do you have any concept of how our military operates?
>
> With all due respect, no past experience provides any expertise in how
> our military does or should operate because of the changes (OK,
> advancements) in weaponry and coordination. For example, a 'Nam Vet
> might hesitate to call in a B52 strike anywhere near his position
> because B52 fire control was designed to get nukes within a mile or so
> of the target. Now his equivalent can put a target in his crosshairs and
> punch a button; the designated GPS position is radioed to a B52 orbiting
> miles overhead and in seconds down comes a suitable bomb, selected based
> on target range, to strike within feet of the designated target. Pinned
> down by a bunker? Push a button and it goes away! Or imagine replacing a
> human Kamakazi pilot with "the terminator": a mindless machine that,
> shown a picture of a window in a building, flies his aircraft into it
> then detonates his bombs. Would y'all WW2, Korean, Nam, etc., make any
> op's changes if you'd have had these capabilities? The real problem is
> adapting fast enough.
>
> 73, K3DWW

B52s were not used in NAM for tactical air strikes. Their main function was
to carpet bomb bunker complexes and large area targets such as troop and
supply areas, and interdiction of various routes into S. Vietnam.

Your point is well taken on the many advances.

Dan/W4NTI

2837. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 16:47:27 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304170847.62b03fce@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65074

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030411172311.11494.00000125@mb-fa.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0304110909.5684f766@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030410154430.04182.00000116@mb-fg.aol.com>...
> >> You may have forgotten the "hell no, we won't go!" shouting and
> >> hollering of the 1960s. Most of that shouting was done by
> >> young people who faced conscription into military service. They
> >> feared "dying in Vietnam."
> >
> >Considering how many young people died in Vietnam, that was a pretty
> >rational fear.
>
> Most of those protesters survived to this day and some are the
> "leaders" of present-day USA.

To whom do you refer, Len?
>
> Research the casualty figures of WW2.

Why? You won't accept the results.

> The USA "had no business
> going to Asia or Europe to fight a war" was a common thought
> November 1941 and earlier.

Did YOU think that way? I didn't.

>Prove it was a correct philosophy.

Why?
>
> >> They felt they were "too good for
> >> lower-class military service."
> >
> >All of them? How many did you interview?
>
> Several hundred, mostly as a civilian.

I don't believe you.

> >> They were moral superiors. As
> >> a more noble group they felt entitled to enjoy the guarantees
> >> of a better life. Those guarantees had been kept in place by
> >> "lower class, less morally superior" citizens in a very large

> >> world war and a smaller one in northeast Asia and the beginnings
> >> of the MAD standoff between the USSR and USA, held in place
> >> by the resolve and work of non-pacifists.
> >
> >Did you know that some young people left the country rather than be
> >forced to fight in Vietnam? Sweden was a popular destination.
>
> Canada was much more popular than Sweden. Most Canadians
> can speak English. I can speak Swedish and have visited there
> three times. Sweden is a European neutral, was so throughout
> the last century. Sweden still has compulsory military service,
> has had such throughout the last century. In the USA the
> draft ended in 1973, 30 years ago.

How many wars has Sweden fought in the last century? How many Swedish
casualties in WW2, Korea, Vietnam, etc.?
>
> >From what I saw in the Vietnam era, most of the anti-war protest was
> >an expression of conscience that the war was not morally justified and
> >was not necessary for the defense of the USA. I remember a group
> >called "Vietnam Veterans Against The War", composed of servicemen who
> >had done tours of duty in Vietnam.
>
> Most of them had ONE tour.

So?

They were THERE, Len. Fighting in Vietnam, and then they came home and
said the war was wrong.

> How many tours have you done?
>
I've done as many tours of duty in Vietnam as you have, Len. Zero. So
we're even.

Perhaps you should ask W4NTI or K8MN about their experiences. They
were there,
in the combat zone, when the Vietnam War was actually being fought.

> Let's cry great big crocodile tears and wail forever about Vietnam
> and awful WAR!

> Let's bring out minor examples and highlight them to "prove" that
> war is terrible, ghastly, brutal, and SHOULD NEVER BE.
>
> Fight for peace.

Seems to me you don't want to learn from history.
>
> >Vietnam was a French colony that was under Japanese control during
> >WW2. After WW2, some Vietnamese wanted their country to be
> >independent, and asked the USA for help in breaking away from France.
> >But the USA and other Western nations would not help out, so the

> >Vietnamese turned to the USSR for help - and got it. Just like some
> >colonies who wanted independence from Britain 227 years ago, and
> >turned to France for help.....
>
> Of course..."similarities!"
>
> France struggled through EIGHT YEARS of fighting the Vietminh
> during the French Indo-China War...1944 through 1952, just 59
> to 51 years ago...NOT 227 years ago. That French colonial
> country, taken (by force of arms, really) long ago, had been
> fractioned and conquered by others before.

So?

Does any of this justify the continued colony status of Vietnam after
WW2, when its people wanted independence?

> Research the
> distance from France to Vietnam and compare from the UK to
> North America. Did the French speak any form of Vietnamese
> when they took over than colony? Were they of the same
> racial background? Did they share a common history?

Why do those things matter? If anything, the cultural differences of
France and Vietnam argue for Vietnamese independence, not colony
status.

Tell us how well the French handled Algerian independence, Len.
>
> Segue to 1775 and the "English Colony" of the Americas.
> English for the most part through ancestry, language, and a
> shared history of roots IN Europe.

So what?

> The Revolution of 1776
> was more of a civil war with a direct resentment of rule by
> royalty.

I disagree. Enough colonials got tired of second-class treatment and
won independence.

> The colonialists resented rule by royalty and wanted
> independence. You may have read about it.
>
> Hop back to 2003. Guess who were PARTNERS in the Iraqi
> Liberation...USA and United Kingdom!

What's your point?

> Where was France? Have the French ever had any victory
> of their own in two centuries? They couldn't hold Vietnam,
> even with lots of aid from the USA. They folded. It was a
> "dien-ben-phooey" for them.

You're avoiding the question of colony status vs. independence.
>
> >> You have forgotten the returnees from Vietnam being spat upon
> >> and ridiculed by the morally-superior peaceniks in the 60s and
> >> 70s.
> >
> >A few did that. Not many. They were wrong.
>
> They were all over the press and TV at the time. I was a working
> adult back then, had received my Honorable Discharge from US
> Army service. Peace and flower-power and free love for every-
> body. Wonderful, widespread exposure in the media.

So was the body count and the war in Southeast Asia.
>
> They felt "better red than dead." Communism was a wonderful
> thing they thought, everyone retreat to a commune and commune
> with nature. No worries, no problems. They could do so in
> safety, protected by non-peaceniks.

Not all of them. Not even most.
>
> Meanwhile, away from the applause for "Dr. Strangelove," a
> quiet majority kept to MAD, loitered the B-52s just short of the
> USSR, practiced on "oil burner routes" just in case, installed
> the BMEWS and those advanced electronics in Alaska. They
> kept on volunteering for military service even though the draft
> was on until 1973, kept watch in NATO in places like Berlin.
> Boomers and sharks were active in the oceans, aided by
> things like SOSUS and advanced sonar, resolve and
> responsibility of their crews. Oh yes, some of us evil, code-
> hating professionals even helped on making precision
> munitions that minimized collateral damage while improving
> targeting accuracy.

What's your point, Len? Do you think the war in Vietnam was justified?
Do you think that no one must ever question the decisions of the
Commander In Chief?
>
> >The people to blame for
> >Vietnam were the politicians who gave the orders, not those who
> >carried them out.
>
> Well, then, speaking as a moral superior, your experience in
> such order-giving should be a model for all politicians.

Sounds like you don't handle strong opposition very well.
>
> >Anti-war protestors were beaten, jailed, some even killed.
>
> Better get some media involved on such "gangster" tactics
> and bring the "ciminals" to trial!

"Ciminals"?
>
> >> You have forgotten the rash of anti-war motion pictures of
> >> that time and the media portraying the military and government
> >> as instruments of evil.
> >
> >Were those anti-war movies inaccurate?
>
> Yes. Hunt the radio surplus stores for a "Gold Code Receiver."
>
> You won't find any. It existed only in movie.

Are you referring to the CRM-114 in the film "Dr. Strangelove"?
>
> Did the USA suffer any nuclear bombardment during the Cold
> War?

No. Nor did anyone else.

We also did not suffer any invasion of elephants. So the
anti-elephant-invasion paln worked, too. ;-)

> Was MAD successful in preventing wholesale
> slaughter of the "western" world?

Prove that such slaughter would have happened without the arms race,
Len.

> Did the USSR survive past 1991?

Not as a country. Which is worse, in a way, because there is more of a
chance that some of those weapons built for MAD will wind up in the
hands of those who are not deterred by the possibility of their own
destruction.

One reason MAD "worked" was that those "godless communists" did not
think that they would wind up in an afterlife paradise if they blew up
the world. Today we face opponents who are not deterred by that.

btw, the USSR suffered about 20 million dead in WW2. The country was
invaded and devastated in ways that make the Sherman's march to the
sea look like minor vandalism. The USSR was not told in advance of the
success of the Manhattan project.

Of course the incompetence and ruthlessness of Stalin, as well as the
inherent problems of collective systems, were to blame for many of the
deaths and much of the devastation. But after all that, it was
somewhat understandable if the Soviets were a bit paranoid.

Over a million civilians died in the siege of Leningrad. That's about
twice the entire number of American lives lost in WW2. That sort of
thing affects people a bit. Guess where young Vladimir Putin grew up.
>
> >> The peaceniks and media felt safe doing
> >> all that...the guarantees of the US Constitution permitted them

> >> free speech.
> >
> >Guess they shouldn't have actually USED it, huh, Len?
>
> Not only did they USE all of it, the media made them a glorious
> example of a "superior moral" group.

Only in your eyes.

> >> They felt morally superior. They felt safe to
> >> express themselves. Guarantees of safety were the responsibility
> >> of the lower-class, less superior people. It wasn't the nobles'
> >> task. They were owed it, they felt. Noble people feel like that.
> >
> >Where DO you get such mixed-up ideas? Were there no "upper class"
> >people fighting in Vietnam?
>
> The "moral superiority class," the peaceniks thought they WERE
> the "upper class." They felt they could accomplish things by
> NOT doing things.
>
> Did you fight in Vietnam?

Just as much as YOU did, Len. Zip. Zilch. Nada.

Perhaps you should ask W4NTI or K8MN about their experiences. They
were there,
in the combat zone, when the Vietnam War was actually being fought.

> >I recall a man who was heavyweight champion of the world. They wanted
> >to draft him, but he said no, he didn't think the war was justified
> >and he would not go. Spent five years in jail, lost his title, the
> >prime of his carrer and a whole lot of money.
>
> TS. Cassius Marcellus Clay changed his name to Mohammed
> Ali after turning professional in boxing. I fail to see any
> redeeming qualities for human society in professional boxing
> other than as entertainment.

The point is that he stood behind his beliefs. Doesn't mean he was
right, just that he had the courage of his convictions.
>
> >The reality was that the Army almost certainly would not have put him
> >in a combat situation, and he would have done his service in some rear
> >area. But his conscience would not allow him to accept such a deal.
> >Principle of the thing.
>
> FEAR not "principle."

Why do you say fear? Did you meet him?

> Let's not kid anyone, mighty moral superior.
>

> Elvis Presley served in the US Army. BFD.

James Stewart did, too. Ted Williams as well.
>
> How have Ali and Presley fared since then?

Do you have a problem with famous people who enter military service?
happened on 27 Jan 73.
>
> >> For
> >> a few months longer than 30 years the USA military has been
> >> all-volunteer. In those three decades a few things happened
> >> that threatened our guarantees and the fates of several nations
> >> besides our own.
> >
> >Like what?
>
> Almanacs are full of such information. I can't be your history
> teacher all the time. DO YOUR OWN WORK.

You're avoiding the answer, Len.
>
> You may begin with MAD, try the Sinai (twice), Lebanon, both
> places for peacekeeping forces. There's the Philippines, at least
> two countries in the middle of Africa, an island in the
> Carribbean called Cuba that once had IRBMs from the USSR
> pointed at us (but while the draft was going on),

While we had IRBMs in Turkey pointed at Moscow.

> Haiti, Grenada,
> Panama (USA built their canal).

USA also sponsored a "revolution" there to get a better deal. Why was
it OK to help the Panamanians get independence but not the Vietnamese?

> There's the DMZ in Korea, the
> Korean War still technically going on (its a sort of perpetual
> truce). "Checkpoint Charlie" is gone in Berlin now that the
> USSR dissolved and the Germanys reunited.
>
> >> Pacifists didn't help keep our guarantees or
> >> take action.
> >
> >There are actions other than military ones, Len.
>
> Of course...lie down and "stop" a tank sometime.

There's this thing called "negotiation".
>
> >> The USSR dissolved, not from any actions of pacifists, but
> >> from the inherent socio-economic faults of communism.
> >

> >It also did not dissolve because of any war.
>
> Ah...so a place called Afghanistan "meant nothing" to the
> soviet republics? Better check the years the USSR was in
> there and the body counts they accumulated. Better check
> out a few places in middle Europe (Hungary is an example
> that comes to mind) where force of arms aided and abetted
> communist ideology as a ruling party.

Neither of which caused the USSR to fall apart. Nobody invaded the
USSR.
>
> >> The
> >> Germanys united and "the wall" fell from action, not a result
> >> of pacifism.
> >
> >Not because of any war, either.
>
> The Germanys were DIVIDED by post-WW2 "peace negotiations"
> so that eastern Germany could be taken over by communists.
> That was in all the papers and recorded fact.

After what the USSR suffered in WW2, do you blame them?

> >It wasn't pacifists who sold weapons and weapons technology to Iraq,
> >either.
>
> USSR/Russia, France, Germany were the biggest sellers.

And the USA.
>
> Did any of them help the Iraqi people? Were any of them involved
> in the second Gulf War?
>
> No to all the above.

So? What's your point?
>
> >Pacifists didn't train or fund the people who became terrorists,
> >either. Nor did pacifists put the Taliban into power.
>
> Ah, you are finally seeing the light of dawn! Amazing!
>
> Tell us how pacifists, peaceniks, and flower-power love children
> stopped those groups. At any time.

If something never starts, it doesn't have to be stopped.
>
> >Speaking of martyrs - we're coming up on the 91st anniversary of the
> >sinking of the Titanic. Not one of the engineering officers of the
> >Titanic survived, because they were all below decks to the very end.
> >They were keeping steam up and the dynamos turning so that there would

> >be lights and power for the radio.
>
> How many passengers did they "save?"

705. Do you think more would have lived if the engineers had abandoned
their duty and let the lights go out?
>
> >Not a loaded question at all. No rational persondisoputes the bravery
> >of the troops fighting to free Iraq. The question is why does the USA
> >support such regimes in the first place?
>
> Another Gang of Four member exhibits typos in the "heat" of
> message battle... :-)

Who is this "Gang of Four"? Any Vietnam Veterans in it? Anybody with
more military/government service than you? Anybody in life-critical
emergency medical care?
>
> How in the world did you get the idea that the USA "supported"
> Iraq since 1980?!?!? Iraq is oil-rich and has sold petroleum on
> the world market...is that "support?!?"

The USA bought the oil and sold weapons and weapons technology to SH's
regime. It was in all the papers. The main reason was that Iran and
Iraq were enemies.
>
> "Support" isn't defined as largely keeping a hands-off policy due
> to a touchy Middle Eastern sociopolitical situation in the 1980s.
>
> "Support" ENDED - in no uncertain terms - when Iraq invaded
> Kuwait in 1990.

Which was not in the 1980s.
>
> >> Most of those who thought Saddam Hussein was wrong were
> >> either silent or dead. There was no guarantee of free speech in
> >> Iraq. There was no glorifying videobites of pacifists on Iraqi TV
> >> protesting the invasion of Kuwait a dozen or so years ago.
> >> Perhaps some Kurds in northern Iraq were pacifists...we don't
> >> know...several hundred were gassed to death.
> >
> >Pacifists didn't sell weapons or weapons technology to Iraq. Nor the
> >techniques of how to make chemical weapons.
>
> Pacifists didn't STOP all that military hardware from Russia, France,
> or chemical, civil engineering services from Germany.

Or from the USA.
>
> >What action should the USA have taken to free the hostages?
>
> Teach the Iranians morse code and love for the most effective

> mode in ancient amateur radio, of course.

In other words, you have no answers.
>
> >> About two years after the end of the Iraq-Iran
> >> War, Iraq invaded Kuwait. A coalition led by the USA kicked
> >> out Iraq. Pacifists didn't do it but their nobility rose to the top
> >> and demanded "go no further!"
> >
> >INCORRECT. The first Gulf war was stopped because the goals had been
> >achieved.
>
> Kiss my yes, Jimmie.

Kiss it yourself, girlfriend ;-)
>
> >Here are some direct quotes from the "pacifists" who decided to stop
> >that war short of kicking out SH's regime.
>
> Jimmie boy, I've already heard and seen those quoted individuals.

They back up my statements. Those leaders decided to stop the first
Gulf war short of removing SH in 1991, NOT the pacifists.
>
> You sum up the Gulf War(s) in the ultra-simplistic "it's all about
> oil!" and won't be corrected on it.

Without the oil, none of those countries would have the money to buy
weapons. Nor would they be of such concern to the rest of the world.
It's as simple as that.

> It's far more complex than
> that...but it's nice for you in trying to win message points. :-)

Tell us all about it, Professor...
>
> Have your years of experience in government affairs made you
> an "expert" in What To Do and What Is Correct? I don't think so.

The same applies to YOU, Len, but that doesn't stop you from
pontificating here at great length.

Peace be to you.

2838. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 17:01:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9EDDCF.D3D11A61@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65075

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030415200650.11012.00000142@mb-fm.aol.com>, nocwtest@aol.com (No
> CW Test) writes:
>
> >In article <20030415155041.04182.00000180@mb-fg.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:

> >Tell us how it tasted, Len. And why you went back for seconds.....;-)
>
> Why should I tell any PLAGIARIST anything?

A PLAGIARIST? What's been plagiarized--your lengthy treatise on your
amateur radio experiences?

> "No CW Test" was a screen name I used some years ago on
> America Online and for messaging in here. I haven't used that
> screen name for at least two years. AOL only reserves old
> screen names for six months. After six months anyone can
> use it.

It looks like someone is using it.

> You've used it here without any respect whatsoever, trying to
> ape the original screen name user. No supplementary ID at
> all. Just blatant COPYING of what another has done. In the
> media that is PLAGIARISM, boy.

I've never heard of a case where three words run together constituted
plagiarism. It looks more like an exerpt from some of your work.
What's with the "boy" stuff? How do you know that the current user of
the screen name isn't older than you? If he happens to be black, he
might think about kicking your tired, old, white butt.

> You are without honor, without respect for acts of plagiarism.

I'm not certain about the honor portion but the guy does have a great
sense of humor.

> >Back in my early days with the Rural Electrification Authority down in New
> >Mexico, I had the job of bringing electricity to some of the larger Navajo
> >outhouses and privies. They said it was the first time anyone had wired a
> >head for a reservation.....
>
> You are also a racial bigot. No respect earned there, either.

You've just used the term "boy" toward someone and you call him a racial bigot over the above joke? I'd love to know where you find the bigotry in the joke. Nothing demeaning at all was said about American Indians. Privies aren't a racial stereotype of the North American Indian. We have plenty of 'em in this state but we're a little shy of North American Indians. Use of the names of North American Indians isn't an indication of racial bigotry. The term "reservation" isn't an indicator or racial bigotry. I'll mark this down as yet another in a long line of baseless rants posted by you.

> If you wish to audition for the Comedy Store doing stand-up acts,
> I can tell Mitzi Shore you are coming. Neither she nor the
> audience cares for plagiarists who copy others' material.

They never booked Milton Berle? How did you come to be in the know about what Mitzi Shore cares for?

Dave K8MN

2839. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 17:19:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9EE221.C7E4ED8E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65076

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E9CAA87.2030406@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> Mike, tsk, tsk, tsk...you should have stayed with "wry" instead
> of hitting the rye:
>
> > Contesting gets people to dust off the rigs and make sure the antenna
> >is up and working.
>
> One has to do contesting to find that out?!?!?

I didn't see a claim that contesting was the only way to find out.

> > Contesting gets people to communicate across the country/world.
>
> True, but do they need contests to do that? I don't think so.

I didn't see a claim that it requires a contest for that to happen.
They do provide an excuse for it to happen, much like a hamfest provides
an opportunity for hams to get together, swap yarns, pick through junk
and eat generally bad food.

> > In pursuit of the score, it hones your operating skills, that is, you
> >work stations that may be weak and hard to read. Good practice for real
> >emergencies.
>
> WHAT "real emergencies" need low-level operating skills?

What low level operating skills? What do you know of contesters'
operating skills?

> Be specific there. Use ARRL newsletters for a reference.

Be specific. Call upon your vast experience in amateur radio contesting
as a reference.

> > In real emergencies, people exchange information, just like in a
> >contest. THe information is certainly more in depth, but so what?
>
> "So what?!?" Real emergencies involve Loss of Life or
> Possible Loss of Life.

Our ARES group participates in mock prison riots. We haven't figured
out how to arrange a real prison riot. That and we no longer have an
operational prison in the area.

> Contesting doesn't have any mortal danger, despite the
> peculiar fantasies of some contesters.

Practice makes perfect.

> >If you
> >don't get the information correct in the exchange, you don't get the
> >score. In some contests, they subtract points. Accuracy is important in
> >both cases.
>
> If you are going to "equate" contesting with Real Emergencies
> in such a flippant manner, then it's time for some psychological
> counseling for you.

If you're going to dismiss the value of contesting in honing operating
skills in such an arrogant manner, it is time for you to seek new
sources of information for your mental database.

> > So yeah, it is a game. But its practice for emergency ops too.
>
> No, contesting is certainly NOT any "practice" for "emergency
> ops."

Is this more from your vast experience in amateur radio contesting?

> Games have rules. Real Emergencies don't come with "rules,"
> aren't announced ahead of time, and you may have to work with
> a lot of OTHER agencies who DO plan, drill, practice for all kinds
> of contingencies NOT in any game rule book.

We haven't figured out how to arrange a real prison riot, a real tornado
or a real flood for practice purposes. Field Day and drills will have
to do for most of us. If you'd like to drop by, we can arrange to leave
you in Wildcat Hollow so the gang can practice looking for a lost
person. It would be, from your perspective, fairly realistic.

> >And it's
> >fun. So what? How many people would participate if it wasn't?
>
> Are Real Emergencies "fun" in your estimation? Have you ever
> been IN one? Or do you get your Real Emergency news from
> good old ARRL along with all the self-serving self-promotional
> emotional pumping they do?

You always resort to something like this in an effort to dismiss the
skills of another or to take a shot at the ARRL. You surely do know a
lot for a guy who isn't involved in amateur radio.

> > Since we don't know where the next emergency is going to happen, if we
> >have lots of people who are trained all over the country, there is a
> >good chance someone will be able to help if disaster strikes.
>
> MOST of the Real Emergencies that happen in the USA and most
> of its possessions involve LOCAL communications, distances

> within line of sight range.

Not all emergencies happen in the United States. Not all of those which do take place in the United States involve local communications. As you've told us, real emergencies don't have rules. You use what you need or what you have in dealing with an emergency.

> Real Emergencies need liason with local authorities: Medics,
> firemen, policemen, aid agencies. Real Emergencies don't have
> rules or "point scorers." Real Emergencies need all involved to
> work with other agencies for as many possible contingencies as
> one can think of, and to be prepared for those that nobody could
> foresee. Real Emergencies do NOT need expert, trained
> morsemen to interface with other emergency agencies in a
> local area. Real Emergency organizations don't give a damn
> if you've appeared in three successive sweepstakes in the top
> ten for three years running or have file cabinets full of QSL
> cards. Real Emergencies don't have preplanned events and
> you don't "score points" by thinking you are better than all the
> other agency professionals...unless you train, plan, practice
> WITH them.

SOME real emergencies involve liaison with local authorities. Some need liaison with state or federal authorities. Some don't need liaison with any authorities. If you decide to come to participate in our Wildcat Hollow lost person scenario, you might as well leave that cellular phone at home. They don't work in Wildcat Hollow.

> Now quit all the fantasizing about contesting being the "same"
> as emergency ops. It isn't. No points for you.

Quit pretending that you know all about contesting and amateur radio's part in emergency efforts. You don't.

Dave K8MN

2840. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 17:25:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9EE395.899A3EDC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65077

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0304160844.4512d9e7@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:

> Do you have a granted patent in radio? I have. Just one.

You've regaled us with the tale so often that it seems like many more.

> [the bear shooter has only one, but not about radio...]

That's one each for the bear shooter and the bull shooter.

That brings up an interesting point. Weren't you the guy working safely
in the rear area during the Korean War who felt compelled to tell us
about they flying time for a Soviet Bear bomber to reach Tokyo? If I'm
not mistaken, that'd give you both the bear shooter and bull shooter
crowns.

Dave K8MN

2841. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 18:33:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E9EF377.E7B29DA@att.net>
Source record: 65078

Dave Heil wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9DDF4F.736EC45C@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > Communication at near the speed of light and still you have nothing to
> > > say. :-) :-) :-(
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Yet you keep posting and posting and posting....
>
> With your record, I'd have thought you'd have had enough sense to keep
> mum on this one.

Aw, come on, Dave. Not really.

2842. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 19:22:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417152222.19020.00000068@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 65079

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 4/17/2003 11:47 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0304170847.62b03fce@posting.google.com>

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030411172311.11494.00000125@mb-fa.aol.com>...
>> In article <c2356669.0304110909.5684f766@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>> (N2EY) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20030410154430.04182.00000116@mb-fg.aol.com>...

>> Most of those protesters survived to this day and some are the
>> "leaders" of present-day USA.

Lennie, I thought this was an Amateur Radio newsgroup, not a medical,
nursing, driving, geogrphy or political newsgroup...(so says you)

Soooooo...You get into a debate YOU like on an "off topic", and it's
"OK"...?!?!

Leadership by example was neevr your forte, was it...?!?!

One of the benefits of only seeing your bile in others quotes or when
someone sends it to me e mail.....

Steve, K4YZ

2843. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 19:29:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417152914.19020.00000069@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 65080

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/17/2003 8:57 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3E9EB36A.3C409C86@earthlink.net>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <f45722ac.0304161752.28395836@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >> HEY BURKIE! Hurry up and get your bags packed! Maybe you can GET
>IT
>> >> RIGHT this time!
>> >>
>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >Steve, I'd would have been proud to have served in Iraq. That would
>> >make the 3rd SWA service medal for me.
>> >
>> >How many do you have? Would you consider it a hostile environment?
>> >List your hostile envirnments, and don't BS us with your Buckeye
>> >wives.
>>
>> Steamy the one-man schmuck can't detail his "hostile actions"
>> since he has no reference for them. He is a blowhard braggart
>> who didn't get out of the USMC with an Honorable Discharge.

Dave...Whyathink an allegedly educated person like Lennie would make so
brazen and obviously false statement like "...didn't get out of the USMC with
an Honorable Discharge"...?!?!

ESPECIALLY when it's so easily disproven...???

Personally, I think he LOVES being humiliated in public...Why would a man
(I am being gracious there) do so many things to draw NEGATIVE attention to
himself otherwise?

>N2EY:
>
>"No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
>ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
>infantile behavior."

On the money, Jim.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2844. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 19:44:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417154403.19020.00000072@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 65081

>Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/17/2003 12:01 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3E9EDDCF.D3D11A61@earthlink.net>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20030415200650.11012.00000142@mb-fm.aol.com>, nocwtest@aol.com
>(No
>> CW Test) writes:
>>
>> >In article <20030415155041.04182.00000180@mb-fg.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> >(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>> >Tell us how it tasted, Len. And why you went back for seconds.....;-)
>>
>> Why should I tell any PLAGIARIST anything?
>
>A PLAGIARIST? What's been plagiarized--your lengthy treatise on your
>amateur radio experiences?

That's a laugh...From a guy who's "experiences" come from what he's
cut-and-pasted from other websites...

>> "No CW Test" was a screen name I used some years ago on
>> America Online and for messaging in here. I haven't used that
>> screen name for at least two years. AOL only reserves old
>> screen names for six months. After six months anyone can
>> use it.
>
>It looks like someone is using it.

Hmmmmm...first Lennie starts berating whoever has reactivated his
"NoCWTest" nomme de guerre, (there never WAS a "CW" test anyway...), then he
openly admits that "anyone" can use an inactive screen name after six months.

Seems to me he's got nothing to gripe about.

>> You've used it here without any respect whatsoever, trying to
>> ape the original screen name user. No supplementary ID at
>> all. Just blatant COPYING of what another has done. In the
>> media that is PLAGIARISM, boy.

No...PLAGIARISM is taking the works of another and claiming it as your
own...The current "owner" of "NoCWTest" has done no such thing.

>I've never heard of a case where three words run together constituted
>plagiarism. It looks more like an exerpt from some of your work.
>What's with the "boy" stuff? How do you know that the current user of
>the screen name isn't older than you? If he happens to be black, he
>might think about kicking your tired, old, white butt.
>
>> You are without honor, without respect for acts of plagiarism.
>
>I'm not certain about the honor portion but the guy does have a great
>sense of humor.

For sure! And I think Lennie should be dodging lightning bolts for his
assailing another about "honor".

Leonard H Anderson is one of the most cowardly, lying, dishonorable creeps
I have ever known.

His attempts to embellesh his own military service by associating himself
with Army KIA's in Korea was absolutely disgusting. There are more vile and
evil things in the world (murderers, child molesters, etc), but after them,
Lennie's right up there.

>> >Back in my early days with the Rural Electrification Authority down in New
>> >Mexico, I had the job of bringing electricity to some of the larger Navajo
>> >outhouses and privies. They said it was the first time anyone had wired a
>> >head for a reservation.....
>>
>> You are also a racial bigot. No respect earned there, either.
>
>You've just used the term "boy" toward someone and you call him a racial
>bigot over the above joke? I'd love to know where you find the bigotry
>in the joke. Nothing demeaning at all was said about American Indians.
>Privies aren't a racial stereotype of the North American Indian. We
>have plenty of 'em in this state but we're a little shy of North
>American Indians. Use of the names of North American Indians isn't an
>indication of racial bigotry. The term "reservation" isn't an indicator
>or racial bigotry. I'll mark this down as yet another in a long line of
>baseless rants posted by you.
>
>> If you wish to audition for the Comedy Store doing stand-up acts,
>> I can tell Mitzi Shore you are coming. Neither she nor the
>> audience cares for plagiarists who copy others' material.
>
>They never booked Milton Berle? How did you come to be in the know
>about what Mitzi Shore cares for?

Lennie's very selective in who he chooses to invoke as "evidence" that
he's right or "vindicated" But very rarely is he ever right.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2845. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 21:05:28 UTC
From: USMC retired <Gunny@halfthemxout.net>
Message-ID: <b7n4ss$rb1$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 65084

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
> I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
> to standing procedures binding upon the military.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>

Do you also participate in the anti-war marches? I'd
love to hear you blabber this crap to General Tommy Franks!
Go spew your anti-military crap somewhere else.

Sgt Maj Hornoff, USMC retired

2846. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 21:09:52 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <AKEna.2622$Hy1.428144@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65082

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3E9EBC2A.79A1A2AC@crosslink.net...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9AFCD9.D8949D40@crosslink.net>...
> >
> > > What irks me is Morse - the requirement, not the mode.
> >
> > Do you really think that Element 1 is a big problem?
>
> If your hearing is impaired, yes. It's akin to putting up obsticals to
> keep cripples out of rest rooms to make more room for healthy people.

Since one can change both the pitch and volume of the side tone on a radio to the individual needs of the operator, morse would be easier to hear, once the operator is trained, than voices. It is a simple on/off scheme with variable duration (i.e. dots and dashes) rather than the variable volume, pitch, modulation, etc of the human voice. Also the human voice tends to fall right at the same pitch as the background noise.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2847. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 21:18:47 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <XSEna.2655$Hy1.430028@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65083

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3E9EC7C3.AE3915CF@crosslink.net...
> Even our opportunities to provide EMCOMMs is disappearing. We provided
> backup for 'normal' communications, which often failed or were non
> existant. But now those 'normal' comms are at once more available and
> more reliable. People lost in the woods are more likely to whip out a
> cell phone than need a ham and police, fire and rescue comm's are so
> reliable that ARES/RACES teams have become like the proverbial appliance
> repairman on TV.

Not disappearing but changing. We are no longer needed for the little, personal disasters like the ones you cite. However read up on the communications situation following the World Trade Center Disaster. Phones, both regular ones and cell phones, were either out completely or there were long delays in getting through. Part of this was due to the loss of equipment when the World Trade Center collapsed and part was due to overload of the system since it was designed to handle average communication levels with only a small margin for increased traffic. None of our public communications (telephone, cell phone, etc) or public services (police, fire, etc) have sufficient equipment to handle the communications needs for large scale disasters. Taxpayers won't foot the bill for the extra capacity that would be unused the majority of the time. This is the void that ham radio will continue to fill well into the future.

Even natural disasters (hurricanes, earthquakes, tornadoes, etc.) still cause sufficient breakdown or overload of normal communications that the assistance of hams will be badly needed.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2848. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 21:23:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417172336.18770.00000019@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 65086

In article <20030417022300.18769.00000031@mb-m24.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030416195345.18769.00000005@mb-m24.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>The practical limitation in computer Morse is the performance of the
>hardware
>>and software. With dedicated hardware, almost any speed is possible.
>>
>>In practice, however, there's the factor of radio conditions. Which is why
>even
>>the early Baudot RTTY systems usually used FSK.
>
> No, not at all, Jimmie.

Len,

Is there a reason you make fun of people's names? Do you think people will
respect you more if you insult them?

Here's a hint: People respect you less.

> Early RTTY systems of the 1930s era used FSK because that
> was the easiest way to get some kind of very fast keying on
> transmitters that couldn't do such fast on-off keying.

I don't believe you.

> The
> conventional HF transmitter used a separate "exciter" similar
> to an early ham separate VFO...although most commercial
> and military exciters used crystal control.

I think you are giving us a snowjob.

> The early TTYs were mechanical marvels but all were designed
> for wired applications..."Baudot" or not. 5-level early TTY code
> is not strictly "Baudot." In wired applications the loop current
> can be 30 to 60 mA, bipolar (Mark in one direction, Space in the
> other). Polar relays were common then (SPDT contacts, center
> off). Contacts were not heavy-duty nor high voltage (typically a
> loop supply was 150 VDC at most).

I know. Been there, done that.

> FSK was fine and dandy, even with the wide spread (frequency
> difference of Mark to Space) of 850 Hz. No real hardware
> changes to those old CW transmitters, just the addition of an
> exciter, a low-power RF source.

There were high speed Morse transmitters back in the 1930s and earlier. Your
story does not compute. I don't believe it.
>
> Reception was no problem with an outboard FSK to TTY loop
> current converter. Better receive converters had AFC loops
> using mechanical servo tuning...some had separate Mark and
> Space loops to make certain neither was lost if the other end
> shifted their spread and/or drifted off frequency slightly.

I know.
>
> One of the first-ever time-division multiplexers was through a
> USN contract input-output converter operating digitally but
> with small 7-pin miniature thyratron tubes as memory elements.

Probably 5823s if they were cold-cathode or 2D21s if hot cathode. Or their
military equivalents.

> Existing FSK exciters and receiving converters could handle
> switching rates about 4 1/2 times normal TTY switching rates
> of 60 WPM machines. The polar relays had to be exchanged
> for vacuum tube equivalents; not really a problem since the
> polar relays were big enough and plug-in, plug-out so that
> adapters could be made to replace them. That time-MUX
> was operational about 1952 with the US military.

And these units cost how much?
>
> Commercial and military SSB already had frequency multiplexing
> through adapted wireline "carrier" equipment in the first (Dutch)
> SSB circuit on HF. Such TTY had tone pairs and used AFSK.
> Not a problem since the carrier bays had already been used on
> wireline circuits and were proven. Up to 12 TTY circuits could
> exist in a 6 KHz half of the 12 KHz bandwidth. That would be
> halved when pairing of tone pairs was used to overcome the HF
> phenomenon of "selective fading," one of the earliest methods
> of error correction and not possible with single-circuit "morse"
> telegraphy.

Sounds like you are merely repeating what I wrote earlier.
>
> By 1960 the conversion had already begun to change from pre-
> WW2 60 WPM machines to the newer 100 WPM machines,
> both military and commercial.

Previously you wrote that 100 wpm was the minimum speed used for the past four
decades. Now you're saying the conversion had begun by 1960.

> Newer machines used a 7-level
> or 8-level coding (USA had 8-level, ten "bits" in all). The most
> common USA 8-level coding scheme became known as
> ASCII (American Standard Code for Information Interchange).
> The FSK spread would narrow down to 170 Hz between
> Mark and Space. FSK was kept with just a few channels of
> TTY on an HF radio circuit.
>
I know...

> "Early RTTY" used FSK for hardware reasons in the then-old
> transmitters which had been designed for CW-only operation.

I don't believe you.

> AFSK was used on TTY over SSB because the wireline carrier
> equipment had already been proven and adapted easily to early
> SSB.

Sounds like a snowjob.
>
> Modern-day MODEMs can exist on a single PCB structure and
> transceive at 56 KBPS rates over a bandwidth of about 2.8
> KHz (easily fits on a POTS wireline circuit).

Not easily. The wire circuit must be of sufficient quality. And that's not a
radio circuit.

Have you ever operated a 56 kb modem over an HF radio circuit 2.8 kHz wide?

> 56 KPBS translates
> to roughly 4800 characters per second of text (the remainder
> are varied signals, may include FEC of various forms, housekeeping
> bits, etc.). 4800 characters per second, taking 6 characters per
> word is 800 words per second...or 48,000 WPM equivalent rate.

I know. First year EE stuff.

> Coder-burst keyers for CW telegraphy typically did 300 WPM but
> absolutely had to use some kind of recording device to hold the
> received signal. No human can head-copy 300 WPM, let alone
> "get it on paper."

Really? Is speed all that matters to you?
>
> I've actually operated what I described above.

Way back in the early 1930s, Len? Before you were even born? Were your diapers
made from old chadless paper tape? ;-)

You operated all of the above? I think you EXAGGERATE.

Or did you just operate some of it? Maybe just the modem?

When did you allegedly operate the high speed Morse burst keyer?

> How is your
> experience with "early Baudot RTTY?"

I have some. Including 60 wpm and 100 wpm Baudot FSK RTTY machines in the early 1970s. Less than three decades ago.

I have far more experience with RTTY than you have with Morse code.

N2EY

2849. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 21:23:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417172337.18770.00000020@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 65088

In article <20030416205901.18878.00000062@mb-m18.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From K4YZ:
>>What does YOUR lack of knowledge of your own occupational field hve to do
>>with EE's hombrewing?
>
>Firstly, a "Professional Engineer" is not relevant to what I want to do with
>EE degree.

Then you don't need one.

In other fields of EE, a PE is almost mandatory. And the terms "PE" and "Professional Engineer" have specific meanings. They both require a license from the state.
>
>Secondly, Dee has came up with several reasons why many EEs don't homebrew.
>Seems like endorsing that EEs should not homebrew.
>
Only to you. Dee and I were explaining, not advocating.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2850. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 21:23:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417172338.18770.00000021@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 65085

In article <20030415194659.06680.00000346@mb-cv.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From(N2EY)
>
>>FCC set up the structure that way, not hams.
>
>Refer to statements from FCC stating learning Morse code does not necesarily
>make you a better operator.

Which statements?

From my reading of the FCC's statements on the need for Morse code TESTING, the FCC thinks that there is no longer any need for Morse code testing other than meeting the requirements of ITU-R S25.5. FCC said, in effect, that they don't see any significant difference in the on-air behavior of non-code-tested vs. code-tested hams. In other words, they don't think reducing or dropping the code test would cause any more rules violations that we have now.

>>Which is why you see lots of hams homebrewing antennas, linear
>>amplifiers, etc.
>
>True, I've seen several Hams homebrewing amplifiers as well as antenna at a
>CT Hamfest.

See? Homebrewing is out there.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2851. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 21:23:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417172338.18770.00000022@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 65087

In article <20030416234508.18878.00000084@mb-m18.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>To show that Morse code is a growth industry, N2EY should post the Morse code >numbers along with the ARS License Numbers.

What "Morse code numbers"?

Where are they available?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2852. Re: "No Matches Found"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 22:19:08 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdi4nb5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 65089

On Thu, 17 Apr 2003 05:30:43 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>When the FCC revised the roles, didn't they make GROL's
>lifetime? Therefore, he might have a GROL document that has an
>expiration date, but in reality, it didn't actually expire.

Not so. The license-holder still had to renew if the license
had an expiration date but for convenience the FCC computer
generated lifetime certificates for every valid license holder
as of January 1, 1985. There was a one-year "window" to turn
in the old certificate and get the lifetime certificate from the
office that last issued the license. After that, a "renewal" would
result in a card-form license which is all that is issued today, and
failure to renew or request the certificate would result in not being
licensed past the expiration date.

The latest renewal date for a Radiotelephone Operator license
would have been in 1990, five years after the lifetime license
went into effect.

The only ways to let the license lapse in 2000 would be to either
send it in to the FCC with a request to cancel it, or have it
taken away by a suspension or revocation order issued by the FCC.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2853. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:48:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417194813.08129.00000049@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65003

In article <20030417022300.18769.00000031@mb-m24.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030416195345.18769.00000005@mb-m24.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>>The practical limitation in computer Morse is the performance of the
hardware
>>>and software. With dedicated hardware, almost any speed is possible.
>>>
>>>In practice, however, there's the factor of radio conditions. Which is why
even
>>>the early Baudot RTTY systems usually used FSK.
>>
>> No, not at all, Jimmie.

>Len,

>Is there a reason you make fun of people's names? Do you think people will
>respect you more if you insult them?

>Here's a hint: People respect you less.

Morsemen in here don't respect non-morsemen. That's a given.

Poor babies get all upset when tables are turned. Boo hoo.

>> Early RTTY systems of the 1930s era used FSK because that
>> was the easiest way to get some kind of very fast keying on
>> transmitters that couldn't do such fast on-off keying.

>I don't believe you.

You don't have to...you can disbelieve the entirety of earlier
HF communications practice if you wish. You aren't forced to
believe anyone. Continue on in blessed ignorance if you want.

If you bother to research it, you will find out I'm right.

That sticks in your craw, sport, but I can't help that.

>I think you are giving us a snowjob.

Nope. Research it yourself. You'll have to use Real Books,
though. Google doesn't have it.

>> The early TTYs were mechanical marvels but all were designed
>> for wired applications..."Baudot" or not. 5-level early TTY code

>> is not strictly "Baudot." In wired applications the loop current
>> can be 30 to 60 mA, bipolar (Mark in one direction, Space in the
>> other). Polar relays were common then (SPDT contacts, center
>> off). Contacts were not heavy-duty nor high voltage (typically a
>> loop supply was 150 VDC at most).

>I know. Been there, done that.

I don't believe you. :-)

Describe the common tool used to adjust Western Electric
polar relays and I might start acknowledging you thought
you knew something about TTY loops. :-)

>There were high speed Morse transmitters back in the 1930s and earlier. Your
>story does not compute. I don't believe it.

You refuse to believe the truth.

Look it up in the "Collins SSB Book," known by the official book
title of "Single Sideband Principles and Circuits," by Pappenfus,
Bruene, and Shoenike, McGraw-Hill 1964. Most of it is in the
first chapter on radio communications history overview.

>> Reception was no problem with an outboard FSK to TTY loop
>> current converter. Better receive converters had AFC loops
>> using mechanical servo tuning...some had separate Mark and
>> Space loops to make certain neither was lost if the other end
>> shifted their spread and/or drifted off frequency slightly.

>I know.

No, you don't. You've never worked in commercial HF comms
or have any experience in anything but simple amateur radio
stations.

>> One of the first-ever time-division multiplexers was through a
>> USN contract input-output converter operating digitally but
>> with small 7-pin miniature thyratron tubes as memory elements.

>Probably 5823s if they were cold-cathode or 2D21s if hot cathode. Or their
>military equivalents.

Irrelevant factoid. You've never used one of those "Muxes"
or have any idea of how they sound through a conventional
HF receiver. Describe the whole Mux in detail and I'll see
if it compares to the photo I took of one in operation.

>> Existing FSK exciters and receiving converters could handle
>> switching rates about 4 1/2 times normal TTY switching rates
>> of 60 WPM machines. The polar relays had to be exchanged
>> for vacuum tube equivalents; not really a problem since the
>> polar relays were big enough and plug-in, plug-out so that
>> adapters could be made to replace them. That time-MUX

>> was operational about 1952 with the US military.

>And these units cost how much?

More than you could afford in the 1950s. :-)

>> Commercial and military SSB already had frequency multiplexing
>> through adapted wireline "carrier" equipment in the first (Dutch)
>> SSB circuit on HF. Such TTY had tone pairs and used AFSK.
>> Not a problem since the carrier bays had already been used on
>> wireline circuits and were proven. Up to 12 TTY circuits could
>> exist in a 6 KHz half of the 12 KHz bandwidth. That would be
>> halved when pairing of tone pairs was used to overcome the HF
>> phenomenon of "selective fading," one of the earliest methods
>> of error correction and not possible with single-circuit "morse"
>> telegraphy.

>Sounds like you are merely repeating what I wrote earlier.

Jimmie is CONFUSED. I repeated what *I* wrote earlier. :-)

Jimmie, you've never used a commercial 12 KHz BW SSB
transmitter in your life. Get over it.

>Previously you wrote that 100 wpm was the minimum speed used for the past four
>decades. Now you're saying the conversion had begun by 1960.

Both apply. You want to misdirect by leading off on a tangent
for some EXACT DATE.

I really don't care what hams did in RTTY four decades (plus minus)
ago. Most that they could afford was surplus 60 WPM machines.

Stop to think of WHY they were "surplus." They were surplus
because they were REPLACED...by the higher-rate TTYs.

>I know...

>I don't believe you.

>Sounds like a snowjob.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Miccolis's views, they will
be the target of his arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Miccolis's self-
importance and experience...not to mention puerile pique.

>Have you ever operated a 56 kb modem over an HF radio circuit 2.8 kHz wide?

Yes...one specifically designed for radio.

>> I've actually operated what I described above.

>Way back in the early 1930s, Len? Before you were even born? Were your diapers
>made from old chadless paper tape? ;-)

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Miccolis's views, they will
be the target of his arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Miccolis's self-
importance and experience...not to mention puerile pique.

>You operated all of the above? I think you EXAGGERATE.

>Or did you just operate some of it? Maybe just the modem?

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Miccolis's views, they will
be the target of his arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Miccolis's self-
importance and experience...not to mention puerile pique.

I have far more experience with RTTY than you have with Morse code.

Are you STILL snarling or have you taken lessons?

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Miccolis's views, they will
be the target of his arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Miccolis's self-
importance and experience...not to mention puerile pique.

2854. Re: Military Ops (was We apologize...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:48:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417194814.08129.00000050@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65092

In article <3E9ECE08.3D5BE3D6@crosslink.net>, Vito <vito@crosslink.net> writes:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > >Do you have any concept of how our military operates?
>
>With all due respect, no past experience provides any expertise in how
>our military does or should operate because of the changes (OK,
>advancements) in weaponry and coordination. For example, a 'Nam Vet
>might hesitate to call in a B52 strike anywhere near his position
>because B52 fire control was designed to get nukes within a mile or so
>of the target. Now his equivalent can put a target in his crosshairs and
>punch a button; the designated GPS position is radioed to a B52 orbiting
>miles overhead and in seconds down comes a suitable bomb, selected based
>on target range, to strike within feet of the designated target. Pinned
>down by a bunker? Push a button and it goes away! Or imagine replacing a
>human Kamakazi pilot with "the terminator": a mindless machine that,
>shown a picture of a window in a building, flies his aircraft into it
>then detonates his bombs. Would y'all WW2, Korean, Nam, etc., make any
>op's changes if you'd have had these capabilities? The real problem is
>adapting fast enough.

Agreed, Vito.

Problem in here is all the PCTA *refusing* to adapt.

Morse code is well on its way to extinction as a communications
mode in the larger world of all radio. The only place it still lives
is in amateur radio where morsemen insist and insist is a
"requirement" for an amateur radio license having below-30-MHz
privileges.

Maybe the morsemen are confusing themselves with "greenies,"
the environmentalists who insist on protecting certain species
by law? That would be asking for federal welfare to support their
minority viewpoint...or the federal government to formally
recognize the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society.

2855. Re: At The End Of The Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:48:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417194819.08129.00000051@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65002

In article <20030417083326.19114.00000070@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/17/2003 1:22 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030417022255.18769.00000025@mb-m24.aol.com>
>
>>He is a blowhard braggart
>> who didn't get out of the USMC with an Honorable Discharge.
>
> Why does Leonard H. Anderson find it necessary to make such brazen and
>obviously dishonest pronouncements in the face of facts to the contrary?

Obviously Stevie hasn't begun his mental therapy yet.

Stevie wrote in here that he left the USMC on a medical discharge.
Later he "amended" that to say "it was changed to an honorable."

That's very rare in the armed forces of the USA.

Poor lil Stevie goes on...

>
> Could it be his penchant for pathological lying?
>
> I think it is. But there's more...
>
> I think it's because Lennie is a loser. Period. I have called him putz,
>His Lyingness, etc, but the very bottom line is, that despite whatever he
>THINKS he did in electronics, at the end of the day he's accomplished nothing,
>is appreciated by no one, and has no one "thanking" him for whatever he THINKS
>he accomplished.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Stevie IMAGINES too much...

IMAGINATION is not the same as "thinking."

> I may never have a patent of my own or a house in the middle of one of
the
>most heavily taxed regions of the United States, but then I don't care to have
>them.

"Heavily taxed?" Property taxes on the southern house are almost
half of that of the northern house in the 10 acres of woods near
Tacoma, Washington.

>What I DO care about is that I made a positive impact on other's lives,
>and that I HAVE done.

Wonderful. Then you came in here and threw it all away...

> People stop me in Kroger and tell me how well they or a family member are
>doing as a result of something I did or said, and they appreciate it. At the
>end of the day my kids say "I love you Daddy", and that makes it all worth it.

Suggestion: Take up some Remedial English night classes and
write for Reader's Digest magazine. They love that kind of copy.

This newsgroup is about AMATEUR RADIO POLICY, not super-
markets, interpersonal relations with neighbors (on non-radio
matters), or family matters.

> It's not bragging to say I am an Honorably Discharged United States
>Marine. It is a fact, one that can be verified via the VA.

National Archives and Records Agency in St. Louis is a better
place. NARA. They have the official version.

I've never checked NARA for Stevie's records. He said FIRST he
had a medical, then later backtracked to say it was "amended"
to honorable.

As to "bragging," Stevie's own words claim:

SEVEN HOSTILE ACTIONS

He hasn't referenced those or established any bona fides for that.
He hasn't described any of them in sufficient detail of any sort.

If anyone else said so, they would have this "seven hostile action"
hero all over their case. Evidently "hostile action" heroes have
some sort of divine blessing to be HYPOCRITES. :-)

>Lennie knows this
>but yet he persists in trying to perpetuate yet another of his blatantly
>false stories in order to glorify himself.

Hmmm...myself AND others have called Stevie on his claims,
Stevie didn't answer with any believability, but he says that
"others" are lying?

That's not just illogical, it is insanity.

>Yet another attempt to embellish his own
>meager military service at the cost of others.

I don't "embellish" anything of my military record. All that I've said
in here is verifiable through third-party, disinterested sources.

Eight years of military service isn't exactly "meager." It involved
HF radio communications on a big scale. Not only is that
verifiable, Eugene Rosenbaum (N2JTV, now living on Long
Island, NY) served in the same unit doing the same thing.

Cost to others? As an E-5 overseas, I got the glorious sum of
about $154 a month. That cost taxpayers about 12.3 microcents
a year each!

>Lennie has made a habit of
>embellishing his lackluster service at the expense of others, including a
>cowardly attempt to "polish his brass" behind the tombstones of US Army KIA's
>from the Korean Conflict.

Poor baby...imagination working overtime again. Google has the
archives, Stevie.

I HONORED the 23 killed from the 71st Signal Service Battalion in
the Korean WAR. Stevie can read about it in the Pacific Stars &
Stripes for 10 November, 2002. It's on-line, with pictures, searchable
there at www.estripes under "Hardy Barracks."

> And it's not bragging to say that I am a licensed aviator, nurse AND
radio
>operator with over 30 years experience in PRACTICAL radio skills...Not only in
>"morsemanship", but in realtime, on-the-air operations. These are all facts.
>
>Facts that Lennie cannot stand.

I usually SIT during newsgroup sessions. I could stand up to do it
but the keyboard is rather fastened to its little sliding shelf, ideal
for sitting operation. Standing and bending over to reach the keyboard
is uncomfortable, therefore I do not stand while operating the computer.

Stevie needs to tell ALL, not just a part of what he "has."

Stevie is licensed as a PRIVATE PILOT. That isn't commercial,
it certainly isn't military. Stevie's list of aircraft he has flown are
all in the "light" general aviation category.

Stevie is a civilian nurse, not a doctor, cannot practice medicine
like a REAL medical doctor. My sister-in-law is a licensed nurse,
a wonderful person but doesn't claim to be any kind of medical
"expert."

Stevie's "radio license" is for AMATEUR RADIO...as is nearly
all of his "30 years operating experience." Amateurism.
"Practicality" limited to allocated amateur modes/modulations
which are a tiny part of all those available to the rest of the radio
world.

> Lennie can not claim any of that.

True. I cut short my private pilot lessons for economic reasons.
I've never had any desire to be a nurse. I've never tried to get an
amateur radio license, just got a commercial license, one as a
First Class Radiotelephone Operator.

I spent a career working IN electronic engineering since late 1956,
first as a Senior Lab Technician, then advancing on to being a

Senior Staff Engineer responsible for all phases of design and
production of radio-electronic hardware. Stevie hasn't done a
single thing in that area...the closest he got was as a purchasing
agent for a short time (less than a year) in some middle-sized
corporation making modems, LANs, and set-top boxes.

>Oh yes, he can cut-and-paste from a
>great many websites, including ones on medical and nursing topics, but at the
>end of the day, he's DONE none of it.

I'm not licensed to practice medicine. Neither is Stevie (nurses
cannot do that in lieu of a licensed physician).

Medical and nursing topics are not prime requisites for discussing
amateur radio policy, are they?

>> During his "career" in electronics, Lennie caused RF to be generated,
but
>what did he do with it? Obviously making friends was low on the priority
list.

Oh? :-)

Allan Walston, W6MJN, an old friend, was best man at my wedding.
Jim Hall, KD6JG, is an old friend and our host at his beautiful home
in central California in 2001...he was my immediate-level manager
at RCA Corporation and later a senior staffer at Rocketdyne where
some of us migrated to after RCA Corporation was dissolved.

My list of friends is rather large, but few of them are licensed in
amateur radio. Stevie would never ever make that list. :-)

> So yes...at the end of the day when it's all said and done, Lennie is
just
>a loser, and losers are a dime a dozen.

I'm retired. So is my wife. Together we have nice residences and
a comfortable income, no debts, no mortgage. Our respective
health conditions are rather good. That's priceless.

> What a pity.

...for Stevie.

2856. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:48:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417194820.08129.00000053@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65090

In article <20030416231432.18878.00000078@mb-m18.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>>Should all driver's license tests include a test of ability to drive a
>>>stick-shift car across an empty parking lot at not less than 5 mph?
>>
>> A very silly analogy.
>>
>> Driving an automobile or even any vehicle has NOTHING to do
>> with amateur radio licensing.
>
>N2EY keeps endorsing removal of Morse code testing (from this analogy). Then
>if you ask him about it, he denies it.

He can't keep a focus on RADIO for all the beeping he hears. :-)

2857. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:48:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417194820.08129.00000052@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65093

In article <3E9EB2E2.CB03D72E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E9DDF86.6E07CA07@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >> Driving an automobile or even any vehicle has NOTHING to do
>> >> with amateur radio licensing.
>> >
>> >Come to think of it, neither do you.
>>
>> Poor baby. Did I "upset your sensibilities" also?
>
>It is apparent from your response, poor baby, that I upset yours.

Nah...just amused that a State Department trainee has
to embelish his past of THIRTY YEARS AGO.

Or were you "fighting charlie" after 1973? :-)

>> Tsk, tsk, tsk, the in-country combat vet offended by not being
>> able to shoot others down with words...
>
>I'm not "the" in-country combat vet, I'm an in-country combat vet who
>addressed one who is not an in-country combat vet. I'd think you'd be
>used to being shot down with words by now.

Not even scratched, big-time "combat vet shooter." :-)

What does your alleged "combat vet" experience have to do
with amateur radio policy?

You weren't ALSO "saving a whole brigade in 'Nam with your
trusty PRC-25," were you?

How about "behind enemy lines in 'Nam sending intel back
via CW?" Before 1973, that is. :-)

Where are your bona fide references to all this "combat"
experience? Engraved on your tongue? Or did you read
about it in Pacific Stars & Stripes and wish you were in
infantry in the jungle instead of being a USAF type hauling
stock boxes around at a supply depot?

Did you go AWOL in-country to seek out and destroy charlie regardless of your military assignment? Not good, that. Not very diplomatic. Did State check up on your resume thoroughly or did you flumox them also with fast talk and arrogant air?

NARA probably has your REAL military record on file. You aren't worth the effort to message them or spend the postage.

2858. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:48:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417194821.08129.00000054@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65094

In article <3E9EB36A.3C409C86@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY:
>
>"No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
>ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
>infantile behavior."
>
>Dave K8MN

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

That paragraph can be repeated ad nauseum if that is the mode
decreed by Herr Robust of the Gang of Four. That isn't a good
way to debate anything. However, the Lieder of the Gang of Four
keeps on with that chorus in nauseating repetition. Childish
behavior. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

2859. Re: "No Matches Found"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:48:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417194822.08129.00000055@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65004

In article <Pine.LNX.4.53.0304170530050.1218@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>On Thu, 17 Apr 2003, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>> >Subject: Re: "No Matches Found"
>> >From: Duane Allen computeruser@sprintmail.com
>> >Date: 4/16/2003 6:24 AM Central Daylight Time
>> >Message-id: <3E9D4081.30702@sprintmail.com>
>>
>> >The FCC Advance license search yields a Anderson, Leonard holding a CM
>> >license with a Ship Radar Endorsement.
>>
>> Hmmmm.....Could be. But he SWORE he let his GROL "expire" in Oct 2000.
>> And we KNOW he wouldn't lie to US... ! ! !
>
>When the FCC revised the roles, didn't they make GROL's lifetime? Therefore,
>he might have a GROL document that has an expiration date, but in reality, it
>didn't actually expire.

Dieter, it's not important to Robeson about the actual existance
of any license, only that he can attempt to score message points
in here to avenge his self-perceived message wounds.

I tested for a First Class Radiotelephone (Commercial) Operator
license at an FCC field office in Chicago in March, 1956, passed
all four parts of it, received the certificate two weeks later and
kept renewing that until the FCC regulations made all the
Radiotelephone (Commercial) licenses into a single class, the
General Radiotelephone Operator License. That became a
non-renewable or "lifetime" license...at a time when the FCC
decided that such licensing wasn't really of much value in
regulating US civil radio.

A problem existed in here with Stevie some time back when
I sent him several scans of my First Phone certificate. He
refused them (in public) although no one can know if he ever
opened one of the several scans to actually see it. He really
doesn't want to accept factual information that interferes with
his fantasy du jour.

The last time I had to legally use that license was back in
1984. That's a whole 19 years ago. Just the same, I was
ON HF just a few months ago, communicating on SSB from
a sailing vessel in a marina harbor in Ventura. Didn't need
to sign any forms or get "permission in writing." :-)

There are very few instances where anyone "must" be
licensed to transmit RF above incidental radiation maximums
on government contract projects to develop such systems.
Indeed, I don't think there are any, although some rare
exceptions might exist.

A problem in here seems to be all the olde-tymers still hanging
onto old standards, old practices, old regulations, old ways
that disappeared along with their youth. None will remain, yet
they NEED all the status, rank, privileges of the old US amateur
way of life in order to Lord it over others. That may be the only
thing they have left in life to show their imagined superiority
over others.

2860. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:48:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417194823.08129.00000056@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65095

In article <3E9EE395.899A3EDC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <c2356669.0304160844.4512d9e7@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>> (N2EY) writes:
>
>> Do you have a granted patent in radio? I have. Just one.
>
>You've regaled us with the tale so often that it seems like many more.
>
>> [the bear shooter has only one, but not about radio...]
>
>That's one each for the bear shooter and the bull shooter.
>
>That brings up an interesting point. Weren't you the guy working safely
>in the rear area during the Korean War who felt compelled to tell us
>about they flying time for a Soviet Bear bomber to reach Tokyo? If I'm
>not mistaken, that'd give you both the bear shooter and bull shooter
>crowns.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

2861. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:48:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417194825.08129.00000057@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65100

In article <3E9EE221.C7E4ED8E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E9CAA87.2030406@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>I didn't see a claim that it requires a contest for that to happen.
>They do provide an excuse for it to happen, much like a hamfest provides
>an opportunity for hams to get together, swap yarns, pick through junk
>and eat generally bad food.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

>What low level operating skills? What do you know of contesters'
>operating skills?
>
>> Be specific there. Use ARRL newsletters for a reference.
>
>Be specific. Call upon your vast experience in amateur radio contesting
>as a reference.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

>
>> > In real emergencies, people exchange information, just like in a
>> >contest. THe information is certainly more in depth, but so what?
>>
>> "So what?!?" Real emergencies involve Loss of Life or
>> Possible Loss of Life.
>
>Our ARES group participates in mock prison riots. We haven't figured
>out how to arrange a real prison riot. That and we no longer have an
>operational prison in the area.

>
>> Contesting doesn't have any mortal danger, despite the
>> peculiar fantasies of some contesters.

>If you're going to dismiss the value of contesting in honing operating
>skills in such an arrogant manner, it is time for you to seek new
>sources of information for your mental database.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

>Is this more from your vast experience in amateur radio contesting?

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

>We haven't figured out how to arrange a real prison riot, a real tornado
>or a real flood for practice purposes. Field Day and drills will have
>to do for most of us. If you'd like to drop by, we can arrange to leave
>you in Wildcat Hollow so the gang can practice looking for a lost
>person. It would be, from your perspective, fairly realistic.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

>You always resort to something like this in an effort to dismiss the
>skills of another or to take a shot at the ARRL. You surely do know a
>lot for a guy who isn't involved in amateur radio.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

>SOME real emergencies involve liaison with local authorities. Some need
>liaison with state or federal authorities. Some don't need liaison with
>any authorities. If you decide to come to participate in our Wildcat
>Hollow lost person scenario, you might as well leave that cellular phone
>at home. They don't work in Wildcat Hollow.
>
>> Now quit all the fantasizing about contesting being the "same"
>> as emergency ops. It isn't. No points for you.
>
>Quit pretending that you know all about contesting and amateur radio's
>part in emergency efforts. You don't.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

2862. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:48:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417194826.08129.00000058@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65001

In article <3E9EDDCF.D3D11A61@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20030415200650.11012.00000142@mb-fm.aol.com>, nocwtest@aol.com
>(No
>> CW Test) writes:
>>
>> >In article <20030415155041.04182.00000180@mb-fg.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> >(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>> >Tell us how it tasted, Len. And why you went back for seconds.....;-)
>>
>> Why should I tell any PLAGIARIST anything?
>
>A PLAGIARIST? What's been plagiarized--your lengthy treatise on your
>amateur radio experiences?

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

>plagiarism. It looks more like an exerpt from some of your work.
>What's with the "boy" stuff? How do you know that the current user of
>the screen name isn't older than you? If he happens to be black, he
>might think about kicking your tired, old, white butt.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

>They never booked Milton Berle? How did you come to be in the know
>about what Mitzi Shore cares for?

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,

if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

2863. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:48:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417194826.08129.00000059@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65096

In article <3E9EB331.ACEEC53D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20030417001940.18971.00000136@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>>
>> > Since this is an Amateur Radio newsgroup and we are (supposedly, but
>not
>> >really) discussing things germane to Amateur Radio, who CARES if Morse
>Code
>> >is useful outside of Amateur Radio or not?
>> >
>> > I don't.
>>
>> Not a problem. Steamy Stalker hasn't known anything about
>> radio outside of amateur radio since he pounded his first beep
>> in the crib.
>
>N2EY:
>
>"No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
>ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
>infantile behavior."
>
>Dave K8MN

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

2864. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:48:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417194827.08129.00000060@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65091

In article <20030416231211.18878.00000077@mb-m18.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
(Vshah101) writes:

>From K4YZ:
>
>>I can't think of too many things in life that are a "do it once now or
>>forget about it forever" situation.
>
>Thats how the EE field /IT phenom works in this country. I cannot go back in
>time and get that IT job that I don't like (I like EE stuff).
>
>>But they DID choose it, and it WAS useful.
>
>Those Hams chose Morse code, because the hobby pressures them to do so.
>Outside of Ham radio, Morse code is not useful.

Robeson doesn't realize this last paragraph. Robeson hasn't
worked in radio communications outside of amateur radio.

2865. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:48:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417194828.08129.00000061@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65098

In article <20030417001940.18971.00000136@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/16/2003 10:12 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030416231211.18878.00000077@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>>From K4YZ:
>>
>>>I can't think of too many things in life that are a "do it once now or
>>>forget about it forever" situation.
>>
>>Thats how the EE field /IT phenom works in this country. I cannot go back in
>>time and get that IT job that I don't like (I like EE stuff).
>
> Vippy, if you want to work in IT, I can safely promise you that there
will
>be more opportunities if yo just keep your eyes open.
>
>>>But they DID choose it, and it WAS useful.
>>
>>Those Hams chose Morse code, because the hobby pressures them to do so.
>
>BBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! !
! ! ! !

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of his
self-importance...not to mention using the childish "BWAHA"
across the screen.

2866. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:48:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417194829.08129.00000062@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65099

In article <3E9EB4CA.D3009530@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E9DDDEF.500716DE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >> Do you have a record of "seven hostile actions," too?!?
>> >
>> >Watch it, Bub. During my war time service, I was at least stationed in
>> >the country where the conflict was taking place. I wasn't leaning on an
>> >equipment rack in a different country. I was drawing combat pay.
>>
>> You were a counterfeiter in a combat zone?
>>
>> Or did you just draw little pictures on paper money?
>>
>> Tell us all about your "combat experience," mighty warrior.
>>
>> Did you save an entire brigade of troops with your trusty
>> AN/PRC-25? Or was that someone else?
>>
>> Were you "behind enemy lines" sending intel via CW?
>>
>> How far "in-country" were you? Did you ever meet Jane
>> Fonda?
>>
>> Can you scan your medals and make them available at
>> e-images?
>
>N2EY:
>
>"No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
>ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
>infantile behavior."
>
>Dave K8MN

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,

if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

2867. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:48:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417194830.08129.00000063@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65097

In article <3E9EB46C.4C0CCB75@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> >> > Watch it, Bub. During my war time service, I was at least stationed
>in
>> >> > the country where the conflict was taking place. I wasn't leaning on
>an
>> >> > equipment rack in a different country. I was drawing combat pay.
>> >
>> >> I like the way you put that Dave.
>> >
>> >Leonard is quick to dismiss the military experiences of others,
>> >preferring to draw on his own rear echelon experiences of fifty years
>> >ago. Leonard doesn't play well with others.
>>
>> I don't play with those who EXAGGERATE either their
>> "combat experiences" or toss off a lot of bullshit about
>> their own "importance."
>
>You ARE one who exaggerates his own military experiences and who tosses
>off a lot of BS about your own importance.
>
>> Poor baby. Can't take any negativism whatsoever when he
>> is shown to be wrong about his illustrious State Department
>> experience in the cashew nut capital of Africa.
>
>I don't have to "take any negativism whatsoever" from a rear echelon
>type of fifty years ago who lives in the nut capital of America.
>
>> Now he has become a HE-Row of Vietnam?
>
>I served in Vietnam.
>
>> Hooo-WAH!
>
>"No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
>ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
>infantile behavior."
>

>Dave K8MN

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

2868. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:57:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdi7fj6.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 65005

On Tue, 15 Apr 2003 23:18:30 -0400, Geoff wrote:

> The FCC has no jurisdiction in this matter.

News for you - the FCC can take action against a FCC licensed amateur licensee who violates radio regulations in a foreign jurisdiction if those regulations can be tied to an international treaty binding upon the US, such as the International Radio Regulations or the Telecommunications Convention.

>Got a news flash for you. The U.S.
>Military right now IS the authority in Iraq. Meaning, the
>military command can authorize anything.

More news for you - there are standing orders and procedures binding upon all branches of the military as to when and where they may use non-government frequencies (amateur radio springs to mind) both inside and outside the US and for what MILITARY purposes. IIRC amateur frequencies may be used for MILITARY operational communications only.

Ham radio is not a military purpose, and my inquiry is whether the local commander has NOW been given the authority to authorize non-military communications unilaterally (they didn't have it when I did frequency coordination at the FCC).

"The military command can authorize anything" plays well on TV shows like JAG or Wings of Gold, but not in real life. There's LOTS of bureaucracy above the level of the local commander for non-military actions.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2869. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:57:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdi7r97.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 65006

On Tue, 15 Apr 2003 19:00:16 -0500, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>Not trying to be a smart alec here...but...since there is no actual
>government....and the only authority seems to be the US Military....I see no
>particular problem if the ham in question has a valid FCC license and the
>commander gives him the authority. Isnt the CO the defacto licensing
>authority in this case???

Only if the "book" has been changed to give him/her unilateral
authority to authorize non-military recreational radio use
(i.e. ham or CB radio) by members of the military - emphasis on
the non-military use.

IIRC they did not have this authority when last I worked in that area
of frequency coordination, hence the inquiry.

Let's see what they say now......

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2870. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:57:14 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdi7tk8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 65009

On 16 Apr 2003 06:53:32 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>Do you really want to deny access to a basically benign form of recreation
>to 75,000 men with rifles and a lot of adrenalline reserves?

I want to make sure that they play by the book like I have to
play by the book.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2871. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:57:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdi87o9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 65007

On Wed, 16 Apr 2003 08:03:18 -0400, Col Davis ret wrote:

> HA HA HA, I would love to see you tell this to
>Gen. Tommy Franks! Obviously, you have no idea
>of what a forward hot combat zone is all about. One
>thing is for sure, There are no tin horn bureaucrats to
>be found anywhere close to a hot combat zone.
>

It's the local commander's a** on the line if she or he is
doing something that the book says s/he can't and it's not a
military action with a military goal. You knew that all
along.

And we tinhorn bureaucrats have all the leisure in the world to
pick apart and examine such actions long after the fire stops
flying. That's what I do for a living and I do it well.

>Get a reality check!

A two-way street. I've been with both the military and
non-military sides of the Feds long enough to know both
systems.

>Col. F.H. Davis ret.
>Forward Recon, Special Forces
>Korea
>Grenada
>Viet Nam (6 tours)

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
FCC District Director ret.
Former Comm. Engineer - USAF SAC
Lots more fruit salad if needed

2872. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:57:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdi8aza.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 65008

On 16 Apr 2003 18:56:22 -0700, Brian wrote:

>> I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
>> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
>> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
>> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
>> to standing procedures binding upon the military.
>
>It's nice to see an amateur atempting to squash the spirit of amateur radio.
>
>Probably an attorney.

One of the better communications attornies around if I say so
myself. Rule compliance is my specialty and I've been on the
prosecution side as well as the defense side.

If I gotta play by the book, ev'one gotta play by the book.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2873. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:57:16 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdi945c.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 65010

On Thu, 17 Apr 2003 17:05:28 -0400, USMC retired wrote:

> Do you also participate in the anti-war marches?

Yes - I was one of the Federal officers doing surveillance
"snapping pictures and taking names" in the 1968-1970 demos.
That's the extent of MY "participation" in anti-war demos.

>I'd
>love to hear you blabber this crap to General Tommy Franks!
>Go spew your anti-military crap somewhere else.

What anti-military statements did I make, Sergeant? Never ever once.
I was assigned to and on duty in the SAC HQ Command Post when Pres.
Kennedy was shot. Where were you?

Read my other posts on this subject.

If I gotta play by the book. ev'body gotta play by the book.
Didn't they teach you that in leadership school?

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2874. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-17 23:57:16 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdi8sab.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 65011

On Thu, 17 Apr 2003 07:36:28 -0400, Korean Veteran wrote:

> Did you also participate in any of the anti-war
>demonstrations too?

Yes - I was one of the Federal officers doing surveillance
"snapping pictures and taking names" - in the 1968-1970 demos.
That was MY "participation" in anti-war demonstrations.

As far as this war goes, I have a vested interest - my family
was forced out of what is now Iraq by the Arab invasion of
Bavel in the 13th century and as things go in the Middle East
we have long memories for "setting things right".....our boys
and girls did good work.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2875. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 00:40:25 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7nhgf$2ri$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65012

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030417194813.08129.00000049@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article <20030417022300.18769.00000031@mb-m24.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >In article <20030416195345.18769.00000005@mb-m24.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >(N2EY)
> >writes:
> >
> >>>The practical limitation in computer Morse is the performance of the
> hardware
> >>>and software. With dedicated hardware, almost any speed is possible.
> >>>
> >>>In practice, however, there's the factor of radio conditions. Which is
why
> even
> >>>the early Baudot RTTY systems usually used FSK.
> >>
> >> No, not at all, Jimmie.
>
> >Len,
>
> >Is there a reason you make fun of people's names? Do you think people
will
> >respect you more if you insult them?
>
> >Here's a hint: People respect you less.
>
> Morsemen in here don't respect non-morsemen. That's a given.
>
> Poor babies get all upset when tables are turned. Boo hoo.
>
>
> >> Early RTTY systems of the 1930s era used FSK because that
> >> was the easiest way to get some kind of very fast keying on
> >> transmitters that couldn't do such fast on-off keying.
>
> >I don't believe you.
>
> You don't have to...you can disbelieve the entirety of earlier
> HF communications practice if you wish. You aren't forced to
> believe anyone. Continue on in blessed ignorance if you want.
>

> If you bother to research it, you will find out I'm right.
>
> That sticks in your craw, sport, but I can't help that.
>
> >I think you are giving us a snowjob.
>
> Nope. Research it yourself. You'll have to use Real Books,
> though. Google doesn't have it.
>
> >> The early TTYs were mechanical marvels but all were designed
> >> for wired applications..."Baudot" or not. 5-level early TTY code
> >> is not strictly "Baudot." In wired applications the loop current
> >> can be 30 to 60 mA, bipolar (Mark in one direction, Space in the
> >> other). Polar relays were common then (SPDT contacts, center
> >> off). Contacts were not heavy-duty nor high voltage (typically a
> >> loop supply was 150 VDC at most).
>
> >I know. Been there, done that.
>
> I don't believe you. :-)
>
> Describe the common tool used to adjust Western Electric
> polar relays and I might start acknowledging you thought
> you knew something about TTY loops. :-)
>
> >There were high speed Morse transmitters back in the 1930s and earlier.
Your
> >story does not compute. I don't believe it.
>
> You refuse to believe the truth.
>
> Look it up in the "Collins SSB Book," known by the official book
> title of "Single Sideband Principles and Circuits," by Pappenfus,
> Bruene, and Shoenike, McGraw-Hill 1964. Most of it is in the
> first chapter on radio communications history overview.
>
> >> Reception was no problem with an outboard FSK to TTY loop
> >> current converter. Better receive converters had AFC loops
> >> using mechanical servo tuning...some had separate Mark and
> >> Space loops to make certain neither was lost if the other end
> >> shifted their spread and/or drifted off frequency slightly.
>
> >I know.
>
> No, you don't. You've never worked in commercial HF comms
> or have any experience in anything but simple amateur radio
> stations.
>
> >> One of the first-ever time-division multiplexers was through a
> >> USN contract input-output converter operating digitally but

> >> with small 7-pin miniature thyratron tubes as memory elements.
>
> >Probably 5823s if they were cold-cathode or 2D21s if hot cathode. Or
their
> >military equivalents.
>
> Irrelevant factoid. You've never used one of those "Muxes"
> or have any idea of how they sound through a conventional
> HF receiver. Describe the whole Mux in detail and I'll see
> if it compares to the photo I took of one in operation.
>
> >> Existing FSK exciters and receiving converters could handle
> >> switching rates about 4 1/2 times normal TTY switching rates
> >> of 60 WPM machines. The polar relays had to be exchanged
> >> for vacuum tube equivalents; not really a problem since the
> >> polar relays were big enough and plug-in, plug-out so that
> >> adapters could be made to replace them. That time-MUX
> >> was operational about 1952 with the US military.
>
> >And these units cost how much?
>
> More than you could afford in the 1950s. :-)
>
> >> Commercial and military SSB already had frequency multiplexing
> >> through adapted wireline "carrier" equipment in the first (Dutch)
> >> SSB circuit on HF. Such TTY had tone pairs and used AFSK.
> >> Not a problem since the carrier bays had already been used on
> >> wireline circuits and were proven. Up to 12 TTY circuits could
> >> exist in a 6 KHz half of the 12 KHz bandwidth. That would be
> >> halved when pairing of tone pairs was used to overcome the HF
> >> phenomenon of "selective fading," one of the earliest methods
> >> of error correction and not possible with single-circuit "morse"
> >> telegraphy.
>
> >Sounds like you are merely repeating what I wrote earlier.
>
> Jimmie is CONFUSED. I repeated what *I* wrote earlier. :-)
>
> Jimmie, you've never used a commercial 12 KHz BW SSB
> transmitter in your life. Get over it.
>
> >Previously you wrote that 100 wpm was the minimum speed used for the past
four
> >decades. Now you're saying the conversion had begun by 1960.
>
> Both apply. You want to misdirect by leading off on a tangent
> for some EXACT DATE.
>
> I really don't care what hams did in RTTY four decades (plus minus)
> ago. Most that they could afford was surplus 60 WPM machines.

>
> Stop to think of WHY they were "surplus." They were surplus
> because they were REPLACED...by the higher-rate TTYs.
>
>
> >I know...
>
> >I don't believe you.
>
> >Sounds like a snowjob.
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Miccolis's views, they will
> be the target of his arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
> downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Miccolis's self-
> importance and experience...not to mention puerile pique.
>
> >Have you ever operated a 56 kb modem over an HF radio circuit 2.8 kHz
wide?
>
> Yes...one specifically designed for radio.
>
> >> I've actually operated what I described above.
>
> >Way back in the early 1930s, Len? Before you were even born? Were your
diapers
> >made from old chadless paper tape? ;-)
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Miccolis's views, they will
> be the target of his arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
> downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Miccolis's self-
> importance and experience...not to mention puerile pique.
>
> >You operated all of the above? I think you EXAGGERATE.
>
> >Or did you just operate some of it? Maybe just the modem?
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Miccolis's views, they will
> be the target of his arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
> downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Miccolis's self-
> importance and experience...not to mention puerile pique.
>
>
> I have far more experience with RTTY than you have with Morse code.
>

> Are you STILL snarling or have you taken lessons?
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Miccolis's views, they will
> be the target of his arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
> downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Miccolis's self-
> importance and experience...not to mention puerile pique.

Amazingly I have to agree with "Len over 21". His commentary of RTTY and Multiplex (Mux) operation is top shelf...and CORRECT.

Been there, but not to his extent.

Dan/W4NTI

2876. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 00:41:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9F4A33.FD9C2B16@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65013

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E9EB36A.3C409C86@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY:
> >
> >"No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
> >ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
> >infantile behavior."
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
> be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
> downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
> importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
> very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.
>
> That paragraph can be repeated ad nauseum if that is the mode
> decreed by Herr Robust of the Gang of Four. That isn't a good
> way to debate anything. However, the Lieder of the Gang of Four
> keeps on with that chorus in nauseating repetition. Childish
> behavior. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

You weren't debating. Why'd you snip your "debating technique in
replying, Leonard. Here you are in this one with the "Herr Robust",
"Gang of Four" stuff. You can't avoid fulfilling what the N2EY profile
says you do.

Dave K8MN

2877. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 01:03:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9F4EE6.F653E0E8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65014

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E9EE395.899A3EDC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <c2356669.0304160844.4512d9e7@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> >> (N2EY) writes:
> > >
> >> Do you have a granted patent in radio? I have. Just one.
> > >
> >You've regaled us with the tale so often that it seems like many more.
> > >
> >> [the bear shooter has only one, but not about radio...]
> > >
> >That's one each for the bear shooter and the bull shooter.
> > >
> >That brings up an interesting point. Weren't you the guy working safely
> >in the rear area during the Korean War who felt compelled to tell us
> >about they flying time for a Soviet Bear bomber to reach Tokyo? If I'm
> >not mistaken, that'd give you both the bear shooter and bull shooter
> >crowns.
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
> be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
> downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
> importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
> very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

From: Len Over 21 (lenover21@aol.com)
Subject: Re: 34 Years Ago Today
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-12-08 21:01:08 PST

"The distance between Chongjin, North Korea and Tokyo (where
I was assigned) is about 500 air miles. The distance between
Vladivostok, USSR, was about the same distance. That's about
an hour's flight in a Bear (NATO name for a Soviet bomber). Less
time of flight now with jet turbine aircraft."

There it is. Google knows.

Love your "I have a patent and you don't" routine, Leonard. You're a class act.

Dave K8MN

2878. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 01:05:14 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87k7dspqd1.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 65015

"USMC retired" <Gunny@halfthemxout.net> wrote:
>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>>
>> I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
>> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
>> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
>> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
>> to standing procedures binding upon the military.
>>
>> --
>> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>>
>>
>
> Do you also participate in the anti-war marches? I'd
>love to hear you blabber this crap to General Tommy Franks!
>Go spew your anti-military crap somewhere else.
>
>Sgt Maj Hornoff, USMC retired

Well, little doubt about why *you* were a jarhead.

I don't see any "anti-military crap" in the above quoted post.
What I do see is a mistaken idea that the FCC has anything to
do with

1) The US Government (military) use of radio spectrum
2) Use of radio spectrum outside the US
3) ARRL's regulation of it's DXCC award.

The simple fact is that a military commander on foriegn soil
can do whatever his superior officer says he can do. That is
indeed just exactly what an army is for.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

2879. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 01:15:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417211508.18767.00000016@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 65016

In article <20030417172338.18770.00000021@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030415194659.06680.00000346@mb-cv.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
>(Vshah101) writes:
>
>>From(N2EY)
>>
>>>FCC set up the structure that way, not hams.
>>
>>Refer to statements from FCC stating learning Morse code does not necesarily
>>make you a better operator.
>
>Which statements?

See FCC 90-53, 98-143, and 99-412.

An R&O, an NPRM, and an R&O.

Go direct to the FCC Reading Room in DC or on the web.

2880. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 01:15:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417211508.18767.00000015@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 65017

In article <XSEna.2655$Hy1.430028@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Even natural disasters (hurricanes, earthquakes, tornadoes, etc.) still
>cause sufficient breakdown or overload of normal communications that the
>assistance of hams will be badly needed.

Dee, I'd suggest you review some REAL disasters such as past earthquakes.

I've been through three very noticeable ones in the Los Angeles area, from 1971 to 1994. In the latest one, the Northridge Earthquake, ALL the primary power for an area of 10 million urban residents was suddenly gone...due to a fallen MHV tower that caused all local electric power stations to trip off the Pacific Intertie. That one happened at a bit after 4:30 AM on January 17, 1994.

LAPD and other cities' PDs functioned okay within minutes, having the plans, preparations, equipment for such things. LAFD and other cities' FDs functioned okay within minutes since they were similarly ready...all the engine companies rolled their vehicles, a standard drill even with small quakes. PDs and FDs all have leased landlines for intercommunication and alerting, planned that way. They can, and did function and roll to fires started by the quake. I witnessed one such from my backyard, very easy to see and hear (only a mile distant) in the dark stillness of the morning. All the area's PDs and FDs have VHF-UHF radio sets, many capable of operating on several frequencies for local netting.

Local hospitals all had emergency power, visible working evidence seen by various pools of light springing up in otherwise total darkness. That's a code, by the way. Local hospitals and local ambulance services are already netted together using VHF-UHF radios. Those nets work in conjunction with PDs and FDs.

Utility companies would bear the brunt of the most work in the immediate aftermath of the quake. They are also radio-equipped and netted-in. Utility headquarters have the telephone capability to call in their workers through the telephone system without being tied up in the crush of startled ordinary subscribers. It isn't known but is a fact that traffic overload on telco switching centers stops ordinary subscribers from calling out...doesn't stop certain subscribers from calling through to individuals. They could also use supervisors' autos (radio-equipped also) to individually alert

their workers by direct contact at their residences.

The Greater Los Angeles Emergency Center was already built and staffed in Center City area of L.A., was quickly activated with full staff as soon as they could arrive. They coordinated all the nets, including the nets which had no normal intercommunication and with such companies that did construction work on streets and buildings, various city agencies for utilities and aid needed for temporary housing, food, water.

The electric power people had a tough job, too, bringing an area of 10 MILLION back on-line from a complete power blackout. Such is called a "black start" in the power business and is NOT a normal thing. They had to both phase-in all the individual power companies to the Intertie and bring up various neighborhoods one by one to avoid the phasing problems. Except for damaged neighborhood feed systems, the entire area was back on-line by late afternoon.

Larger businesses and corporations helped in the communication problems through use of radio-equipped vehicles. That was also planned into the emergency preparedness. There was quite a bit of structural damage to buildings and roadways plus some ruptured gas pipelines on fire. While it taxed the available resources, those resources did come through from planning, organization, and drills.

In the early morning there was temporary shelters put up and the first wide-scale deployment of the FEMA video message board system (a fly-in system) in two local Valley locations. Those video bulletin boards provided instant readable H&W messages to/from locals and distant loved ones.

Some amateur radio local nets would have been useful, I'm sure, but the existing infrastructure of many agencies managed without them. There was no evidence in the local news media (all the radio and TV stations had their own emergency power) that amateur radio emergency teams functioned during the quake's first week.

2881. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 01:15:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417211510.18767.00000017@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 65018

In article <20030417154403.19020.00000072@mb-m25.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Stevie Stalker) writes:

>>Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>>Date: 4/17/2003 12:01 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <3E9EDDCF.D3D11A61@earthlink.net>
>>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>
>>> In article <20030415200650.11012.00000142@mb-fm.aol.com>, nocwtest@aol.com
>>(No
>>> CW Test) writes:
>>>
>>> >In article <20030415155041.04182.00000180@mb-fg.aol.com>,
>>lenover21@aol.com
>>> >(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>> >Tell us how it tasted, Len. And why you went back for seconds.....;-)
>>>
>>> Why should I tell any PLAGIARIST anything?
>>
>>A PLAGIARIST? What's been plagiarized--your lengthy treatise on your
>>amateur radio experiences?
>
> That's a laugh...From a guy who's "experiences" come from what he's
>cut-and-pasted from other websites...

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

> For sure! And I think Lennie should be dodging lightning bolts for his
>assailing another about "honor".
>
> Leonard H Anderson is one of the most cowardly, lying, dishonorable
>creeps I have ever known.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,

if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

> His attempts to embellesh his own military service by associating himself
>with Army KIA's in Korea was absolutely disgusting. There are more vile and
>evil things in the world (murderers, child molesters, etc), but after them,
>Lennie's right up there.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

> Lennie's very selective in who he chooses to invoke as "evidence" that
>he's right or "vindicated" But very rarely is he ever right.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

Get mental help, Robeson.

2882. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 01:27:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9F548C.93C26090@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65019

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E9EB2E2.CB03D72E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E9DDF86.6E07CA07@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >> Driving an automobile or even any vehicle has NOTHING to do
> >> >> with amateur radio licensing.
> >> >
> >> >Come to think of it, neither do you.
> >>
> >> Poor baby. Did I "upset your sensibilities" also?
> >
> >It is apparent from your response, poor baby, that I upset yours.
>
> Nah...just amused that a State Department trainee has
> to embelish his past of THIRTY YEARS AGO.

I'm not a State Department trainee. I did not embellish (it has two
"L's", Len) my past of THIRTY YEARS AGO.

> Or were you "fighting charlie" after 1973? :-)

My tour in Vietnam was 1970-71.

> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk, the in-country combat vet offended by not being
> >> able to shoot others down with words...
> >>
> >I'm not "the" in-country combat vet, I'm an in-country combat vet who
> >addressed one who is not an in-country combat vet. I'd think you'd be
> >used to being shot down with words by now.
>
> Not even scratched, big-time "combat vet shooter." :-)

I think you might have taken a direct hit, non-combat vet, bull shooter
:-)

> What does your alleged "combat vet" experience have to do
> with amateur radio policy?

Every bit as much as your military expertise as a non-combat type safely tucked away in Japan during the Korean conflict.

> You weren't ALSO "saving a whole brigade in 'Nam with your
> trusty PRC-25," were you?

No, I wasn't. Then again, I never mentioned brigades or PRC-25's. I never used any small QRP gear or any equipment in that frequency range.

> How about "behind enemy lines in 'Nam sending intel back
> via CW?" Before 1973, that is. :-)

> Where are your bona fide references to all this "combat"
> experience?

They'd be in my records.

> Engraved on your tongue? Or did you read
> about it in Pacific Stars & Stripes and wish you were in
> infantry in the jungle instead of being a USAF type hauling
> stock boxes around at a supply depot?

I never hauled stock boxes and never visited a supply depot.

> Did you go AWOL in-country to seek out and destroy
> charlie regardless of your military assignment?

No. Where'd you come up with such a simple notion?

> Not good,
> that. Not very diplomatic. Did State check up on your
> resume thoroughly or did you flumox them also with fast
> talk and arrogant air?

The federal law enforcement officers assigned to the Bureau of Diplomatic Security do a very thorough background investigation on each Department of State applicant. Updates to that BI take place at least every five years. Now, don't you feel like a complete fool?

> NARA probably has your REAL military record on file. You
> aren't worth the effort to message them or spend the postage.

I'm sure they do. I'm not sure they'd release it to Leonard H. Anderson but you can try if you can't control your curiousity.

Dave K8MN

2883. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 01:32:45 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87el40pp36.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 65020

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
>>Probably an attorney.
>
> One of the better communications attornies around if I say so
> myself. Rule compliance is my specialty and I've been on the
> prosecution side as well as the defense side.
>
> If I gotta play by the book, ev'one gotta play by the book.

You need to visit with your mother. Perhaps she can explain to
you the difference between law and justice. You apparently are
hung up on law, and have forgotten that the actual goal is
supposed to be justice.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

2884. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 01:45:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417214534.18759.00000046@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 65022

In article <b7m4dl$2cllo$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

> I (my opinion only) think there is a "lethargy" in amatuer radio as
>a whole.

Perhaps. There are other factors, too, like antenna restrictions.

>650,000 licenses out there??

686,000, to be exact.

>ALL bands should be hopping, 24
>hours a day, 7 days a week.

I agree! Time to do my bit.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2885. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 01:45:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417214535.18759.00000047@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 65023

In article <3E9EBC2A.79A1A2AC@crosslink.net>, Vito <vito@crosslink.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E9AFCD9.D8949D40@crosslink.net>...
>>
>> > What irks me is Morse - the requirement, not the mode.
>>
>> Do you really think that Element 1 is a big problem?
>
>If your hearing is impaired, yes.

Hearing impaired people have been passing the test for decades. Flashing light, vibrating speaker cone, different tones and volumes, etc. All kinds of accomodations are available.

>It's akin to putting up obsticals to
>keep cripples out of rest rooms to make more room for healthy people.

The same can be said for the written test.
>>
>> > I'd be downright
>> > PO'd if I showed up to see Old Faithful but had to prove I could start a
>> > fire with flint & steel in, say, 30 seconds befor I was allowed into the
>> > park.
>>
>> Not a very good analogy. Try this one:
>>
>> Should all driver's license tests include a test of ability to drive a
>> stick-shift car across an empty parking lot at not less than 5 mph?
>>
>No. Besides I like mine better.
>
Well, there you have it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2886. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 01:45:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417214536.18759.00000048@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 65021

In article <20030416210552.18878.00000067@mb-m18.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From N2EY:
>>> When ads for Hamfests have Morse code keyers in it, and a non-Ham asks >what
>>> those are, it does not look good for Ham radio.
>>
>>Why not?
>
>It looks like a bunch of grown up kids playing with their baby keyer toys.

If it makes them feel younger, that's a good thing.

After all, the only difference between men and boys is the price/size of their toys ;-)

>
>The non-Ham does know that Morse code is old, something unfortunately, a >large group of Hams does not know.
>
So what if it's old? The English language is old, and the alphabet we use with it even older.

Sailboats have been around for thousands of years. Are sailboats bad because they use an older technology?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2887. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 02:27:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417222748.18827.00000027@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65024

In article <3E9EDDCF.D3D11A61@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20030415200650.11012.00000142@mb-fm.aol.com>, nocwtest@aol.com
>(No
>> CW Test) writes:
>>
>> >In article <20030415155041.04182.00000180@mb-fg.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> >(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>> >Tell us how it tasted, Len. And why you went back for seconds.....;-)
>>
>> Why should I tell any PLAGIARIST anything?
>
>A PLAGIARIST? What's been plagiarized--your lengthy treatise on your
>amateur radio experiences?

Seems like my description of Len's behavior has been plagiarized, Dave ;-)
>
>> "No CW Test" was a screen name I used some years ago on
>> America Online and for messaging in here. I haven't used that
>> screen name for at least two years. AOL only reserves old
>> screen names for six months. After six months anyone can
>> use it.
>
>It looks like someone is using it.

"Use it or lose it"!
>
>> You've used it here without any respect whatsoever, trying to
>> ape the original screen name user. No supplementary ID at
>> all. Just blatant COPYING of what another has done. In the
>> media that is PLAGIARISM, boy.
>
>I've never heard of a case where three words run together constituted
>plagiarism. It looks more like an exerpt from some of your work.
>What's with the "boy" stuff? How do you know that the current user of
>the screen name isn't older than you? If he happens to be black, he
>might think about kicking your tired, old, white butt.

Dave, how do you know that the user is a male? Could be a woman. I don't recall
any mention of gender, age or ethnicity. Not that any of those things really

matter.
>
>> You are without honor, without respect for acts of plagiarism.
>
>I'm not certain about the honor portion but the guy does have a great
>sense of humor.

Guy?
>
>> >Back in my early days with the Rural Electrification Authority down in New
>> >Mexico, I had the job of bringing electricity to some of the larger Navajo
>> >outhouses and privies. They said it was the first time anyone had wired a
>> >head for a reservation.....
>>
>> You are also a racial bigot. No respect earned there, either.
>
>You've just used the term "boy" toward someone and you call him a racial
>bigot over the above joke?

Typical "do as I say, not as I do" Len behavior.

>I'd love to know where you find the bigotry
>in the joke. Nothing demeaning at all was said about American Indians.
>Privies aren't a racial stereotype of the North American Indian. We
>have plenty of 'em in this state but we're a little shy of North
>American Indians. Use of the names of North American Indians isn't an
>indication of racial bigotry. The term "reservation" isn't an indicator
>or racial bigotry. I'll mark this down as yet another in a long line of
>baseless rants posted by you.
>
>> If you wish to audition for the Comedy Store doing stand-up acts,
>> I can tell Mitzi Shore you are coming. Neither she nor the
>> audience cares for plagiarists who copy others' material.
>
>They never booked Milton Berle? How did you come to be in the know
>about what Mitzi Shore cares for?
>
Doesn't anyone think it's odd that Len attacked someone who has not opposed his
views on code testing?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2888. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 02:27:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417222749.18827.00000028@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65025

In article <20030417194813.08129.00000049@mb-m01.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>n article <20030417022300.18769.00000031@mb-m24.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20030416195345.18769.00000005@mb-m24.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>>
>>>>The practical limitation in computer Morse is the performance of the
>hardware
>>>>and software. With dedicated hardware, almost any speed is possible.
>>>>
>>>>In practice, however, there's the factor of radio conditions. Which is why
>even
>>>>the early Baudot RTTY systems usually used FSK.
>>>
>>> No, not at all, Jimmie.
>
>>Len,
>
>>Is there a reason you make fun of people's names? Do you think people will
>>respect you more if you insult them?

Well?
>
>>Here's a hint: People respect you less.
>
> Morsemen in here don't respect non-morsemen. That's a given.

It's a false statement.

Most people here don't respect YOU.
>
> Poor babies get all upset when tables are turned. Boo hoo.

Yes, you sure do cry and wail when the tables are turned on you.

>>I know.
>
> No, you don't.

Yes, I do.

> You've never worked in commercial HF comms
> or have any experience in anything but simple amateur radio

> stations.

How do you know what I have and have not done? You don't even know where I work, or where I have worked.

> Irrelevant factoid. You've never used one of those "Muxes"
> or have any idea of how they sound through a conventional
> HF receiver.

How do you know?

>>And these units cost how much?
>
> More than you could afford in the 1950s. :-)

More than you could afford, too!
>
>>Previously you wrote that 100 wpm was the minimum speed used for the past
>four
>>decades. Now you're saying the conversion had begun by 1960.
>
> Both apply. You want to misdirect by leading off on a tangent
> for some EXACT DATE.

No, I'm simply pointing out inconsistencies in your postings.

> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Miccolis's views, they will
> be the target of his arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
> downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Miccolis's self-
> importance and experience...not to mention puerile pique.

Looks like you've stooped to PLAGIARISM, Len!
>
>>Have you ever operated a 56 kb modem over an HF radio circuit 2.8 kHz wide?
>
> Yes...one specifically designed for radio.

I don't believe you.
>
>>> I've actually operated what I described above.
>
>>Way back in the early 1930s, Len? Before you were even born? Were your
>diapers
>>made from old chadless paper tape? ;-)
>
>>You operated all of the above? I think you EXAGGERATE.
>
>>Or did you just operate some of it? Maybe just the modem?

Interesting to note that you don't answer the question.
>

>I have far more experience with RTTY than you have with Morse code.

I don't believe you.

I do believe you have more RTTY experience than I do. And I KNOW I have more Morse code experience than you do.

In which case I will defer to and accept your statements on RTTY if and when you defer to and accept my statements on Morse code.

2889. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 02:43:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAC4DE78.172A8%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 65026

"Dave Heil" wrote:

> Jon talks about the no-fly zones; you respond
> about the operations in the no-fly zone and
> TURKEY.

Find the message he quoted when he mentioned the no-fly zones - the
overall topic was Syria, Turkey, and so on, not no-fly zones.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2890. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 02:47:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304171847.3e5e61a5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65027

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9E28D1.2997FC7D@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9DDC6D.CF4D5E13@earthlink.net>...
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > >
> > > > In article <20030415210105.06680.00000356@mb-cv.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
> > > > (Vshah101) writes:
> .
> > > >
> > > > >I meant having the test as a requirement is embarrassing to the hobby.
> > > > >When ads for Hamfests have Morse code keyers in it, and a non-Ham asks what
> > > > >those are, it does not look good for Ham radio.
> > > >
> > > > Those uptighters ought to inform the public that they think
> > > > US ham radio is all about "working DX on HF with CW."
> > >
> > > I've been informing the public that YOU believe that amateur radio is
> > > all about working DX on HF with CW. A number of them want to know what
> > > DX is, what HF is and what CW is. When I told some hams what you
> > > believe, they all wondered who Leonard H. Anderson is.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > And who Heil/K8MN is.
>
> That'd be silly. The hams hereabouts all know who I am.

You said, "the public." Now you say the local hams all know you. Which is it?

> > I told them that you showed up in my logs a couple of times, but I was
> > working so many at the time that I realy couldn't recall.
>
> Was that during your alleged DXpedition to Somalia, Brian?
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, I just checked my Somali logs again, and you're still not in them. Sorry.

2891. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 02:50:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304171850.345098d7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65028

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9E27D6.F7086B4E@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9DDF4F.736EC45C@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > Communication at near the speed of light and still you have nothing to
> > > say. :-) :-) :-(
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Yet you keep posting and posting and posting....
>
> With your record, I'd have thought you'd have had enough sense to keep
> mum on this one.
>
> Dave K8MN

With yout tit for every tat, what do you think your record might be?

2892. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 02:56:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304171856.1f6646bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65029

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E9EF377.E7B29DA@att.net>...

> Aw, come on, Dave. Not really.

The DICK speaks. And so it is written (in snow).

2893. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 03:01:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304171901.3e7f562f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65030

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2003.04.15.19.55.18.46259.8488@arrl.org>...
> On Tue, 15 Apr 2003 12:43:18 -0400, Brian Kelly wrote:
> > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > news:<pan.2003.04.13.18.06.39.331305.14016@arrl.org>...
>

Apologies for not responding to your rant with this rant sooner Jon, I
been busy.

God bless cheap bandwidth.

> But if there's not a moderate goverment in Kabul that's capable of
> controlling the country, what's to prevent the Taliban from regaining
> control? Or if not that, what prevents a regional warlord from hosting the
> Taliban and al Qaeda types in some corner of the country? If that happens,
> sure, we could go dig them out again, but how much better would it be not
> to have to do so?

A number of the warlords fought the Taliban tooth & nail after the
Afghans booted the Soviets and they're still into the effort. Does the
phrase "Northern Alliance" ring a bell? The reality of the matter is
that the history of Afghanistan going back to the days of the Mongol
hordes which invaded Afghanistan is a litany of failed attempts
internal and external to transform Afghanistan into a coherent nation
for any length of time. The numerous implications should be obvious.

> > With who doing the heavy lifting in the air which paved the way?
> > Remember the F-16 jock who ate bugs for a week to survive in the woods
> > after he got shot down? When was the last time NATO did anything which
> > we didn't lead? France kicked NATO out of Paris years ago and quit the
> > organization.
>
> Wasn't your complaint that they wouldn't participate?

No, my complaint was and is that NATO wouldn't have done a thing about
the problem if we hadn't led them by their noses. In other words they
would have sat around and "discussed" the problem to death intstead of
getting it solved and Milosovic would probably still be in power if
we'd just sat back and let them deal with it. Gets tiresome.

> > Those are "French internal affairs", having to inject themselves into
> > those squabbles are paybacks for their days as the colonial masters of
> > those countries.
>
> They don't *have* to. They could easily walk away from those problems and

> they deserve at least a little credit for not doing so.

OK, OK fer chrissake, ten points for the damned Frogs in their African
enclaves now let's move on. Sheeeesh.

> >> Except that we HAVE done just that in the past. Consider the Mexican
> >> War. The Spanish-American War. The Panama Canal. Invasion of the
> >> Dominican Republic (multiple times).
> >
> > C'mon, gimmee a break Jon, most of those go back well over a century
> > ago.
>
> Is there a statute of limitations? More to the point, what reason is there
> to think that things have changed?

What *hasn't* changed??!

> > You don't support the Monroe Doctrine?
>
> But, Brian, that was well over a century ago.

National doctrines are are not incidents and are forever unless
retracted or squashed, the Monroe Doctrine is still as valid today as
it was the day it was laid down.

> > You'd rather
> > Sweden & Belarus had a UN mandate to patrol our back porch?
>
> Why should anyone be patrolling it?

Start with the mess we'd have on our back porch today if we hadn't put
the clamps on Castro in 1960.

> Why did we need to foster a coup to
> eliminate the democratically elected government of Chile in 1973, for
> example?

Because Allende (sp?) was taking Chile toward Communism which was
clearly a threat to our hemisphere and our interests. Monroe Doctrine
again. We sank the Communist thrusts to overtake the fragile French &
Italian democracies after WW2 with dollars, we sank 'em in Chile with
the CIA. Same war, shifting fronts. In the end we won.

> Reject what you will, but that international adventurism of the past --
> including the not-so-distant past -- was all performed under the aegis of
> leaders we freely elected and with the same checks and balances in place.
> Some times it was done with the knowledge and support of the Americn
> people, some times it was not.

A very few and for the most part in a bunch of bush-league banana
republics.

Balance of powers in action: Dubya asked for $80bb for the war, all of
it for use at his discretion. Congress sed, "No George, here's a $15bb

slush fund for you and that's all you're getting." And they damned
near gave the rest to Colin. Yeah, the system works.

> > Based in their own sordid thousand year history of periodically mauling
> > each other. We don't have that genetic flaw. How long has it been since
> > we attempted to conquer and occupy Mexico or Canada?
>
> Substantially less than a thousand years.

It ain't happened yet, I guess that's "substantial" enough . .

> For that matter, how long as it
> been since we attempted (with success) to conquer and occupy the Indian
> nations?

Spare me willya Jon? Pick up on this one and harpoon me with it.

During WW2 the authorities locked up native born Japanese-American
citizens on the West Coast by the thousands for years without due
process.

Here's another harpoon for ya: Jefferson the Father of our
Constitution which proclaimed equality and justice for all had slaves.
How 'bout Tommy's DNA-documented cavorting with his pet slave between
the sheets? A relationship which was public knowledge back then . . .
Hell, Slick Willy was a nocode in comparison to The Father Our Nation.
A lousy blow job on the way home from work and a silly lie about it
and Willy almost got himself impeached. Yeah Jon, things have changed.

There ya are, now get it outta yer system.

Yes, our American ancestors did some awful things. By today's
standards. But in most instances not by their standards in those days.
The problem you're having is that you're not factoring in the enormous
changes in our thinking and values as a nation since those days as a
result of the political and ethical evolutions we've experienced.
Which are ongoing to this moment. Dredging up examples of crap we did
in Panama a hundred years ago has little or nothing to do with to do
with what we would do if we were in the same situations today.

> Are any of the European states that tried to invade one another operating
> today under the same form of government as they were at the time?
> Specifically, did any of them invade one another when their governments
> were democratic?

No. Who was it who "imposed" their current democracies on them?

> > They're a bunch of hypocrites. They can't past their own history and are
> > trying to "Euopeanize" us via rhetoric at the UN and in other channels.
>
> To this extent you're right: They're saying, "We KNOW what the end result
> of militarism is. We lived it in the 20th century. The US should learn
> from the European experience." You don't have to agree with them to
> recognize that their concern is based on experiences we've never had.

90% +/- of the generation which lived thru the horrors of WW2 let alone WW1 have passed away, few if any of the members of their current leadership had clue one abt what was going on around them then as kids. Putin was born seven years after the end of WW2. He and most of the others "lived" thru nothing more "brutal" than the Cold War.

And I second Dick's comment on this one.

And here they come again today:

Dubya: "OK, now lift the sanctions so that reconstruction can get underway".

Control Freaks: "We're really sorry George but we can't lift the sanctions until we have control over reconstruction".

In other words screw the Iraqui innocents who need the sanctions lifted right now.

This could be a the last straw.

> > The Kyoto Treaty debacle comes to mind here. To hell with 'em, let 'em
> > sink in their own socialist PC swamps.
>
> They seem to be doing quite well in their "swamps

Jon, have you checked the income tax rates in Germany & France recently? What do you suppose you'd have left of yer paycheck if you worked for the DARC instead of for the ARRL?

> Fortunately, we're not what we were the day after 4 July 1776. We now do a
> much better job of living up to the principles agreed to in the
> Declaration. There's still room for improvement, though.

And there always will be room for improvement.

> > Been there, done that. I did look at it from both sides. Going into the
> > diplomatic upheaval which preceeded the invasion I was 100% neutral WRT
> > to whether we should or should not go in without a mandate. I'm not a
> > hawk or a hardcore conservative. It was the behavior of the "bloc"
> > during those last days before we went in which put me squarely in the
> > pro-war camp.
>
> I don't understand that, Brian. If you were ambivalent about the war, wh
> would their opposition make you FOR the war? On the surface, it sounds
> like petulance.

Uh-huh. I'm really well known for my petulance. I explained it before. It became obvious that SH could very well have gone on thumbing his nose at the sanctions for another twelve years if we didn't step in. Note the terrorists our military has glomed in Iraq after SH swore Iraq didn't have anything to do with supporting terrorists and terrorism.

> That wasn't my question. Was war the ONLY way that could have been
> accomplished?

Yes. Per the demise of Hitler, Mussolini, Tojo and some lesser & later
demons here and there.

> That last part was happening before Iraq. I think Phil Kane has it right
> that probably having both Sharon and Arafat out of the picture would make
> it easier to find a solution (I'm paraphrasing). I'd settle for just
> having Arafat gone, though.

That would certainly be in the right direction. If I was Dubya I'd use
some of my new $15bb slush fund to "treat" the whole Likud bunch to an
all expenses paid one-year tour of the Falklands to get 'em outta the
way so that those who didn't win a berth on the trip could cut the
deal with the Palestinians.

> > Maybe the time has finally come to settle the the conflict which
> > triggered the destruction of the WTC and installed our troops in
> > Bagdhad. That would not be a bad output from our efforts of the past
> > three weeks eh?
>
> I'm skeptical. In the history of the Israeli-Palestinian problem the light
> at the end of the tunnel has appeared often, only to reveal itself
> repeatedly as the proverbial oncoming train. It will be interesting to see
> what the "road map" looks like when/if it gets revealed.

My tummy tells me that the time has arrived.

I'd much rather we had never gotten anywhere near any of it.

In violation of my own rules of engagement WRT doing what-ifs what do
you suppose the situation would look like if the world was looking to
Chiraq for his "road map" for the resolution of that conflict?

> > As far as the polls are concerned as of yesterday 70% of the U.S.
is
> > opposed to any more "premptive strikes" against anybody including
> > Syria. Dubya is not going to invade Syria. Period.
>
> Not today, sure. If he decides he needs to there will have to be a period
> of propaganda, ah, I mean explaining it to the American people to reverse
> those poll numbers. (Although, of COURSE the President doesn't make
> decisions based on polling data.)

He'd better listen to his daddy, Willy rode in on Daddy's lousy poll
nummers.

. . . I need a card from one of those new YIs . . . beep-beep.

>
> Jon

brian

2894. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 03:09:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAC4E4A8.172AA%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 65031

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> (snip) I understand what a contingency is (snip)

What contingency? Do you honestly believe our military felt the Iraqi soldiers were going to come running out in mass from the towns and cities they were pushed into, with only the MOAB to save our war? Nonsense.

> (snip) and I understand that the weapon was not
> used in towns and cities. (snip)

No, it wasn't. But the conflict was not over when that weapon was deployed, or when I first commented about that deployment. Regardless, the conflict is over, so continued discussion is rather moot - the military will have to wait until the next conflict to try out their new toy.

> I asked you if you had a problem with the weapon
> being deployed.

I thought that was fairly clear. In a war we justified by pointing to Iraq's supposed indiscriminate weapons of mass destruction, absolutely.

> I'm trying to understand your hand wringing,
> Dwight but I find it difficult. It looks to me
> as if you're grasping at straws.

There is no "hand wringing," Dave. I simply believe it is my right as an American to publicly ask questions about our military's intentions. Why the hand wringing over that?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2895. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 03:11:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E9F6D1C.3060907@adelphia.net>
Source record: 65039

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3E9EBC2A.79A1A2AC@crosslink.net>, Vito <vito@crosslink.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
>>
>>news:<3E9AFCD9.D8949D40@crosslink.net>...
>>
>>>>What irks me is Morse - the requirement, not the mode.
>>>
>>>Do you really think that Element 1 is a big problem?
>>
>>If your hearing is impaired, yes.
>
>
> Hearing impaired people have been passing the test for decades. Flashing light,
> vibrating speaker cone, different tones and volumes, etc. All kinds of
> accomodations are available.
>
>
>>It's akin to putting up obsticals to
>>keep cripples out of rest rooms to make more room for healthy people.

Ahh, I missed this in the original post. I AM hearting impaired, I have overall major hearing loss, and several 100 db holes in my hearing (that was the estimate from my testing). I have tinnitus in both ears, a different frequency in each. I depend on closed captioning, and I read lips. My hearing problems are just about untreatable, so I live with it.

Tough! I passed the test, just like everyone else, putting on the headphones and doing it. It took me longer to learn Morse code that the average person, but so what? I wear headphones, and can work every mode - thought I frighten the XYL with how loud I turn it up. One day she actually came in and asked me if I wasn't worried if I'd make myself deaf listening to it so loud. My reply was "DUH", and she was pretty red-faced.

Too many whiners these days!

- Mike -

2896. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 03:13:27 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417231327.18955.00000172@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65032

From (N2EY)

>>Secondly, Dee has came up with several reasons why many EEs don't homebrew.
>>Seems like endorsing that EEs should not homebrew.
>>
>Only to you. Dee and I were explaining, not advocating.

Listing several reasons why is advocating.

By the way, I counted calories today. I ate <a little over> 2,600 calories
today.
With this many calories, how could I say I "counted" calories?

Easy - at the end of the day, I noted what I ate, and "counted" it by adding up
the number of calories each food contains. It came out to be over 2,600.

No buffet today. (Otherwise, how could I calculate the number of calories I
ate?)

Yes, I did the math right. No, I'm not overweight (Nor am I very tall to be
able to eat that much).

I was just "explaining". I do not advocate that one do the same.

Tomorrow I'll have a HAM and cheese sandwich.

2897. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 03:17:48 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304171917.104503f3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65033

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030417022255.18769.00000025@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0304161752.28395836@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> HEY BURKIE! Hurry up and get your bags packed! Maybe you can GET IT
> >> RIGHT this time!
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Steve, I'd would have been proud to have served in Iraq. That would
> >make the 3rd SWA service medal for me.
> >
> >How many do you have? Would you consider it a hostile environment?
> >List your hostile envirnments, and don't BS us with your Buckeye
> >wives.
>
> Steamy the one-man schmuck can't detail his "hostile actions"
> since he has no reference for them. He is a blowhard braggart
> who didn't get out of the USMC with an Honorable Discharge.

Steve, has contacted me off-line. Very general and extremely vague
about one (not seven) possible deployments to the sandbox in the late
70's (to my knowledge) through the 80's until Desert Storm kicked off.
I know what the AF referred the operation, but don't know that it has
been declass. Live munitions and all.

That leaves at -least- 6 unexplained hostile actions.

Brian

2898. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 03:28:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304171928.34aca5a9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65034

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9EB36A.3C409C86@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <f45722ac.0304161752.28395836@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >> HEY BURKIE! Hurry up and get your bags packed! Maybe you can GET IT
> > >> RIGHT this time!
> > >>
> > >> Steve, K4YZ
> > >
> > >Steve, I'd would have been proud to have served in Iraq. That would
> > >make the 3rd SWA service medal for me.
> > >
> > >How many do you have? Would you consider it a hostile environment?
> > >List your hostile envirnments, and don't BS us with your Buckeye
> > >wives.
> >
> > Steamy the one-man schmuck can't detail his "hostile actions"
> > since he has no reference for them. He is a blowhard braggart
> > who didn't get out of the USMC with an Honorable Discharge.
>
> N2EY:
>
> "No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
> ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
> infantile behavior."
>
> Dave K8MN

Wow, Dave. It's telling where you stand on this issue. It makes me
wonder who's still smoking dope from the barrel of his M-16.

2899. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 03:32:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304171932.7bca65dc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65035

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030417152914.19020.00000069@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >Date: 4/17/2003 8:57 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3E9EB36A.3C409C86@earthlink.net>
> >
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <f45722ac.0304161752.28395836@posting.google.com>,
> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >>
> >> >> HEY BURKIE! Hurry up and get your bags packed! Maybe you can GET
> IT
> >> >> RIGHT this time!
> >> >>
> >> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >> >
> >> >Steve, I'd would have been proud to have served in Iraq. That would
> >> >make the 3rd SWA service medal for me.
> >> >
> >> >How many do you have? Would you consider it a hostile environment?
> >> >List your hostile envirnments, and don't BS us with your Buckeye
> >> >wives.
> >>
> >> Steamy the one-man schmuck can't detail his "hostile actions"
> >> since he has no reference for them. He is a blowhard braggart
> >> who didn't get out of the USMC with an Honorable Discharge.
>
> Dave...Whyathink an allegedly educated person like Lennie would make so
> brazen and obviously false statement like "...didn't get out of the USMC with
> an Honorable Discharge"...?!?!
>
> ESPECIALLY when it's so easily disproven...???
>
> Personally, I think he LOVES being humiliated in public...Why would a man
> (I am being gracious there) do so many things to draw NEGATIVE attention to
> himself otherwise?
>
> >N2EY:
> >
> >"No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.

> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
> >ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
> >infantile behavior."
>
> On the money, Jim.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Loosey, you got plenty O'splainin to do.

2900. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 03:46:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304171946.9e6942c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65036

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9C984F.C703F3F8@earthlink.net>...
> "Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" wrote:
> >
> > DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> > 2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> > League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> > British military personnel
> >
> > provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
> > officer.
> >
> > "There is precedent for this," Mills said, citing an operation during
> > the 1991 Gulf War. "These operators will need written authorization to
> > operate from their commanding officers
>
> I'm sitting here grinning from ear to ear. All of this, of course,
> reminds me of lengthy tale of an alleged operation from Somalia.
>
> Dave K8MN

Grin away, it only makes you look simple.

You said a military commander cannot authorize ANY amateur operation. Hmmm?

Keep grinning from ear to Rear ... as you are shown to be wrong.

Take it up with GW and Tommy if you've got a problem with it.

2901. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 03:52:12 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030417235212.18955.00000173@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65037

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Perhaps I should take a break from digital modes
>and dust off my Bencher paddles!

Technically, Morse code is a digital mode.

2902. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 03:56:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304171956.1c4eccf4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65038

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9CC8CC.364D78AF@earthlink.net>...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3E9C984F.C703F3F8@earthlink.net...
> > > "Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> > > > 2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> > > > League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> > > > British military personnel
> > > >
> > > > provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
> > > > officer.
> > > >
> > > > "There is precedent for this," Mills said, citing an operation during
> > > > the 1991 Gulf War. "These operators will need written authorization to
> > > > operate from their commanding officers
> > >
> > > I'm sitting here grinning from ear to ear. All of this, of course,
> > > reminds me of lengthy tale of an alleged operation from Somalia.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Not trying to be a smart alec here...but...since there is no actual
> > government....and the only authority seems to be the US Military....I see no
> > particular problem if the ham in question has a valid FCC license and the
> > commander gives him the authority. Isnt the CO the defacto licensing
> > authority in this case???
>
> That's the usual case, Dan. In N0IMD's case, he didn't think it
> important to have the permission in writing for operating from Somalia.
> He says he operated on a verbal OK.
>
> Dave K8MN

In K8MN's case, he said that no military commander can authorize any
amateur radio activity. Just ask him if he said that. He will
confirm it.

Brian

2903. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 04:36:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9F80DE.9245BE44@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65040

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> > Jon talks about the no-fly zones; you respond
> > about the operations in the no-fly zone and
> > TURKEY.
>
> Find the message he quoted when he mentioned the no-fly zones - the
> overall topic was Syria, Turkey, and so on, not no-fly zones.
>
Look, Dwight, the northern no-fly zone was being discussed as it
effected both Turkey and Syria. I commented upon it. I provided the
quotes which you earlier snipped. Damned if you didn't snip them again.

I'll let you get back to your hand-wringing.

Dave K8MN

2904. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 04:40:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9F81AE.7B980F6A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65041

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9E28D1.2997FC7D@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9DDC6D.CF4D5E13@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > In article <20030415210105.06680.00000356@mb-cv.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
> > > > > (Vshah101) writes:
> > .
> > > > > >
> > > > > >I meant having the test as a requirement is embarrassing to the hobby.
> > > > > >When ads for Hamfests have Morse code keyers in it, and a non-Ham asks what
> > > > > >those are, it does not look good for Ham radio.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Those uptighters ought to inform the public that they think
> > > > > US ham radio is all about "working DX on HF with CW."
> > > > >
> > > > I've been informing the public that YOU believe that amateur radio is
> > > > all about working DX on HF with CW. A number of them want to know what
> > > > DX is, what HF is and what CW is. When I told some hams what you
> > > > believe, they all wondered who Leonard H. Anderson is.

> > > And who Heil/K8MN is.
> > >
> > That'd be silly. The hams hereabouts all know who I am.
>
> You said, "the public." Now you say the local hams all know you. Which is it?

You don't read well.

> > > I told them that you showed up in my logs a couple of times, but I was
> > > working so many at the time that I realy couldn't recall.
> > >
> > Was that during your alleged DXpedition to Somalia, Brian?

> Dave, I just checked my Somali logs again, and you're still not in them. Sorry.

I don't even know that they exist, Brian. If they do, you have no proof
that you were given permission to operate. Finally, I have it confirmed
on multiple bands. Sorry.

Dave K8MN

2905. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 04:40:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418004046.18769.00000032@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65044

In article <3E9F4A33.FD9C2B16@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>You weren't debating. Why'd you snip your "debating technique in
>replying, Leonard. Here you are in this one with the "Herr Robust",
>"Gang of Four" stuff. You can't avoid fulfilling what the N2EY profile
>says you do.
>
>Dave K8MN

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

2906. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 04:40:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418004047.18769.00000033@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65042

In article <3E9F4EE6.F653E0E8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>There it is. Google knows.
>
>Love your "I have a patent and you don't" routine, Leonard. You're a
>class act.
>
>Dave K8MN

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

2907. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 04:40:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418004048.18769.00000034@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65043

In article <b7nhgf$2ri$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Amazingly I have to agree with "Len over 21". His commentary of RTTY and
>Multiplex (Mux) operation is top shelf...and CORRECT.
>
>Been there, but not to his extent.

Thank you, Dan. I think you did more than you mention.

You did military communications. The methods changed
by the time I got my Honorable in 1960. TTY was still the
mode of choice for written communications for the next
decade-plus.

In 1963 the USAF took over the entire HF, torn-tape relay,
microwave linking from the US Army at what had been ADA.
USAF had its own HF comm nets going and expanded what
had been ADA. Few of the old WW2 equipments stayed
around and more high-power SSB (12 KHz BW) was added.
More Muxes were added to the control center and USAF
started conversion to 100 WPM TTYs. Message throughput
increased with USAF handling both the Army and AF comm
needs. By 1978 USAF gave land and buildings back to the
Japanese...end of an era.

Field radio morphed from GRC-26 huts into Troposcatter and
the combo wireline-radio radio-relay systems used in Vietnam
(at least three varieties). By the start of the first Gulf War the
field communications resembled a digital data exchange and
the Model 33s had given way to data terminals and line
printers plus local message group storage in disk. With the
start of operational use of the SINCGARS in 1989, the old
PRC-77s gave way to low-VHF frequency hoppers, something
quite complete by Operation Iraqi Freedom. About a quarter
million SINCGARS radio sets had been made by March 2003,
most by ITT, Fort Wayne, the rest by General Dynamics Land
Division (now disbanded).

The military communications scene of today is VASTLY
different than in my time of service, yet so few hams know of
it or even how it was back in the first half of the 1950s. Still,
what was used before WW2 was carried through to post-WW2,
including TTYs for majority of all military messaging done in both
periods. In all periods thereafter, the military communications
methods are extensions of the old systems, modernized and

even transmuted into much more golden methods in both
hardware and software. It's kind of shame that such information
isn't carried through to radio amateur publications.

2908. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 04:42:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9F822A.7426CDAA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65045

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9E27D6.F7086B4E@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9DDF4F.736EC45C@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > Communication at near the speed of light and still you have nothing to
> > > > say. :-) :-) :-(
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Yet you keep posting and posting and posting....
> >
> > With your record, I'd have thought you'd have had enough sense to keep
> > mum on this one.

> With yout tit for every tat, what do you think your record might be?

I'd have thought you'd have had enough sense to keep mum on this one
too.

Dave K8MN

2909. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 04:51:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9F84A3.74E20AB4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65046

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) I understand what a contingency is (snip)
>
> What contingency? Do you honestly believe our military felt the Iraqi
> soldiers were going to come running out in mass from the towns and cities
> they were pushed into, with only the MOAB to save our war? Nonsense.

I honestly believe that our military doesn't take many chances. There's
always a contingency plan.

>
> > (snip) and I understand that the weapon was not
> > used in towns and cities. (snip)
>
> No, it wasn't. But the conflict was not over when that weapon was
> deployed, or when I first commented about that deployment. Regardless, the
> conflict is over, so continued discussion is rather moot - the military will
> have to wait until the next conflict to try out their new toy.

Then why are you still trying to argue a point?

> > I asked you if you had a problem with the weapon
> > being deployed.
>
> I thought that was fairly clear. In a war we justified by pointing
> to Iraq's supposed indiscriminate weapons of mass destruction,
> absolutely.

The MOAB is a conventional weapon.

> > I'm trying to understand your hand wringing,
> > Dwight but I find it difficult. It looks to me
> > as if you're grasping at straws.

> There is no "hand wringing," Dave. I simply believe it is my right as an
> American to publicly ask questions about our military's intentions. Why the
> hand wringing over that?

I'm not the one doing the Chicken Little routine, Dwight. I'm quite
comfortable with what our military did and the way it was undertaken.
You've voiced your opinion. I think that opinion is silly.

Dave K8MN

2910. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 04:59:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9F868F.E926046@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65047

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9EB36A.3C409C86@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <f45722ac.0304161752.28395836@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >> HEY BURKIE! Hurry up and get your bags packed! Maybe you can GET IT
> > > >> RIGHT this time!
> > > >>
> > > >> Steve, K4YZ
> > > >
> > > >Steve, I'd would have been proud to have served in Iraq. That would
> > > >make the 3rd SWA service medal for me.
> > > >
> > > >How many do you have? Would you consider it a hostile environment?
> > > >List your hostile envirnments, and don't BS us with your Buckeye
> > > >wives.
> > >
> > > Steamy the one-man schmuck can't detail his "hostile actions"
> > > since he has no reference for them. He is a blowhard braggart
> > > who didn't get out of the USMC with an Honorable Discharge.
> >
> > N2EY:
> >
> > "No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> > government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> > amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> > Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
> > ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
> > infantile behavior."

>
> Wow, Dave. It's telling where you stand on this issue. It makes me
> wonder who's still smoking dope from the barrel of his M-16.

You mean my opinion that Len acts like a first class jerk? Yeah, I love
the part where he tells someone else that they act like a blowhard
braggart. Isn't the part where he lives up to the N2EY profile in
making unsubstantiated statements about Steve's discharge a class act?
Len will tell you that he's only here to engage in civil debate over the
code testing issue. His behavior is consistently very different from
that stated goal.

Dave K8MN

2911. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 05:04:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9F87C2.9C40737D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65048

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9C984F.C703F3F8@earthlink.net>...
> > "Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" wrote:
> > >
> > > DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> > > 2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> > > League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> > > British military personnel
> > >
> > > provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
> > > officer.
> > >
> > > "There is precedent for this," Mills said, citing an operation during
> > > the 1991 Gulf War. "These operators will need written authorization to
> > > operate from their commanding officers
> >
> > I'm sitting here grinning from ear to ear. All of this, of course,
> > reminds me of lengthy tale of an alleged operation from Somalia.

> Grin away, it only makes you look simple.

I'm grinning. You'd be the simple one. I have documentation for each
of my operations from foreign soil.

> You said a military commander cannot authorize ANY amateur operation. Hmmm?

Did I?

> Keep grinning from ear to Rear ... as you are shown to be wrong.

I didn't allege that I had permission to operate an amateur radio
station from Somalia. You did.

> Take it up with GW and Tommy if you've got a problem with it.

Why? Did either one of them bootleg from Somalia?

Dave K8MN

2912. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 05:29:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418012916.18821.00000008@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 65049

In article <3E9F548C.93C26090@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>The federal law enforcement officers assigned to the Bureau of
>Diplomatic Security do a very thorough background investigation on each
>Department of State applicant. Updates to that BI take place at least
>every five years. Now, don't you feel like a complete fool?

No, the FBI should. Does the surname "Hansen" mean anything
to you? He was IN the FBI.

>> NARA probably has your REAL military record on file. You
>> aren't worth the effort to message them or spend the postage.
>
>I'm sure they do. I'm not sure they'd release it to Leonard H. Anderson
>but you can try if you can't control your curiousity.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

2913. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 05:29:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418012917.18821.00000009@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 65050

In article <f45722ac.0304171917.104503f3@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Steamy the one-man schmuck can't detail his "hostile actions"
>> since he has no reference for them. He is a blowhard braggart
>> who didn't get out of the USMC with an Honorable Discharge.
>
>Steve, has contacted me off-line. Very general and extremely vague
>about one (not seven) possible deployments to the sandbox in the late
>70's (to my knowledge) through the 80's until Desert Storm kicked off.
> I know what the AF referred the operation, but don't know that it has
>been declass. Live munitions and all.
>
>That leaves at -least- 6 unexplained hostile actions.

A few in here have their "gotta get it in writing" erection fully deployed.

Until there is public record of ALL 7 hostile actions BY the military,
all of the claims are just claims and vaporous BS.

...and that's just the way it stands.

2914. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 05:29:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418012918.18821.00000010@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 65101

In article <20030417222749.18827.00000028@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>> You've never worked in commercial HF comms
>> or have any experience in anything but simple amateur radio
>> stations.
>
>How do you know what I have and have not done? You don't even know where I
>work, or where I have worked.

You've never worked in commercial HF comms
or have any experience in anything but simple amateur radio
stations.

Had you actually done any, you would have talked about it. You
didn't. At most you mentioned some amateur radio stuff, nothing
more.

>> Irrelevant factoid. You've never used one of those "Muxes"
>> or have any idea of how they sound through a conventional
>> HF receiver.
>
>How do you know?

Had you ever done that, you would have remarked on it. You
didn't and don't.

>No, I'm simply pointing out inconsistencies in your postings.

Nope. You've got your pique all in a dander and are searching
for a way in to a misdirection and argument.

You've never done commercial HF communications in your life
outside of ham radio and you certainly did NOT do any
military communications. You were never in the military.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Miccolis's views, they will
be the target of his arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Miccolis's self-
importance and experience...not to mention puerile pique.

>I don't believe you.

>Interesting to note that you don't answer the question.

>I don't believe you.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Miccolis's views, they will
be the target of his arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Miccolis's self-
importance and experience...not to mention puerile pique.

>I do believe you have more RTTY experience than I do.

Far, far more.

>And I KNOW I have more Morse code experience than you do.

You don't know what I've done in radio since before you were
born. :-)

>In which case I will defer to and accept your statements on RTTY if and when
>you defer to and accept my statements on Morse code.

You are NOT in any position to DEMAND anything in here, boy.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Miccolis's views, they will
be the target of his arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Miccolis's self-
importance and experience...not to mention puerile pique.

2915. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 05:34:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9F8E69.FBEFBDB1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65102

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9CC8CC.364D78AF@earthlink.net>...
> > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3E9C984F.C703F3F8@earthlink.net...
> > > > "Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> > > > > 2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> > > > > League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> > > > > British military personnel
> > > > >
> > > > > provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
> > > > > officer.
> > > > >
> > > > > "There is precedent for this," Mills said, citing an operation during
> > > > > the 1991 Gulf War. "These operators will need written authorization to
> > > > > operate from their commanding officers
> > > >
> > > > I'm sitting here grinning from ear to ear. All of this, of course,
> > > > reminds me of lengthy tale of an alleged operation from Somalia.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Not trying to be a smart alec here...but...since there is no actual
> > > government....and the only authority seems to be the US Military....I see no
> > > particular problem if the ham in question has a valid FCC license and the
> > > commander gives him the authority. Isnt the CO the defacto licensing
> > > authority in this case???
> >
> > That's the usual case, Dan. In N0IMD's case, he didn't think it
> > important to have the permission in writing for operating from Somalia.
> > He says he operated on a verbal OK.

> In K8MN's case, he said that no military commander can authorize any
> amateur radio activity. Just ask him if he said that. He will
> confirm it.

Here you go, Brian. These quotes might jog your memory about what took
place.

From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
Subject: Re: DSP vs human decoding of OOK CW
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-08-01 11:42:56 PST

"Is it a lame assertion if your operation doesn't count toward DXCC and the "authority" granting you permission to operate had no right to do so? Surely you knew that as a self-proclaimed moral and ethical man that your actions were neither moral nor ethical."

From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-08-03 06:20:14 PST

"No, I say that a commander might grant authorization which is not his to grant. I say that higher-ups might not approve of such authorization. I say that the DXCC desk might not credit such operation. What has the DXCC desk said about your operation from Somalia? Have you found if it counts or not?"

From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-08-09 22:05:19 PST

"Ah Ah, Brian. I've questioned whether your commander had the authority to do so. I've also asked if you obtained "written permission". So far, you've just played dodge ball with the question. I've repeatedly asked if your operation was accepted for DXCC credit."

It's only a small issue since the message we've seen about GI's operating from Iraq requires written permission. Obtaining writtern persmission never crossed your mind during your time in Somalia.

Thanks for the giggles.

Dave K8MN

2916. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 05:41:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E9F8FF6.178EA1ED@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65103

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E9F548C.93C26090@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >The federal law enforcement officers assigned to the Bureau of
> >Diplomatic Security do a very thorough background investigation on each
> >Department of State applicant. Updates to that BI take place at least
> >every five years. Now, don't you feel like a complete fool?
>
> No, the FBI should. Does the surname "Hansen" mean anything
> to you? He was IN the FBI.

I wasn't in the FBI, Len. The Department of State's Diplomatic Security
officers aren't in the FBI either. Does the name "Aide" mean anything
to you? He went to our church back in the sixties.

> >> NARA probably has your REAL military record on file. You
> >> aren't worth the effort to message them or spend the postage.
> >
> >I'm sure they do. I'm not sure they'd release it to Leonard H. Anderson
> >but you can try if you can't control your curiousity.
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
> be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
> downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
> importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
> very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

You've plagiarized the profile. Why not see if you can find someone
who'll teach you how to use it?

Dave K8MN

2917. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 06:05:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418020511.19054.00000085@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65104

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>Date: 4/17/2003 8:05 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <87k7dspqd1.fld@barrow.com>

>The simple fact is that a military commander on foriegn soil
>can do whatever his superior officer says he can do. That is
>indeed just exactly what an army is for.

Not under the current "circumstances" that Prsident Bush sent the Armed Forces into Iraq for, Floyd.

He SPECIFICALLY and REPEATEDLY stated that our "sole" purpose was to depose SH and "liberate" the Iraqi people, and to allow them to take control of their own detiny and country.

While as a Ham I am excited about the prospect of seeing more activity coming from the Middle East, as a US Citizen I have to be concerned that our business in Iraq is OTHER than what the President stated.

An Army is NOT for the purpose of usurping international law. Indeed, we have entered Iraq under force of arms for the stated purpose of UPHOLDING the law, to wit the UN mandates for the disarmament of Iraq.

So...Do we beleive our leaders, and then expect them to do what they say? Or do we "believe" it until it doesn't suit us any longer?

Steve, K4YZ

2918. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 06:09:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418020939.19054.00000086@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65105

>Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/17/2003 10:13 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030417231327.18955.00000172@mb-m02.aol.com>

>By the way, I counted calories today. I ate 2,600 calories

Glad to hear it! Keep it up! As long as people keep doing this, I am
assured a job!

>Yes, I did the math right. No, I'm not overweight...(SNIP)

You're on your way, Vipul.

>Tomorrow I'll have a HAM and cheese sandwich.

PNP or NPN...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2919. Re: At The End Of The Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 06:37:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418023742.19054.00000089@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65106

>Subject: Re: At The End Of The Day
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/17/2003 6:48 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030417194819.08129.00000051@mb-m01.aol.com>

>Stevie wrote in here that he left the USMC on a medical discharge.
> Later he "amended" that to say "it was changed to an honorable."

Lennie has his "facts" wrong...again.

Sorry Lennie...it's been "Honorable" from Day One. oua re free to ask the
VA about it, if you care.

>Wonderful. Then you came in here and threw it all away.

No. It recycles every day. That's the beauty of it.

>This newsgroup is about AMATEUR RADIO POLICY...(SNIP)

You may stuff it, Your Impotentness. Everyone here sees how you adhere to
your own "direction" on newsgroup content. Usual "Do What I Say, Not Do What I
Do" rhetoric.

More lying from somone whose experience should make them one of the most
trusted...Not most humiliating...

>I've never checked NARA for Stevie's records. He said FIRST he
> had a medical, then later backtracked to say it was "amended"
> to honorable.

Sorry Lennie. I never "backtracked" anything.

>I don't "embellish" anything of my military record. All that I've said
> in here is verifiable through third-party, disinterested sources.

The only thing in here that's "disinterested" is you...Disinterested in
facts...Disinterested in truth...Disinterested in honor.

>I HONORED the 23 killed from the 71st Signal Service Battalion in
> the Korean WAR.

Sure you did...AFTER you got caught trying to polish your brass on them.

Coward.

>Stevie is licensed as a PRIVATE PILOT. That isn't commercial,
> it certainly isn't military. Stevie's list of aircraft he has flown are
> all in the "light" general aviation category.

And nothing is anything other than what I stated...Just facts,
Lennie...verifyable facts.

> Stevie is a civilian nurse, not a doctor, cannot practice medicine
> like a REAL medical doctor. My sister-in-law is a licensed nurse,
> a wonderful person but doesn't claim to be any kind of medical
> "expert."

One more opportunity for Lennie to "quote" where I EVER said I was a
"medical expert". Of course we'll add it to the pile of OTHER opportunities
Lennie has been provided to "disprove" what others have stated, but has failed
to do.

>Stevie's "radio license" is for AMATEUR RADIO...as is nearly
> all of his "30 years operating experience." Amateurism.
> "Practicality" limited to allocated amateur modes/modulations
> which are a tiny part of all those available to the rest of the radio
> world.

Sorry Lennie. You're a day late and a dollar short again.

>> Lennie can not claim any of that.
>
> True. I cut short my private pilot lessons for economic reasons.

Yet you profess to know more than I in matters of practical aeronautical
navigation. The other day you insisted that CAP is flying T-6's, and demanded
to know what aircraft I am current in. I told you and asked you what aircraft
YOU are current in.

You failed to repsond.

Another grand exclusion, I am sure.

> I've never had any desire to be a nurse.

Thank God. Now if we could just get rid of HMO's...

> I've never tried to get an
> amateur radio license, just got a commercial license, one as a
> First Class Radiotelephone Operator.

Then yoU HAVEN'T ahd a GROL?

>>Oh yes, he can cut-and-paste from a
>>great many websites, including ones on medical and nursing topics, but at
>the
>>end of the day, he's DONE none of it.
>
> I'm not licensed to practice medicine. Neither is Stevie (nurses
> cannot do that in lieu of a licensed physician).

I need to be an MD to cite from a website...?!?!

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! !

>>> During his "career" in electronics, Lennie caused RF to be generated,
>but
>>what did he do with it? Obviously making friends was low on the priority
>list.
>
> Oh? :-)
>
> Allan Walston, W6MJN, an old friend, was best man at my wedding.
> Jim Hall, KD6JG, is an old friend and our host at his beautiful home
> in central California in 2001...he was my immediate-level manager
> at RCA Corporation and later a senior staffer at Rocketdyne where
> some of us migrated to after RCA Corporation was dissolved.

TWO..?!?! Including your Army buddy makes THREE..?!?!

BBBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! !

> My list of friends is rather large, but few of them are licensed in
> amateur radio. Stevie would never ever make that list.

Another reason to add thanks to my prayers tonight.

And you only served to acknowledge my assertions about what you HAVEN'T
done with a radio license...

> So yes...at the end of the day when it's all said and done, Lennie is
>just
>>a loser, and losers are a dime a dozen.
>
> I'm retired. So is my wife. Together we have nice residences and
> a comfortable income, no debts, no mortgage. Our respective
> health conditions are rather good. That's priceless.

That you think you are getting anywhere with your lying rhetoric and
demeaning conduct in here is priceless, Lennie.

It's the end of another day, Lennie...What did YOU do...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

2920. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 10:42:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304180242.537c6793@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65107

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9F8E69.FBEFBDB1@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9CC8CC.364D78AF@earthlink.net>...
> > > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3E9C984F.C703F3F8@earthlink.net...
> > > > > "Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> > > > > > 2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> > > > > > League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> > > > > > British military personnel
> > > > > >
> > > > > > provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
> > > > > > officer.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "There is precedent for this," Mills said, citing an operation during
> > > > > > the 1991 Gulf War. "These operators will need written authorization to
> > > > > > operate from their commanding officers
> > > > > >
> > > > > I'm sitting here grinning from ear to ear. All of this, of course,
> > > > > reminds me of lengthy tale of an alleged operation from Somalia.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > Not trying to be a smart alec here...but...since there is no actual
> > > > government....and the only authority seems to be the US Military....I see no
> > > > particular problem if the ham in question has a valid FCC license and the
> > > > commander gives him the authority. Isnt the CO the defacto licensing
> > > > authority in this case???
> > >
> > > That's the usual case, Dan. In N0IMD's case, he didn't think it
> > > important to have the permission in writing for operating from Somalia.
> > > He says he operated on a verbal OK.
> >
> > In K8MN's case, he said that no military commander can authorize any
> > amateur radio activity. Just ask him if he said that. He will
> > confirm it.
> >
> Here you go, Brian. These quotes might jog your memory about what took
> place.

>
> From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> Subject: Re: DSP vs human decoding of OOK CW
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: 2002-08-01 11:42:56 PST
>
> "Is it a lame assertion if your operation doesn't count toward DXCC and
> the "authority" granting you permission to operate had no right to do
> so? Surely you knew that as a self-proclaimed moral and ethical man
> that your actions were neither moral nor ethical."
>
>
> From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: 2002-08-03 06:20:14 PST
>
> "No, I say that a commander might grant authorization which is not his
> to grant. I say that higher-ups might not approve of such
> authorization. I say that the DXCC desk might not credit such operation.
> What has the DXCC desk said about your operation from Somalia? Have you
> found if it counts or not?"
>
> From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: 2002-08-09 22:05:19 PST
>
> "Ah Ah, Brian. I've questioned whether your commander had the authority
> to do so. I've also asked if you obtained "written permission". So
> far, you've just played dodge ball with the question. I've repeatedly
> asked if your operation was accepted for DXCC credit."
>
> It's only a small issue since the message we've seen about GI's
> operating from Iraq requires written permission. Obtaining writtern
> persmission never crossed your mind during your time in Somalia.
>
> Thanks for the giggles.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, that's nice of you quote yourself -after- your education of operating from a country without a government. Your first pass at it claimed a commander had no authority to authorize anything to do with amateur radio.

Keep giggling, it makes you look even more simple. Better yet, why not go work some more Frenchmen (out of band) on 6M?

2921. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 10:48:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304180248.79f4beae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65108

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9F87C2.9C40737D@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9C984F.C703F3F8@earthlink.net>...
> > > "Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> > > > 2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> > > > League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> > > > British military personnel
> > > >
> > > > provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
> > > > officer.
> > > >
> > > > "There is precedent for this," Mills said, citing an operation during
> > > > the 1991 Gulf War. "These operators will need written authorization to
> > > > operate from their commanding officers
> > >
> > > I'm sitting here grinning from ear to ear. All of this, of course,
> > > reminds me of lengthy tale of an alleged operation from Somalia.
> >
> > Grin away, it only makes you look simple.
> >
> I'm grinning. You'd be the simple one. I have documentation for each
> of my operations from foreign soil.
> >
> > You said a military commander cannot authorize ANY amateur operation. Hmmm?
> >
> Did I?
> >
> > Keep grinning from ear to Rear ... as you are shown to be wrong.
> >
> I didn't allege that I had permission to operate an amateur radio
> station from Somalia. You did.

Right. You knew nothing about operating from any country without a
government.

> > Take it up with GW and Tommy if you've got a problem with it.
> >
> Why? Did either one of them bootleg from Somalia?
> >
> Dave K8MN

You were proved wrong on your assertion that a military commander could grant permission to operate amateur radio. After your education concerning amateur operations from a country w/o a government, you had to rephrase your accusations. So if you still don't like commanders having that authority, take it up with GW.

2922. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 10:55:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304180255.47558d1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65109

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9F868F.E926046@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9EB36A.3C409C86@earthlink.net>...
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > >
> > > > In article <f45722ac.0304161752.28395836@posting.google.com>,
> > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > > >
> > > > >> HEY BURKIE! Hurry up and get your bags packed! Maybe you can GET IT
> > > > >> RIGHT this time!
> > > > >>
> > > > >> Steve, K4YZ
> > > > >
> > > > >Steve, I'd would have been proud to have served in Iraq. That would
> > > > >make the 3rd SWA service medal for me.
> > > > >
> > > > >How many do you have? Would you consider it a hostile environment?
> > > > >List your hostile envirnments, and don't BS us with your Buckeye
> > > > >wives.
> > > >
> > > > Steamy the one-man schmuck can't detail his "hostile actions"
> > > > since he has no reference for them. He is a blowhard braggart
> > > > who didn't get out of the USMC with an Honorable Discharge.
> > >
> > > N2EY:
> > >
> > > "No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> > > government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> > > amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> > > Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
> > > ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
> > > infantile behavior."
> >
> > >
> > Wow, Dave. It's telling where you stand on this issue. It makes me
> > wonder who's still smoking dope from the barrel of his M-16.
> >
> You mean my opinion that Len acts like a first class jerk? Yeah, I love
> the part where he tells someone else that they act like a blowhard
> braggart. Isn't the part where he lives up to the N2EY profile in
> making unsubstantiated statements about Steve's discharge a class act?
> Len will tell you that he's only here to engage in civil debate over the

> code testing issue. His behavior is consistently very different from
> that stated goal.
>
> Dave K8MN

Len states that he was stationed in Japan, and Huffy calls him a REMF.
Huffy then makes claims that he is/was a warrior, but cannot
reference any of it. Dave can only clip and past others remarks, and
is somehow making a positive contribution.

What is your stated goal here?

2923. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 11:01:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304180301.441d2057@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65110

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdi8aza.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 16 Apr 2003 18:56:22 -0700, Brian wrote:
>
> >> I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
> >> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
> >> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
> >> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
> >> to standing procedures binding upon the military.
> >
> >It's nice to see an amateur atempting to squash the spirit of amateur radio.
> >
> >Probably an attorney.
>
> One of the better communications attornies around if I say so
> myself. Rule compliance is my specialty and I've been on the
> prosecution side as well as the defense side.
>
> If I gotta play by the book, ev'one gotta play by the book.

Phil, if you wanna play at all, you've got to get yourself in the game.

Go enlist, then volunteer for Iraq.

2924. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 11:12:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418071208.18831.00000050@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 65111

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 4/17/2003 6:57 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdi7tk8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
>
>On 16 Apr 2003 06:53:32 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
>>Do you really want to deny access to a basically benign form of recreation
>>to 75,000 men with rifles and a lot of adrenalline reserves?
>
> I want to make sure that they play by the book like I have to
> play by the book.

Which book is that, Phil?

These guys are not within the civil jurisdiction of the United States right now. The US Government has made it very clear that no US flag is to fly over any US controlled areas of Iraq.

With the exception of the guys in the Navy, they are clearly NOT on the high seas.

The Un-tied Nations is NOT in control nor responsible for the civil infrastructure of Iraq pending elections.

That being said, it can only come down to one choice...And that is the Armed Forces command structure. Appropriate WRITTEN authorization should be obtained, this being necessary to know who's-doing-what and can be reigned in when the civil authority of Iraq is re-established.

However if the military DOES assume this responsibility, how are they going to regulate it? Non-Amateur "LT Smuckatelli" doesn't know what "priviledges" any given class of US license grants, ergo will there be any attempt to issue callsigns ala AMRS in Japan and Korea?

Part 97 clearly delineates where it has jurisdiction, and I do not see "foreign territory that recently got it's butt kicked by the Armed Forces of the United States" anywhere in there.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2925. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 11:18:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418071842.18831.00000051@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 65112

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 4/17/2003 6:57 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdi87o9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>

>And we tinhorn bureaucrats have all the leisure in the world to
> pick apart and examine such actions long after the fire stops
> flying. That's what I do for a living and I do it well.

No doubt you do, Phil. But the only US civilians with ANY "authority" in Iraq right now are the President and Secretary of Defense. I doubt that an FCC staff lawyer would get a whole lot of anyone's ear right now or in the future.

I'd also not want to be an FCC lawyer trying to enforce US civil law on US citizens NOT within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2926. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 11:21:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418072135.18831.00000052@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 65113

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 4/17/2003 6:57 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdi8sab.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>

>As far as this war goes, I have a vested interest - my family
> was forced out of what is now Iraq by the Arab invasion of
> Bavel in the 13th century and as things go in the Middle East
> we have long memories for "setting things right".....our boys
> and girls did good work.

Here's part of that mindset I was trying to define in another post. Part of what's wrong in the Middle East...Who did what to whom, why, and how long ago.

Sheeesh.

Steve, K4YZ

2927. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 11:26:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418072603.18831.00000053@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 65114

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>Date: 4/17/2003 8:05 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <87k7dspqd1.fld@barrow.com>

>"USMC retired" <Gunny@halfthemxout.net> wrote:
>>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message

>>Sgt Maj Hornoff, USMC retired
>
>Well, little doubt about why *you* were a jarhead.

Snipped.

I have little doubt that the last two "anonymous" posts, one allegedly
from some Army "recon" Colonel, and now a Marine Corps Gunnery Sergeant, are
the work of a single person who has already demonstrated contempt for the Armed
Forces, including the one he served in.

Semper Fi

Steve, K4YZ
a REAL USMC Gunny

2928. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 11:27:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418072722.18755.00000048@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65117

In article <20030416231211.18878.00000077@mb-m18.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From K4YZ:
>
>>I can't think of too many things in life that are a "do it once now or
>>forget about it forever" situation.
>
>Thats how the EE field /IT phenom works in this country. I cannot go back in
>time and get that IT job that I don't like (I like EE stuff).

Live and learn. Next time an IT job comes up, you may change your mind.
>
>>But they DID choose it, and it WAS useful.
>
>Those Hams chose Morse code, because the hobby pressures them to do so.

Not at all. We chose it because we like it. Lots of fun.

Last night I had three QSOs on 80 meter CW. One DX (S58A, pounding in at 8:30 pm local) and two ragchews with amateurs in RI and MI. Great fun.

>Outside
>of Ham radio, Morse code is not useful.

Incorrect.

Outside of amateur radio, Morse code is not very useful. Inside amateur radio, Morse code is very useful.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

2929. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 11:27:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418072723.18755.00000049@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65116

In article <20030417231327.18955.00000172@mb-m02.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From (N2EY)
>
>>>Secondly, Dee has came up with several reasons why many EEs don't homebrew.
>>>Seems like endorsing that EEs should not homebrew.
>>>
>>Only to you. Dee and I were explaining, not advocating.
>
>Listing several reasons why is advocating.

Not at all. I think it would be great if more hams homebrewed and experimented. But there are reasons why most hams don't.

btw, building a kit is not homebrewing. Neither is converting surplus or fixing up older equipment. I have never claimed that any of my kit, surplus or restored rigs were homebrewed.

>
>---
>By the way, I counted calories today. I ate <a little over> 2,600 calories
>today.

That's about right if your size and level of physical activity requires that much. For most people, that's simply too many calories.

>With this many calories, how could I say I "counted" calories?

You did both - ate and counted.

>
>Easy - at the end of the day, I noted what I ate, and "counted" it by adding
>up
>the number of calories each food contains. It came out to be over 2,600.

And how much of that did you burn off with physical activity?

>
>No buffet today. (Otherwise, how could I calculate the number of calories I
>ate?)
>
>Yes, I did the math right. No, I'm not overweight (Nor am I very tall to be
>able to eat that much).
>
>I was just "explaining". I do not advocate that one do the same.

Exactly.

Note that if you keep eating that much, and don't burn it off with physical
activity, you'll get fatter and fatter. Which has serious health consequences.
>--
>
>Tomorrow I'll have a HAM and cheese sandwich.
>
SMT or through-hole?

2930. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 11:27:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418072725.18755.00000050@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65115

In article <20030418012918.18821.00000010@mb-m10.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030417222749.18827.00000028@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>> You've never worked in commercial HF comms
>>> or have any experience in anything but simple amateur radio
>>> stations.
>>
>>How do you know what I have and have not done? You don't even know where I
>>work, or where I have worked.
>
> You've never worked in commercial HF comms
> or have any experience in anything but simple amateur radio
> stations.

Doesn't answer the question. You're just repeating yourself.
>
> Had you actually done any, you would have talked about it.

Incorrect. Unliked you, Len, I don't use this newsgroup to mention everything
I've ever done outside amateur radio. In fact, I don't talk about my work here
very much.

> You didn't.

> At most you mentioned some amateur radio stuff, nothing
> more.

Doesn't prove a thing, len. You're presuming your conclusion.

Just because someone doesn't talk about something doesn't mean they haven't
done it. For example, not everyone named in a patent grant tells everyone about
it.

>>> Irrelevant factoid. You've never used one of those "Muxes"
>>> or have any idea of how they sound through a conventional
>>> HF receiver.
>>
>>How do you know?
>
> Had you ever done that, you would have remarked on it. You
> didn't and don't.

See above. There's lots of things I don't talk about.

btw, I have worked with cystems that use 5823s.
>
>>No, I'm simply pointing out inconsistencies in your postings.
>
> Nope. You've got your pique all in a dander and are searching
> for a way in to a misdirection and argument.

You're projecting your own emotions and behavior onto others, Len.
>
> You've never done commercial HF communications in your life
> outside of ham radio

Incorrect!

> and you certainly did NOT do any
> military communications. You were never in the military.

I never claimed to be in any military nor to have done military comms. So what?
This is an amateur radio policy newsgroup, as you keep reminding us.

Does having done military comms decades ago automatically make someone
infallible in amateur radio policy matters? Nope.
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Miccolis's views, they will
> be the target of his arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
> downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Miccolis's self-
> importance and experience...not to mention puerile pique.

You're plagiarizing again, Len. Can't even be original. Tsk, tsk, tsk ;-)

>>I do believe you have more RTTY experience than I do.
>
> Far, far more.

So? Doesn't mean a thing in reference to AMATEUR RADIO POLICY.
>
>>And I KNOW I have more Morse code experience than you do.

Far, far more.
>
> You don't know what I've done in radio since before you were
> born. :-)

Sure I do. You've told us all about it here for years.

It's a VERY safe bet that if you had any Morse code experience or skill at all,
you would have told us about it over and over again here.

That's just what you do, Len.
>
>>In which case I will defer to and accept your statements on RTTY if and when
>>you defer to and accept my statements on Morse code.
>

> You are NOT in any position to DEMAND anything in here,

How in the world do you read my statement as a DEMAND? It's not a DEMAND. It's just a clear, concise statement of fact.

>boy.

OK, girlfriend ;-)

2931. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 11:49:09 UTC
From: USMC retired <Gunny@halfthemxout.net>
Message-ID: <b7oolupor0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 65118

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hdehv13.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>
> I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
> to standing procedures binding upon the military.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>

TROLL-O-METER
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
Troll Reading Starts

You post here for one reason, to flame and
then bicker with the reactions you get.

2932. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 12:07:05 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3FBC1C7E7C4E3716.ADD562C6E9C93C00.D3E88E6BD256C498@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65120

"Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b7huij$16ad2$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> Well, basically like I said, I support your actions as a soldier over
there,
> but do not necessarily agree with the idiots that sent all of the soldiers
> out there..... Fortunately that is a right that I have to say that, and
> that is part of what you guys were fighting for.
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> God Bless Our Soldiers!
>

Absolutely, Ryan. However <sigh> there are those who 1) equate that dissent as non-American; 2) can't get that one can fully support our men and women in battle yet not support a war; and 3) actually enjoy being in the trench their train-of-thought is in and won't tolerate your opinion.

What they don't/choose not to realize is that it is no different than "doing your job" every day. I don't totally agree with everything my employer does, says, etc. But, I do the job I am expected to do and reckon myself with that. I know soldiers who wholeheartedly disagreed with some of the things they are/were involved with--but it was their job to be involved with it and they gave every ounce of their being to it.

Kim W5TIT

2933. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 12:18:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418081819.18831.00000055@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 65119

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: "USMC retired" Gunny@halfthemxout.net
>Date: 4/18/2003 6:49 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <b7oolupor0@pita.alt.net>

>You post here for one reason, to flame and
>then bicker with the reactions you get.

Like I said...probably the work of one person already known to this NG who has demonstrated resentment and contempt for the Armed Forces.

As for who's trolling who...It's NOT Phil...

Steve, K4YZ

2934. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 13:10:00 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <D7299D78A53B2638.67D1EE3CE2219A34.70B24CD983166E26@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65122

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b7iddamek1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:pan.2003.04.15.00.41.39.359560.18630@arrl.org...
> > On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 18:14:08 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > > news:pan.2003.04.14.20.27.18.993573.24487@arrl.org...
> > >> On Mon, 14 Apr 2003 14:56:47 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >> > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > >> > news:pan.2003.04.14.12.21.04.19467.24274@arrl.org...
> > >>
> > >> Their statements are ad hominem. They are intended to belittle those
> > >> with whom they disagree rather than argue a case, and I just don't
> > >> think that's the way public discourse out to be carried out,
> > >> particularly by those in leadership positions. It has the effect of
> > >> polarizing the debate, making it harder to reach agreement.
> > >
> > > Frankly, I don't see the press being part of any effort to reach
> > > agreements. They report and that's it. Your mileage may vary.
> >
> > Why do you persist in thinking this is about the press? I'm talking
about
> > how the Administration talks about their political opponents and other
> > nations.
>
> What's the problem then? Does the administration have
> to play kissy/huggy with those that oppose us, undermine our efforts,
etc.?
>

You may not have done this, Bill, but how can someone see fault with other Americans who say things out loud about their government (that aren't kissy/huggy) and, yet, think nothing is wrong with a government/administration doing the same thing? When democracy is so distrusted/hated/despised/whatever across the world, isn't it important for the US Gov't/Administration to be mindful of not making it seem they are an island among the people? When someone uses "my" or "me" or "I" in terms of being in a leadership position in gov't. and speaking of the gov't. as a whole, it worries me about what their mindset is concerning the rest of us. PLUS, it just doesn't sound right for a US President to say, or even imply "my gov't." At best, it is "his" Administration.

> > >> Sure. Every society has its problem members.
> > >

> > > I think OBL is a pretty extreme example of a problem member. OBL
isn't
> > > just some McVeigh or other serial killer...OBL fosters suicide bombing
> > > on a global basis. Who else has taken that stance?
> >
> > I don't see any moral difference between OBL and McVeigh. Both attacked
> > what their warped minds saw as their enemies.
>
> But McVeigh was pretty much a lone wolf operation with only
> a handful of accomplices. OBL takes things to a global
> organization basis. Morally they are both evil scum, but OBL
> is by far the worse and greter threat than a McVeigh type.
>

There is no proof at all of that. Unless you have some inside information. Is it OK for you to think that without evidence, but it's not OK for someone to believe there are no WMD in Iraq (for example?). Both are statements that no one can be absolutely sure of, to be certain. But, both are also general beliefs and should be accepted as such.

> > >> > What behavior of ours makes a rational Muslim hate us then?
> > >>
> > >> Our support for Israel is number one on their hit parade.
> > >
> > > So we should NOT support Israel?
> >
> > Remember what the topic is here, Bill. I'm trying to explain my view
that
> > it's what we do in the Middle East that they hate, not our freedom. So
> > whether we SHOULD support Israel is beside the point. Let me ask you
this:
> > Do you think if we decided to support the Palestinians over Israel the
> > Muslim world would remain just as angry at us? I don't. I think it's
what
> > we DO that matters to them.
>
> You are avoiding the realities. then. Either you believe we should
support
> Israel or you don't. The fact that our support of Israel leads some
> to hate us doesn't change the reality of what you point to.
>

It is nothing of the sort, Bill. I tend to more agree with Jon. We (the US) are generally "hated" because of our being free or having a democratic nation. We are hated due to actions in the world that we undertake. Our supposed attachment to material things (perceived as such by many religious people) is detestable to others--especially in religions like you'll find in the Middle East.

[SNIP on media comments] -- they're all following the money

> > >> Over the years we have demonstrated a near total lack of concern for
> > >> the well-being of the inhabitants of the Middle East outside of
Israel.
> > >
> > > I think that's an extreme statement and one in which I don't agree to
> > > the extent you indicate.
> >
> > Then you should learn more about the history of US relations with
> > countries in the Middle East. For example, in 1953 the CIA and British
SIS
> > set up a military coup to topple the legitimate government of Iran,
which
> > was at the time led by Premier Mohammad Mossadeq. The resulting
government
> > ran a nasty secret police called SAVAK which controlled the population
> > using the usual secret-police methods for years. The Shah's Iran was an
> > ally of the US -- of course! Naturally, Iranians associated the US with
> > the repressive regime and with SAVAK. And in 1979, when the Iranians
> > revolted, Americans asked plaintively, "Why are they mad at us?" Why,
> > indeed.
>
> Amazing that we apparently have to accept a 50 year old act
> as causing people to hate us. There have been errors in judgement
> by administrations (both Rep and Democratic). Some of that
> explains some of the hate...but not all of it...and the reality
> of many today (as is OBL) is that they hate
> the USA's freedom and success.
>

Bill, I am not as astute as Jon is with history. So, let me make myself an example. I am on the uneducated side of this argument when it comes to history--I just am not a history buff/student and so it's never been one of my interests. BUT, I tend to agree with the things I see coming from Jon (on this debate) more than I do with yours. I also tend to "think" along his reasoning. SO, take that and understand this:

In a repressive gov't., the greatest power is keeping the people (the masses) in need and, more importantly, uneducated. The Iraqi people are uneducated. They--for the most part--have no resources from which to get other opinions than those that are force-fed to them by the people who provide for them. Thus, not only do they conscribe to a 50-year old act, they conscribe to the "leaders" of their religions who tell them that we (the US) are their enemy. I don't have to educated or know history to understand that whole concept.

> > The US motive for all this? Well, it was Britain that came up with the
> > idea. See, Mossadeq was thinking of nationalizing the oil industry,
which
> > was controlled by the British. Naturally, the Brits weren't crazy about
> > THAT! The US was worried that Iran might go Commie (this was 1953, after
> > all, and here was a guy nationalizing an industry), so it wholeheartedly
> > supported and participated in the idea. The CIA was knee-deep in the

coup.
> > Where was our concern for the well-being of the Iranian people? Nowhere
to
> > be found.
> >
> > It's not just in the Middle East that the US is viewed as a bully out to
> > serve only itself, either. Ask around in, say, Central and South
America.
> > See what folks there think about the history of their relations with the
> > US. You'll find several well documented instances of the US toppling
> > legitimate governments that didn't toe the US line.
> >
> > I'd like to think we're past that sort of thing now. But I can't say I'm
> > absolutely certain of it. And I think it's perfectly understandable that
a
> > lot of people are deeply suspicious of US intentions and fearful of our
> > newly stated willingness to attack countries that we think MIGHT pose a
> > threat to us.
>
> What countries have we taken over in the last 20/30 years and
> permanently occupied?
>
> > Will we attack only brutal regimes that violate human rights
> > or that actually threaten us? Or, once on the slippery slope, will we
find
> > it ever easier to justify attacking regimes we see as not serving US
> > interests?
>
> Whatever happens will still require congressional approval.
> The administration can't operate unilaterally.
>

Oh, c'mon. Congressional approval conschmessional nothing. Congress is not
always "in" on approval/disapproval for things. And, it is looking like the
Admin. can operate more and more unilaterally than ever.

> > >> Our words don't always match our deeds, and that's a recipe for
> > >> generating distrust and hatred.
> > >
> > > I agree we have room to improve and this is a good time to do it.
> >
> > Ah, but will we? And just as important, will we do so in a measured way,
> > making sure to use force only where it's necessary?
>
> Have you seen excessive force used so far?
>

WHAT????!!!!!

> > >> > Should we have NOT helped Kuwait 12 years ago?
> > >>

> > >> We should have, but did we do that out of altruism, or did we do it
> > >> because it was in our own interests?
> > >
> > > What difference does the motive make? Indeed, we can speculate till
> > > hell freezes over and never understand all motives or know what any of
> > > them contributed to all the decisions.
> >

The motive makes a LOT of difference. I did not witness as much disagreement over the Kuwaiti assistance we provided. Motives are *very* important and the motives for this war weren't clear. Oh, sure, we saw lips moving and heard sounds coming out, but neither the tone nor the facts were very clear. And, what was very clear was world opinion. And, yes, I do believe we should consider world opinion. It is a much smaller world today than it was--even 12 years ago.

> > The point is that historically, we can only be counted on when
> > self-interest is our motive. Which is the way of the world, I'm afraid.
>
> Maybe so...time will tell.
>

I think, generally, time has told.

> > >> The GHW Bush administration certainly SAID it was a compelling
interest
> > >> of the US.
> > >
> > > A point I have no problem with.
> >
> > Good. Then can we agree that when the US goes to war it is for our own
> > benefit? Can we also agree to can the holier-than-thou trashing of other
> > countries who pursue THEIR own interests?
>
> Depends on how they manifest that interest. This is still
> America and I have as much right to trash (your word) another
> country as some of the Hollywood celebs have to trash Bush.
> The difference is that I can accept you or anyone else labeling
> me anything you want (war monger, Bush lover, whatever).
> I don't play the victim gambit because others don't like my
> opinions.
>

A) Your acceptance isn't noted. B) no one should "trash" anyone for the *WAY THEY THINK.* That is a very dangerous thing to begin condoning. Trashing leads to thrashing. An example is: I am vehemently opposed to bigotry of any kind. However, I have been friends with bigots. I oppose most thought processes I see coming from Hawks. However, I have been friends with Hawks. I do not trash the way they think. *IF* they acted--ACTED--on the way they think, they'd see my attitude do a flip right away and they'd be dropped as friends/relatives/whatever.

Now, you used/Jon used the word trash. What I mean by that is when hate is expressed through words. And, trashing implies hate. If I am just disagreeing with the way someone thinks, I don't see a problem with that. And, yes, that is me. And, no, I am not an island unto myself. But, I will react to trashing/negativism/hate in a very negative way.

There's a difference between disagreeing (rational) and hateful (unrational) behaviors. And, there is a very sure way in which each is responded to.

> > >> > Should we have not ended the Taliban regime after 911?
> > >>

"We" haven't. The Taliban regime, the Iraqi regime, the you-name-it regime can and will surface elsewhere.

> > >> Sure, but again, did we do it for the Afghans or did we do it for our
> > >> own security? More to the point, if our purpose was to free the
> > >> Afghanis, why did we wait through years of Taliban repression before
> > >> acting? In the case of Iraq, why did we wait through 20 years SH
before
> > >> liberating the Iraqi people? Answer: Because it was 20 years before
it
> > >> became in our interest to do so, irrespective of the suffering of the
> > >> Iraqi people.
> > >
> > > So we have two choices then:
> > > Take on all regimes immediately...or never take them on. If we don't
> > > take on a regime today we forfeit doing so in the future?
> >
> > No, of course not. But if we knowingly allow a repressive regime to
fester
> > unopposed -- or even aided! -- for years we do forfeit any justification
> > for saying we're attacking it to eliminate repression. And we also
forfeit
> > any justification for criticizing other countries for NOT supporting the
> > attack when the attack is not in their interest.
>
> Fair enough, and I see far less US support of repressive/despotic regimes
> now and in the future.
>

Well, before I feel comfortable with that statement, I would like repressive/despotic to be defined--and not in terms of our own lifestyles/religions/politics. Cuba may be a good example. The people there seem, generally, to be OK. My guess would be they are as OK as the per capita population here. We have destitute people on our streets, we have an education crisis, a healthcare crisis, hunger, etc. So, I see no real difference in the two populations. Yet, Castro is the last bastion of Communism (which--for the record is not a political system it is a financial system) and we leave him alone. I thnk we should continue to leave him alone. How do I acknowledge that, and yet support and agree with actions that will extinguish "repressive/despotic" regimes?

> > >> Define "accept." If you mean am I in favor of overthrowing by force
> > >> every regime that restricts freedom in any way, no, I'm not. We
> > >> certainly should encourage more freedom by other means where we can.
> > >> And in cases where the repression turns exceptionally brutal and
where
> > >> we can intervene by force, I don't have a problem with doing that.
> > >
> > > Works for me...would you not agree that the SH regime was, as you
state:
> > > "exceptionally brutal?"
> >
> > Sure would. Which is why, as I've said, I support taking out his regime
by
> > force.
>
> Great, glad we agree.
>
> > >> But as Jim said, what's freedom to one person is license to another.
We
> > >> better be very careful about what constitutes freedom worth fighting
> > >> for. There's no absolute freedom in any society -- ours included --
and
> > >> what constitutes acceptable limitation of freedom is influenced by
> > >> culture.
> > >

Thank you. Very well said. I would also add to your last sentance "and how asleep the people are." What I mean by that is in order for "us" to begin making decisions on stomping out (my terminology) other leaders/countries, then we the people had best wake up and get a whole lot more involved (i.e., be less fat happy and stupid/apathetic) to the goings on in our world. I don't want to be ignorantly saying whooah. And, the people in this country are, to a larger degree than I like, very apathetic.

> > > How far do you let culture influence limitations to individual
freedoms?
> >
> > I don't think there's any easy answer to that. I do think it's important
> > to recognize that there are cultural differences and that one culture's
> > point of view is not necessarily better than another's.
>
> Let me give you an example of a cultural difference I can't accept.
> Oppression of woman in many cultures is a gross human rights
> violation. I personally won't accept that. I may have no say
> in the matter, but I'm not afraid to tell anyone who would claim
> oppression of women is a cultural thing that I shouldn't question
> in some country.
>

I disagree. While it is a hard truth to admit, I don't think it is for us to determine that a nation should be militarily mounted upon for any way in which its *CULTURE* acts. Now, if you are talking about a government that

is brutalizing, anyone, then I think much differently. But, if it a culture, it is my belief that we don't interfere with cultures. The reason, as a court-appointed attorney might argue, is because then we begin making culture judgements, and that is just not right IMHO.

Now, before you get all "go to Russia" on me, YES, I would totally disagree with any culture in which anyone/thing is brutalized. And, I would call upon our human rights organizations, and government to act in way that effects change--SHORT of military action. Wars are not the way to change cultures.

> > >> >> That doesn't mean they give a damn about freedom in ours.
> > >> >
> > >> > Agree completely...
> > >>
> > >> I think you misunderstood me. By "don't give a damn" I meant they don't
> > >> care one way or the other whether we have freedom in the US, not that
> > >> they dislike our having freedom in the US.
> > >
> > > I disagree. I think many of the extremists absolutely hate that
> > > American women have the rights that they do. I think they hate the
> > > freedoms of expression we allow.
> >
> > Do they hate that Swedish, French and German women have the freedoms they
> > do? Do they hate that Japan, Mexico and Iceland allow freedom of
> > expression?
>
> Probably they do, but since we are the super power, we are
> the focus of the anti-western society.
>
> > >> > and it is a primary objection of those people, the powerful, to the
> > >> > American way of life, for two reasons... 1. We value individual life,
> > >> > equality and justice...
> > >>
> > >> No, Bill, that's not quite right. The problem is not that we value
> > >> those things. It's that we value them for us but all too often, not for
> > >> others. At least, not when valuing them for others is inconvenient for
> > >> us.
> > >
> > > You lost me here. How about an example to make your point.
> >
> > Iraq is a perfect example. We were happy to help Saddam gas Iranians when
> > we were pissed off at the Iranians (despite the fact that we knew
> > perfectly well he was brutalizing his own people). Then he made the
> > mistake of interfering with one of our oil suppliers. Tell me, what was

> > the moral difference between Saddam's attack on the Iranians and his
> > attack on the Kuwaitis? Why did we help him with one and attack him for
> > the other? The answer, in case it isn't obvious, is that in each case we
> > were pursuing our self-interest. In the case of Iran, it wasn't
important
> > to us that hundreds of thousands of Iranians were killed and maimed. But
> > when we went to Kuwait's aid the press was filled with stories of the
> > suffering of Kuwaitis. (Which was real enough, let me add.) Moral
> > relativism of the worst sort.
> >
> > And then when we decided Saddam had to go, we were shocked! Shocked to
> > find that he had been killing and torturing his own people! Shocked to
> > find that he had WMD (which we helped him get)!
>
> Without debating any points, I belive we know there were
> mistakes made. Hopefully, with the major anti-communist
> cold war behind us, we won't see such errors in judgements.
>

Why not debate those points, Bill. You acquiese whenever the nitty-gritty point is made. It is exactly that point--all other agruing and points aside--that Jon has been trying to make. He just finally got through to you with that observation. I think you realize what he was saying, but you only looked at it in a microcosmic way. It is exactly that point that he's been trying to get across to you in the WHOLE debate.

The "major anti-communist" cold war is not behind us, Bill!!!! It is part of OUR culture (to go back to earlier comments on culture). Haven't you seen some of the comments even here in this newsgroup of "go to _____"?. Fill in the blank with Russia--or whatever favorite despotic regime (ahem) you'd like.

> > >> Really? The British Empire abolished slavery in 1833 (in the home
> > >> islands it became illegal in the 1770's). The US didn't abolish it
> > >> until 1865, and then only after a bloody civil war. Which society was
> > >> "damn well better" at implementing equality and justice?
> > >
> > > If your only measure you use is slavery, perhaps you're right. There's
> > > much more than racial equality involved.
> >
> > Sure, and there are plenty of positive things one can cite. But the
> > jingoistic "we're better than everybody else" refrain is just not
> > supportable. We have our warts.
>
> I never said we were perfect.
>

And, for "us" (the US) to move, in a militaristic manner, toward any other country, shouldn't we get a whole lot more perfect?

> > >> As for modern times, can you be explicit as to how we implement our
> > >> values of life, equality and justice better than, oh, say, Sweden?

> > >
> > > I see the standard of living, the American justice system, etc.
> >
> > That would be the system that has about 3% of our population in jail, on
> > parole or on probation, right? Want to hazard a guess what the
percentage
> > is in European countries? What to compare crime rates with theirs?
>
> I'm sure there are other differences where Europe wins via some
> metric.
>

Acquiescing again?

> > And, oh yeah, that would be the justice system that now allows the
> > government to imprision an American citizen without charge for as long
as
> > they want.
>
> Who?
>

Many. Since the Patriot Act has been in effect.

> > > If
> > > Sweden or any other country was better then why do so many people
leave
> > > those countries and come to the US?
> >
> > Not many of them have left Western Europe for the US lately, Bill.
>
> One reason why is the immigration quotas. I have a friend from the
> UK that took over a year to finally be able to move hear.
>

I think you are deliberately ignoring Jon's observation.

> > It's
> > certainly true that the US led the way to democracy. But some countries
> > that came to democracy and freedom later than the US are at least as
good
> > in most respects and arguably better in some. The US is a good country.
I
> > wouldn't want to live anywhere else. But while acting like we're the
best
> > of everything may make us feel good, it's hubris with a capital H.
>
> Again, I never said we were perfect. I do, however, belive that on a
broad
> brush basis we enjoy the freeist and best economic system in the world.
>
> Cheers,

> Bill K2UNK
>
>

I don't think that is the debate, Bill. We certainly do enjoy the freeist and best economic system in the world, or at least we have. Your last sentence seems to produce the belief that because of what Jon has said, and me, that you think our debate is that this country is *not* the freeist and best economic system in the world. It is how we act upon--and to what limits--and permit our government to act upon--and to what limits, what we perceive as threats to our way of living, that this debate is about.

Kim W5TIT

2935. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 13:16:40 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <AE1D7CB6389E15E8.4B61CCBB48EA002D.C57E6BF8FCAD2A0E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65123

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3E9DD62E.171F08E8@att.net...
>
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> > They're saying, "We KNOW what the end result
> > of militarism is. We lived it in the 20th century. The US should learn
> > from the European experience." You don't have to agree with them to
> > recognize that their concern is based on experiences we've never had.
>
> That's load of nonsense, Jon. It wasn't "militarism" that caused those
> problems, it was dictatorial radicalism of the same Saddam mold. It TOOK
> a large dose of militarism to stamp it out. Militarism is no vice, rather
a
> complete
> necessity, as we learned by the middle of the 20th century. Be thankful
> that Hitler et al didn't have today's capabilities in 1940, when those
Americans
>
> like you joined their European counteparts in a vain effort to talk WW2
out
> of happening.
>
> So just where do you think we'd be today if the Demos had been successful
> in totally downsizing out military in the past couple decades, as was done
> following WW1? Not a pleasant question to contemplate.
>

Ya know what's scary?

Kim W5TIT

2936. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 13:17:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418091756.18831.00000056@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 65121

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: "W5TIT" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>Date: 4/18/2003 7:07 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id:
><3FBC1C7E7C4E3716.ADD562C6E9C93C00.D3E88E6BD256C498@lp.airnews.net>

>2) can't get that one can fully support our men and women
>in battle yet not support a war...(SNIP)

Hi Kim. The problem here is that if you actively "protest" some action wherein our troops are engaged in active combat or "peacekeeping" missions, that is read as weakenss by the "other side" and is interpreted as a lack of support at home for that mission.

This only emboldens them to more hostilities, being certain that such will only heighten the angst at home.

That Soldier, Sailor, Airman or Marine is now in MORE danger than he/she would have been otherwise because "Charlie" (Or Muhammed, or Wun Phat Dik, or whoever...) is now willing to try and use that against our troops.

>I know soldiers who wholeheartedly disagreed with some of the
>things they are/were involved with--but it was their job to be involved with
>it and they gave every ounce of their being to it.

Been there...done that...And they will...but let's not make it any harder for them than necessary, huh?

73/88

Steve, K4YZ

2937. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 13:20:22 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <66353993EFD1CF9F.DC59A9F44B12E699.EF9A33B01FC8591A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65124

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BAC3B759.17103%stewart@say.net...
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> > Do you have any concept of how our military operates?
>
>
> Your concept obviously differs from mine. Dave. You said that weapon
> (MOAB) was deployed to Iraq to attack troops massed in open terrain. I
> pointed out that, according to the military itself, there were no troops
> still massed in open terrain when that weapon was deployed - only isolated
> pockets in towns and cities. You responded to that with the above.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

It's called ignoring an inarguable truth when it doesn't support your
framework of thought. Children do it every day...

Kim W5TIT

2938. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 13:33:45 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <533EC67022ECA953.E5AD055786D41C11.9A49122FB1480168@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65125

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030418091756.18831.00000056@mb-m12.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
> >From: "W5TIT" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >Date: 4/18/2003 7:07 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id:
> ><3FBC1C7E7C4E3716.ADD562C6E9C93C00.D3E88E6BD256C498@lp.airnews.net>
>
> >2) can't get that one can fully support our men and women
> >in battle yet not support a war...(SNIP)
>
> Hi Kim. The problem here is that if you actively "protest" some
action
> wherein our troops are engaged in active combat or "peacekeeping"
missions,
> that is read as weakenss by the "other side" and is interpreted as a lack
of
> support at home for that mission.
>

Then, the other side would be wrong. I don't think it is disputed that the United States has an incredible military force and is quite capable of success with any mission. Actually, it might be a strategic benefit for the other side to think that we are weak due to dissent at home. :)

As to a lack of support for the mission. Well, it may very well be a lack of support for a particular mission. I wouldn't want that to be a secret if it's the way I felt. Just as I wouldn't want pertinent facts from the other side to be a secret. What I mean by that is that a part of war and peace is how the population is reacting to it. It isn't just the military that goes to war, it is all of us. And, it isn't just the government on the other side that is a victim of the war, it is all of them.

> This only emboldens them to more hostilities, being certain that such
will
> only heighten the angst at home.
>
> That Soldier, Sailor, Airman or Marine is now in MORE danger than
he/she
> would have been otherwise because "Charlie" (Or Muhammed, or Wun Phat Dik,
or
> whoever...) is now willing to try and use that against our troops.
>

Our strategists are able to account for and respond to things that go on at home, IMHO.

> >I know soldiers who wholeheartedly disagreed with some of the
> >things they are/were involved with--but it was their job to be involved with
> >it and they gave every ounce of their being to it.
>
> Been there...done that...And they will...but let's not make it any harder
> for them than necessary, huh?
>
> 73/88
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>

I just don't agree with that, Steve. I think that to be a free nation means we support the act of freedom during any time--war or peace. Now, if you're talking about becoming one with the enemy...that's a whole different ballgame. If my objection to a war means that I begin publicly saying things that are military secrets, or anything akin to that, then I would be wrong. But, to disagree with a war and to state my belief against it--even act on my belief against it by taking to the streets and joining a peace rally, is the most extreme expression of freedom and what it stands for, that I can think of.

73/88 to you!!! Kim W5TIT

2939. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 14:21:26 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7p1jucgj1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65126

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:533EC67022ECA953.E5AD055786D41C11.9A49122FB1480168@lp.airnews.net...
> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030418091756.18831.00000056@mb-m12.aol.com...
> > >Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
> > >From: "W5TIT" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> > >Date: 4/18/2003 7:07 AM Central Daylight Time
> > >Message-id:
> > ><3FBC1C7E7C4E3716.ADD562C6E9C93C00.D3E88E6BD256C498@lp.airnews.net>
> >
> > >2) can't get that one can fully support our men and women
> > >in battle yet not support a war...(SNIP)
> >
> > Hi Kim. The problem here is that if you actively "protest" some
> action
> > wherein our troops are engaged in active combat or "peacekeeping"
> missions,
> > that is read as weakenss by the "other side" and is interpreted as a
lack
> of
> > support at home for that mission.
> >
>
> Then, the other side would be wrong. I don't think it is disputed that
the
> United States has an incredible military force and is quite capable of
> success with any mission. Actually, it might be a strategic benefit for
the
> other side to think that we are weak due to dissent at home. :)
>
> As to a lack of support for the mission. Well, it may very well be a lack
> of support for a particular mission. I wouldn't want that to be a secret
if
> it's the way I felt. Just as I wouldn't want pertinent facts from the
other
> side to be a secret. What I mean by that is that a part of war and peace
is
> how the population is reacting to it. It isn't just the military that
goes
> to war, it is all of us. And, it isn't just the government on the other
> side that is a victim of the war, it is all of them.
>
>
> > This only emboldens them to more hostilities, being certain that

such
> will
> > only heighten the angst at home.
> >
> > That Soldier, Sailor, Airman or Marine is now in MORE danger than
> he/she
> > would have been otherwise because "Charlie" (Or Muhammed, or Wun Phat
Dik,
> or
> > whoever...) is now willing to try and use that against our troops.
> >
>
> Our strategists are able to account for and respond to things that go on
at
> home, IMHO.
>
> > >I know soldiers who wholeheartedly disagreed with some of the
> > >things they are/were involved with--but it was their job to be involved
> with
> > >it and they gave every ounce of their being to it.
> >
> > Been there...done that...And they will...but let's not make it any
> harder
> > for them than necessary, huh?
> >
> > 73/88
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >
>
> I just don't agree with that, Steve. I think that to be a free nation
means
> we support the act of freedom during any time--war or peace. Now, if
you're
> talking about becoming one with the enemy...that's a whole different
> ballgame. If my objection to a war means that I begin publicly saying
> things that are military secrets, or anything akin to that, then I would
be
> wrong. But, to disagree with a war and to state my belief against
it--even
> act on my belief against it by taking to the streets and joining a peace
> rally, is the most extreme expression of freedom and what it stands for,
> that I can think of.
>
> 73/88 to you!!! Kim W5TIT
>
>

The Vietnam War was extended several YEARS because of Hanoi's beliefe that the American PEOPLE were against the war (ALL OF THEM). This gave the the needed 'push' to keep on going.

That is exactly what your kind of thinking will lead us into AGAIN.

'Those that fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it" Or something like that. Well you get the point.

Dan/W4NTI

2940. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 14:29:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA00BAE.AEF07704@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65127

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9F8E69.FBEFBDB1@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9CC8CC.364D78AF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3E9C984F.C703F3F8@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > "Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> > > > > > > 2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> > > > > > > League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> > > > > > > British military personnel
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
> > > > > > > officer.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "There is precedent for this," Mills said, citing an operation during
> > > > > > > the 1991 Gulf War. "These operators will need written authorization to
> > > > > > > operate from their commanding officers
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I'm sitting here grinning from ear to ear. All of this, of course,
> > > > > > reminds me of lengthy tale of an alleged operation from Somalia.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > > > Not trying to be a smart alec here...but...since there is no actual
> > > > > government....and the only authority seems to be the US Military....I see no
> > > > > particular problem if the ham in question has a valid FCC license and the
> > > > > commander gives him the authority. Isnt the CO the defacto licensing
> > > > > authority in this case???
> > > >
> > > > That's the usual case, Dan. In N0IMD's case, he didn't think it
> > > > important to have the permission in writing for operating from Somalia.
> > > > He says he operated on a verbal OK.
> > >
> > > In K8MN's case, he said that no military commander can authorize any
> > > amateur radio activity. Just ask him if he said that. He will
> > > confirm it.

> >
> > Here you go, Brian. These quotes might jog your memory about what took
> > place.
> >
> > From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > Subject: Re: DSP vs human decoding of OOK CW
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Date: 2002-08-01 11:42:56 PST
> >
> > "Is it a lame assertion if your operation doesn't count toward DXCC and
> > the "authority" granting you permission to operate had no right to do
> > so? Surely you knew that as a self-proclaimed moral and ethical man
> > that your actions were neither moral nor ethical."
> >
> >
> > From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Date: 2002-08-03 06:20:14 PST
> >
> > "No, I say that a commander might grant authorization which is not his
> > to grant. I say that higher-ups might not approve of such
> > authorization. I say that the DXCC desk might not credit such operation.
> > What has the DXCC desk said about your operation from Somalia? Have you
> > found if it counts or not?"
> >
> > From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Date: 2002-08-09 22:05:19 PST
> >
> > "Ah Ah, Brian. I've questioned whether your commander had the authority
> > to do so. I've also asked if you obtained "written permission". So
> > far, you've just played dodge ball with the question. I've repeatedly
> > asked if your operation was accepted for DXCC credit."
> >
> > It's only a small issue since the message we've seen about GI's
> > operating from Iraq requires written permission. Obtaining writtern
> > persmission never crossed your mind during your time in Somalia.
> >
> > Thanks for the giggles.

>
> Dave, that's nice of you quote yourself -after- your education of
> operating from a country without a government.

I knew that it was important to obtain written permission. You muffed
that part.

> Your first pass at it
> claimed a commander had no authority to authorize anything to do with

> amateur radio.

You continue to have difficulty with reading comprehension. You overlook the key word "if". I questioned your "commander's" authority to issue such permission, especially when he doesn't issue it writing. I still question it. You seem to think that the term "commander" means anybody anywhere up the chain of command from you. I don't see it that way. You haven't offered what position your "commander" occupied.

> Keep giggling, it makes you look even more simple.

I'm not the one left holding the the empty bag of alleged T5 permissions.

> Better yet, why
> not go work some more Frenchmen (out of band) on 6M?

I was never out of band when working French stations on 6m from Tanzania. These days, I'm not even hearing any Frenchmen.

Did you do any studying on those questions about your alleged T5 operation posed to you by N2EY and me?

Dave K8MN

2941. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 14:35:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA00D1B.4C785DDD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65128

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9F868F.E926046@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9EB36A.3C409C86@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > In article <f45722ac.0304161752.28395836@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > > >
> > > > > >> HEY BURKIE! Hurry up and get your bags packed! Maybe you can GET IT
> > > > > >> RIGHT this time!
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >> Steve, K4YZ
> > > > > >
> > > > > >Steve, I'd would have been proud to have served in Iraq. That would
> > > > > >make the 3rd SWA service medal for me.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >How many do you have? Would you consider it a hostile environment?
> > > > > >List your hostile envirnments, and don't BS us with your Buckeye
> > > > > >wives.
> > > > >
> > > > > Steamy the one-man schmuck can't detail his "hostile actions"
> > > > > since he has no reference for them. He is a blowhard braggart
> > > > > who didn't get out of the USMC with an Honorable Discharge.
> > > >
> > > > N2EY:
> > > >
> > > > "No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> > > > government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> > > > amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> > > > Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
> > > > ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
> > > > infantile behavior."
> > >
> > >
> > > Wow, Dave. It's telling where you stand on this issue. It makes me
> > > wonder who's still smoking dope from the barrel of his M-16.
> >
> > You mean my opinion that Len acts like a first class jerk? Yeah, I love
> > the part where he tells someone else that they act like a blowhard
> > braggart. Isn't the part where he lives up to the N2EY profile in

> > making unsubstantiated statements about Steve's discharge a class act?
> > Len will tell you that he's only here to engage in civil debate over the
> > code testing issue. His behavior is consistently very different from
> > that stated goal.

>
> Len states that he was stationed in Japan, and Huffy calls him a REMF.

We all know what Len implied with his tales. I don't know anyone named "Huffy". Len was a rear echelon type. Len did make a wild accusation about Steve's discharge from the USMC. With which of these did you take issue?

> Huffy then makes claims that he is/was a warrior, but cannot
> reference any of it. Dave can only clip and past others remarks, and
> is somehow making a positive contribution.

Who is "Huffy"? Do you believe the words I'm using to respond to your comments were a clip and "past" job?

> What is your stated goal here?

I haven't stated a goal here. I might offer one after you've answered those questions about your alleged T5 operation.

Dave K8MN

2942. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 14:35:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EA00D42.5030904@psu.edu>
Source record: 65129

Dave Heil wrote:

> I didn't see a claim that contesting was the only way to find out.

You're correct, Dave. I made no such claim

> I didn't see a claim that it requires a contest for that to happen.
> They do provide an excuse for it to happen, much like a hamfest provides
> an opportunity for hams to get together, swap yarns, pick through junk
> and eat generally bad food.

Once again correct, Dave

> Our ARES group participates in mock prison riots. We haven't figured
> out how to arrange a real prison riot. That and we no longer have an
> operational prison in the area.

There you go! The only way to practice for emergencies is to practice for them. The whole practice thing is kind of like say, the "Vomit Comet" that the astronauts do. they look like they are even having fun while experiencing weightlessness. How would anyone practice for anything if the rationale was that you had to experience the real thing, and not practice. go figure.

> Practice makes perfect.

Right. You have to know if your rig is going to put out a good signal, and it helps to have some sort of coverage knowledge. How we gonna do this if we don't practice?

> If you're going to dismiss the value of contesting in honing operating
> skills in such an arrogant manner, it is time for you to seek new
> sources of information for your mental database.

Of course, more knowledge might make it difficult to dismiss it in an arrogant fashion.

> We haven't figured out how to arrange a real prison riot, a real tornado
> or a real flood for practice purposes. Field Day and drills will have
> to do for most of us. If you'd like to drop by, we can arrange to leave
> you in Wildcat Hollow so the gang can practice looking for a lost
> person. It would be, from your perspective, fairly realistic.

Of course we can't. My guess is that anyone thinking otherwise needs to educate themselves.

> You always resort to something like this in an effort to dismiss the
> skills of another or to take a shot at the ARRL. You surely do know a

> lot for a guy who isn't involved in amateur radio.

I don't know about you, but I tend to listen to my peers. Maybe to those who aren't my peers, but only if they present a good argument, and use the manners their mama should have taught them.

> Not all emergencies happen in the United States. Not all of those which
> do take place in the United States involve local communications. As
> you've told us, real emergencies don't have rules. You use what you
> need or what you have in dealing with an emergency.

As I recall, many of the emergencies in the US use HF also. So they definitely don't use simply local comms.

> SOME real emergencies involve liaison with local authorities. Some need
> liaison with state or federal authorities. Some don't need liaison with
> any authorities. If you decide to come to participate in our Wildcat
> Hollow lost person scenario, you might as well leave that cellular phone
> at home. They don't work in Wildcat Hollow.

In our area, we rescue people all the time. Not so long ago we rescued a fellow who was having heart problems on the side of the road. That one did involve authorities. I've been rescued twice now during the pursuit of one of my other hobbies (off road Bahaing) This just required some hams and an FWD and a winch. Several 911 call rescues have been made in the past year or so. Cell phones are almost not in the picture, because they are often out of range, or there seems to be a fair amount of "I don't want to get involved" syndrome among the users.

> Quit pretending that you know all about contesting and amateur radio's
> part in emergency efforts. You don't.

Lack of knowledge has never been a prerequisite for an opinion, has it?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2943. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 14:38:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA00DCE.6709A863@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65130

Brian wrote:
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdi8aza.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > On 16 Apr 2003 18:56:22 -0700, Brian wrote:
> >
> > >> I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
> > >> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
> > >> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
> > >> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
> > >> to standing procedures binding upon the military.
> > >
> > >It's nice to see an amateur atempting to squash the spirit of amateur radio.
> > >
> > >Probably an attorney.
> >
> > One of the better communications attornies around if I say so
> > myself. Rule compliance is my specialty and I've been on the
> > prosecution side as well as the defense side.
> >
> > If I gotta play by the book, ev'one gotta play by the book.
>
> Phil, if you wanna play at all, you've got to get yourself in the game.

On the face of it, your comment was the usual, silly Brian Burke stuff.
The more I thought it about it, the more I saw some logic in it. To
extend your idea, if Len Anderson wants to play, he has to get in the
game.

> Go enlist, then volunteer for Iraq.

Why would Phil do that?

Dave K8MN

2944. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 14:51:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA01164.3C0C6074@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65131

W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> news:BAC3B759.17103%stewart@say.net...
> > "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > > Do you have any concept of how our military operates?
> >
> >
> > Your concept obviously differs from mine. Dave. You said that weapon
> > (MOAB) was deployed to Iraq to attack troops massed in open terrain. I
> > pointed out that, according to the military itself, there were no troops
> > still massed in open terrain when that weapon was deployed - only isolated
> > pockets in towns and cities. You responded to that with the above.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
> >
>
> It's called ignoring an inarguable truth when it doesn't support your
> framework of thought. Children do it every day...

That's how I'd access Dwight's comments, Kim. Nice that you agree.

Dave K8MN

2945. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 14:51:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EA010FF.8060608@psu.edu>
Source record: 65132

N2EY wrote:
> In article <20030416231211.18878.00000077@mb-m18.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
> (Vshah101) writes:
>
>>From K4YZ:
>
>>>I can't think of too many things in life that are a "do it once now or
>>>forget about it forever" situation.
>>
>>Thats how the EE field /IT phenom works in this country. I cannot go back in
>>time and get that IT job that I don't like (I like EE stuff).
>
>
> Live and learn. Next time an IT job comes up, you may change your mind.
>
>>>But they DID choose it, and it WAS useful.
>>
>>Those Hams chose Morse code, because the hobby pressures them to do so.
>
>
> Not at all. We chose it because we like it. Lots of fun.

Jim, I felt really pressured to learn the RF safety requirements! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2946. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 14:54:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EA011A4.60002@psu.edu>
Source record: 65133

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Brian wrote:
>
>
>>Marvy. What can you tell us about Morse as a growth industry?
>
>
> Far as anyone here can determine it's impossible to tell you anything.

Slam! Ya gotta admit it Dick. He does a pretty good job as your straight man! Maybe we need a rrap retort of the week contest. Whaaya think?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2947. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 15:00:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EA01329.3030603@psu.edu>
Source record: 65134

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/16/2003 10:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030416234508.18878.00000084@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>
>>To show that Morse code is a growth industry, N2EY should post the Morse code
>>numbers along with the ARS License Numbers.
>
>
> "Morse code numbers"...?!?!

Here ya go!

```
-----
.----
..---
...--
....-
.....
-....
--...
---..
----.
```

- Mike KB3EIA -

2948. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 16:25:42 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304180825.526e6340@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65135

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304180255.47558d1@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9F868F.E926046@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9EB36A.3C409C86@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > In article <f45722ac.0304161752.28395836@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > > > >
> > > > > >> HEY BURKIE! Hurry up and get your bags packed! Maybe you can GET IT
> > > > > >> RIGHT this time!
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >> Steve, K4YZ
> > > > > >
> > > > > >Steve, I'd would have been proud to have served in Iraq. That would
> > > > > >make the 3rd SWA service medal for me.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >How many do you have? Would you consider it a hostile environment?
> > > > > >List your hostile envirnments, and don't BS us with your Buckeye
> > > > > >wives.
> > > > >
> > > > > Steamy the one-man schmuck can't detail his "hostile actions"
> > > > > since he has no reference for them. He is a blowhard braggart
> > > > > who didn't get out of the USMC with an Honorable Discharge.
> > > >
> > > > N2EY:
> > > >
> > > > "No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> > > > government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> > > > amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> > > > Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
> > > > ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
> > > > infantile behavior."
> >
> > >
> > > Wow, Dave. It's telling where you stand on this issue. It makes me
> > > wonder who's still smoking dope from the barrel of his M-16.
> > >
> > You mean my opinion that Len acts like a first class jerk? Yeah, I love
> > the part where he tells someone else that they act like a blowhard
> > braggart. Isn't the part where he lives up to the N2EY profile in

> > making unsubstantiated statements about Steve's discharge a class act?
> > Len will tell you that he's only here to engage in civil debate over the
> > code testing issue. His behavior is consistently very different from
> > that stated goal.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
>
> Len states that he was stationed in Japan, and Huffy calls him a REMF.

Brian,

Who is "Huffy"?

I've read Dave's posts, looked back through this thread, and even
searched Google, but I cannot find the post where Dave calls Len an
"REMF".

Could you point us to it, please?

> Huffy then makes claims that he is/was a warrior, but cannot
> reference any of it.

Can not or will not?

2949. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 16:25:47 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304180825.25d5028e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65136

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304180255.47558d1@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9F868F.E926046@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9EB36A.3C409C86@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > In article <f45722ac.0304161752.28395836@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > > > >
> > > > > >> HEY BURKIE! Hurry up and get your bags packed! Maybe you can GET IT
> > > > > >> RIGHT this time!
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >> Steve, K4YZ
> > > > > >
> > > > > >Steve, I'd would have been proud to have served in Iraq. That would
> > > > > >make the 3rd SWA service medal for me.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >How many do you have? Would you consider it a hostile environment?
> > > > > >List your hostile envirnments, and don't BS us with your Buckeye
> > > > > >wives.
> > > > >
> > > > > Steamy the one-man schmuck can't detail his "hostile actions"
> > > > > since he has no reference for them. He is a blowhard braggart
> > > > > who didn't get out of the USMC with an Honorable Discharge.
> > > >
> > > > N2EY:
> > > >
> > > > "No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> > > > government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> > > > amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> > > > Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
> > > > ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
> > > > infantile behavior."
> >
> > >
> > > Wow, Dave. It's telling where you stand on this issue. It makes me
> > > wonder who's still smoking dope from the barrel of his M-16.
> > >
> > You mean my opinion that Len acts like a first class jerk? Yeah, I love
> > the part where he tells someone else that they act like a blowhard
> > braggart. Isn't the part where he lives up to the N2EY profile in

> > making unsubstantiated statements about Steve's discharge a class act?
> > Len will tell you that he's only here to engage in civil debate over the
> > code testing issue. His behavior is consistently very different from
> > that stated goal.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
>
> Len states that he was stationed in Japan, and Huffy calls him a REMF.

Brian,

Who is "Huffy"?

I've read Dave's posts, looked back through this thread, and even
searched Google, but I cannot find the post where Dave calls Len an
"REMF".

Could you point us to it, please?

> Huffy then makes claims that he is/was a warrior, but cannot
> reference any of it.

Can not or will not?

2950. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 16:34:31 UTC
From: Ronnie W <q@rryahooey.com>
Message-ID: <b7p9clqth0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 65138

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030418081819.18831.00000055@mb-m12.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >From: "USMC retired" Gunny@halfthemxout.net
> >Date: 4/18/2003 6:49 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <b7oolupor0@pita.alt.net>
>
> >You post here for one reason, to flame and
> >then bicker with the reactions you get.
>
> Like I said...probably the work of one person already known to this
NG who
> has demonstrated resentment and contempt for the Armed Forces.
>
> As for who's trolling who...It's NOT Phil...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

So says one of r.r.a.p.'s Sanhedrin cheerleaders!
ROTFLMAO!!!

rw

2951. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 16:38:05 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304180838.3d3f31d4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65139

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9F4EE6.F653E0E8@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3E9EE395.899A3EDC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >>
> > >> In article <c2356669.0304160844.4512d9e7@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> > >> (N2EY) writes:
>
> > >> Do you have a granted patent in radio? I have. Just one.
> > >
> > >You've regaled us with the tale so often that it seems like many more.
> > >
> > >> [the bear shooter has only one, but not about radio...]
> > >
> > >That's one each for the bear shooter and the bull shooter.
> > >
> > >That brings up an interesting point. Weren't you the guy working safely
> > >in the rear area during the Korean War who felt compelled to tell us
> > >about they flying time for a Soviet Bear bomber to reach Tokyo? If I'm
> > >not mistaken, that'd give you both the bear shooter and bull shooter
> > >crowns.
> >
> > No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> > government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> > if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
> > be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
> > downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
> > importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
> > very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.
>
> From: Len Over 21 (lenover21@aol.com)
> Subject: Re: 34 Years Ago Today
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: 2002-12-08 21:01:08 PST
>
> "The distance between Chongjin, North Korea and Tokyo (where
> I was assigned) is about 500 air miles. The distance between
> Vladivostok, USSR, was about the same distance. That's about
> an hour's flight in a Bear (NATO name for a Soviet bomber). Less
> time of flight now with jet turbine aircraft."
>

> There it is. Google knows.

I think you missed some relevant points, Dave. Len's reference to the "Bear" bomber might lead the unsuspecting to think he was in some sort of danger from them while in Japan. However:

- The airline distance from Chongjin, North Korea to Tokyo is at least 670
statute miles. The distance from Vladivostok to Tokyo is 663 statute miles.
(Source: "Esso War Map III, Featuring The Pacific Theater", printed 1944).

- For interesting info on the Tupolev TU-95, and its variants, known to NATO as
the "Bear", see:

http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/russia/bomber/tu-95.htm

which tells us that:

- Development of the TU-95/"Bear" began in June, 1951.

- First flight of the first prototype, November, 1952.

- Production began January, 1956.

- First deployment August, 1957.

- Four turboprop engines driving counterrotating propellers. "Turboprop" refers
to jet turbine engines driving propellers.

- Len left Japan before any TU-95s were deployed.
>
> Love your "I have a patent and you don't" routine, Leonard.

A US patent granted in 1968 would have expired in 1985. Perhaps a more timely question would be "who has a current US patent?"

73 de Jim, N2EY

2952. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 17:16:41 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304180916.4a28633d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65142

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b7p1jucgj1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:533EC67022ECA953.E5AD055786D41C11.9A49122FB1480168@lp.airnews.net...
> > "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030418091756.18831.00000056@mb-m12.aol.com...
> > > >Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
> > > >From: "Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> > > >Date: 4/18/2003 7:07 AM Central Daylight Time
> > > >Message-id:
> > > ><3FBC1C7E7C4E3716.ADD562C6E9C93C00.D3E88E6BD256C498@lp.airnews.net>
> >
> > > > >2) can't get that one can fully support our men and women
> > > > >in battle yet not support a war...(SNIP)
> > > >
> > > > Hi Kim. The problem here is that if you actively "protest" some
> action
> > > > wherein our troops are engaged in active combat or "peacekeeping"
> missions,
> > > > that is read as weakenss by the "other side" and is interpreted as a
> lack
> of
> > > > support at home for that mission.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Then, the other side would be wrong. I don't think it is disputed that
> the
> > > United States has an incredible military force and is quite capable of
> > > success with any mission. Actually, it might be a strategic benefit for
> the
> > > other side to think that we are weak due to dissent at home. :)
> > >
> > > As to a lack of support for the mission. Well, it may very well be a lack
> > > of support for a particular mission. I wouldn't want that to be a secret
> if
> > > it's the way I felt. Just as I wouldn't want pertinent facts from the
> other
> > > side to be a secret. What I mean by that is that a part of war and peace
> is
> > > how the population is reacting to it. It isn't just the military that
> goes
> > > to war, it is all of us. And, it isn't just the government on the other
> > > side that is a victim of the war, it is all of them.
> > >

> >
> > > This only emboldens them to more hostilities, being certain that
> such
> will
> > > only heighten the angst at home.
> > >
> > > That Soldier, Sailor, Airman or Marine is now in MORE danger than
> he/she
> > > would have been otherwise because "Charlie" (Or Muhammed, or Wun Phat
> Dik,
> or
> > > whoever...) is now willing to try and use that against our troops.
> > >
> >
> > Our strategists are able to account for and respond to things that go on
> at
> > home, IMHO.
> >
> > > >I know soldiers who wholeheartedly disagreed with some of the
> > > >things they are/were involved with--but it was their job to be involved
> with
> > > >it and they gave every ounce of their being to it.
> > >
> > > Been there...done that...And they will...but let's not make it any
> harder
> > > for them than necessary, huh?
> > >
> > > 73/88
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> > >
> > >
> >
> > I just don't agree with that, Steve. I think that to be a free nation
> > means
> > we support the act of freedom during any time--war or peace.

Exactly! Once we start down the road of not allowing nonviolent, legal dissent or protest against govt. decisions in wartime, we can easily wind up with results that essentially eliminate the very freedoms that are being defended. For example, maybe presidential elections should be suspended in wartime, because, by definition, anyone who runs against an incumbent president disagrees with that incumbent on some policy issues. Instead, perhaps in wartime an incumbent president should have the power to stay in office as long as he/she feels up to the job, and then to name his/her successor without an election.

Or perhaps a wartime President should have unilateral power to increase taxes and impose new taxes during wartime. After all, dissent about taxes would give aid and comfort to the enemy, right?

> >Now, if
> > you're
> > talking about becoming one with the enemy...that's a whole different
> > ballgame. If my objection to a war means that I begin publicly saying
> > things that are military secrets, or anything akin to that, then I would
> > be
> > wrong. But, to disagree with a war and to state my belief against
> > it--even
> > act on my belief against it by taking to the streets and joining a peace
> > rally, is the most extreme expression of freedom and what it stands for,
> > that I can think of.

A nonviolent peace rally, of course. Illegally blocking access or
damaging others' property is not nonviolent action.
> >
> > 73/88 to you!!! > >
> >
>
> The Vietnam War was extended several YEARS because of Hanoi's beliefe that
> the American PEOPLE were against the war (ALL OF THEM). This gave the the
> needed 'push' to keep on going.

I disagree.

In 1968, Richard M. Nixon ran for president on a platform that said,
in part, that he "had a secret plan to end the war in Vietnam". Nixon
won, of course. It seems to me that the election of a president who
repeatedly stated that he has a plan to end the war (he didn't say
"WIN the war", he said "END the war") might give the folks in Hanoi
that impression much more than any anti-war rally.
>
> That is exactly what your kind of thinking will lead us into AGAIN.

So what's the solution? Ban all protest against presidential policies
during declared and undeclared wars? Allow the President to have
unlimited tax and other powers he deems necessary for the war effort,
with no checks and balances?
>
> 'Those that fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it" Or
> something like that. Well you get the point.

Yup.

But it's more important that the freedoms not be destroyed in the
process of defending them. As in "we destroyed the village in order to
save it".

73 de Jim, N2EY

"UN Secretary Kofi Annan said he thinks the arms inspectorsshould
resume looking for weapons in Iraq. Hey, forget arms in Iraq, how
about looking for some backbone in the UN?" - Jay Leno

"There's now talk that US wants to spray the poppy fields of Afghanistan in an effort to destroy the drug crop before it can be harvested. If you thought Bush was unpopular in Hollywood before......-Jay Leno

"And now the really difficult part: We have to rebuild Iraq into a strong and independent nation that will one day hate the United States" - David Letterman

2953. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 18:52:39 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418145239.18836.00000181@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65144

>I simply resent having had to copy Morse by hand to do
>these things then have people with good ears tell me how easy it is.

Yea I know what you mean. I want Millions of dollars, and I resent these fools that tell me I have to work for it, what a bunch of BS. Im a nice guy why cant someone just give me a Million.

2954. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 19:10:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418151053.18783.00000039@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 65148

In article <3E9F8FF6.178EA1ED@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>You've plagiarized the profile. Why not see if you can find someone
>who'll teach you how to use it?

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

2955. Re: At The End Of The Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 19:10:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418151053.18783.00000038@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 65151

In article <20030418023742.19054.00000089@mb-m24.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker who doesn't know how to "killfile") writes:

> You may stuff it, Your Impotentness. Everyone here sees how you adhere to
>your own "direction" on newsgroup content. Usual "Do What I Say, Not Do What
>I Do" rhetoric.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has, if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

> More lying from somone whose experience should make them one of the most
>trusted...Not most humiliating...

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has, if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

> The only thing in here that's "disinterested" is you...Disinterested in
>facts...Disinterested in truth...Disinterested in honor.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has, if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

> Coward.

> One more opportunity for Lennie to "quote" where I EVER said I was a
>"medical expert". Of course we'll add it to the pile of OTHER opportunities
>Lennie has been provided to "disprove" what others have stated, but has
>failed to do.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

> Sorry Lennie. You're a day late and a dollar short again.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

> Another reason to add thanks to my prayers tonight.
>
> And you only served to acknowledge my assertions about what you HAVEN'T
>done with a radio license...

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

> That you think you are getting anywhere with your lying rhetoric and
>demeaning conduct in here is priceless, Lennie.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

2956. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 19:10:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418151054.18783.00000041@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 65145

In article <f45722ac.0304180301.441d2057@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> If I gotta play by the book, ev'one gotta play by the book.
>
>Phil, if you wanna play at all, you've got to get yourself in the game.
>
>Go enlist, then volunteer for Iraq.

He's waiting for the book to come out...

2957. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 19:10:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418151054.18783.00000040@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 65146

In article <3EA00DCE.6709A863@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:

>> Phil, if you wanna play at all, you've got to get yourself in the game.
>
>On the face of it, your comment was the usual, silly Brian Burke stuff.
>The more I thought it about it, the more I saw some logic in it. To
>extend your idea, if Len Anderson wants to play, he has to get in the
>game.
>
>> Go enlist, then volunteer for Iraq.
>
>Why would Phil do that?

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

2958. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 19:10:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418151056.18783.00000043@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 65147

In article <20030418072722.18755.00000048@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030416231211.18878.00000077@mb-m18.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
>(Vshah101) writes:

>>Outside
>>of Ham radio, Morse code is not useful.
>
>Incorrect.
>
>Outside of amateur radio, Morse code is not very useful. Inside amateur
>radio, Morse code is very useful.

Inconsistent. "Ham radio" is supposed to equal "amateur radio"
yet the renowned judge of petty details rules that it is "incorrect."

Morse code cognition MUST be demonstrated to obtain a US
amateur radio license having below-30-MHz privileges. That's
a LEGAL REQUIREMENT and does not fall into the "useful"
category...except to those who would bastardize English
language use for their own narrow-minded little purposes.

Outside of either "ham radio," "amateur radio," or the Archaic
Radiotelegraphy Society, morse code has VERY LITTLE USE.

2959. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 19:10:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418151056.18783.00000042@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 65152

In article <f45722ac.0304180255.47558d1@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Dave K8MN
>
>Len states that he was stationed in Japan, and Huffy calls him a REMF.
> Huffy then makes claims that he is/was a warrior, but cannot
>reference any of it. Dave can only clip and past others remarks, and
>is somehow making a positive contribution.
>
>What is your stated goal here?

Heil has no "stated" goal here, but it is fairly obvious: Claim
expertise by wording statements carefully so that they
APPEAR to be more than they are. On that basis he can
then expound on it using Google archives as "references" and
feel free to put down others through his "superiority."

Heil appeared to "wow" the readership by all those early
mentions of State Department communications and office
titles. Very few readers here can be expected to have State
Department communications experience, so the stage is set
for a nice snowjob.

What Heil did not reckon on is that military communications
is larger than what Department of State has and, with normal
military assignment turnover rates, there would be a greater
chance of readers here having past experience in military
radio communications. Not only that, but mentioning a very
small African country that is relatively unfamiliar to most was
another attempt at "exotic locale glamour" which backfired.

Heil has been on damage-control for years in here, attempting
to misdirect the subject away from talking directly about his
claims through comments about the person of participants.
The common technique he uses is to attempt humiliation by
using details others have supplied then "comparing" those to
his own very general, undetailed statements of his own.

For an example, his "combat experience" is alluded to by a
simple, no-details statement that he was in a country at war.
Vietnam, even just South Vietnam, is not a small place and
the ratio of supply/support personnel to active combat troops
in the US Army was then about 7:1. Heil claimed USAF
military service which had a higher ratio of support to active
combat personnel. Heil had NO identification of his unit or

geographic location or any statement of his duties. So far, his "combat activity" statements are ambiguous...and begin to look like just another snowjob.

2960. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 19:10:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418151058.18783.00000044@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 65150

In article <20030418072725.18755.00000050@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030418012918.18821.00000010@mb-m10.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20030417222749.18827.00000028@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>>
>>>> You've never worked in commercial HF comms
>>>> or have any experience in anything but simple amateur radio
>>>> stations.
>>>
>>>How do you know what I have and have not done? You don't even know where I
>>>work, or where I have worked.
>>
>> You've never worked in commercial HF comms
>> or have any experience in anything but simple amateur radio
>> stations.
>
>Doesn't answer the question. You're just repeating yourself.

You haven't stated anything about your past experience
except the most general ambiguous statements about work
and alleged experience as an amateur licensee. You have
NO references about communications experience outside
of amateurism. From that no one has to accede to your
demand for any answer.

>Incorrect. Unliked you, Len, I don't use this newsgroup to mention everything
>I've ever done outside amateur radio. In fact, I don't talk about my work
>here very much.

Incorrect. You do NOT MENTION ANYTHING. Ergo, you have
NO experience in radio communication outside of amateurism.

>Doesn't prove a thing, len. You're presuming your conclusion.

You have NO REFERENCES. Outside of amateur radio your
radio communications is blank, a null, non-existant.

No one can prove non-existance yet you attempt to "prove" you
have non-amateur radio experience. Bad.

>Just because someone doesn't talk about something doesn't mean they haven't
>done it. For example, not everyone named in a patent grant tells everyone

>about it.

Another morseman in here claimed "26 patents" for many
messages...yet there was only ONE such US patent and he was
co-inventor of record.

Irrelevant and gratuitous snowjobbing by a morseman.

>See above. There's lots of things I don't talk about.

Proves nothing other than you have NO REFERENCE for such
things.

>btw, I have worked with cystems that use 5823s.

C-Systems was not under discussion. Did you or did you not
work at C-Systems?

>You're projecting your own emotions and behavior onto others, Len.

Incorrect. I'm detailing where you have NO REFERENCES
outside of amateur radio.

YOU cannot prove any non-amateur radio experience by
saying nothing of detail.

>> You've never done commercial HF communications in your life
>> outside of ham radio
>
>Incorrect!

Then BE SPECIFIC on what you have "done."

Otherwise you are nothing more than vapor, working on vaporware.

>Sure I do. You've told us all about it here for years.

I have detailed it and have the references and documentation.

You have vapor and vaporware.

>> You are NOT in any position to DEMAND anything in here,
>
>How in the world do you read my statement as a DEMAND? It's not a DEMAND.
>It's just a clear, concise statement of fact.

Incorrect. You have stated nothing in regards to non-amateur
radio communications. Yet you demand others to be detailed
in responses to your questions, prattle endlessly about
NON-amateur-radio subjects, and behave as if your words
are sacrosanct. That leads to the following "profiling" -

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Miccolis's views, they will
be the target of his arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-

downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Miccolis's self-importance and experience...not to mention puerile pique.

2961. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 19:10:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418151059.18783.00000045@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 65149

In article <3E9F868F.E926046@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:

>> Wow, Dave. It's telling where you stand on this issue. It makes me
>> wonder who's still smoking dope from the barrel of his M-16.
>
>You mean my opinion that Len acts like a first class jerk? Yeah, I love
>the part where he tells someone else that they act like a blowhard
>braggart. Isn't the part where he lives up to the N2EY profile in
>making unsubstantiated statements about Steve's discharge a class act?
>Len will tell you that he's only here to engage in civil debate over the
>code testing issue. His behavior is consistently very different from
>that stated goal.

Evolution...playing the game as others do it...

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

2962. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 19:25:22 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA05122.BA78E08D@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65137

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >If your hearing is impaired, yes. It's akin to putting up obsticals to
> >keep cripples out of rest rooms to make more room for healthy people.
>
> .... One Question if your hearing so Impared, what makes you think you will
> be able to hear a SSB QSO with no problem?

I can't hear SSB QSOs with "NO problem". That's why I leave nets and DX chasing to my XYL. I just set up & maintain her station, do some packet, chew the rag with friends and plan to work digital modes like PSK31 when time permits.Computer to computer Morse at really high speeds has always intrigued me too. I simply resent having had to copy Morse by hand to do these things then have people with good ears tell me how easy it is.

73, K3DWW

2963. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 19:27:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304181127.37415fb6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65153

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA00DCE.6709A863@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdi8aza.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > > On 16 Apr 2003 18:56:22 -0700, Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > >> I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
> > > >> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
> > > >> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
> > > >> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
> > > >> to standing procedures binding upon the military.
> > > >
> > > >It's nice to see an amateur atempting to squash the spirit of amateur radio.
> > > >
> > > >Probably an attorney.
> > >
> > > One of the better communications attornies around if I say so
> > > myself. Rule compliance is my specialty and I've been on the
> > > prosecution side as well as the defense side.
> > >
> > > If I gotta play by the book, ev'one gotta play by the book.
> >
> > Phil, if you wanna play at all, you've got to get yourself in the game.
>
> On the face of it, your comment was the usual, silly Brian Burke stuff.
> The more I thought it about it, the more I saw some logic in it. To
> extend your idea, if Len Anderson wants to play, he has to get in the
> game.

That's what you've been saying all along.

Why is it bad when I adopt that theology?

> > Go enlist, then volunteer for Iraq.
>
> Why would Phil do that?
>
> Dave K8MN

So he could properly frame the written permission required by deployed
amateurs. Sure would be nice for those deployed commanders and
amateurs to have some professional legal advice, instead of a bunch of
armchair warriors and codester lawyers.

2964. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 19:41:19 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA054DF.6A5ED272@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65140

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Since one can change both the pitch and volume of the side tone on a radio
> to the individual needs of the operator, morse would be easier to hear, once
> the operator is trained, than voices.

That hasn't been my experience. I have such severe tininitis I can't
even spell it coupled with profound hearing loss from the midrange up.
Problem I have with Morse is that I hear dits and dahs that are
generated by my own ears as well as missing real ones due to deafness
and the whole session goes south once one of my self-generated tones
modulates with the one I'm trying to hear to make a warble.

Voices are a little easier, even with some QRM/N, because I 'copy' them
much more than I do code (eg, the XYL never chews me out in Morse) but I
limit my SSB and even FM rag chews to friends willing to excuse my
mistakes. That's why PC Morse kind of interests me. Maybe when I retire
....

Meanwhile 73, K3DWW

2965. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 19:50:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304181150.6f4fda93@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65154

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA00BAE.AEF07704@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9F8E69.FBEFBDB1@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9CC8CC.364D78AF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:3E9C984F.C703F3F8@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > "Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> > > > > > > > 2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> > > > > > > > League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> > > > > > > > British military personnel
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
> > > > > > > > officer.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > "There is precedent for this," Mills said, citing an operation during
> > > > > > > > the 1991 Gulf War. "These operators will need written authorization to
> > > > > > > > operate from their commanding officers
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I'm sitting here grinning from ear to ear. All of this, of course,
> > > > > > > > reminds me of lengthy tale of an alleged operation from Somalia.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Not trying to be a smart alec here...but...since there is no actual
> > > > > > > government....and the only authority seems to be the US Military....I see no
> > > > > > > particular problem if the ham in question has a valid FCC license and the
> > > > > > > commander gives him the authority. Isnt the CO the defacto licensing
> > > > > > > authority in this case???
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That's the usual case, Dan. In N0IMD's case, he didn't think it
> > > > > > important to have the permission in writing for operating from Somalia.
> > > > > > He says he operated on a verbal OK.
> > > >
> > > > In K8MN's case, he said that no military commander can authorize any
> > > > amateur radio activity. Just ask him if he said that. He will

> > > > confirm it.
> > >
> > > Here you go, Brian. These quotes might jog your memory about what took
> > > place.
> > >
> > > From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > > Subject: Re: DSP vs human decoding of OOK CW
> > > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > Date: 2002-08-01 11:42:56 PST
> > >
> > > "Is it a lame assertion if your operation doesn't count toward DXCC and
> > > the "authority" granting you permission to operate had no right to do
> > > so? Surely you knew that as a self-proclaimed moral and ethical man
> > > that your actions were neither moral nor ethical."
> > >
> > >
> > > From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > > Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
> > > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > Date: 2002-08-03 06:20:14 PST
> > >
> > > "No, I say that a commander might grant authorization which is not his
> > > to grant. I say that higher-ups might not approve of such
> > > authorization. I say that the DXCC desk might not credit such operation.
> > > What has the DXCC desk said about your operation from Somalia? Have you
> > > found if it counts or not?"
> > >
> > > From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > > Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
> > > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > Date: 2002-08-09 22:05:19 PST
> > >
> > > "Ah Ah, Brian. I've questioned whether your commander had the authority
> > > to do so. I've also asked if you obtained "written permission". So
> > > far, you've just played dodge ball with the question. I've repeatedly
> > > asked if your operation was accepted for DXCC credit."
> > >
> > > It's only a small issue since the message we've seen about GI's
> > > operating from Iraq requires written permission. Obtaining writtern
> > > persmission never crossed your mind during your time in Somalia.
> > >
> > > Thanks for the giggles.
>
> >
> > Dave, that's nice of you quote yourself -after- your education of
> > operating from a country without a government.
>
> I knew that it was important to obtain written permission. You muffed
> that part.

You muffed all of it.

You said that a commander could not grant permission to operate
amateur radio under any circumstance.

Now you say that he has to put it in writing.

Why would he put it in writing if you say he could not grant it?

> > Your first pass at it
> > claimed a commander had no authority to authorize anything to do with
> > amateur radio.
>
> You continue to have difficulty with reading comprehension. You
> overlook the key word "if". I questioned your "commander's" authority
> to issue such permission, especially when he doesn't issue it writing.

Why would you question a commander's authority? Oh, forgot. You were
in Vietnam.

> I still question it.

Marvy. Take it up with GW, the Joint Chiefs, and the Judge Advocate.

You seem to think that the term "commander" means
> anybody anywhere up the chain of command from you.

Obviously not. These and other misconceptions you have about the
military in general, and the Air Force in particular are staggering
considering that you once served in the Air Force. Oh, forgot. You
were in Vietnam.

I don't see it that
> way. You haven't offered what position your "commander" occupied.

He occupied a command position.

> > Keep giggling, it makes you look even more simple.
>
> I'm not the one left holding the the empty bag of alleged T5
> permissions.

You have a full bag of T5 permissions? Wow!!! Who granted them?

Amateur radio operation was one of the few enjoyable things about
serving in Somalia. I don't regret any part of it.

> > Better yet, why
> > not go work some more Frenchmen (out of band) on 6M?
>
> I was never out of band when working French stations on 6m from
> Tanzania. These days, I'm not even hearing any Frenchmen.

Those frenchmen were out of band. Another Frenchman here confirmed it
in a post directly to you, and which you replied to, and which I
reposted due to your loss of memory. Later, Ferguson confirmed it

with a post from the French telecommunications website, so it wasn't just heresay.

You said that you would keep operating regardless, couldn't be concerned with knowing anything about another country's regulations. You didn't mind helping others violote regulations as long as you were on frequency.

> Did you do any studying on those questions about your alleged T5
> operation posed to you by N2EY and me?

Those were some pretty hard questions, most of which had been answered prior to the latest iteration of Jim and you asking them.

You guys really do need to work on your reading comprehension.

2966. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 19:52:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304181152.714e3b27@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65155

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA00D1B.4C785DDD@earthlink.net>...

> I haven't stated a goal here.

You don't need to. It's obvious.

2967. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 19:53:07 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA057A3.6E9FD3DA@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65141

N2EY wrote:
>
> Hearing impaired people have been passing the test for decades. Flashing light,
> vibrating speaker cone, different tones and volumes, etc. All kinds of
> accomodations are available.

Yes indeed. A cripple could prolly get a wheel chair up the stairs to a
rest room too, but we don't require it. It was a lot harder for me to
get up to 15WPM than someone with good ears. Then all I could find were
"standard" QSOs (name is, rig is, qth is ...). Boreing! When I dared
tell one dude I'd been born in his QTH he went QRT! So I gave it up.
>
> The same can be said for the written test.

Yes, IF it's prime purpose is to limit the number of hams; but I'm not
sure that is true. Unlike Morse, a well thot out written exam could
serve a good purpose.

73, K3DWW

2968. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 19:56:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304181156.7791627c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65156

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9F822A.7426CDAA@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9E27D6.F7086B4E@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9DDF4F.736EC45C@earthlink.net>...
> > > >
> > > > > Communication at near the speed of light and still you have nothing to
> > > > > say. :-) :-) :-(
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > Yet you keep posting and posting and posting....
> > >
> > > With your record, I'd have thought you'd have had enough sense to keep
> > > mum on this one.
>
>
> > With yout tit for every tat, what do you think your record might be?
>
> I'd have thought you'd have had enough sense to keep mum on this one
> too.

Your record speaks for itself.

2969. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 19:57:01 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304181157.1f23a2d5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65157

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdi7tk8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 16 Apr 2003 06:53:32 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Do you really want to deny access to a basically benign form of recreation
> >to 75,000 men with rifles and a lot of adrenalline reserves?
>
> I want to make sure that they play by the book like I have to
> play by the book.

As far as the FCC goes they can't even be bothered enforcing the laws
against blatently illegal activities like freebanding & such in their
own back yard. I seriously doubt that they'll be particulary
interested in extending their reach to Iraq to whack a few guys who
are most likely operating legally by not only ITU but also under U.S.
technical & operating regs. Nobody dies, nobody gets hurt, nobody
suffers illegal interfernce. Lotta pedantic blather. But then this is
RRAP huh . . ?

w3rv

2970. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 20:36:56 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA061E8.B815AC06@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65143

Mike Coslo wrote:
> ... I AM hearting impaired,...
> ... I have tinnitus in both ears, a different frequency in each.

I'm a tad worse off. I hear many tones at once, different in each ear, that turn themselves on and off at random making it hard to tell them from real dits and dahs.
>
> Tough! I passed the test, just like everyone else,.....

By that logic everybody should share our hearing loss and my diabetes and we should all have cancer.
>
> Too many whiners these days!

Naw, too many selfish people who think that everybody should suffer every injustice and misery they did.

K3DWW

2971. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 21:12:20 UTC
From: Foolish Bureaucrats <Corruption@FlunkedClownCollege.org>
Message-ID: <b7pplj$63b$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 65158

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0304181157.1f23a2d5@posting.google.com...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdi7tk8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > On 16 Apr 2003 06:53:32 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >
> > >Do you really want to deny access to a basically benign form of
recreation
> > >to 75,000 men with rifles and a lot of adrenalline reserves?
> >
> > I want to make sure that they play by the book like I have to
> > play by the book.
>
> As far as the FCC goes they can't even be bothered enforcing the laws
> against blatently illegal activities like freebanding & such in their
> own back yard. I seriously doubt that they'll be particulary
> interested in extending their reach to Iraq to whack a few guys who
> are most likely operating legally by not only ITU but also under U.S.
> technical & operating regs. Nobody dies, nobody gets hurt, nobody
> suffers illegal interfernce. Lotta pedantic blather. But then this is
> RRAP huh . . ?
>
> w3rv

The FCC is a useless corrupt bureaucracy. I think it
is funny as hell the way k1man has been thumbing his
nose at the assholes for years!

Dave

2972. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 21:24:15 UTC
From: Mr Mike Hurley <sanfran@mikeyhurleysan.com>
Message-ID: <b7pqbu$7fa$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 65159

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0304181157.1f23a2d5@posting.google.com...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdi7tk8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > On 16 Apr 2003 06:53:32 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >
> > >Do you really want to deny access to a basically benign form of
recreation
> > >to 75,000 men with rifles and a lot of adrenalline reserves?
> >
> > I want to make sure that they play by the book like I have to
> > play by the book.
>
> As far as the FCC goes they can't even be bothered enforcing the laws
> against blatently illegal activities like freebanding & such in their
> own back yard. I seriously doubt that they'll be particulary
> interested in extending their reach to Iraq to whack a few guys who
> are most likely operating legally by not only ITU but also under U.S.
> technical & operating regs. Nobody dies, nobody gets hurt, nobody
> suffers illegal interfernce. Lotta pedantic blather. But then this is
> RRAP huh . . ?
>
> w3rv

Also, don't forget that shrimp boats, long-line fishing
boats, tuna boats, and many pleasure yachts that have been
unlawfully using HF aeronautical frequencies for years.
This creates a distinct danger to aircraft and safety of
life! What has the FCC done? Nothing! despite the
fact that such violations have been reported to the FCC
year after year after year. FCC idiots!

Mike W

2973. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 21:24:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7pqdi$l5q$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65160

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030418145239.18836.00000181@mb-m02.aol.com...
> >I simply resent having had to copy Morse by hand to do
> >these things then have people with good ears tell me how easy it is.
>
> Yea I know what you mean. I want Millions of dollars, and I resent these
fools
> that tell me I have to work for it, what a bunch of BS. Im a nice guy why
cant
> someone just give me a Million.

Me too....since were both such nice guys...wanna cut a deal and split it?
That way we don't have to be but half as nice.

Dan/W4NTI

2974. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 21:28:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7pqml$o9g$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65161

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EA057A3.6E9FD3DA@crosslink.net...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > Hearing impaired people have been passing the test for decades. Flashing
light,
> > vibrating speaker cone, different tones and volumes, etc. All kinds of
> > accomodations are available.
>
> Yes indeed. A cripple could prolly get a wheel chair up the stairs to a
> rest room too, but we don't require it. It was a lot harder for me to
> get up to 15WPM than someone with good ears. Then all I could find were
> "standard" QSOs (name is, rig is, qth is ...). Boreing! When I dared
> tell one dude I'd been born in his QTH he went QRT! So I gave it up.
> >
> > The same can be said for the written test.
>
> Yes, IF it's prime purpose is to limit the number of hams; but I'm not
> sure that is true. Unlike Morse, a well thot out written exam could
> serve a good purpose.
>
> 73, K3DWW

With all due respect Vito...you should have checked it out a bit longer. I
have NO PROBLEM finding interesting QSOs on CW on a DAILY basis.

You can find me on about 7030 or so. Usually in the late afternoons. And if
Im too fast, I'll slow down to what you like.

Dan/W4NTI

2975. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 21:30:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7pqor$b6m$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65162

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EA061E8.B815AC06@crosslink.net...
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> > ... I AM hearting impaired,...
> > ... I have tinnitus in both ears, a different frequency in each.
>
> I'm a tad worse off. I hear many tones at once, different in each ear,
> that turn themselves on and off at random making it hard to tell them
> from real dits and dahs.
> >
> > Tough! I passed the test, just like everyone else,.....
>
> By that logic everybody should share our hearing loss and my diabetes
> and we should all have cancer.
> >
> > Too many whiners these days!
>
> Naw, too many selfish people who think that everybody should suffer
> every injustice and misery they did.
>
> K3DWW

Are all you 'hearing handicapped' individuals also blind? Or can not feel
with ones fingers? Try blinking lights and finger sense.

Sounds like a bunch of excuses to me.

Dan/W4NTI

2976. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 23:02:53 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <xu%na.1376$Oc3.297451@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65163

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EA054DF.6A5ED272@crosslink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > Since one can change both the pitch and volume of the side tone on a
radio
> > to the individual needs of the operator, morse would be easier to hear,
once
> > the operator is trained, than voices.
>
> That hasn't been my experience. I have such severe tininitis I can't
> even spell it coupled with profound hearing loss from the midrange up.
> Problem I have with Morse is that I hear dits and dahs that are
> generated by my own ears as well as missing real ones due to deafness
> and the whole session goes south once one of my self-generated tones
> modulates with the one I'm trying to hear to make a warble.
>
> Voices are a little easier, even with some QRM/N, because I 'copy' them
> much more than I do code (eg, the XYL never chews me out in Morse) but I
> limit my SSB and even FM rag chews to friends willing to excuse my
> mistakes. That's why PC Morse kind of interests me. Maybe when I retire

My ex had a 70% hearing loss in each ear, severe ringing in the ears (I
can't spell the technical term either), and could not wear hearing aids. He
passed the 5 words per minute by adjusting the pitch so it was very
different from the ringing and adjusting the volume so it was loud enough to
drown out the ringing. Of course I could not stay in the same room unless
he was wearing headphones to practice.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2977. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 23:04:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304181504.2f1bbbc4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65164

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030418145239.18836.00000181@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >I simply resent having had to copy Morse by hand to do
> >these things then have people with good ears tell me how easy it is.
>
> Yea I know what you mean. I want Millions of dollars, and I resent these fools
> that tell me I have to work for it, what a bunch of BS. Im a nice guy why cant
> someone just give me a Million.

$250 is a good start.

2978. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 23:08:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304181508.3327c042@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65165

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030415121015.14532.00001197@mb-fe.aol.com>...
> >I do. I'd believe that WA8ULX took $250 to take a CBr's test for him.
> >Lucky they didn't get caught .... yet
>
> No dufus boy that was not the case at all. Just for your info, a couple of
> Cbers who were going to take there CBplusser Test, bet me I couldnt pass the
> EXTRA. Not only did I pass it with 100% score, with no studying, I also got to
> collect the money from the Cbers. But the best part was I got to see both of
> the Fools fail the NoCode CB Plusser Test.

You forgot that it took you less than 8 minutes to take the test.

2979. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 23:15:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304181515.6552a36c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65166

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0304180825.526e6340@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304180255.47558d1@posting.google.com>...
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9F868F.E926046@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9EB36A.3C409C86@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > In article <f45722ac.0304161752.28395836@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >> HEY BURKIE! Hurry up and get your bags packed! Maybe you can GET IT
> > > > > > >> RIGHT this time!
> > > > > > >>
> > > > > > >> Steve, K4YZ
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >Steve, I'd would have been proud to have served in Iraq. That would
> > > > > > >make the 3rd SWA service medal for me.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >How many do you have? Would you consider it a hostile environment?
> > > > > > >List your hostile envirnments, and don't BS us with your Buckeye
> > > > > > >wives.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Steamy the one-man schmuck can't detail his "hostile actions"
> > > > > > since he has no reference for them. He is a blowhard braggart
> > > > > > who didn't get out of the USMC with an Honorable Discharge.
> > > > >
> > > > > N2EY:
> > > > >
> > > > > "No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> > > > > government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> > > > > amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> > > > > Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
> > > > > ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
> > > > > infantile behavior."
>
> > > >
> > > > Wow, Dave. It's telling where you stand on this issue. It makes me
> > > > wonder who's still smoking dope from the barrel of his M-16.
> > >

> > > You mean my opinion that Len acts like a first class jerk? Yeah, I love
> > > the part where he tells someone else that they act like a blowhard
> > > braggart. Isn't the part where he lives up to the N2EY profile in
> > > making unsubstantiated statements about Steve's discharge a class act?
> > > Len will tell you that he's only here to engage in civil debate over the
> > > code testing issue. His behavior is consistently very different from
> > > that stated goal.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> >
> > Len states that he was stationed in Japan, and Huffy calls him a REMF.
>
> Brian,
>
> Who is "Huffy"?
>
> I've read Dave's posts, looked back through this thread, and even
> searched Google, but I cannot find the post where Dave calls Len an
> "REMF".
>
> Could you point us to it, please?
>
> > Huffy then makes claims that he is/was a warrior, but cannot
> > reference any of it.
>
> Can not or will not?

Jim, please don't quote "REMF" as it isn't polite.

2980. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 23:16:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304181516.72d2bc90@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65167

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0304180825.25d5028e@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304180255.47558d1@posting.google.com>...
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9F868F.E926046@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9EB36A.3C409C86@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > In article <f45722ac.0304161752.28395836@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >> HEY BURKIE! Hurry up and get your bags packed! Maybe you can GET IT
> > > > > > >> RIGHT this time!
> > > > > > >>
> > > > > > >> Steve, K4YZ
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >Steve, I'd would have been proud to have served in Iraq. That would
> > > > > > >make the 3rd SWA service medal for me.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >How many do you have? Would you consider it a hostile environment?
> > > > > > >List your hostile envirnments, and don't BS us with your Buckeye
> > > > > > >wives.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Steamy the one-man schmuck can't detail his "hostile actions"
> > > > > > since he has no reference for them. He is a blowhard braggart
> > > > > > who didn't get out of the USMC with an Honorable Discharge.
> > > > >
> > > > > N2EY:
> > > > >
> > > > > "No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> > > > > government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> > > > > amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> > > > > Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
> > > > > ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general
> > > > > infantile behavior."
>
> > > >
> > > > Wow, Dave. It's telling where you stand on this issue. It makes me
> > > > wonder who's still smoking dope from the barrel of his M-16.
> > >

> > > You mean my opinion that Len acts like a first class jerk? Yeah, I love
> > > the part where he tells someone else that they act like a blowhard
> > > braggart. Isn't the part where he lives up to the N2EY profile in
> > > making unsubstantiated statements about Steve's discharge a class act?
> > > Len will tell you that he's only here to engage in civil debate over the
> > > code testing issue. His behavior is consistently very different from
> > > that stated goal.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> >
> > Len states that he was stationed in Japan, and Huffy calls him a REMF.
>
> Brian,
>
> Who is "Huffy"?
>
> I've read Dave's posts, looked back through this thread, and even
> searched Google, but I cannot find the post where Dave calls Len an
> "REMF".
>
> Could you point us to it, please?
>
> > Huffy then makes claims that he is/was a warrior, but cannot
> > reference any of it.
>
> Can not or will not?

Jim, please don't quote "REMF" as it isn't polite.

2981. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 23:22:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA088A4.B011F968@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65168

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA00DCE.6709A863@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdi8aza.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > > > On 16 Apr 2003 18:56:22 -0700, Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >> I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
> > > > >> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
> > > > >> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
> > > > >> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
> > > > >> to standing procedures binding upon the military.
> > > > >
> > > > >It's nice to see an amateur atempting to squash the spirit of amateur radio.
> > > > >
> > > > >Probably an attorney.
> > > >
> > > > One of the better communications attornies around if I say so
> > > > myself. Rule compliance is my specialty and I've been on the
> > > > prosecution side as well as the defense side.
> > > >
> > > > If I gotta play by the book, ev'one gotta play by the book.
> > >
> > > Phil, if you wanna play at all, you've got to get yourself in the game.
> >
> > On the face of it, your comment was the usual, silly Brian Burke stuff.
> > The more I thought it about it, the more I saw some logic in it. To
> > extend your idea, if Len Anderson wants to play, he has to get in the
> > game.
>
> That's what you've been saying all along.
>
> Why is it bad when I adopt that theology?

I didn't say it was bad. You only thought that because of your poor
reading comprehension. I think it was good and I'm glad that you're the
one who wrote it. I'm afraid though that you've aroused the ire of your
mentor.

> > > Go enlist, then volunteer for Iraq.
> >
> > Why would Phil do that?

> So he could properly frame the written permission required by deployed
> amateurs. Sure would be nice for those deployed commanders and
> amateurs to have some professional legal advice, instead of a bunch of
> armchair warriors and codester lawyers.

Seems to me that in past applicable situations, most have figured it out without the assistance of an attorney. You, for example, seem to be the only guy in Somalia who had trouble with the concept.

Dave K8MN

2982. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 23:27:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304181527.797f8e61@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65169

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030417235212.18955.00000173@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >Perhaps I should take a break from digital modes
> >and dust off my Bencher paddles!
>
> Technically, Morse code is a digital mode.

A digital mode that (Dick says) computers cannot copy? Doesn't sound right.

2983. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 23:32:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA08AF9.38BB2099@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65170

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA00BAE.AEF07704@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9F8E69.FBEFBDB1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9CC8CC.364D78AF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:3E9C984F.C703F3F8@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > > "Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> > > > > > > > > 2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> > > > > > > > > League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> > > > > > > > > British military personnel
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
> > > > > > > > > officer.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > "There is precedent for this," Mills said, citing an operation during
> > > > > > > > > the 1991 Gulf War. "These operators will need written authorization to
> > > > > > > > > operate from their commanding officers
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I'm sitting here grinning from ear to ear. All of this, of course,
> > > > > > > > > reminds me of lengthy tale of an alleged operation from Somalia.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Not trying to be a smart alec here...but...since there is no actual
> > > > > > > > > government....and the only authority seems to be the US Military....I see no
> > > > > > > > > particular problem if the ham in question has a valid FCC license and the
> > > > > > > > > commander gives him the authority. Isnt the CO the defacto licensing
> > > > > > > > > authority in this case???
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > That's the usual case, Dan. In N0IMD's case, he didn't think it
> > > > > > > > > important to have the permission in writing for operating from Somalia.
> > > > > > > > > He says he operated on a verbal OK.
```

> >
> > > > > In K8MN's case, he said that no military commander can authorize any
> > > > > amateur radio activity. Just ask him if he said that. He will
> > > > > confirm it.
> > > > >
> > > > Here you go, Brian. These quotes might jog your memory about what took
> > > > place.
> > > > >
> > > > From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > > > Subject: Re: DSP vs human decoding of OOK CW
> > > > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > > Date: 2002-08-01 11:42:56 PST
> > > > >
> > > > "Is it a lame assertion if your operation doesn't count toward DXCC and
> > > > the "authority" granting you permission to operate had no right to do
> > > > so? Surely you knew that as a self-proclaimed moral and ethical man
> > > > that your actions were neither moral nor ethical."
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > > > Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
> > > > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > > Date: 2002-08-03 06:20:14 PST
> > > > >
> > > > "No, I say that a commander might grant authorization which is not his
> > > > to grant. I say that higher-ups might not approve of such
> > > > authorization. I say that the DXCC desk might not credit such operation.
> > > > What has the DXCC desk said about your operation from Somalia? Have you
> > > > found if it counts or not?"
> > > > >
> > > > From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > > > Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
> > > > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > > Date: 2002-08-09 22:05:19 PST
> > > > >
> > > > "Ah Ah, Brian. I've questioned whether your commander had the authority
> > > > to do so. I've also asked if you obtained "written permission". So
> > > > far, you've just played dodge ball with the question. I've repeatedly
> > > > asked if your operation was accepted for DXCC credit."
> > > > >
> > > > It's only a small issue since the message we've seen about GI's
> > > > operating from Iraq requires written permission. Obtaining writtern
> > > > persmission never crossed your mind during your time in Somalia.
> > > > >
> > > > Thanks for the giggles.
> > >
> > > Dave, that's nice of you quote yourself -after- your education of
> > > operating from a country without a government.
> >

> > I knew that it was important to obtain written permission. You muffed
> > that part.
>
> You muffed all of it.
>
> You said that a commander could not grant permission to operate
> amateur radio under any circumstance.

Where's that quote, Brian?

> Now you say that he has to put it in writing.

I've said all along that you needed it in writing. Are you still having
trouble with the concept?

> Why would he put it in writing if you say he could not grant it?

See the above request for a quote.

> > > Your first pass at it
> > > claimed a commander had no authority to authorize anything to do with
> > > amateur radio.
> >
> > You continue to have difficulty with reading comprehension. You
> > overlook the key word "if". I questioned your "commander's" authority
> > to issue such permission, especially when he doesn't issue it writing.
>
> Why would you question a commander's authority? Oh, forgot. You were
> in Vietnam.

As stated previously, the permission may not have been his to give. You
may not have gone high enough in the command chain.

> > I still question it.
>
> Marvy. Take it up with GW, the Joint Chiefs, and the Judge Advocate.

None of them alleged permission for amateur radio operation from
Somalia. You did. I'm taking it up with you.

> > You seem to think that the term "commander" means
> > anybody anywhere up the chain of command from you.
>
> Obviously not. These and other misconceptions you have about the
> military in general, and the Air Force in particular are staggering
> considering that you once served in the Air Force. Oh, forgot. You
> were in Vietnam.

You seem to be the only fellow "staggered".

> I don't see it that
> > way. You haven't offered what position your "commander" occupied.
>
> He occupied a command position.

That's a non-answer.

> > > Keep giggling, it makes you look even more simple.
> >
> > I'm not the one left holding the the empty bag of alleged T5
> > permissions.
>
> You have a full bag of T5 permissions? Wow!!! Who granted them?

You might qualify for a disability for that reading comprehension
difficulty.

> Amateur radio operation was one of the few enjoyable things about
> serving in Somalia. I don't regret any part of it.

That has been apparent. That doesn't prove that your operation was a
legal one.

> > > Better yet, why
> > > not go work some more Frenchmen (out of band) on 6M?
> >
> > I was never out of band when working French stations on 6m from
> > Tanzania. These days, I'm not even hearing any Frenchmen.
>
> Those frenchmen were out of band. Another Frenchman here confirmed it
> in a post directly to you, and which you replied to, and which I
> reposted due to your loss of memory. Later, Ferguson confirmed it
> with a post from the French telecommunications website, so it wasn't
> just heresay.

As indicated to you in quite a number of previous posts, I'm not
responsible for the actions of French hams. I'm only responsible for
operating my station in accordance with the regs of the country in which
I reside.

> You said that you would keep operating regardless, couldn't be
> concerned with knowing anything about another country's regulations.
> You didn't mind helping others violote regulations as long as you were
> on frequency.

No help from me was required. Each station who keys a transmitter is
responsible for his own actions. "I couldn't help calling that P5 on
14.110 because he enticed me with his presence" isn't an excuse.

> > Did you do any studying on those questions about your alleged T5
> > operation posed to you by N2EY and me?
>
> Those were some pretty hard questions, most of which had been answered
> prior to the latest iteration of Jim and you asking them.

...not by you, they've not been answered.

> You guys really do need to work on your reading comprehension.

You've evolved into a being who delivers a simultaneous straight line
and punch line.

Dave K8MN

2984. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 23:33:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA08B39.5D963178@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65171

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA00D1B.4C785DDD@earthlink.net>...
>
> > I haven't stated a goal here.
>
> You don't need to. It's obvious.

Then, pray tell, why are you wasting my time in asking me for a stated
goal?

Dave K8MN

2985. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 23:34:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA08B8E.B6023667@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65172

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9F822A.7426CDAA@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9E27D6.F7086B4E@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9DDF4F.736EC45C@earthlink.net>...
> > > > >
> > > > > > Communication at near the speed of light and still you have nothing to
> > > > > > say. :-) :-) :-(
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > > > Yet you keep posting and posting and posting....
> > > >
> > > > With your record, I'd have thought you'd have had enough sense to keep
> > > > mum on this one.
> > >
> > >
> > > With yout tit for every tat, what do you think your record might be?
> >
> > I'd have thought you'd have had enough sense to keep mum on this one
> > too.
>
> Your record speaks for itself.

I like to think that it does, despite the attempted pot shots by guys
like yourself.

Dave K8MN

2986. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 23:42:09 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418194209.01935.00000103@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65173

>Me too....since were both such nice guys...wanna cut a deal and split it?
>That way we don't have to be but half as nice.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Cant we just whine about Dan, and maybe somebody will give us both a Million.

2987. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 23:45:06 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418194506.01935.00000104@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65174

>My ex had a 70% hearing loss in each ear, severe ringing in the ears (I
>can't spell the technical term either), and could not wear hearing aids. He
>passed the 5 words per minute by adjusting the pitch so it was very
>different from the ringing and adjusting the volume so it was loud enough to
>drown out the ringing. Of course I could not stay in the same room unless
>he was wearing headphones to practice.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Dee, you know that cant be done, dont believe me, ask any of the Whinning CBplusser they will tell you.

2988. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 23:47:02 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418194702.01935.00000105@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65175

>$250 is a good start.

Yea your right, but the FCC will only let you take it once when you pass. But not to fear, im looking into other things to Con the CBplussers out of there money. God there so easy.

2989. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-18 23:55:49 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418195549.01935.00000107@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65176

>You forgot that it took you less than 8 minutes to take the test.
>

Your right, I guess I missed that, thanks for updating it for me.
Oh by the way, I see your still a Welfare General. Could you do us all a favor and tell us how many times you flunked the EXTRA so far?
Maybe you and your Buddy Karl are trying to set a record on how many times it takes to pass the EXTRA. It took the Tech Guru Karl over a year, it took me 8 minutes, my guess for you is 4 to 5 Years,
unless they start just handing them out to anybody. Thats what your waiting for isnt? Another FREE Handout.

2990. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 00:38:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdk3xfd.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 65178

On 17 Apr 2003 17:05:14 -0800, Floyd Davidson wrote:

>What I do see is a mistaken idea that the FCC has anything to
>do with
>
> 1) The US Government (military) use of radio spectrum

The FCC is a party to an inter-agency agreement as to what
spectrum the military can use and where, and the inquiry was
made to the individual who is in the best postion to get me
the answers that I need. Had I had a suitable contact in DoD
or NTIA or the State Department I wouild have asked there.

> 2) Use of radio spectrum outside the US

The FCC still retains a "hook" on the conduct of an amateur
licensee operating under color of his/her US license even in a
foreign country.

> 3) ARRL's regulation of it's DXCC award.

Never said that it did. That's ARRL's problem.

>The simple fact is that a military commander on foriegn soil
>can do whatever his superior officer says he can do. That is
>indeed just exactly what an army is for.

And there are regs that define the limits of what a commander
may authorize in radio use and what has to be authorized by the
service frequency coordinator in conjunction with the NTIA and
the US State Department.

In this case, there certainly is a provision for using amateur-band
frequencies world-wide for MILITARY puposes. No question about that.

An amateur playing DX on 20 meters is not a military purpose.

Have the regs been changed since I checked them last (7 years ago)?

THAT's my inquiry.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2991. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 00:38:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdk4g8f.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 65179

On 18 Apr 2003 11:21:35 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>Here's part of that mindset I was trying to define in another post. Part
>of what's wrong in the Middle East...Who did what to whom, why, and how long
>ago.

Wait 'till the Cherokee and the Navajo catch up.......

I worked with someone who was 1/4 Cherokee and I could see it
below the surface.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2992. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 00:38:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdk4bbe.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 65180

On 18 Apr 2003 11:12:08 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> Part 97 clearly delineates where it has jurisdiction, and I do not see
>"foreign territory that recently got it's butt kicked by the Armed Forces of
>the United States" anywhere in there.

See my earlier post this date for details of who has what hook
and where. My inquiry was whether the military regs have been
changed to permit such authority to be issued.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2993. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 00:38:01 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdk4u4g.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 65177

On 18 Apr 2003 12:27:56 -0700, Brian wrote:

>So he could properly frame the written permission required by deployed
>amateurs. Sure would be nice for those deployed commanders and
>amateurs to have some professional legal advice, instead of a bunch of
>armchair warriors and codester lawyers.

It's all written down in the regs as to who can authorize what
and when.

As far as joining, The Selective Service Board had their crack
at me in 1961 and even though they found in the pre-induction
physical that I had a hidden from-birth disability that exempted
me from military service I went and worked as a civilian for the
military and then the civilian side, a total of nearly 40 years.

I've done my thing and that thing was not draft-dodging.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2994. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 00:38:01 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdk68ah.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 65181

On 18 Apr 2003 12:57:01 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>As far as the FCC goes they can't even be bothered enforcing the laws
>against blatently illegal activities like freebanding & such in their
>own back yard. I seriously doubt that they'll be particulary
>interested in extending their reach to Iraq to whack a few guys who
>are most likely operating legally by not only ITU but also under U.S.
>technical & operating regs. Nobody dies, nobody gets hurt, nobody
>suffers illegal interfernce. Lotta pedantic blather. But then this is
>RRAP huh . . ?

All depends on whose ox is gored, right? And what do I advise
a client who wants to know if it's really legal or not?

One of the principles by which I practice law and advise
clients is to be clear what the WORST case is, not what they
can get away with (I chase a higher class of ambulance, right?).
My usual statement is "if you get caught, what defense can you
offer" based on two principles - ignorance does not cut it, and
the "dude" defense ("some other dude did it") is not applicable
to these sort of things.

If the regs have changed to permit a commander to issue ham
operating permission, so be it (I think that would be a bad
move if it was so).

We will see.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2995. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 00:38:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EA09AAD.7060006@adelphia.net>
Source record: 65182

Vito wrote:
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> ... I AM hearting impaired,...
>>... I have tinnitus in both ears, a different frequency in each.
>
>
> I'm a tad worse off. I hear many tones at once, different in each ear,
> that turn themselves on and off at random making it hard to tell them
> from real dits and dahs.
>
>> Tough! I passed the test, just like everyone else,.....
>
>
> By that logic everybody should share our hearing loss and my diabetes
> and we should all have cancer.

I don't know where you get that as my logic, Vito. My point is that in the card game of life, we are all dealt different hands. We have to work with what we have. It took me over six months to learn Morse code well enough to pass the test that some people here say can be learned in weekend. Should I have just given up because they are so much better than me? Thing one is they aren't better, thing two is I wanted the ticket, so I learned Morse Code. Simple.

>> Too many whiners these days!
>
> Naw, too many selfish people who think that everybody should suffer
> every injustice and misery they did.

I think everyone should pass the the tests in life that we are given. Let's take another of my hobbies, Ice Hockey. If someone wants to be on my team, they need to know how to skate. If there is some problem that they cannot skate, they can't be on the team (albeit with my condolences) But it's just how it is. If we were forced to take people who couldn't skate, the game would be messed up a bit. It's the same that I can't play in the NHL. My skills are just not good enough. I deal with it though, and don't think the people playing in the NHL are selfish. Rather, I admire them instead of resent and envy them.

I enjoy the little challenges like learning Morse code while having a problem that hinders it. Things that are just handed to us are seldom appreciated. Of course in America these days, everything is owed to us.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2996. Re: Article in World Radiol

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 00:42:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EA09BAC.9090501@adelphia.net>
Source record: 65183

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
> news:3EA061E8.B815AC06@crosslink.net...
>
>>Mike Coslo wrote:
>>
>>> ... I AM hearting impaired,...
>>>... I have tinnitus in both ears, a different frequency in each.
>>
>>I'm a tad worse off. I hear many tones at once, different in each ear,
>>that turn themselves on and off at random making it hard to tell them
>>from real dits and dahs.
>>
>>> Tough! I passed the test, just like everyone else,.....
>>
>>By that logic everybody should share our hearing loss and my diabetes
>>and we should all have cancer.
>>
>>> Too many whiners these days!
>>
>>Naw, too many selfish people who think that everybody should suffer
>>every injustice and misery they did.
>>
>>K3DWW
>
>
> Are all you 'hearing handicapped' individuals also blind? Or can not feel
> with ones fingers? Try blinking lights and finger sense.
>
> Sounds like a bunch of excuses to me.

What are you talking about Dan? I support testing and retaining the
test, and although I have some severe hearing problems, I was pointing
out that I overcame it to passs the test.

I AM MAKING NO EXCUSES. IS THAT CLEAR?

I bet you like kicking the canes out from under cripples.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2997. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 00:47:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EA09CD1.6050005@adelphia.net>
Source record: 65184

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
> news:3EA054DF.6A5ED272@crosslink.net...
>
>>"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>>
>>>Since one can change both the pitch and volume of the side tone on a
>>
> radio
>
>>>to the individual needs of the operator, morse would be easier to hear,
>>
> once
>
>>>the operator is trained, than voices.
>>
>>That hasn't been my experience. I have such severe tininitis I can't
>>even spell it coupled with profound hearing loss from the midrange up.
>>Problem I have with Morse is that I hear dits and dahs that are
>>generated by my own ears as well as missing real ones due to deafness
>>and the whole session goes south once one of my self-generated tones
>>modulates with the one I'm trying to hear to make a warble.
>>
>>Voices are a little easier, even with some QRM/N, because I 'copy' them
>>much more than I do code (eg, the XYL never chews me out in Morse) but I
>>limit my SSB and even FM rag chews to friends willing to excuse my
>>mistakes. That's why PC Morse kind of interests me. Maybe when I retire
>
>
> My ex had a 70% hearing loss in each ear, severe ringing in the ears (I
> can't spell the technical term either), and could not wear hearing aids. He
> passed the 5 words per minute by adjusting the pitch so it was very
> different from the ringing and adjusting the volume so it was loud enough to
> drown out the ringing. Of course I could not stay in the same room unless
> he was wearing headphones to practice.

Right. We can do it. I also have a pair of headphones attached to my
television, but I don't use them when my wife is in the room because the
sound escaping from them drives her nuts.And her and my boy don't like
closed captioning. Basically I only watch tv after they have gone to bed
for the evening. That may be why I have so many hobbies! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2998. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 00:52:54 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <81BD6DACD3EEC2EB.C999C620FC531C59.9B432F0625B1459B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65187

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0304180916.4a28633d@posting.google.com...
> [SNIP]
> But it's more important that the freedoms not be destroyed in the
> process of defending them. As in "we destroyed the village in order to
> save it".
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> "UN Secretary Kofi Annan said he thinks the arms inspectorsshould
> resume looking for weapons in Iraq. Hey, forget arms in Iraq, how
> about looking for some backbone in the UN?" - Jay Leno
>
> "There's now talk that US wants to spray the poppy fields of
> Afghanistan in an effort to destroy the drug crop before it can be
> harvested. If you thought Bush was unpopular in Hollywood
> before......-Jay Leno
>
> "And now the really difficult part: We have to rebuild Iraq into a
> strong and independent nation that will one day hate the United
> States" - David Letterman

Oh man, so true, so true!!!

Kim W5TIT

2999. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 00:54:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418205412.18828.00000107@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65185

In article <20030418151058.18783.00000044@mb-m27.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>n article <20030418072725.18755.00000050@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>In article <20030418012918.18821.00000010@mb-m10.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>>In article <20030417222749.18827.00000028@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>>(N2EY)
>>>writes:
>>>
>>>>> You've never worked in commercial HF comms
>>>>> or have any experience in anything but simple amateur radio
>>>>> stations.
>>>>
>>>>How do you know what I have and have not done? You don't even know where I
>>>>work, or where I have worked.
>>>
>>> You've never worked in commercial HF comms
>>> or have any experience in anything but simple amateur radio
>>> stations.
>>
>>Doesn't answer the question. You're just repeating yourself.
>
> You haven't stated anything about your past experience
> except the most general ambiguous statements about work
> and alleged experience as an amateur licensee.

That's right, Len.

I also haven't stated my past experience baking bread. That doesn't mean I have
never baked any bread, only that I haven't talked about it here.

> You have
> NO references about communications experience outside
> of amateurism.

"References"? From whom?

> From that no one has to accede to your
> demand for any answer.

I don't demand anything, Len. I simply asked a simple question: How do you know
what I have and have not done?

I posted here for several years before I mentioned that I have BSEE and MSEE degrees. Did the fact I did not mention them before mean I did not have them? Of course not.
>
>>Incorrect. Unlike you, Len, I don't use this newsgroup to mention
>>everything I've ever done outside amateur radio. In fact, I don't talk
>>about my work here very much.
>
> Incorrect. You do NOT MENTION ANYTHING.

Sure I do. I work as an electrical engineer. That's what I've done since I graduated in 1976. That's all you need to know.

> Ergo, you have
> NO experience in radio communication outside of amateurism.

That's simply incorrect. I DO have "experience in radio communication outside of amateurism." I just don;t talk about it here because it's not relevant to amateur radio policy.
>
>>Doesn't prove a thing, len. You're presuming your conclusion.
>
> You have NO REFERENCES.

References from whom?

> Outside of amateur radio your
> radio communications is blank, a null, non-existant.

That's just not true, Len. Live with it.
>
> No one can prove non-existance yet you attempt to "prove" you
> have non-amateur radio experience. Bad.

Incorrect. I just don't talk about my work here.
>
>>Just because someone doesn't talk about something doesn't mean they haven't
>>done it. For example, not everyone named in a patent grant tells everyone
>>about it.
>
> Another morseman in here claimed "26 patents" for many
> messages...yet there was only ONE such US patent and he was
> co-inventor of record.

I'm not him, Len. I don't control what others post.
>
> Irrelevant and gratuitous snowjobbing by a morseman.

What is a "morseman"?
>
>>See above. There's lots of things I don't talk about.
>
> Proves nothing other than you have NO REFERENCE for such
> things.

Again with the REFERENCES?

What it proves is that I don't talk about them.
>
>>btw, I have worked with cystems that use 5823s.
>
> C-Systems was not under discussion. Did you or did you not
> work at C-Systems?

Typo. You make more typos than I, Len.

I have worked with systems that used 5823s. Cold cathode gas tube. Same system also used Dekatron counter tubes (sometimes nicknamed "whirligig tube" because of its appearance in operation).

>>You're projecting your own emotions and behavior onto others, Len.
>
> Incorrect. I'm detailing where you have NO REFERENCES
> outside of amateur radio.

What are these REFERENCES you keep harping on, and what difference do they make to amateur radio policy?
>
> YOU cannot prove any non-amateur radio experience by
> saying nothing of detail.

That's right! And neither can YOU prove I have no experience.
>
>>> You've never done commercial HF communications in your life
>>> outside of ham radio
>>
>>Incorrect!
>
> Then BE SPECIFIC on what you have "done."

Why? "No one has to accede to your demand for any answer." You refuse to answer many of my questions - why should I answer yours? Because you DEMAND it?
>
> Otherwise you are nothing more than vapor, working on vaporware.

No, Len, I'm very real, working on real things. I just don't discuss most of them here. Since this is an amateur radio newsgroup, I discuss amateur radio here. If it were a bread baking newsgroup, I'd discuss bread baking.

btw, I do not and have never baked bread for a living. But I know a radio amateur who does. He's famous for it in these parts.
>
>>Sure I do. You've told us all about it here for years.
>
> I have detailed it and have the references and documentation.

I have references and documentation of what I've done, too. But I don't talk about it here.

>>> You are NOT in any position to DEMAND anything in here,

Neither are you, Len. Live with it.

>>How in the world do you read my statement as a DEMAND? It's not a
>> DEMAND.
>>It's just a clear, concise statement of fact.
>
> Incorrect.

How is it incorrect?

> You have stated nothing in regards to non-amateur
> radio communications.

Incorrect! I just haven't given the details you want. And I'm not going to.

Your attempt to find out where I work and more details about what I do has failed, Len. Give it up - I'm not going to tell you.

Besides, it doesn't matter. No matter what job experience, references or documentation I present, you would almost certainly find fault with it, demean it and insult me with it. You have behaved that way towards everyone here whose work experience is known to you and who disagrees with you on unrelated amateur radio policy issues.

Why would any rational person who disagrees with you tell you their work experience, given the way you have consistently behaved towards those do tell you their work experience and who disagree with you on unrelated amateur radio policy matters?

3000. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 00:57:01 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <F053B11384A4DB09.FE9F66A7A2A2481B.BDB519E82BBFEC9B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65188

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3EA01164.3C0C6074@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> > news:BAC3B759.17103%stewart@say.net...
> > > "Dave Heil" wrote:
> > >
> > > > Do you have any concept of how our military operates?
> > >
> > >
> > > Your concept obviously differs from mine. Dave. You said that weapon
> > > (MOAB) was deployed to Iraq to attack troops massed in open terrain. I
> > > pointed out that, according to the military itself, there were no
troops
> > > still massed in open terrain when that weapon was deployed - only
isolated
> > > pockets in towns and cities. You responded to that with the above.
> > >
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > >
> > >
> >
> > It's called ignoring an inarguable truth when it doesn't support your
> > framework of thought. Children do it every day...
>
> That's how I'd access Dwight's comments, Kim. Nice that you agree.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

I do agree Dave, if the word is changed to assess and the name to Dave.

And, I'm not even slightly interested in engaging your flippant, arrogant
attitude.

Kim W5TIT

3001. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 01:00:01 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418210001.19022.00000111@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65186

From K4YZ
>>By the way, I counted calories today. I ate 2,600 calories
>
> Glad to hear it! Keep it up! As long as people keep doing this, I am
>assured a job!

It was one of those occasional times.

>I'm not overweight...(SNIP)
>
> You're on your way, Vipul.

No, I'll be fine. I don't normally eat that much. I am in control and I don't have to worry that it will happen again

>>Tomorrow I'll have a HAM and cheese sandwich.
>
> PNP or NPN...?!?!

I prefer NPN transistors.

My watch can get on HF. I know it can get on HF since it says "30 METERS" on it.

3002. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 01:30:04 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418213004.19022.00000112@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65189

From N2EY:

>I think it would be great if more hams homebrewed and experimented.
>But there are reasons why most hams don't.
>

Yes, most Hams like to operate and don't like experimenting so they don't.

Also, the current group of Hams encourages new Hams to learn Morse code above other skills.

3003. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 01:43:40 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418214340.19022.00000115@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65191

From K4YZ:
> I can't think of too many things in life that are a "do it once now or
>forget about it forever" situation.

Unfortunately, thats the way the system works.

I may be getting out of the EE field soon and into something that makes more money, and is a more stable field. I have one thing due at the end of this month. If I can make that deadline, I will probably stay in EE (even at alot less money).

3004. Need Radio Station Listening Help

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 01:43:49 UTC
From: icycool7227@aol.com
Message-ID: <536ed219.0304181743.5b8b64@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65190

This is Scotty Duke and I want you to all know that I am bisexual. There, now that thats out, I am looking for someone in any area to see if they will use their phone to let me listen to radio stations. My favorite format is hot AC (hot adult contemporary), 80s, rock, and smooth jazz stations, and also some top 40 stations. Since I can't get these on my regular radio, I am looking for someone to let me listen through their telephone. If you need to get to know me first we can wait a while. I know this may be weird but I am obsessed with radio and would like to get in the business. You can email me at icycool7227@aol.com. Thanks a lot!

3005. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 02:04:10 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418220410.19022.00000117@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65192

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>Thats how the EE field /IT phenom works in this country. I cannot go back in
>>time and get that IT job that I don't like (I like EE stuff).
>
>Live and learn. Next time an IT job comes up, you may change your mind.

There is no such thing as "Live and learn" in the EE/IT professions. As soon as you try to learn (for example, by taking courses), you no longer fit the desired profile. This counteracts any positive efforts you have made. I don't want to go into detail, but steering your profile becomes impossible, or very costly.

I may be getting out of the EE field soon and into something that makes more money (although not glamorous), and is a more stable field. Most of real EE stuff is not glamorous, anyway. I wanted to do something reasonably interesting, if not glamorous.

I have one thing due at the end of this month. If I can make that deadline, I will probably stay in EE (even at less money).

3006. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 02:12:18 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418221218.19022.00000118@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65193

>Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

The local Ham radio club has a gathering tomorrow.
Tomorrow's Ham club gathering I would like to ask:

Questions about Hams:

-Why are Hams fat, male, old, nerdy, boring, anti-social, code lovers, non-technical. (I'll try to get in as many of these as possible. First ask "why fat" if I don't have time for other parts of this question).

-What would a non-Ham's impression of Ham be, if invited to a Hamfest.

-Why do Hams use so many unneeded codewords in their conversation?

-Some people believe Ham radio is some kind of cult. Do you see a small part of Ham radio having "cult-like" existence? Part of this is hating CBers and modifying radios or removing CB crystal freqs to not permit CB operation.

-Why do Hams like contesting, a repetetive, boring activity.

-Why do Hams claim contesting prepares them for emergency communications?

-Why is Morse code so much a focus of Ham radio?

-Would anyone, or do you know anyone, that would be interested in a technical focus club?

Club specific questions:

-Why does newsletter state buying an HF rig is supporting "advancement of the radio art".

-Why is club photo of people homebrewing shown on club photo, when everyone in that photo hates homebrewing? (First, I will ask people in the photo if they like homebrewing).

3007. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 02:54:40 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304181854.615327cf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65194

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030417235212.18955.00000173@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >Perhaps I should take a break from digital modes
> >and dust off my Bencher paddles!
>
> Technically, Morse code is a digital mode.

It's actually a digitized language . .

w3rv

3008. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 03:12:59 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418231259.19022.00000120@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65195

From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net

>I think everyone should pass the the tests in life that we are given.
>Let's take another of my hobbies, Ice Hockey. If someone wants to be on
>my team, they need to know how to skate.

Tests are useful if they are relevant. Learning how to skate is relaevant to learning hockey. Learning Morse code is not relavant to radio, including amateur radio.

>My skills are just not good enough. I deal
>with it though, and don't think the people playing in the NHL are
>selfish. Rather, I admire them instead of resent and envy them.

I certainly don't admire them learning a skill of little use.

I resent Morse coders blocking the license class and taking over the hobby.

I don't envy Morse coders at all. I have tested for realtime encoding abilities. I know I can do it. I don't want to waste my time learning the whole Morse code encoding scheme.

>I enjoy the little challenges like learning Morse code while having a
>problem that hinders it.

Congratulations on learning Morse code.

>Things that are just handed to us are seldom
>appreciated. Of course in America these days, everything is owed to us.

That argument would be useful if a USEFUL skill was tested to obtain a benefit.

When such a non-useful skill is a barrier to a higher license class, something is very wrong with the hobby. I would be fine with a more useful practical skill or a more difficult written test, so the license class is not "just handed to us".

3009. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 03:17:08 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030418231708.19022.00000121@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65196

From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

>> Technically, Morse code is a digital mode.
>
>It's actually a digitized language .

Morse code is NOT a language. English is a language. Morse code is an encoding scheme.

Morse code is an encoding scheme, used in the On-Off Keying (OOK) digital mode.

3010. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 04:03:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA0CAE1.F2542A95@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65199

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <20030418151058.18783.00000044@mb-m27.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:

> > Irrelevant and gratuitous snowjobbing by a morseman.
>
> What is a "morseman"?

I think they were the Mordic types who used their great kmowledge of
mavigation to visit Morth America in the Mimth or Temth cemtury.

Dave K8MN

3011. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 04:05:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA0CB93.EF098248@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65200

W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3EA01164.3C0C6074@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> > > news:BAC3B759.17103%stewart@say.net...
> > > > "Dave Heil" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Do you have any concept of how our military operates?
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Your concept obviously differs from mine. Dave. You said that weapon
> > > > (MOAB) was deployed to Iraq to attack troops massed in open terrain. I
> > > > pointed out that, according to the military itself, there were no
> troops
> > > > still massed in open terrain when that weapon was deployed - only
> isolated
> > > > pockets in towns and cities. You responded to that with the above.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > > >
> > > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > It's called ignoring an inarguable truth when it doesn't support your
> > > framework of thought. Children do it every day...
> > >
> > That's how I'd access Dwight's comments, Kim. Nice that you agree.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> I do agree Dave, if the word is changed to assess and the name to Dave.

> And, I'm not even slightly interested in engaging your flippant, arrogant
> attitude.

Sure you are, Kim. You responded to the post, didn't you?

Dave K8MN

3012. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 04:14:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA0CD9E.E2A7588B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65251

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>
> The local Ham radio club has a gathering tomorrow.
> Tomorrow's Ham club gathering I would like to ask:
>
> Questions about Hams:
>
> -Why are Hams fat, male, old, nerdy, boring, anti-social, code lovers,
> non-technical. (I'll try to get in as many of these as possible. First ask "why
> fat" if I don't have time for other parts of this question).
>
> -What would a non-Ham's impression of Ham be, if invited to a Hamfest.
>
> -Why do Hams use so many unneeded codewords in their conversation?
>
> -Some people believe Ham radio is some kind of cult. Do you see a small part of
> Ham radio having "cult-like" existence? Part of this is hating CBers and
> modifying radios or removing CB crystal freqs to not permit CB operation.
>
> -Why do Hams like contesting, a repetetive, boring activity.
>
> -Why do Hams claim contesting prepares them for emergency communications?
>
> -Why is Morse code so much a focus of Ham radio?
>
> -Would anyone, or do you know anyone, that would be interested in a technical
> focus club?
>
> Club specific questions:
>
> -Why does newsletter state buying an HF rig is supporting "advancement of the
> radio art".
>
> -Why is club photo of people homebrewing shown on club photo, when everyone in
> that photo hates homebrewing? (First, I will ask people in the photo if they
> like homebrewing).

Although I suspected it earlier and have even made reference to it, this
last post of yours certainly explains why you have trouble being
welcomed with open arms at amateur radio club meetings. If you notice a
bag of chicken feathers and a caldron of hot tar anywhere near the
meeting site, I'd advise skipping the meeting.

While you're apparently not old or fat, your numerous posts lead me to believe that you're male, nerdy and without social skills.

Dave K8MN

3013. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 04:25:15 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Lc4oa.1433$Oc3.401640@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65197

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030418231259.19022.00000120@mb-m16.aol.com...
> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>
> >I think everyone should pass the the tests in life that we are given.
> >Let's take another of my hobbies, Ice Hockey. If someone wants to be on
> >my team, they need to know how to skate.
>
> Tests are useful if they are relevant. Learning how to skate is relaevant
to
> learning hockey. Learning Morse code is not relavant to radio, including
> amateur radio.

You haven't proven it isn't relevant. You just keep saying it hoping that
repetitions will convince people.

>
> I certainly don't admire them learning a skill of little use.
>
> I resent Morse coders blocking the license class and taking over the
hobby.
>
> I don't envy Morse coders at all. I have tested for realtime encoding
> abilities. I know I can do it. I don't want to waste my time learning the
whole
> Morse code encoding scheme.
>

You haven't proven that it is of little use. They haven't taken over the
hobby. In the amount of time that you have spent posting to this group
railing against the code, you could have learned it and gotten it behind
you. If there is anything that is a waste of time, it's reading and writing
posts protesting against various aspects of the hobby.

>
> That argument would be useful if a USEFUL skill was tested to obtain a
benefit.
>
> When such a non-useful skill is a barrier to a higher license class,
something
> is very wrong with the hobby. I would be fine with a more useful practical
> skill or a more difficult written test, so the license class is not "just
> handed to us".

It's no more of a barrier than the written tests and you have yet to prove
that it's not useful. Every mode has its advantages and disadvantages.

Learn them for yourself. Once you've been through a few solar cycles and geomagnetic disturbances, you will develop a new appreciation for morse code & CW.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

3014. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 04:36:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419003644.18771.00000039@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 65252

In article <20030418205412.18828.00000107@mb-m07.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030418151058.18783.00000044@mb-m27.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>n article <20030418072725.18755.00000050@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>>
>>>In article <20030418012918.18821.00000010@mb-m10.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>>
>>>>In article <20030417222749.18827.00000028@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>>>(N2EY)
>>>>writes:
>>>>
>>>>> You've never worked in commercial HF comms
>>>>> or have any experience in anything but simple amateur radio
>>>>> stations.
>>>>
>>>>How do you know what I have and have not done? You don't even know where
>I
>>>>>work, or where I have worked.
>>>>
>>>> You've never worked in commercial HF comms
>>>> or have any experience in anything but simple amateur radio
>>>> stations.
>>>
>>>Doesn't answer the question. You're just repeating yourself.
>>
>> You haven't stated anything about your past experience
>> except the most general ambiguous statements about work
>> and alleged experience as an amateur licensee.
>
>That's right, Len.
>
>I also haven't stated my past experience baking bread. That doesn't mean I
have
>never baked any bread, only that I haven't talked about it here.

You do NOT work in radio and it is doubtful you work in
electronics. Other EEs would talk shop. You don't out of
fear. What "fear" is that? Of being discovered that you

are NOT even close to working in radio or electronics?

>> You have
>> NO references about communications experience outside
>> of amateurism.
>
>"References"? From whom?

Continue to talk in riddles. It only proves you have NO
experience in radio outside of amateurism.

>> From that no one has to accede to your
>> demand for any answer.
>
>I don't demand anything, Len. I simply asked a simple question: How do you
>know what I have and have not done?

You are very tiring. You are blustering and bluffing at great length
about something you claim to be true but you cannot prove a
single thing about communications outside of amateur radio.

Fakery is what you practice.

>I posted here for several years before I mentioned that I have BSEE and MSEE
>degrees. Did the fact I did not mention them before mean I did not have them?
>Of course not.

You could have a PhD and won a Nobel Prize a quarter century
ago and it wouldn't matter any more on the subject of
communications outside of amateurism. You don't have any
such knowledge or experience on communications outside of
amateur radio.

You can't prove any...you can't talk about it...all you are doing
is BLUFFING. A knowledge con-job is what you are pulling
in here. You are a grifter.

>Sure I do. I work as an electrical engineer. That's what I've done since I
>graduated in 1976. That's all you need to know.

Ho ho ho...the imperial speaks.

"That's all you need to know."

That's all everyone else needs to know. You know nothing of
what you claim on communications experience outside of
amateur radio. No problem. You are null, a zero on that
subject.

>> Ergo, you have
>> NO experience in radio communication outside of amateurism.
>
>That's simply incorrect. I DO have "experience in radio communication outside
>of amateurism." I just don;t talk about it here because it's not relevant to

>amateur radio policy.

Oh, boo hoo, is the pedantic parson starting to cry, too?

You DON'T have any such experience in radio communications
outside of amateur radio. You CAN'T talk about it because the
first time you did you would make a mistake. Those who HAVE
worked on such would spot it right away.

You cannot make a mistake. You cannot admit a mistake.
You keep trying to cover up with misdirections and those
terribly long posts where you get into all kinds of irrelevant
minutae in order to avoid answering the original subject.

>> Outside of amateur radio your
>> radio communications is blank, a null, non-existant.
>
>That's just not true, Len. Live with it.

In that regard I AM RIGHT. LIVE WITH IT, pedantic perfectionist.

>Incorrect. I just don't talk about my work here.

Fear.

>>>btw, I have worked with cystems that use 5823s.
>>
>> C-Systems was not under discussion. Did you or did you not
>> work at C-Systems?
>
>Typo. You make more typos than I, Len.

"C-Systems" is/was a corporation. Not a big one.

No one can have a meaningful discussion with you if you make
such terrible errors and talk in riddles.

>I have worked with systems that used 5823s. Cold cathode gas tube.

You could have said the same thing about any other active
device by simply looking it up from a tube chart.

Did you EVER work on a piece of communications equipment
for any reason that used any gas tubes?

Had you ever worked with the time-division multiplexes that I
mentioned you would have been between -2 and about +10
years old. NO ONE is so good that they can make others
believe they worked on certain equipment BEFORE THEY
WERE BORN.

You have become just an ordinary amateur grifter, a BS
flinger who can't provide any references for himself beyond
1976 and outside of amateur radio.

>That's right! And neither can YOU prove I have no experience.

No one can prove a nothing. You are a nothing.

>No, Len, I'm very real, working on real things.

Few give a damn any more.

>I just don't discuss most of them here.

You can't. The fear factor is too high for you.

>Since this is an amateur radio newsgroup, I discuss amateur radio
>here.

You have "discussed" mightily on NON-amateur subjects in
here...from foreign policy having NO bearing on amateur radio
and railroads and military aviation of a time when you were
a newborn. A whole lot of BS going down and you, Jimmie, are
a class-A hypocrite on your own statements.

Google has all that stuff archived. Live in fear that someone
might yank out some of those "I only talk about amateur radio
subjects in here" postings that DO NOT do so.

>I have references and documentation of what I've done, too. But I don't talk
>about it here.

You can't. The fear factor is too high for you.

>>>> You are NOT in any position to DEMAND anything in here,
>
>Neither are you, Len. Live with it.

Then you are just an amateur charlatan, a poseur, a non-expert
on radio-electronics outside of amateur radio, an intellectual
con-man, a grifter. A nothing but with a 1976 set of degrees.

We all have to live with what you DON'T say. You can't absolve
yourself by being arrogant, imperious.

>> You have stated nothing in regards to non-amateur
>> radio communications.
>
>Incorrect! I just haven't given the details you want. And I'm not going to.

You can't. You don't have any such details.

>Besides, it doesn't matter. No matter what job experience, references or
>documentation I present, you would almost certainly find fault with it,
>demean it and insult me with it.

See? Paranoia. Mindless, irrational paranoia. FEAR.

>You have behaved that way towards everyone here whose
>work experience is known to you and who disagrees with you on unrelated
>amateur radio policy issues.

More FEAR. You can't possibly know the future. Your "defense"
is the vaporware of "waa...waa...he might do something!...waa."

BABY.

>Why would any rational person who disagrees with you tell you their work
>experience, given the way you have consistently behaved towards those do tell
>you their work experience and who disagree with you on unrelated amateur
>radio policy matters?

Let's see some COURAGE demonstrated in here. Most other
folks have the guts to take any situation, like it or no.

You cannot ever be wrong, you cannot ever make a big mistake
so you assume that silly imperious, arrogant "I don't have to tell
you" pose. You must be a radio god in your mind. You aren't
a god in anyone else's mind.

Here, have a "profile," big radio god -

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Miccolis's views, they
will be the target of Miccolis's snide sarcasm, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Miccolis's self-importance and experience...plus the excessively
long misdirections which antagonistically argue minutae without
discussing the original subject.

3015. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 04:36:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419003645.18771.00000040@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 65253

In article <c2356669.0304180838.3d3f31d4@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>> Love your "I have a patent and you don't" routine, Leonard.
>
>A US patent granted in 1968 would have expired in 1985. Perhaps a more
>timely question would be "who has a current US patent?"

Why is that "timely?" How does that apply to amateur radio?

Last I looked, US patents had a "life" of 17 years and were renewable once for 17 more. Could have changed.

My patent was granted in 1974. It was on a radio circuit and sub-system. You can look it up under the Delphion site searching by inventor's name. I was the sole inventor on that patent. It was assigned to RCA Corporation and up for renewal in 1991...but General Electric Company bought RCA Corp. then and may or may not have renewed it or had it reissued under a different patent number. No hu-hu on my part. I did it first.

Does Miccolis have ANY sort of patent, in or out of electronics?

If not, why hasn't he done so? He's had 27 years since he got his EE degrees. Or, none of us "has the right to know what he did." Jimmie is super-special. Everyone has to believe him and take him at his imperial word. No one may challenge him for he is never wrong.

...and that's the way it is...

3016. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 04:47:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <2y4oa.1437$Oc3.409455@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65198

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030418221218.19022.00000118@mb-m16.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>
> The local Ham radio club has a gathering tomorrow.
> Tomorrow's Ham club gathering I would like to ask:
>

With social skills like this, they'll throw you out the door.

> Questions about Hams:
>
> -Why are Hams fat, male, old, nerdy, boring, anti-social, code lovers,
> non-technical. (I'll try to get in as many of these as possible. First ask
"why
> fat" if I don't have time for other parts of this question)

This doesn't describe the club I belong to. Out of 7 board members, only two of us are overweight. The club members range from skinny to fat just like the normal non-ham population. You do know of course that Americans average 20 pounds or more overweight. We have several female members and are working to get more. Ages range from teenagers through college kids and on up. Any one who is into intellectual or technical pursuits is often considered nerdy, it's not limited to ham radio. Besides, what's wrong with being a nerd. One of the richest men in the country got rich because of being a nerd (Bill Gates if you don't recognize the profile). Most of our club members show up about 1/2 hour before the meeting to socialize plus socialize during the break between the presentation portion and the business portion of the meeting. They go out of their way to greet and talk to anyone new. We have a presentation at every meeting and about half of them are technical in nature. Some of our club members work code regularly and some do not.

What's your hangup on weight anyway? You act like that's the most important issue.

>
> -What would a non-Ham's impression of Ham be, if invited to a Hamfest.
>

Gadgets. That's what would register on the non-Ham. But a non-gardener would be equally confused at a garden convention. Any non-participant in an activity will be confused by that activity.

> -Why do Hams use so many unneeded codewords in their conversation?

They don't. They are using terms relevant to the hobby. Every activitiy has it's own vocabulary. When you join that activity, you learn it to facilitate communication.

>
> -Some people believe Ham radio is some kind of cult. Do you see a small part of
> Ham radio having "cult-like" existence? Part of this is hating CBers and
> modifying radios or removing CB crystal freqs to not permit CB operation.

No one but you considers it to have any cult like aspects.

>
> -Why do Hams like contesting, a repetetive, boring activity.
>

Why does anybody compete in anything? Car racing is certainly a repetitive boring activity and it has many participants and spectators.

> -Why do Hams claim contesting prepares them for emergency communications?

Because it gives you experience in adverse conditions. It helps you learn to deal with stress. You learn the limits and capabilities of your equipment. You learn the vagaries of propagation for the various bands. All this would take much longer just doing casual ragchewing.

>
> -Why is Morse code so much a focus of Ham radio?
>

It isn't. While a lot of hams use it, others don't after they have achieved their license. No one has to use it. The only ones who are making Morse code a focus of ham radio are those who are trying to get out of having to take the test.

> -Would anyone, or do you know anyone, that would be interested in a technical
> focus club?
>

Probably not. It's too limiting to have a club that focuses on just one aspect of the hobby. As previously stated, our club has technical presentations and non-technical presentations. Some members participate in community service activities and some do not. A couple are big contestors although most are not. Some are into homebrewing and some are not. Others are into doing special events. It is the variety that keeps a club strong as the members can try out different things at different times as their interests grow or change.

Our club respects each other's abilities and we do not worry about whether some one came in through the older testing standards or today's testing standards. For example, our club guru on satellite communications has been a ham less than a couple of years. However, if I ever decide to try working the satellites, I will definitely get his assitance. It doesn't matter that he is a codeless Technician and that I've been an Extra for 10 years. He

knows that activity by experience and I do not. I will happily bow to his expertise and experience in this area.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

3017. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 05:21:35 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419012135.18807.00000177@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65254

>I don't envy Morse coders at all. I have tested for realtime encoding
>abilities. I know I can do it. I don't want to waste my time learning the
>whole
>Morse code encoding scheme.

Heres the typical correct answer from most CBplussers, if they would tell the truth. Your real problem is you dont wont to learn it, and since it is a law that prevents you from being able to get on HF, you wont the Law changed to meet your needs. So now you try and come up with every excuse in the world to try and make your case for your self.

> I would be fine with a more useful practical
>skill or a more difficult written test, so the license class is not "just
>handed to us".

That interesting, a more difficult written huh. Well I guess someone could just as easily say, why should the written be more difficult, I dont plan on doing anything with theory, so why should be forced to learn it.

so the license class is not "just
>handed to us".

Well with the present system it Basically is just a give away. The present written test proves nothing other than an ability to memorize Q&As that have no meaning to most new Hams. You dont believe it ask them, they will tell you, there have been plenty posters here that will tell you thats all they did. Once the CW test goes away then your above statment will be very valid. In case you forgot your statment here it is.

"so the license class is not "just
handed to us"

3018. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 05:56:11 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EA0E4FB.D231EBCA@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 65255

Vshah101 wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> > Example: If everyone else calls a 2N2222 a transistor, and you insist on
> > calling it a cheese sandwich, you're the one who is the cause of confusion.
>
> Apparently, there is some confusion here on what is a 2N2222 transistor,
> compared to a cheese sandwich.
>

Sure don't taste like a cheese sandwich. Too crunchy.....

3019. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 06:12:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419021211.18769.00000062@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 65257

In article <20030418231708.19022.00000121@mb-m16.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
>>> Technically, Morse code is a digital mode.
>>
>>It's actually a digitized language .
>
>Morse code is NOT a language. English is a language. Morse code is an
>encoding scheme.

To add in specifics, International Morse Code encodes only the so-called "western" alphabetic language letters, numbers, and punctuation.

International Morse Code has no provision for syllabic languages which are primary in Asia and the Middle East and some parts of Africa. In terms of percentages and total populations, more people have syllabic language as their primary in the world as opposed to those having alphabetic languages as a primary.

>Morse code is an encoding scheme, used in the On-Off Keying (OOK) digital
>mode.

The original morse code began commercial service on wire lines in 1844 in the USA. It spread throughout the world less on the "code" but more on the simplicity of the system and ability to "relay" unattended up to three times on a wireline circuit. The Morse-Vail patent is for that relay mechanism.

It is quite probably the entymological start of the term "relay" describing an electromagnet-driven switch contact.

Primitive radio in the first 24 years or so of radio since 1896 (without vacuum tubes) could ONLY use on-off keying codes to communicate anything. On-off "morse" codings were already established for 52 years when the first radio communication was demonstrated in 1896 (in Italy and in czarist Russia). Both demonstrations used on-off codings.

In the 107 years of radio's existance, every other radio service in the world has either dropped morse code on-off modes or never considered it to begin with...but radio amateurs seem insistent on keeping the morse code test for any amateur license grant having below-30-MHz privileges.

They have NO rational or valid reasons for such a test
retention.

3020. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 06:12:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419021215.18769.00000063@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 65259

In article <Lc4oa.1433$Oc3.401640@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030418231259.19022.00000120@mb-m16.aol.com...
>> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>
>> >I think everyone should pass the the tests in life that we are given.
>> >Let's take another of my hobbies, Ice Hockey. If someone wants to be on
>> >my team, they need to know how to skate.
>>
>> Tests are useful if they are relevant. Learning how to skate is relaevant
>to
>> learning hockey. Learning Morse code is not relavant to radio, including
>> amateur radio.
>
>You haven't proven it isn't relevant. You just keep saying it hoping that
>repetitions will convince people.

Other radio services in the world have either dropped on-off morse codings as a communications mode or never considered it in the first place. Some of those radio services DO work in HF on radio paths as long as any used by radio amateurs.

In 1990 and again in 1999 the FCC stated that a morse code test serves no purpose in their determination for granting any US radio amateur license. Ref: FCC 90-53, 99-412, both R&Os.

>> I certainly don't admire them learning a skill of little use.
>>
>> I resent Morse coders blocking the license class and taking over the hobby.
>>
>> I don't envy Morse coders at all. I have tested for realtime encoding
>> abilities. I know I can do it. I don't want to waste my time learning the
>whole
>> Morse code encoding scheme.
>
>You haven't proven that it is of little use. They haven't taken over the
>hobby. In the amount of time that you have spent posting to this group
>railing against the code, you could have learned it and gotten it behind
>you. If there is anything that is a waste of time, it's reading and writing
>posts protesting against various aspects of the hobby.

This is another demonstration of the imperious arrogance of
the pro-code-test, already-licensed amateurs. None of them
will be affected by any licensing of newcomers (those not yet
licensed). It is a purely selfish motivation on their part in order
to keep the rank-status-privileges they earned primarily through
demonstrated skill in morse code testing.

Regulations, the LAW on US civil radio, is not sacrosanct,
never to be changed. Removal of amateur radio code testing
will not cause the downfall of US amateur radio.

The arguments of the no-code-test advocates are concerned
with the removal of that code test regulation. The arguments
of the pro-code-test advocates concentrate only on personal
attacks on the no-code-test advocates.

>> That argument would be useful if a USEFUL skill was tested to obtain a
>benefit.
>>
>> When such a non-useful skill is a barrier to a higher license class,
>something
>> is very wrong with the hobby. I would be fine with a more useful practical
>> skill or a more difficult written test, so the license class is not "just
>> handed to us".
>
>It's no more of a barrier than the written tests and you have yet to prove
>that it's not useful. Every mode has its advantages and disadvantages.
>Learn them for yourself. Once you've been through a few solar cycles and
>geomagnetic disturbances, you will develop a new appreciation for morse code
>& CW.

It's been 50 years and a bit over a month since I first fired up on
HF at US Army radio communications station ADA in Tokyo,
Japan. ADA never used any on-off keying morse codings, had
43 HF transmitters, had a throughput of 220 thousand messages
a month from Seoul, Korea, to San Francisco, California and
several other locations, operating 24/7.

Fifty years is 4 1/2 solar cycles at 11 years per cycle. The only
"geomagnetic disturbance" I observed was in a 1955 and a
complete blackout of across-Pacific paths on HF. That lasted
only four hours on the local midnight shift. No one was observed
to do any "appreciation of CW" because of that blackout. Radio
officers cussed a bit at a backlog developing...but that cleared
up with constant 60 WPM TTY tape messages.

In the 50 years following 1953 I've operated legally on frequencies
and bands from VLF on up to Ku-band microwaves. Never used
any on-off morse codings, never had any need to do so. The last
solar storm disturbance I've witnessed since happened in eastern
Canada and involved a power grid disturbance and a shut-down of
an electric power intertie with both Canada and northeastern USA
affected. Skill at on-off morse codings weren't any help there in

restoring electrical power.

At this point, you may be thinking in terms of the imperial "don't have the right attitude about morse code and amateur radio," but it would not be adviseable to trot that one out in public. You must ask yourself truthfully if morse code testing is of any actual value to the FCC and to newcomers who weren't licensed before. I say such testing has no value, an agreement with the FCC's opinion.

It is up to you and all the pro-code-test advocates to prove a need to continue morse code testing. Not the other way around. Based on the experience of all other radio services using HF, there is no reason to keep on using morse modes for communications; they don't.

About the only validity the pro-code-test advocates can summon with sincerity is tradition. Amateurs have always had to test for code to get on HF...therefore, the tradition logic has it (wrongly)... code testing must always continue. Tradition is nice, but it is seldom practical and it certainly has a vapid argument against the no-code-test advocates' viewpoint. It isn't always a good arguing point for law and regulations.

The only other argument for continued code testing is the so-called "international language" reason. All amateurs using the same mode not involving tone of voice, dialect, or inflection can understand one another. A problem there is that the world population using syllabic or ideographic primary languages far outnumbers all those using an alphabetic language as primary. International Morse Code is based solely on alphabetic languages.

Beyond the first 50 or so characters, including prosigns, the common "CW" abbreviations are still based on the English language and alphabet. Longer text transmissions need to be more in clear language in order to convey correct meanings. However, dialect and other idiosynchrasies of different alphabetic languages can be mis-interpreted. All those with syllabic or ideographic primary languages ARE required to learn a "new language" in order to operate using International Morse Code. Those who speak English as a primary will have little trouble with common abbreviations. This is not a truism with operators not having an alphabetic language as primary. Note: A "let them eat cake" argument did not work for a certain Marie A. She lost her head and came apart at the end...

There are no other compelling reasons to continue advocacy of morse code testing for licensing. The invalid "reason" left is "all have to do it because the already-licensed had to," the old hazing ritual rationalization. Not a good one.

3021. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 06:12:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419021217.18769.00000064@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 65258

In article <3EA0CD9E.E2A7588B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:
>>
>> >Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>>
>> The local Ham radio club has a gathering tomorrow.
>> Tomorrow's Ham club gathering I would like to ask:
>>
>> Questions about Hams:
>>
>> -Why are Hams fat, male, old, nerdy, boring, anti-social, code lovers,
>> non-technical. (I'll try to get in as many of these as possible. First ask
>"why
>> fat" if I don't have time for other parts of this question).
>>
>> -What would a non-Ham's impression of Ham be, if invited to a Hamfest.
>>
>> -Why do Hams use so many unneeded codewords in their conversation?
>>
>> -Some people believe Ham radio is some kind of cult. Do you see a small
>part of
>> Ham radio having "cult-like" existence? Part of this is hating CBers and
>> modifying radios or removing CB crystal freqs to not permit CB operation.
>>
>> -Why do Hams like contesting, a repetetive, boring activity.
>>
>> -Why do Hams claim contesting prepares them for emergency communications?
>>
>> -Why is Morse code so much a focus of Ham radio?
>>
>> -Would anyone, or do you know anyone, that would be interested in a
>technical
>> focus club?
>>
>> Club specific questions:
>>
>> -Why does newsletter state buying an HF rig is supporting "advancement of
>the
>> radio art".
>>
>> -Why is club photo of people homebrewing shown on club photo, when everyone
>in

>> that photo hates homebrewing? (First, I will ask people in the photo if
>they
>> like homebrewing).
>
>Although I suspected it earlier and have even made reference to it, this
>last post of yours certainly explains why you have trouble being
>welcomed with open arms at amateur radio club meetings. If you notice a
>bag of chicken feathers and a caldron of hot tar anywhere near the
>meeting site, I'd advise skipping the meeting.
>
>While you're apparently not old or fat, your numerous posts lead me to
>believe that you're male, nerdy and without social skills.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

3022. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 06:12:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419021218.18769.00000065@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 65256

In article <3EA0CAE1.F2542A95@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <20030418151058.18783.00000044@mb-m27.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
>> > Irrelevant and gratuitous snowjobbing by a morseman.
>>
>> What is a "morseman"?
>
>I think they were the Mordic types who used their great kmowledge of
>mavigation to visit Morth America in the Mimth or Temth cemtury.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

3023. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 10:34:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAC69E5E.17341%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 65260

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> The MOAB is a conventional weapon.

The MOAB is a weapon of mass destruction, Dave. It is one of the largest non-nuclear weapons ever developed, intended to cause massive damage over a wide area. According to the military, its destructive power is only slightly less than some of today's smaller tactical nuclear weapons. As such, it certainly isn't a weapon of small destruction.

> I'm not the one doing the Chicken Little routine,
> Dwight. I'm quite comfortable with what our
> military did and the way it was undertaken. You've
> voiced your opinion. I think that opinion is silly.

You've said repeatedly you don't understand my opinion, so I'm certainly not surprised you think that. Perhaps if you spent less time trying to negatively characterize my opinions (as "hand wringing, a "Chicken Little routine," or whatever), you might be able to better understand them. I, on the other hand, do understand your opinions and think they are foolish and naive. However, rather then continued judgment of each other's opinions, instead of actually discussing issues, I'll end our conversation about this with that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3024. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 10:52:08 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAC6A298.17343%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 65261

"W5TIT" wrote:

> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
>> "Dave Heil" wrote:
>>
>>> Do you have any concept of how our military operates?
>>
>> Your concept obviously differs from mine. Dave. You
>> said that weapon (MOAB) was deployed to Iraq to attack
>> troops massed in open terrain. I pointed out that,
>> according to the military itself, there were no troops
>> still massed in open terrain when that weapon was
>> deployed - only isolated pockets in towns and cities.
>> You responded to that with the above.
>
>
> It's called ignoring an inarguable truth when it doesn't
> support your framework of thought. Children do it every
> day...

I agree, Kim. Many find it is easier to evade the truth when it makes them uncomfortable. Regardless, I have no idea what the military intended to do with that weapon when they shipped it to Iraq when they did, but I certainly thought it was worth discussing. Thankfully, that weapon was not used, perhaps making further discussion somewhat moot (other than to perhaps discuss the thinking behind that deployment with an eye on future conflicts).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3025. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 10:54:08 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304190254.31b53e1f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65262

```
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030419003644.18771.00000039@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <20030418205412.18828.00000107@mb-m07.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <20030418151058.18783.00000044@mb-m27.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> >>n article <20030418072725.18755.00000050@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (N2EY)
> >>writes:
> >>
> >>>In article <20030418012918.18821.00000010@mb-m10.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com
> >>>(Len Over 21) writes:
> >>>
> >>>>In article <20030417222749.18827.00000028@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >>>>(N2EY)
> >>>>writes:
> >>>>
> >>>>> You've never worked in commercial HF comms
> >>>>> or have any experience in anything but simple amateur radio
> >>>>> stations.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>How do you know what I have and have not done? You don't even know where
> I
> >>>>>work, or where I have worked.
> >>>>
> >>>> You've never worked in commercial HF comms
> >>>> or have any experience in anything but simple amateur radio
> >>>> stations.
> >>>
> >>>Doesn't answer the question. You're just repeating yourself.
> >>
> >> You haven't stated anything about your past experience
> >> except the most general ambiguous statements about work
> >> and alleged experience as an amateur licensee.
> >
> >That's right, Len.
> >
> >I also haven't stated my past experience baking bread. That doesn't mean I
> have
> >never baked any bread, only that I haven't talked about it here.
>
```

> You do NOT work in radio and it is doubtful you work in
> electronics. Other EEs would talk shop. You don't out of
> fear. What "fear" is that? Of being discovered that you
> are NOT even close to working in radio or electronics?
>
> >> You have
> >> NO references about communications experience outside
> >> of amateurism.
> >
> >"References"? From whom?
>
> Continue to talk in riddles. It only proves you have NO
> experience in radio outside of amateurism.
>
> >> From that no one has to accede to your
> >> demand for any answer.
> >
> >I don't demand anything, Len. I simply asked a simple question: How do you
> >know what I have and have not done?
>
> You are very tiring. You are blustering and bluffing at great length
> about something you claim to be true but you cannot prove a
> single thing about communications outside of amateur radio.
>
> Fakery is what you practice.
>
> >I posted here for several years before I mentioned that I have BSEE and MSEE
> >degrees. Did the fact I did not mention them before mean I did not have them?
> >Of course not.
>
> You could have a PhD and won a Nobel Prize a quarter century
> ago and it wouldn't matter any more on the subject of
> communications outside of amateurism. You don't have any
> such knowledge or experience on communications outside of
> amateur radio.
>
> You can't prove any...you can't talk about it...all you are doing
> is BLUFFING. A knowledge con-job is what you are pulling
> in here. You are a grifter.
>
>
> >Sure I do. I work as an electrical engineer. That's what I've done since I
> >graduated in 1976. That's all you need to know.
>
> Ho ho ho...the imperial speaks.
>
> "That's all you need to know."
>
> That's all everyone else needs to know. You know nothing of
> what you claim on communications experience outside of

> amateur radio. No problem. You are null, a zero on that
> subject.
>
> >> Ergo, you have
> >> NO experience in radio communication outside of amateurism.
> >
> >That's simply incorrect. I DO have "experience in radio communication outside
> >of amateurism." I just don;t talk about it here because it's not relevant to
> >amateur radio policy.
>
> Oh, boo hoo, is the pedantic parson starting to cry, too?
>
> You DON'T have any such experience in radio communications
> outside of amateur radio. You CAN'T talk about it because the
> first time you did you would make a mistake. Those who HAVE
> worked on such would spot it right away.
>
> You cannot make a mistake. You cannot admit a mistake.
> You keep trying to cover up with misdirections and those
> terribly long posts where you get into all kinds of irrelevant
> minutae in order to avoid answering the original subject.
>
>
> >> Outside of amateur radio your
> >> radio communications is blank, a null, non-existant.
> >
> >That's just not true, Len. Live with it.
>
> In that regard I AM RIGHT. LIVE WITH IT, pedantic perfectionist.
>
>
> >Incorrect. I just don't talk about my work here.
>
> Fear.
>
>
>
> >>>btw, I have worked with cystems that use 5823s.
> >>
> >> C-Systems was not under discussion. Did you or did you not
> >> work at C-Systems?
> >
> >Typo. You make more typos than I, Len.
>
> "C-Systems" is/was a corporation. Not a big one.
>
> No one can have a meaningful discussion with you if you make
> such terrible errors and talk in riddles.
>
>

> >I have worked with systems that used 5823s. Cold cathode gas tube.
>
> You could have said the same thing about any other active
> device by simply looking it up from a tube chart.
>
> Did you EVER work on a piece of communications equipment
> for any reason that used any gas tubes?
>
> Had you ever worked with the time-division multiplexes that I
> mentioned you would have been between -2 and about +10
> years old. NO ONE is so good that they can make others
> believe they worked on certain equipment BEFORE THEY
> WERE BORN.
>
> You have become just an ordinary amateur grifter, a BS
> flinger who can't provide any references for himself beyond
> 1976 and outside of amateur radio.
>
>
> >That's right! And neither can YOU prove I have no experience.
>
> No one can prove a nothing. You are a nothing.
>
>
> >No, Len, I'm very real, working on real things.
>
> Few give a damn any more.
>
> >I just don't discuss most of them here.
>
> You can't. The fear factor is too high for you.
>
> >Since this is an amateur radio newsgroup, I discuss amateur radio
> >here.
>
> You have "discussed" mightily on NON-amateur subjects in
> here...from foreign policy having NO bearing on amateur radio
> and railroads and military aviation of a time when you were
> a newborn. A whole lot of BS going down and you, Jimmie, are
> a class-A hypocrite on your own statements.
>
> Google has all that stuff archived. Live in fear that someone
> might yank out some of those "I only talk about amateur radio
> subjects in here" postings that DO NOT do so.
>
>
> >I have references and documentation of what I've done, too. But I don't talk
> >about it here.
>
> You can't. The fear factor is too high for you.

>
> >>>> You are NOT in any position to DEMAND anything in here,
> >
> >Neither are you, Len. Live with it.
>
> Then you are just an amateur charlatan, a poseur, a non-expert
> on radio-electronics outside of amateur radio, an intellectual
> con-man, a grifter. A nothing but with a 1976 set of degrees.
>
> We all have to live with what you DON'T say. You can't absolve
> yourself by being arrogant, imperious.
>
>
> >> You have stated nothing in regards to non-amateur
> >> radio communications.
> >
> >Incorrect! I just haven't given the details you want. And I'm not going to.
>
> You can't. You don't have any such details.
>
>
> >Besides, it doesn't matter. No matter what job experience, references or
> >documentation I present, you would almost certainly find fault with it,
> >demean it and insult me with it.
>
> See? Paranoia. Mindless, irrational paranoia. FEAR.
>
> >You have behaved that way towards everyone here whose
> >work experience is known to you and who disagrees with you on unrelated
> >amateur radio policy issues.
>
> More FEAR. You can't possibly know the future. Your "defense"
> is the vaporware of "waa...waa...he might do something!...waa."
>
> BABY.
>
> >Why would any rational person who disagrees with you tell you their work
> >experience, given the way you have consistently behaved towards those do tell
> >you their work experience and who disagree with you on unrelated amateur
> >radio policy matters?
>
> Let's see some COURAGE demonstrated in here. Most other
> folks have the guts to take any situation, like it or no.
>
> You cannot ever be wrong, you cannot ever make a big mistake
> so you assume that silly imperious, arrogant "I don't have to tell
> you" pose. You must be a radio god in your mind. You aren't
> a god in anyone else's mind.
>
> Here, have a "profile," big radio god -

>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Miccolis's views, they
> will be the target of Miccolis's snide sarcasm, ridicule, name-
> calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
> Miccolis's self-importance and experience...plus the excessively
> long misdirections which antagonistically argue minutae without
> discussing the original subject.

Heh. Jimmy trolled you into the irrational rant of all rants. Good show James.

Seldom in the history of mankind has anybody worked so hard for so long to make complete asses of themselves in public as you have Leonard. You've finally managed to set a high water mark in at least some field, an achievement which has escaped you for your prior seven decades of beavering away to become a somebody anybody anywhere.

Congratultions ya pointless ZERO, you've arrived.

w3rv

3026. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 12:03:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304190403.3041a07a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65263

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030418195549.01935.00000107@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >You forgot that it took you less than 8 minutes to take the test.
> >
>
> Your right, I guess I missed that, thanks for updating it for me.

You're welcome.

> Oh by the way, I see your still a Welfare General. Could you do us all a favor
> and tell us how many times you flunked the EXTRA so far?
> Maybe you and your Buddy Karl are trying to set a record on how many times it
> takes to pass the EXTRA. It took the Tech Guru Karl over a year, it took me 8
> minutes, my guess for you is 4 to 5 Years,
> unless they start just handing them out to anybody. Thats what your waiting for
> isnt? Another FREE Handout.

Bruce, I live in a restricted neighborhood and have been turned into a
shortwave listener. We're considering building a house further out as
I just got a promotion at work. When I see a benefit to upgrading to
extra, I will do so. I don't collect licenses, nor plaster my wall
with superfluous achievements.

3027. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 12:13:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAC6B59A.17345%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 65264

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:

> The Vietnam War was extended several YEARS
> because of Hanoi's beliefe that the American
> PEOPLE were against the war (ALL OF THEM).
> This gave the the needed 'push' to keep on
> going.

That's only partially true, Dan. Hanoi's prior experience with UK and French troops certainly played a larger role in their thinking, to simply wear us down until we gave up, than the demonstrations in this country. At most, the demonstrations only reinforced that thinking.

However, American attitudes at home certainly played a role in the peace discussions - on both sides of the discussion. Those representing our side in the discussions were more willing to compromise once it became obvious support for the war was waning in this country (something they steadfastly refused to do early in those discussions).

Anything Hanoi gained from the demonstrations here had to be weighed against conditions there. A war to wear us down would have taken many years, resulting in even more damage to their country. Hanoi clearly preferred a quicker route if available. Our move towards compromise fueled Hanoi's thinking they could soon end the conflict, leading them more towards compromise.

In that environment, both side then played a game of increasing the conflict when things didn't go their way in the discussions. Given our hand in this game (the continued destruction of more towns and villages), the demonstrations here in this country certainly wasn't much of a hand for them to play - and they knew that. But, in their eyes, even that was better than what we asked for in the early discussions (unconditional surrender).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3028. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 12:16:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304190416.1cb47371@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65265

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030419021218.18769.00000065@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> In article <3EA0CAE1.F2542A95@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <20030418151058.18783.00000044@mb-m27.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com
> >> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >> > Irrelevant and gratuitous snowjobbing by a morseman.
> >>
> >> What is a "morseman"?
> >
> >I think they were the Mordic types who used their great kmowledge of
> >mavigation to visit Morth America in the Mimth or Temth cemtury.
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
> be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
> downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
> importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
> very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

C'mon Len, that was actually the most profound thing that Dave has ever posted.

3029. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 12:23:58 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304190423.43d84bf2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65266

```
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA0CB93.EF098248@earthlink.net>...
> W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3EA01164.3C0C6074@earthlink.net...
> > > W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:BAC3B759.17103%stewart@say.net...
> > > > > "Dave Heil" wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > Do you have any concept of how our military operates?
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Your concept obviously differs from mine. Dave. You said that weapon
> > > > > (MOAB) was deployed to Iraq to attack troops massed in open terrain. I
> > > > > pointed out that, according to the military itself, there were no
> troops
> > > > > still massed in open terrain when that weapon was deployed - only
> isolated
> > > > > pockets in towns and cities. You responded to that with the above.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > > > >
> > > > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > It's called ignoring an inarguable truth when it doesn't support your
> > > > framework of thought. Children do it every day...
> > >
> > > That's how I'd access Dwight's comments, Kim. Nice that you agree.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> >
> > I do agree Dave, if the word is changed to assess and the name to Dave.
>
> > And, I'm not even slightly interested in engaging your flippant, arrogant
> > attitude.
>
> Sure you are, Kim. You responded to the post, didn't you?
>
```

> Dave K8MN

Kim, I think you're making progress.

Dave doesn't try to deflect the description "flippant and arrogant."

3030. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 12:26:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419082610.18775.00000100@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65267

In article <81BD6DACD3EEC2EB.C999C620FC531C59.9B432F0625B1459B@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0304180916.4a28633d@posting.google.com...
>> [SNIP]
>> But it's more important that the freedoms not be destroyed in the
>> process of defending them. As in "we destroyed the village in order to
>> save it".
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> "UN Secretary Kofi Annan said he thinks the arms inspectorsshould
>> resume looking for weapons in Iraq. Hey, forget arms in Iraq, how
>> about looking for some backbone in the UN?" - Jay Leno
>>
>> "There's now talk that US wants to spray the poppy fields of
>> Afghanistan in an effort to destroy the drug crop before it can be
>> harvested. If you thought Bush was unpopular in Hollywood
>> before......-Jay Leno
>>
>> "And now the really difficult part: We have to rebuild Iraq into a
>> strong and independent nation that will one day hate the United
>> States" - David Letterman
>
>Oh man, so true, so true!!!
>
Kim,

Guess who said this:

"Of course the people don't want war. But after all, it's the leaders of the
country who determine the policy, and it's always a simple matter to drag the
people along whether it's a democracy, a fascist dictatorship, or a parliament,
or a communist dictatorship. Voice or no voice, the people can always be
brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell
them they are being attacked, and denounce the pacifists for lack of
patriotism, and exposing the country to greater danger."

Hint: It's not an American

73 de Jim, N2EY

3031. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 12:26:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419082612.18842.00000173@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 65268

>Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/18/2003 8:43 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030418214340.19022.00000115@mb-m16.aol.com>
>
>From K4YZ:
>> I can't think of too many things in life that are a "do it once now or
>>forget about it forever" situation.
>
>Unfortunately, thats the way the system works.

That's the way the system works if you're just going to whine about it and
do nothing to position yourself for the next opportunity.

>I may be getting out of the EE field soon and into something that makes more
>money, and is a more stable field.

I wholeheartedly recommend nursing, except in your case, Vipul.

>I have one thing due at the end of this
>month. If I can make that deadline, I will probably stay in EE (even at alot
>less money).

Why compromise? There is absolutely NO law that says once you are doing
one thing you can't change to something else.

Who knows, Vipul, maybe you'll find something you're good at.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3032. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 12:31:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419083114.18842.00000174@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 65269

>Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/18/2003 9:04 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030418220410.19022.00000117@mb-m16.aol.com>

>There is no such thing as "Live and learn" in the EE/IT professions.

Sure there is.

You're just not willing to do what it takes to be aggressive enough to
position yourself to be ready for the next opportunity.

You're part of the "Burger King" generation....You want it "Your Way,
Right Away", or you don't want it at all.

>As soon as
>you try to learn (for example, by taking courses), you no longer fit the
>desired profile. This counteracts any positive efforts you have made. I don't
>want to go into detail, but steering your profile becomes impossible, or very
>costly.

Care to try being an Emergency Nurse, Vipul? I'll show you what "hard" is
in trying to stay fresh ! ! !

Steve

3033. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 12:32:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419083244.18842.00000175@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 65270

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 4/18/2003 10:00 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EA01329.3030603@psu.edu>

>> "Morse code numbers"...?!?!
>
>Here ya go!
>
>-----
>.----
>..---
>...--
>....-
>.....
>-....
>--...
>---..
>----.

ta-DAAAAAAAAAH!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3034. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 12:34:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304190434.6048d703@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65271

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA08B39.5D963178@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA00D1B.4C785DDD@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > I haven't stated a goal here.
> >
> > You don't need to. It's obvious.
>
> Then, pray tell, why are you wasting my time in asking me for a stated
> goal?
>
> Dave K8MN

I was curious if you knew.

3035. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 12:36:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA142A7.E5D20E44@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65273

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > The MOAB is a conventional weapon.
>
> The MOAB is a weapon of mass destruction, Dave. It is one of the largest
> non-nuclear weapons ever developed, intended to cause massive damage over a
> wide area. According to the military, its destructive power is only slightly
> less than some of today's smaller tactical nuclear weapons. As such, it
> certainly isn't a weapon of small destruction.

To reiterate: The MOAB is not a weapon of mass destruction. It is not
nuclear. It is not biological. It is not chemical. In short, your
claim falls flat.

> > I'm not the one doing the Chicken Little routine,
> > Dwight. I'm quite comfortable with what our
> > military did and the way it was undertaken. You've
> > voiced your opinion. I think that opinion is silly.
>
> You've said repeatedly you don't understand my opinion, so I'm certainly
> not surprised you think that. Perhaps if you spent less time trying to
> negatively characterize my opinions (as "hand wringing, a "Chicken Little
> routine," or whatever), you might be able to better understand them.

I've negatively characterized my view of your negative position. I'm
comfortable with my assessment.

> I, on
> the other hand, do understand your opinions and think they are foolish > and naive.

You haven't even come up with a realistic description of the MOAB so I
am not surprised about your conclusions on my views.

> However, rather then continued judgment of each other's opinions,
> instead of actually discussing issues, I'll end our conversation about > this with that.

You haven't been "discussing issues". You've been touting your opinions
and others have been responding with their opinions. Yes, I've
characterized your views as "hand wringing" and a "Chicken Little
routine". That's how I see them.

Dave K8MN

3036. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 12:39:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA14389.EA60B579@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65274

Brian wrote:
>
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030419021218.18769.00000065@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> > In article <3EA0CAE1.F2542A95@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >N2EY wrote:
> > >>
> > >> In article <20030418151058.18783.00000044@mb-m27.aol.com>,
> > lenover21@aol.com
> > >> (Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> > >> > Irrelevant and gratuitous snowjobbing by a morseman.
> > >>
> > >> What is a "morseman"?
> > >
> > >I think they were the Mordic types who used their great kmowledge of
> > >mavigation to visit Morth America in the Mimth or Temth cemtury.
> >
> > No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> > government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> > if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
> > be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
> > downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
> > importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
> > very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.
>
> C'mon Len, that was actually the most profound thing that Dave has ever posted.

Len's got his plagiarized statement down pat. He understands the
theory. He is having trouble with the practical application.

Dave K8MN

3037. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 12:40:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419084047.18842.00000176@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 65275

>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/18/2003 10:12 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030418231259.19022.00000120@mb-m16.aol.com>

>Tests are useful if they are relevant. Learning how to skate is relaevant to
>learning hockey. Learning Morse code is not relavant to radio, including
>amateur radio.

In your opinion.

At present it is VERY relevent since it is required by law to know it if
you want to hold an HF-level Amatuer Radio license, Vipul.

So sayeth the FCC.

>I resent Morse coders blocking the license class and taking over the hobby.

Then you are a complete and utter fool, Vippy. No one is "blocking"
anything and certainly NOT "taking over the hobby".

If anything, the nuber of Amateurs with "current" Morse Code skills is far
less than it ever was, ergo any "taking over" is by anyone BUT "coders".

>I don't envy Morse coders at all. I have tested for realtime encoding
>abilities. I know I can do it. I don't want to waste my time learning the
>whole
>Morse code encoding scheme.

Then you obviously don't want an HF-level Amateur Radio license bad enough,
so stop your snivvelling and whining.

>When such a non-useful skill is a barrier to a higher license class,
>something
>is very wrong with the hobby.

You keep responding as if Morse Code proficiency is something new to
Amateur Radio when afterall it is YOU who is new to Amateur Radio. Not that
that is bad, but you are just one of those BK generation types who aren't
satisfied until you are given everything for nothing, and then when you've got
it, you either don't appreciate it, or try to spoil it for those who do.

>I would be fine with a more useful practical
>skill or a more difficult written test, so the license class is not "just
>handed to us".

That's EXACTLY what you want.

Steve

3038. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 12:42:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304190442.63d41ac0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65276

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA088A4.B011F968@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA00DCE.6709A863@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdi8aza.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > > > > On 16 Apr 2003 18:56:22 -0700, Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > >> I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
> > > > > >> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
> > > > > >> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
> > > > > >> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
> > > > > >> to standing procedures binding upon the military.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >It's nice to see an amateur atempting to squash the spirit of amateur radio.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >Probably an attorney.
> > > > >
> > > > > One of the better communications attornies around if I say so
> > > > > myself. Rule compliance is my specialty and I've been on the
> > > > > prosecution side as well as the defense side.
> > > > >
> > > > > If I gotta play by the book, ev'one gotta play by the book.
> > > >
> > > > Phil, if you wanna play at all, you've got to get yourself in the game.
> > >
> > > On the face of it, your comment was the usual, silly Brian Burke stuff.
> > > The more I thought it about it, the more I saw some logic in it. To
> > > extend your idea, if Len Anderson wants to play, he has to get in the
> > > game.
> >
> > That's what you've been saying all along.
> >
> > Why is it bad when I adopt that theology?
>
> I didn't say it was bad. You only thought that because of your poor
> reading comprehension. I think it was good and I'm glad that you're the
> one who wrote it. I'm afraid though that you've aroused the ire of your
> mentor.

Then you agree that Phil needs to get into the game before he can have
a valid opinion on the subject?

And I don't think Phil considers himself my mentor.

> > > > Go enlist, then volunteer for Iraq.
> > >
> > > Why would Phil do that?
>
> > So he could properly frame the written permission required by deployed
> > amateurs. Sure would be nice for those deployed commanders and
> > amateurs to have some professional legal advice, instead of a bunch of
> > armchair warriors and codester lawyers.
>
> Seems to me that in past applicable situations, most have figured it out
> without the assistance of an attorney. You, for example, seem to be the
> only guy in Somalia who had trouble with the concept.

Dave, don't just blow, blow harder. You'll need to do a bit of
research before anyone with at least half a brain would buy into that.

Name all the "guys" in Somalia.
Name all the "guys" in Somalia that were amateur radio operators.
Name all of those "guys" in Somalia that were amateur radio operators
and obtained permission to operate.

And you've left out all the "gals" that were sent as well.

3039. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 12:46:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419084611.18842.00000177@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 65277

>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/19/2003 1:12 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030419021211.18769.00000062@mb-m14.aol.com>

>International Morse Code has no provision for syllabic languages
> which are primary in Asia and the Middle East and some parts
> of Africa.

The standardized communications language is English. (ITU and ICAO refer)

Why should "International Morse Code" have provisions for non-English
language alphabets?

Steve, K4YZ

3040. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 13:00:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304190500.7cfb962@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65279

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030418151056.18783.00000042@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0304180255.47558d1@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> Dave K8MN
> > >
> > >Len states that he was stationed in Japan, and Huffy calls him a REMF.
> > > Huffy then makes claims that he is/was a warrior, but cannot
> > >reference any of it. Dave can only clip and past others remarks, and
> > >is somehow making a positive contribution.
> > >
> > >What is your stated goal here?
> >
> > Heil has no "stated" goal here, but it is fairly obvious: Claim
> > expertise by wording statements carefully so that they
> > APPEAR to be more than they are. On that basis he can
> > then expound on it using Google archives as "references" and
> > feel free to put down others through his "superiority."
> >
> > Heil appeared to "wow" the readership by all those early
> > mentions of State Department communications and office
> > titles. Very few readers here can be expected to have State
> > Department communications experience, so the stage is set
> > for a nice snowjob.
> >
> > What Heil did not reckon on is that military communications
> > is larger than what Department of State has and, with normal
> > military assignment turnover rates, there would be a greater
> > chance of readers here having past experience in military
> > radio communications. Not only that, but mentioning a very
> > small African country that is relatively unfamiliar to most was
> > another attempt at "exotic locale glamour" which backfired.
> >
> > Heil has been on damage-control for years in here, attempting
> > to misdirect the subject away from talking directly about his
> > claims through comments about the person of participants.
> > The common technique he uses is to attempt humiliation by
> > using details others have supplied then "comparing" those to
> > his own very general, undetailed statements of his own.
> >
> > For an example, his "combat experience" is alluded to by a
> > simple, no-details statement that he was in a country at war.
> > Vietnam, even just South Vietnam, is not a small place and

> the ratio of supply/support personnel to active combat troops
> in the US Army was then about 7:1. Heil claimed USAF
> military service which had a higher ratio of support to active
> combat personnel. Heil had NO identification of his unit or
> geographic location or any statement of his duties. So far,
> his "combat activity" statements are ambiguous...and begin
> to look like just another snowjob.

He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.

3041. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 13:01:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419090112.19056.00000186@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 65280

>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 4/18/2003 7:54 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030418205412.18828.00000107@mb-m07.aol.com>

>That's simply incorrect. I DO have "experience in radio communication outside
>of amateurism." I just don;t talk about it here because it's not relevant to
>amateur radio policy.

Hey Jim...didya really think that with all the smoke-screening he does over
"non-policy" topics he'd really keep to his own "rules"...?!?!

>> Outside of amateur radio your
>> radio communications is blank, a null, non-existant.
>
>That's just not true, Len. Live with it.

His Creepiness has obviously not read anything except posts wherein he was
cited. Too bad. He's missed some good stuff.

>> Then BE SPECIFIC on what you have "done."
>
>Why? "No one has to accede to your demand for any answer." You refuse to
>answer
>many of my questions - why should I answer yours? Because you DEMAND it?

Of course, Jim...It's "Do What I Say, Not Do What I Do".

>> You have stated nothing in regards to non-amateur
>> radio communications.
>
>Incorrect! I just haven't given the details you want. And I'm not going to.

And why should you? Lennie frequently "re-directs" anyone who is pulling
the topic away from what he percieves as "off topic". Then right here he is
lambasting you for NOT discussing something that is obviously NOT germane to
Amateur Radio policy.

Same, shame, shame...Lennie cought with his own rhetoric...AGAIN.

>Besides, it doesn't matter. No matter what job experience, references or
>documentation I present, you would almost certainly find fault with it,
>demean
>it and insult me with it. You have behaved that way towards everyone here
>whose
>work experience is known to you and who disagrees with you on unrelated
>amateur

>radio policy issues.

C-R-E-E-P. P-U-T-Z. L-O-S-E-R.

>Why would any rational person who disagrees with you tell you their work
>experience, given the way you have consistently behaved towards those do tell
>you their work experience and who disagree with you on unrelated amateur
>radio
>policy matters?

Why indeed.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3042. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 13:05:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419090535.19056.00000187@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 65281

>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 4/19/2003 5:54 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0304190254.31b53e1f@posting.google.com>
>
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message

(Excessive and overworked berating of Jim Miccolis snipped)

>Heh. Jimmy trolled you into the irrational rant of all rants. Good
>show James.
>
>Seldom in the history of mankind has anybody worked so hard for so
>long to make complete asses of themselves in public as you have
>Leonard. You've finally managed to set a high water mark in at least
>some field, an achievement which has escaped you for your prior seven
>decades of beavering away to become a somebody anybody anywhere.
>
>Congratultions ya pointless ZERO, you've arrived.

When will this creep ever learn? Self-humiliation must be a "personal
best" for Lennie. He does it well.

What a scumbag...What a PUTZ!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3043. Re: At The End Of The Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 13:08:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419090850.19056.00000188@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 65282

>Subject: Re: At The End Of The Day
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/18/2003 2:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030418151053.18783.00000038@mb-m27.aol.com>

>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has...(SNIP)

Gee, Lennie, you wouldn't be PLAGIARIZING this, would you?

Sure looks exactly like the works of another, which is exactly what plagiarism is.

And we KNOW that Lennie the Lame would NEVER plagiarize the works of another, now don't we...?!?!

(Yeah..riiiiiiiiiiiiiiiight....)

PUTZ.

Steve.

3044. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 13:12:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAC6C36C.17347%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 65284

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Exactly! Once we start down the road of not
> allowing nonviolent, legal dissent or protest
> against govt. decisions in wartime, we can
> easily wind up with results that essentially
> eliminate the very freedoms that are being
> defended. For example, maybe presidential
> elections should be suspended in wartime,
> because, by definition, anyone who runs against
> an incumbent president disagrees with that
> incumbent on some policy issues. Instead,
> perhaps in wartime an incumbent president
> should have the power to stay in office as
> long as he/she feels up to the job, and then
> to name his/her successor without an election.
>
> Or perhaps a wartime President should have
> unilateral power to increase taxes and impose
> new taxes during wartime. After all, dissent
> about taxes would give aid and comfort to the
> enemy, right?

Actually, as I'm sure you know, the President already has the power to do exactly that. Under the old Marshall Plan, and the many more recent derivatives of it, the President has the authority to suspend elections, disband Congress, curtail Constitutional freedoms, raise taxes, make arrests without trial, execute prisoners, and so on. The sole trigger of that authority is an attack on this country. For example, the WTC attack triggered one aspect of that authority, which allowed the President to order all aircraft grounded and military personnel to airports. Wrapped in secrecy, we know very little about the full details of this authority - other than it appears to be fairly extensive.

The Patriot Act has now extended some aspects of that authority to non-wartime situations, with some arguing other aspects should be added to that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3045. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 13:12:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419091214.19056.00000189@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 65283

>Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>Date: 4/18/2003 11:47 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <2y4oa.1437$Oc3.409455@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>

>Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030418221218.19022.00000118@mb-m16.aol.com

>> -Why are Hams fat, male, old, nerdy, boring, anti-social...(hateful bile
snipped)

>One of the richest men in the country got rich because of
>being a nerd (Bill Gates if you don't recognize the profile).

Betcha there's a lot of very unhappy ladies who turned down dates with BG
who are now rethinking their "principles"...!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3046. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 13:15:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304190515.5cbbade4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65285

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdk4u4g.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 18 Apr 2003 12:27:56 -0700, Brian wrote:
>
> >So he could properly frame the written permission required by deployed
> >amateurs. Sure would be nice for those deployed commanders and
> >amateurs to have some professional legal advice, instead of a bunch of
> >armchair warriors and codester lawyers.
>
> It's all written down in the regs as to who can authorize what
> and when.
>
> As far as joining, The Selective Service Board had their crack
> at me in 1961 and even though they found in the pre-induction
> physical that I had a hidden from-birth disability that exempted
> me from military service I went and worked as a civilian for the
> military and then the civilian side, a total of nearly 40 years.
>
> I've done my thing and that thing was not draft-dodging.

Phil, I am absolutely not calling you a draft-dodger, and I'm sure
that had you been inducted in the service in 1961, you would have
served proudly.

However, this is rrap and we have rules. Unless you were in the
service, you have no capacity to comment on what military commanders
can and cannot do. Sorry, I didn't make the rules. That's just the
way it is.

Unless the PCTA give you a pass, and they will. That's what they do.
They have two standards. One for themselves, and one for those they
consider unworthy.

But don't feel bad about skirting the rrap rules and getting a pass.
I'm sure you actually do know more about communication law than anyone
else in here, and could probably score even higher than Dave or Steve
on picking out a military commander. It just isn't fair.

3047. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 13:17:20 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <A%boa.9$Bk5.24038@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65272

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0304190403.3041a07a@posting.google.com...
> [snip]
>When I see a benefit to upgrading to
> extra, I will do so. I don't collect licenses, nor plaster my wall
> with superfluous achievements.

Here were my reasons to upgrade to Extra (in no particular order).

1) To see if I could do it.
2) So I didn't have to remember so many different frequencies for my
privilege limits. i.e. I only have to remember the top of the band, bottom
of the band, and split between voice and CW for some bands rather than the
tops and bottoms of the General or Advanced subbands.
3) To participate fully as a VE
4) A significant percentage of the most interesting DX on HF hangs out in
what are the Extra class portions of our bands.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

3048. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 13:20:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304190520.244f98ea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65286

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030418151054.18783.00000041@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0304180301.441d2057@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> If I gotta play by the book, ev'one gotta play by the book.
> > >
> > >Phil, if you wanna play at all, you've got to get yourself in the game.
> > >
> > >Go enlist, then volunteer for Iraq.
>
> He's waiting for the book to come out...

Len, speaking of books, I'm thinking of joining one of those book clubs that specialize in military subjects. Have you or anyone else ever belonged? If so, did you consider it worthwhile?

Brian

3049. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 13:25:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304190525.12a7c5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65287

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030418020511.19054.00000085@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
> >Date: 4/17/2003 8:05 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <87k7dspqd1.fld@barrow.com>
>
>
> >The simple fact is that a military commander on foriegn soil
> >can do whatever his superior officer says he can do. That is
> >indeed just exactly what an army is for.
>
> Not under the current "circumstances" that Prsident Bush sent the Armed
> Forces into Iraq for, Floyd.
>
> He SPECIFICALLY and REPEATEDLY stated that our "sole" purpose was to
> depose SH and "liberate" the Iraqi people, and to allow them to take control of
> their own detiny and country.

OK, they went there and deposed the Saddam regime as ordered. Now
some of our boys want to play radio. Where do they apply for
licensing?

State the Address of the Ministry of Communications, a point of
contact, and what the fees are.

3050. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 13:40:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EA151DB.4030702@adelphia.net>
Source record: 65288

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>Date: 4/18/2003 7:54 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030418205412.18828.00000107@mb-m07.aol.com>
>
>
>>That's simply incorrect. I DO have "experience in radio communication outside
>>of amateurism." I just don;t talk about it here because it's not relevant to
>>amateur radio policy.
>
>
> Hey Jim...didya really think that with all the smoke-screening he does over
> "non-policy" topics he'd really keep to his own "rules"...?!?!

Actually not. You assume that his purpose here is to further some point. This might mean staying on topic. Might even mean an arguing style that doesn't antagonize. After all, there are a couple reasons to argue. One might be to change your opponents mind, another to goad and annoy them. From my observations, his purpose here is mainly to antagonize, in which chastizing others to remain "on topic" while venturing off topic himself is just another goad for thos he seeks to bother. And for whatever his motivations, the method woks quite well.

All in all, quite a good fisherman!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3051. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 13:41:28 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <cmcoa.28$Bk5.29536@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65278

> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 4/18/2003 9:04 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030418220410.19022.00000117@mb-m16.aol.com>
> >As soon as
> >you try to learn (for example, by taking courses), you no longer fit the
> >desired profile. This counteracts any positive efforts you have made. I
don't
> >want to go into detail, but steering your profile becomes impossible, or
very
> >costly.

It is vital to do this in any well paying profession. You have to stay up-to-date and change as the profession changes. If you don't, you'll find yourself sidelined. The ability to learn and be flexible actually helps on your resume as a company will then see that you are able to change as the company changes and/or that even if you don't have everything they want that you are willing and capable of learning whatever it takes to fill in the gaps. Due to ups and downs in industry, I've reshaped my profile and career several times in my life to date.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

3052. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 13:44:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304190544.607fde0d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65289

```
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E9F8E69.FBEFBDB1@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9CC8CC.364D78AF@earthlink.net>...
> > > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3E9C984F.C703F3F8@earthlink.net...
> > > > > "Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> > > > > > 2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> > > > > > League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> > > > > > British military personnel
> > > > > >
> > > > > > provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
> > > > > > officer.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "There is precedent for this," Mills said, citing an operation during
> > > > > > the 1991 Gulf War. "These operators will need written authorization to
> > > > > > operate from their commanding officers
> > > > > >
> > > > > I'm sitting here grinning from ear to ear. All of this, of course,
> > > > > reminds me of lengthy tale of an alleged operation from Somalia.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > Not trying to be a smart alec here...but...since there is no actual
> > > > government....and the only authority seems to be the US Military....I see no
> > > > particular problem if the ham in question has a valid FCC license and the
> > > > commander gives him the authority. Isnt the CO the defacto licensing
> > > > authority in this case???
> > >
> > > That's the usual case, Dan. In N0IMD's case, he didn't think it
> > > important to have the permission in writing for operating from Somalia.
> > > He says he operated on a verbal OK.
> >
> > In K8MN's case, he said that no military commander can authorize any
> > amateur radio activity. Just ask him if he said that. He will
> > confirm it.
> >
> Here you go, Brian. These quotes might jog your memory about what took
> place.
```

>
> From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> Subject: Re: DSP vs human decoding of OOK CW
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: 2002-08-01 11:42:56 PST
>
> "Is it a lame assertion if your operation doesn't count toward DXCC and
> the "authority" granting you permission to operate had no right to do
> so? Surely you knew that as a self-proclaimed moral and ethical man
> that your actions were neither moral nor ethical."
>
>
> From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: 2002-08-03 06:20:14 PST
>
> "No, I say that a commander might grant authorization which is not his
> to grant. I say that higher-ups might not approve of such
> authorization. I say that the DXCC desk might not credit such operation.
> What has the DXCC desk said about your operation from Somalia? Have you
> found if it counts or not?"
>
> From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: 2002-08-09 22:05:19 PST
>
> "Ah Ah, Brian. I've questioned whether your commander had the authority
> to do so. I've also asked if you obtained "written permission". So
> far, you've just played dodge ball with the question. I've repeatedly
> asked if your operation was accepted for DXCC credit."

Yes, yes, Dave. This was all after I had to educate -you- on what was
and is still posted on the ARRL web site, the very same people that
have you grinning from ear to ear now. You might like to refresh you
memory with a quick visit.

Somalia:
http://www.remote.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/io/recip-info_p.html#t5

> It's only a small issue since the message we've seen about GI's
> operating from Iraq requires written permission.

And the information listed by the very same source doesn't state that
written permission is required for Somalia.

Now you're probably grinning and drooling.

3053. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 14:00:00 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87y9268u5b.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 65290

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030418020511.19054.00000085@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>> >From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>> >Date: 4/17/2003 8:05 PM Central Daylight Time
>> >Message-id: <87k7dspqd1.fld@barrow.com>
>>
>>
>> >The simple fact is that a military commander on foriegn soil
>> >can do whatever his superior officer says he can do. That is
>> >indeed just exactly what an army is for.
>>
>> Not under the current "circumstances" that Prsident Bush sent the Armed
>> Forces into Iraq for, Floyd.
>>
>> He SPECIFICALLY and REPEATEDLY stated that our "sole" purpose was to
>> depose SH and "liberate" the Iraqi people, and to allow them to take control of
>> their own detiny and country.
>
>
>OK, they went there and deposed the Saddam regime as ordered. Now
>some of our boys want to play radio. Where do they apply for
>licensing?
>
>State the Address of the Ministry of Communications, a point of
>contact, and what the fees are.

The point is they answer to President Bush, not to anyone who is
an Iraqi (or part of the UN, or anything else). If the US
military decides that Bush as allowed it, it can and will do it.
That includes causing significant death and destruction, not to
mention ignoring Iraq's entire legal system, and of course not
to mention allowing Amateur Radio operations by US troops.

Suggesting that someone else's rule against Amateur Radio
operations by the US military is significant, is absurd.

Steve's comments on International Law, and the idea that
deposing Hussein and liberating Iraq somehow is inconsistent
with allowing recreational use of amateur radio by troops,
indicates a bit of extreme naivete.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>

Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

3054. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 14:18:29 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419101829.18793.00000266@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 65291

>I just got a promotion at work.

Oh good, are you now the Head Fry cook?

>I don't collect licenses, nor plaster my wall
>with superfluous achievement

Well then turn in your General

3055. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 14:20:31 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <F440E146C513C16F.E31262C8E84596ED.8AE660F27A6A327D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65295

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0304190423.43d84bf2@posting.google.com...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA0CB93.EF098248@earthlink.net>...
> > W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3EA01164.3C0C6074@earthlink.net...
> > > > W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:BAC3B759.17103%stewart@say.net...
> > > > > > "Dave Heil" wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Do you have any concept of how our military operates?
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Your concept obviously differs from mine. Dave. You said that
weapon
> > > > > > (MOAB) was deployed to Iraq to attack troops massed in open
terrain. I
> > > > > > pointed out that, according to the military itself, there were
no
> > troops
> > > > > > still massed in open terrain when that weapon was deployed -
only
> > isolated
> > > > > > pockets in towns and cities. You responded to that with the
above.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > > > > >
> > > > > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > It's called ignoring an inarguable truth when it doesn't support
your
> > > > > > framework of thought. Children do it every day...
> > > > >
> > > > > That's how I'd access Dwight's comments, Kim. Nice that you agree.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN

> > > >
> > >
> > > I do agree Dave, if the word is changed to assess and the name to
Dave.
> >
> > > And, I'm not even slightly interested in engaging your flippant,
arrogant
> > > attitude.
> >
> > Sure you are, Kim. You responded to the post, didn't you?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Kim, I think you're making progress.
>
> Dave doesn't try to deflect the description "flippant and arrogant."
>

heh heh heh heh!!! A mere oversight on his part, I'm sure, Brian. Nope, I
lost interest in this oaf.

Kim W5TIT

3056. Re: At The End Of The Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 14:23:56 UTC
From: You Gotta be Kidding <ohno@notme.net>
Message-ID: <drm2av0npupvb9f7jbk3aa6k8oqtlscb10@4ax.com>
Source record: 65292

Robeson you are truly an idiot. Don't you have a life?
Why not scream this shit out your back door and not look
like a fool to the rest of the world?

On 19 Apr 2003 13:08:50 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:

>>Subject: Re: At The End Of The Day
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/18/2003 2:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030418151053.18783.00000038@mb-m27.aol.com>
>
>>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has...(SNIP)
>
> Gee, Lennie, you wouldn't be PLAGIARIZING this, would you?
>
> Sure looks exactly like the works of another, which is exactly what
>plagiarism is.
>
> And we KNOW that Lennie the Lame would NEVER plagiarize the works of
>another, now don't we...?!?!
>
> (Yeah..riiiiiiiiiiiiiiight....)
>
> PUTZ.
>
>Steve.
>

3057. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 14:29:03 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <53E1CF3355AD25C4.81A9793EBE6CECA5.D248DC7287EA7A81@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65296

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030419082610.18775.00000100@mb-m02.aol.com...
> In article
<81BD6DACD3EEC2EB.C999C620FC531C59.9B432F0625B1459B@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >news:c2356669.0304180916.4a28633d@posting.google.com...
> >> [SNIP]
> >> But it's more important that the freedoms not be destroyed in the
> >> process of defending them. As in "we destroyed the village in order to
> >> save it".
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >> "UN Secretary Kofi Annan said he thinks the arms inspectorsshould
> >> resume looking for weapons in Iraq. Hey, forget arms in Iraq, how
> >> about looking for some backbone in the UN?" - Jay Leno
> >>
> >> "There's now talk that US wants to spray the poppy fields of
> >> Afghanistan in an effort to destroy the drug crop before it can be
> >> harvested. If you thought Bush was unpopular in Hollywood
> >> before......-Jay Leno
> >>
> >> "And now the really difficult part: We have to rebuild Iraq into a
> >> strong and independent nation that will one day hate the United
> >> States" - David Letterman
> >
> >Oh man, so true, so true!!!
> >
> Kim,
>
> Guess who said this:
>
> "Of course the people don't want war. But after all, it's the leaders of
the
> country who determine the policy, and it's always a simple matter to drag
the
> people along whether it's a democracy, a fascist dictatorship, or a
parliament,
> or a communist dictatorship. Voice or no voice, the people can always be
> brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is
tell
> them they are being attacked, and denounce the pacifists for lack of

> patriotism, and exposing the country to greater danger."
>
> Hint: It's not an American
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Y'know what, Jim? Before I looked it up (and I did), your leading question and hint, with the aide of the phrase "denounce the pacifists," I truly thought it was going to be Hitler himself. Sure enough, when I looked it up, I find that it was indeed a "Hermann Goering, Nazi leader, at the Nuremberg Trials after World War II." (Source: http://www.bigmagic.com/pages/blackj/column78f.html)

It doesn't surprise me at all...

I was checking out the Reuters website this morning. It's a true shame that "we" didn't think of how to address the problem of rebuilding Iraq--thoroughly--before going in. My prediction: we are not going to be able to "keep a handle on" the Iraqi people before we have to dodge or get out of there.

Kim W5TIT

3058. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 14:38:34 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <AFCC35F1C0AA20A8.EAC153F4CAE4DDF9.CD51697BE4A209E1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65297

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030419082610.18775.00000100@mb-m02.aol.com...
> In article
<81BD6DACD3EEC2EB.C999C620FC531C59.9B432F0625B1459B@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >news:c2356669.0304180916.4a28633d@posting.google.com...
> >> [SNIP]
> >> But it's more important that the freedoms not be destroyed in the
> >> process of defending them. As in "we destroyed the village in order to
> >> save it".
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >> "UN Secretary Kofi Annan said he thinks the arms inspectorsshould
> >> resume looking for weapons in Iraq. Hey, forget arms in Iraq, how
> >> about looking for some backbone in the UN?" - Jay Leno
> >>
> >> "There's now talk that US wants to spray the poppy fields of
> >> Afghanistan in an effort to destroy the drug crop before it can be
> >> harvested. If you thought Bush was unpopular in Hollywood
> >> before......-Jay Leno
> >>
> >> "And now the really difficult part: We have to rebuild Iraq into a
> >> strong and independent nation that will one day hate the United
> >> States" - David Letterman
> >
> >Oh man, so true, so true!!!
> >
> Kim,
>
> Guess who said this:
>
> "Of course the people don't want war. But after all, it's the leaders of
the
> country who determine the policy, and it's always a simple matter to drag
the
> people along whether it's a democracy, a fascist dictatorship, or a
parliament,
> or a communist dictatorship. Voice or no voice, the people can always be
> brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is
tell
> them they are being attacked, and denounce the pacifists for lack of

> patriotism, and exposing the country to greater danger."
>
> Hint: It's not an American
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

By the way, just in case anyone relates this to hysteria:

http://snopes.com/quotes/goering.htm

3059. "enhanced" SSB ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 14:41:44 UTC
From: Bo yawns <boyawns@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ea1602e@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 65293
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I saw today that R.H. issued some
traffic-tickets to a few hams for running
something called "enhanced ssb".

What exactly are the technical specs of
this mode of SSB? URL's which explain it?

3060. Re: Audio Gain Block...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 14:46:45 UTC
From: " \"RRCB\" Freedom" <anycost@antitwisty.com>
Message-ID: <afSdnf9DiefF_DyjXTWcqw@comcast.com>
Source record: 65294
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030419095018.400$Xe@newsreader.com...
> Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > "Brian Griffey" <briangriffey@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> > > No but you still do... <g>
> > >
> > > --
> > > ||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
> > > Brian Griffey
> > > See the SkyWave Linear Amplifier at
> > > http://home.att.net/~briangriffey/Index.html
> > > $130 through April03!
> > > ||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
> > >
> > > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20030419085228.638$DM@newsreader.com...
> > > > What's wrong Brian,amp sales still suck?
> > >
> > how many of those splatter boxes have you sold?
> >
> Is that really a 10 meter amp?

Do you really like assholes?

3061. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 14:48:44 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EA161CC.6080107@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 65212

WA8ULX wrote:

>
>
> Heres the typical correct answer from most CBplussers, if they would tell the
> truth. Your real problem is you dont wont to learn it, and since it is a law
> that prevents you from being able to get on HF, you wont the Law changed to
> meet your needs. So now you try and come up with every excuse in the world to
> try and make your case for your self.

>
> That interesting, a more difficult written huh. Well I guess someone could
> just as easily say, why should the written be more difficult, I dont plan on
> doing anything with theory, so why should be forced to learn it.

>
>
> Well with the present system it Basically is just a give away. The present
> written test proves nothing other than an ability to memorize Q&As that have no
> meaning to most new Hams. You dont believe it ask them, they will tell you,
> there have been plenty posters here that will tell you thats all they did.
> Once the CW test goes away then your above statment will be very valid. In
> case you forgot your statment here it is.

ULX claims to be a college graduate yet he cannot put together a
grammatically correct sentence without spelling errors.
No wonder he had to wait for the "dumbed downed" test to get his
extra.

3062. Re: "enhanced" SSB ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 15:31:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7rq3g$17r$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65298
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

It is when you take twelve to twenty KHZ of AF and force it into your
microphone input stage of the transmitter, which is designed to pass
aproximately 300 to 3000 cycles.

Adjust your carrier frequency of the transmitter to enable more 'LOW' tones.

Then listen to the results on the air.

Can you say too wide?

Dan/W4NTI

"Bo yawns" <boyawns@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3ea1602e@snipnews.snip.net...
> I saw today that R.H. issued some
> traffic-tickets to a few hams for running
> something called "enhanced ssb".
>
> What exactly are the technical specs of
> this mode of SSB? URL's which explain it?
>
>

3063. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 15:39:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7rqic$96g$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65299

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030419101829.18793.00000266@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >I just got a promotion at work.
>
> Oh good, are you now the Head Fry cook?
>
> >I don't collect licenses, nor plaster my wall
> >with superfluous achievement
>
> Well then turn in your General

Thats right....using his logic....since he is now a SWL...he don't even need the General. Turn it in.

Dan/W4NTI

3064. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 15:41:49 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7rqmi$h5g$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65300

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EA09AAD.7060006@adelphia.net...
> Vito wrote:
> > Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> >> ... I AM hearting impaired,...
> >>... I have tinnitus in both ears, a different frequency in each.
> >
> >
> > I'm a tad worse off. I hear many tones at once, different in each ear,
> > that turn themselves on and off at random making it hard to tell them
> > from real dits and dahs.
> >
> >> Tough! I passed the test, just like everyone else,.....
> >
> >
> > By that logic everybody should share our hearing loss and my diabetes
> > and we should all have cancer.
>
> I don't know where you get that as my logic, Vito. My point is that in
> the card game of life, we are all dealt different hands. We have to work
> with what we have. It took me over six months to learn Morse code well
> enough to pass the test that some people here say can be learned in
> weekend. Should I have just given up because they are so much better
> than me? Thing one is they aren't better, thing two is I wanted the
> ticket, so I learned Morse Code. Simple.
>
> >> Too many whiners these days!
> >
> > Naw, too many selfish people who think that everybody should suffer
> > every injustice and misery they did.
>
> I think everyone should pass the the tests in life that we are given.
> Let's take another of my hobbies, Ice Hockey. If someone wants to be on
> my team, they need to know how to skate. If there is some problem that
> they cannot skate, they can't be on the team (albeit with my
> condolences) But it's just how it is. If we were forced to take people
> who couldn't skate, the game would be messed up a bit. It's the same
> that I can't play in the NHL. My skills are just not good enough. I deal
> with it though, and don't think the people playing in the NHL are
> selfish. Rather, I admire them instead of resent and envy them.
>
> I enjoy the little challenges like learning Morse code while having a
> problem that hinders it. Things that are just handed to us are seldom

> appreciated. Of course in America these days, everything is owed to us.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Are all you whinners paying attention? Mike has the right idea.

Dan/W4NTI

3065. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 15:43:45 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7rqs0$gu0$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65201

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030418231259.19022.00000120@mb-m16.aol.com...
> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>
> >I think everyone should pass the the tests in life that we are given.
> >Let's take another of my hobbies, Ice Hockey. If someone wants to be on
> >my team, they need to know how to skate.
>
> Tests are useful if they are relevant. Learning how to skate is relaevant
to
> learning hockey. Learning Morse code is not relavant to radio, including
> amateur radio.
>
> >My skills are just not good enough. I deal
> >with it though, and don't think the people playing in the NHL are
> >selfish. Rather, I admire them instead of resent and envy them.
>
> I certainly don't admire them learning a skill of little use.
>
> I resent Morse coders blocking the license class and taking over the
hobby.
>
> I don't envy Morse coders at all. I have tested for realtime encoding
> abilities. I know I can do it. I don't want to waste my time learning the
whole
> Morse code encoding scheme.
>
> >I enjoy the little challenges like learning Morse code while having a
> >problem that hinders it.
>
> Congratulations on learning Morse code.
>
> >Things that are just handed to us are seldom
> >appreciated. Of course in America these days, everything is owed to us.
>
> That argument would be useful if a USEFUL skill was tested to obtain a
benefit.
>
> When such a non-useful skill is a barrier to a higher license class,
something
> is very wrong with the hobby. I would be fine with a more useful practical
> skill or a more difficult written test, so the license class is not "just
> handed to us".
>

>
>

Translation; I wont do it because I choose to degrade and insult all of those before me that followed the rules and didn't make a career of whinning for changes.

Dan/W4NTI

3066. Re: "enhanced" SSB ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 15:47:19 UTC
From: tad danley <tdanley@nospamatearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA16FE8.3F2E1871@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65202

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> It is when you take twelve to twenty KHZ of AF and force it into your
> microphone input stage of the transmitter, which is designed to pass
> aproximately 300 to 3000 cycles.
>
> Adjust your carrier frequency of the transmitter to enable more 'LOW' tones.
>
> Then listen to the results on the air.
>
> Can you say too wide?

I haven't heard enhanced ssb (temporarily without an hf antenna, unfortunately). How does it differ in bandwidth from am, and might it be appropriate in the am "subbands"?

Thanks and 73,

--
Tad Danley, K3TD

* Anti-spam return address in use *

3067. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 15:55:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7rs2u$d9l$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65205

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030419021215.18769.00000063@mb-m14.aol.com...
You must
> ask yourself truthfully if morse code testing is of any actual value
> to the FCC and to newcomers who weren't licensed before. I say
> such testing has no value, an agreement with the FCC's opinion.
>
> It is up to you and all the pro-code-test advocates to prove a need
> to continue morse code testing. Not the other way around.

OK....you want to prove the need......

In order to work the CW Contests you must know International Morse Code.

next.

Dan/W4NTI

3068. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 15:57:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419115744.18833.00000175@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65203

>Thats right....using his logic....since he is now a SWL...he don't even need
>the General. Turn it in.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Hes not an SWL Dan, hes probably at least a" 2 Meter CBer" looking for handout
to EXTRA.

3069. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 15:59:36 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419115936.18833.00000177@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65204

>Are all you whinners paying attention? Mike has the right idea.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Dan the whinners wont listen to Mikes comments, The whinners abd CBplussers
are only interested in FREE HANDOUTS

3070. Re: Article in World Radiol

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 16:12:30 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7rsg3$3d9$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65206

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EA09BAC.9090501@adelphia.net...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > "Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3EA061E8.B815AC06@crosslink.net...
> >
> >>Mike Coslo wrote:
> >>
> >>> ... I AM hearting impaired,...
> >>>... I have tinnitus in both ears, a different frequency in each.
> >>
> >>I'm a tad worse off. I hear many tones at once, different in each ear,
> >>that turn themselves on and off at random making it hard to tell them
> >>from real dits and dahs.
> >>
> >>> Tough! I passed the test, just like everyone else,.....
> >>
> >>By that logic everybody should share our hearing loss and my diabetes
> >>and we should all have cancer.
> >>
> >>> Too many whiners these days!
> >>
> >>Naw, too many selfish people who think that everybody should suffer
> >>every injustice and misery they did.
> >>
> >>K3DWW
> >
> >
> > Are all you 'hearing handicapped' individuals also blind? Or can not
feel
> > with ones fingers? Try blinking lights and finger sense.
> >
> > Sounds like a bunch of excuses to me.
>
>
> What are you talking about Dan? I support testing and retaining the
> test, and although I have some severe hearing problems, I was pointing
> out that I overcame it to passs the test.
>
> I AM MAKING NO EXCUSES. IS THAT CLEAR?
>
> I bet you like kicking the canes out from under cripples.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

>

Im not directing those comments specifically to you Mike. Im just sick and tired of all this whinning about the CW.

Dan/W4NTI

3071. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 16:45:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419124555.18821.00000073@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 65210

```
In article <20030419003644.18771.00000039@mb-m23.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030418205412.18828.00000107@mb-m07.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>In article <20030418151058.18783.00000044@mb-m27.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>>n article <20030418072725.18755.00000050@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>>writes:
>>>
>>>>In article <20030418012918.18821.00000010@mb-m10.aol.com>,
>>lenover21@aol.com
>>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>>>
>>>>>In article <20030417222749.18827.00000028@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>>>>(N2EY)
>>>>>writes:
>>>>>
>>>>>> You've never worked in commercial HF comms
>>>>>> or have any experience in anything but simple amateur radio
>>>>>> stations.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>How do you know what I have and have not done? You don't even know where
>>I
>>>>>>work, or where I have worked.
>>>>>
>>>>> You've never worked in commercial HF comms
>>>>> or have any experience in anything but simple amateur radio
>>>>> stations.
>>>>
>>>>Doesn't answer the question. You're just repeating yourself.
>>>
>>> You haven't stated anything about your past experience
>>> except the most general ambiguous statements about work
>>> and alleged experience as an amateur licensee.
>>
>>That's right, Len.

Actually, it's not quite right. The statements about my work experience are not
ambiguous, and my experience as an amateur radio operator is documented.
>
```

>>I also haven't stated my past experience baking bread. That doesn't mean I
>>have
>>never baked any bread, only that I haven't talked about it here.
>
> You do NOT work in radio and it is doubtful you work in
> electronics.

I am over six feet tall. There are not many radios big enough for me to work inside.

The simple fact is that you do not know where I work or what I do. And I'm not going to tell you. You have no way of knowing whether I "work in radio" or "work in electronics" or not.

> Other EEs would talk shop.

I do "talk shop" - but not in an amateur radio policy newsgroup. Since I do not work for the FCC, ARRL, an amateur radio equipment manufacturer, or as a communications attorney, such "shop talk" is simply not relevant.

Besides, you would probably not understand my "shop talk" anyway, Len.

> You don't out of fear.

Not fear. Common sense.

> What "fear" is that?

Not fear. Common sense.

> Of being discovered that you
> are NOT even close to working in radio or electronics?
>
Not fear. Common sense.

Besides, commercial radio experience is simply not relevant to amateur radio policy.

>>> You have
>>> NO references about communications experience outside
>>> of amateurism.
>>
>>"References"? From whom?
>
> Continue to talk in riddles. It only proves you have NO
> experience in radio outside of amateurism.

You haven't answered the question, Len. "References" is an ambiguous term.
>
>>> From that no one has to accede to your
>>> demand for any answer.
>>
>>I don't demand anything, Len. I simply asked a simple question: How do you
>>know what I have and have not done?

>
> You are very tiring. You are blustering and bluffing at great length
> about something you claim to be true but you cannot prove a
> single thing about communications outside of amateur radio.

Not at all, Len. I'm simply refusing to answer your questions about my work and work experience. Obviously that refusal infuriates you for some strange reason.
>
> Fakery is what you practice.

Not at all. It's called common sense.

>>I posted here for several years before I mentioned that I have BSEE and MSEE
>>degrees. Did the fact I did not mention them before mean I did not have
>them?
>>Of course not.
>
> You could have a PhD and won a Nobel Prize a quarter century
> ago and it wouldn't matter any more on the subject of
> communications outside of amateurism.

Then there's no reason for me to answer any of your questions, Len. You have just told us that no matter what qualifications I post, you will not accept them as proof of anything involving "the subject of communications outside of amateurism." So there's no point in giving you more information.

> You don't have any
> such knowledge or experience on communications outside of
> amateur radio.

How do you know? You keep making that statement as if it's a fact, but you have nothing to back it up but your own rejection of my already-stated qualifications and experience.
>
> You can't prove any...

Prove any what?

> you can't talk about it...

Sure I can. I choose not to. Choice - what a concept.

> all you are doing
> is BLUFFING. A knowledge con-job is what you are pulling
> in here. You are a grifter.

Not me. This is an amateur radio newsgroup. I'm a radio amateur, talking about amateur radio policy and a few other subjects. I have not made deliberate false statements here. Nor have I tried to mislead anyone.
>
>>Sure I do. I work as an electrical engineer. That's what I've done since I
>>graduated in 1976. That's all you need to know.
>
> Ho ho ho...the imperial speaks.

The only "Imperial" I know is an inexpensive margarine.
>
> "That's all you need to know."

That's correct. Live with it.
>
> That's all everyone else needs to know.

Incorrect. There are some others here who know more about what I do for a
living.

> You know nothing of
> what you claim on communications experience outside of
> amateur radio.

What experience have I claimed that is not true?

> No problem. You are null, a zero on that
> subject.

Incorrect.

>>> Ergo, you have
>>> NO experience in radio communication outside of amateurism.
>>
>>That's simply incorrect. I DO have "experience in radio communication
>>outside
>>of amateurism." I just don;t talk about it here because it's not relevant to
>>amateur radio policy.
>
> Oh, boo hoo, is the pedantic parson starting to cry, too?

Nope.
>
> You DON'T have any such experience in radio communications
> outside of amateur radio.

Incorrect.

> You CAN'T talk about it because the
> first time you did you would make a mistake.

Incorrect.

> Those who HAVE
> worked on such would spot it right away.

Who would that be?
>
> You cannot make a mistake.

Sure I can. I've made plenty. Sope would say replying to your posts is a
mistake.

> You cannot admit a mistake.

Sure I can. You are the one who cannot, even when said mistake is pointed out repeatedly and carefully explained.

> You keep trying to cover up with misdirections and those
> terribly long posts where you get into all kinds of irrelevant
> minutae in order to avoid answering the original subject.

Here, Len, let me hold this mirror for ya....
>
>> Outside of amateur radio your
>>> radio communications is blank, a null, non-existant.
>>
>>That's just not true, Len. Live with it.
>
> In that regard I AM RIGHT.

No, you're simply wrong.

> LIVE WITH IT, pedantic perfectionist.

Seems like you're getting angry.
>
>>Incorrect. I just don't talk about my work here.
>
> Fear.

No, just common sense.
>
>>>>btw, I have worked with cystems that use 5823s.
>>>
>>> C-Systems was not under discussion. Did you or did you not
>>> work at C-Systems?
>>
>>Typo. You make more typos than I, Len.
>
> "C-Systems" is/was a corporation. Not a big one.

Never heard of it.
>
> No one can have a meaningful discussion with you if you make
> such terrible errors and talk in riddles.

Others seem to have no problem having meaningful discussions with me. Look at the stick-shift anaogy discussion I had with Bill Sohl, K2UNK, for just one example. Bill and I have very different opinions on many things, yet we respect each other and arfe able to debate in what I would call a very civil manner.
>
>>I have worked with systems that used 5823s. Cold cathode gas tube.
>
> You could have said the same thing about any other active
> device by simply looking it up from a tube chart.

So could you, Len.

The systems I refer to also had Dekatron counter tubes and a bunch of other specialized hardware. I could go on and on in great detail about that system, and many others. I choose not to.
>
> Did you EVER work on a piece of communications equipment
> for any reason that used any gas tubes?

Oh yes. The one I described above. Many times. That's all you need to know.

> Had you ever worked with the time-division multiplexes that I
> mentioned you would have been between -2 and about +10
> years old. NO ONE is so good that they can make others
> believe they worked on certain equipment BEFORE THEY
> WERE BORN.

I never claimed to have worked on those particular multiplex systems, Len. They are not the only communications systems that used gas tubes, ya know.

Do you claim to know the location and removal date of every single communication system that ever used gas tubes?
>
> You have become just an ordinary amateur grifter, a BS
> flinger who can't provide any references for himself beyond
> 1976 and outside of amateur radio.

Not "can't". "Won't". Not to you, anyway.
>
>>That's right! And neither can YOU prove I have no experience.
>
> No one can prove a nothing. You are a nothing.
>
Incorrect!
>
>>No, Len, I'm very real, working on real things.
>
> Few give a damn any more.

Those who matter, do give a damn.
>
>>I just don't discuss most of them here.
>
> You can't. The fear factor is too high for you.

Not at all. Just common sense.
>
>>Since this is an amateur radio newsgroup, I discuss amateur radio
>>here.
>
> You have "discussed" mightily on NON-amateur subjects in
> here...from foreign policy having NO bearing on amateur radio
> and railroads and military aviation of a time when you were
> a newborn.

So have you, Len. And when your mistakes have been pointed out, you refuse to acknowledge them.

> A whole lot of BS going down and you, Jimmie, are
> a class-A hypocrite on your own statements.

If there's BS, it doesn't come from me. As for "Class A hypocrite", I recall recently reading a post of yours where you called someone unknown to you a "boy" and a "racial bigot" in the same post. Fascinating....
>
> Google has all that stuff archived. Live in fear that someone
> might yank out some of those "I only talk about amateur radio
> subjects in here" postings that DO NOT do so.

Be my guest. Then tell us again about your Extra still being in its box, and how all Technicians are not code tested.....
>
>>I have references and documentation of what I've done, too. But I don't talk
>>about it here.
>
> You can't.

Not can't. Don't.

>The fear factor is too high for you.
>
Not fear. Common sense.

>>>>> You are NOT in any position to DEMAND anything in here,
>>
>>Neither are you, Len. Live with it.
>
> Then you are just an amateur charlatan, a poseur, a non-expert
> on radio-electronics outside of amateur radio, an intellectual
> con-man, a grifter. A nothing but with a 1976 set of degrees.

Incorrect.
>
> We all have to live with what you DON'T say.

Silence is golden.

> You can't absolve
> yourself by being arrogant, imperious.

This mirror is doing a good job...

>>> You have stated nothing in regards to non-amateur
>>> radio communications.
>>
>>Incorrect! I just haven't given the details you want. And I'm not going to.
>
> You can't.

Sure I can.

> You don't have any such details.

Yes, I do. I won't, though.

>>Besides, it doesn't matter. No matter what job experience, references or
>>documentation I present, you would almost certainly find fault with it,
>>demean it and insult me with it.
>
> See? Paranoia. Mindless, irrational paranoia. FEAR.

Nope. COMMON SENSE.
>
>>You have behaved that way towards everyone here whose
>>work experience is known to you and who disagrees with you on unrelated
>>amateur radio policy issues.
>
> More FEAR. You can't possibly know the future.

Neither can you.

But based on your behavior here for the past %+ years, I can make a pretty
educated guess as to how you will behave if I tell you more about my work
experience.

> Your "defense"
> is the vaporware of "waa...waa...he might do something!...waa."
>
> BABY.

Really?
>
>>Why would any rational person who disagrees with you tell you their work
>>experience, given the way you have consistently behaved towards those do
>>tell
>>you their work experience and who disagree with you on unrelated amateur
>>radio policy matters?
>
> Let's see some COURAGE demonstrated in here. Most other
> folks have the guts to take any situation, like it or no.
>
> You cannot ever be wrong, you cannot ever make a big mistake
> so you assume that silly imperious, arrogant "I don't have to tell
> you" pose. You must be a radio god in your mind. You aren't
> a god in anyone else's mind.
>
> Here, have a "profile," big radio god -
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Miccolis's views, they
> will be the target of Miccolis's snide sarcasm, ridicule, name-
> calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
> Miccolis's self-importance and experience...plus the excessively

> long misdirections which antagonistically argue minutae without
> discussing the original subject.
>
Really? Let's see, here's how you've described me in some posts in this thread,
Len. These are actual quotes from you, just from the post I am replying to:

"You are very tiring."

"You are blustering and bluffing at great length about something you claim to
be true but you cannot prove a single thing about communications outside of
amateur radio."

"Fakery is what you practice."

"You could have a PhD and won a Nobel Prize a quarter century ago and it
wouldn't matter any more on the subject of communications outside of
amateurism."

"You don't have any such knowledge or experience on communications outside of
amateur radio." (that one appears in various forms at least a half-dozen times
- probably more like a dozen)

"You are a grifter."

"Ho ho ho...the imperial speaks."

"You are null, a zero on that subject."

"Oh, boo hoo, is the pedantic parson starting to cry, too?"

"pedantic perfectionist."

"Fear."

"just an ordinary amateur grifter, a BS flinger who can't provide any
references for himself beyond 1976 and outside of amateur radio."

"You are a nothing."

"you, Jimmie, are a class-A hypocrite on your own statements."

"you are just an amateur charlatan, a poseur, a non-expert on radio-electronics
outside of amateur radio, an intellectual
con-man, a grifter. A nothing but with a 1976 set of degrees."

"You have stated nothing in regards to non-amateur radio communications."

"Paranoia. Mindless, irrational paranoia. FEAR."

"More FEAR. You can't possibly know the future. Your "defense" is the
vaporware of "waa...waa...he might do something!...waa.""

"BABY."

"You cannot ever be wrong, you cannot ever make a big mistake so you assume
that silly imperious, arrogant "I don't have to tell

you" pose. You must be a radio god in your mind. You aren't a god in anyone else's mind."

After all that, what rational person would tell you anything about their work experience?

3072. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 16:45:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419124556.18821.00000075@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 65207

In article <3EA0CAE1.F2542A95@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <20030418151058.18783.00000044@mb-m27.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
>> > Irrelevant and gratuitous snowjobbing by a morseman.
>>
>> What is a "morseman"?
>
>I think they were the Mordic types who used their great kmowledge of
>mavigation to visit Morth America in the Mimth or Temth cemtury.
>
Imterestimg. But wouldm't such a persom be called a "morsemam"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3073. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 16:45:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419124556.18821.00000074@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 65208

In article <d22b54c3.0304190254.31b53e1f@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

(massive snippage of old stuff)

>Heh. Jimmy trolled you into the irrational rant of all rants.

Troll? I do not troll. I simply ask direct questions, state facts and some opinions, and sometimes point out obvious errors and inconsistencies in others' postings here.

Unfortunately, some people just don't like that. Their opposition is often expressed by personal attacks and irrational behavior.

>Good show James.

I am gratified if others find some benefit in my postings here.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3074. Re: At The End Of The Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 16:45:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419124557.18821.00000076@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 65209

In article <20030419090850.19056.00000188@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> Sure looks exactly like the works of another, which is exactly what
>plagiarism is.
>
Not exactly, Steve.

Plagiarism is the act of presenting the work of another as one's own, original work, without reference to the true source. That's why K8MN always frames that profile I wrote as a quote.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3075. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 16:50:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA17E5D.B781EA9A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65211

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA0CB93.EF098248@earthlink.net>...
> > W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3EA01164.3C0C6074@earthlink.net...
> > > > W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:BAC3B759.17103%stewart@say.net...
> > > > > > "Dave Heil" wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Do you have any concept of how our military operates?
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Your concept obviously differs from mine. Dave. You said that weapon
> > > > > > (MOAB) was deployed to Iraq to attack troops massed in open terrain. I
> > > > > > pointed out that, according to the military itself, there were no
> > troops
> > > > > > still massed in open terrain when that weapon was deployed - only
> > isolated
> > > > > > pockets in towns and cities. You responded to that with the above.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > > > > >
> > > > > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > It's called ignoring an inarguable truth when it doesn't support your
> > > > > > framework of thought. Children do it every day...
> > > > >
> > > > > That's how I'd access Dwight's comments, Kim. Nice that you agree.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > I do agree Dave, if the word is changed to assess and the name to Dave.
> > >
> > > And, I'm not even slightly interested in engaging your flippant, arrogant
> > > attitude.
```

> >
> > Sure you are, Kim. You responded to the post, didn't you?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Kim, I think you're making progress.
>
> Dave doesn't try to deflect the description "flippant and arrogant."

She doesn't argue about being a bubble head anymore either.

Dave K8MN

3076. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 16:53:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA17EE9.186D6088@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65213

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA08B39.5D963178@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA00D1B.4C785DDD@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > I haven't stated a goal here.
> > >
> > > You don't need to. It's obvious.
> >
> > Then, pray tell, why are you wasting my time in asking me for a stated
> > goal?
> >

>
> I was curious if you knew.

No, I had no idea why you were wasting my time. That's why I posed the
question.

Dave K8MN

3077. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 16:58:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA18089.68A200CB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65215

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA088A4.B011F968@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA00DCE.6709A863@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdi8aza.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > > > > > On 16 Apr 2003 18:56:22 -0700, Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >> I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
> > > > > > >> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
> > > > > > >> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
> > > > > > >> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
> > > > > > >> to standing procedures binding upon the military.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >It's nice to see an amateur atempting to squash the spirit of amateur radio.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >Probably an attorney.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > One of the better communications attornies around if I say so
> > > > > > myself. Rule compliance is my specialty and I've been on the
> > > > > > prosecution side as well as the defense side.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > If I gotta play by the book, ev'one gotta play by the book.
> > > > >
> > > > > Phil, if you wanna play at all, you've got to get yourself in the game.
> > > >
> > > > On the face of it, your comment was the usual, silly Brian Burke stuff.
> > > > The more I thought it about it, the more I saw some logic in it. To
> > > > extend your idea, if Len Anderson wants to play, he has to get in the
> > > > game.
> > >
> > > That's what you've been saying all along.
> > >
> > > Why is it bad when I adopt that theology?
> >
> > I didn't say it was bad. You only thought that because of your poor
> > reading comprehension. I think it was good and I'm glad that you're the
> > one who wrote it. I'm afraid though that you've aroused the ire of your

> > mentor.
>
> Then you agree that Phil needs to get into the game before he can have
> a valid opinion on the subject?

Sure I do. Further, I think he's already in the game.

> And I don't think Phil considers himself my mentor.

I don't consider Phil as your mentor either. Phil is a rational man.
Your mentor is the non-participant in amateur radio who frequently posts
here.

> > > > > Go enlist, then volunteer for Iraq.
> > > >
> > > > Why would Phil do that?
> >
> > > So he could properly frame the written permission required by deployed
> > > amateurs. Sure would be nice for those deployed commanders and
> > > amateurs to have some professional legal advice, instead of a bunch of
> > > armchair warriors and codester lawyers.
> >
> > Seems to me that in past applicable situations, most have figured it out
> > without the assistance of an attorney. You, for example, seem to be the
> > only guy in Somalia who had trouble with the concept.
>
> Dave, don't just blow, blow harder. You'll need to do a bit of
> research before anyone with at least half a brain would buy into that.
>
> Name all the "guys" in Somalia.
> Name all the "guys" in Somalia that were amateur radio operators.
> Name all of those "guys" in Somalia that were amateur radio operators
> and obtained permission to operate.
>
> And you've left out all the "gals" that were sent as well.

I didn't have the impression that everyone in Somalia wanted to operate
an amateur radio station. Those who didn't operate on the ham bands had
no problem. Those who operated legally had written permission. Then
there's you.

Dave K8MN

3078. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 16:59:56 UTC
From: Jack <Jack@rummysfieldclub.org>
Message-ID: <b7rv8a$f27$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 65214

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hdi7fj6.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Tue, 15 Apr 2003 23:18:30 -0400, Geoff wrote:
>
> > The FCC has no jurisdiction in this matter.
>
> News for you - the FCC can take action against a FCC licensed
> amateur licensee who violates radio regulations in a foreign
> jurisdiction if those regulations can be tied to an
> international treaty binding upon the US, such as the
> International Radio Regulations or the Telecommunications
> Convention.
>
> >Got a news flash for you. The U.S.
> >Military right now IS the authority in Iraq. Meaning, the
> >military command can authorize anything.
>
> More news for you - there are standing orders and procedures
> binding upon all branches of the military as to when and where
> they may use non-government frequencies (amateur radio springs
> to mind) both inside and outside the US and for what MILITARY
> purposes. IIRC amateur frequencies may be used for MILITARY
> operational communications only.
>
> Ham radio is not a military purpose, and my inquiry is whether
> the local commander has NOW been given the authority to
> authorize non-military communications unilaterally (they didn't
> have it when I did frequency coordination at the FCC).
>
> "The military command can authorize anything" plays well on TV
> shows like JAG or Wings of Gold, but not in real life. There's
> LOTS of bureaucracy above the level of the local commander for
> non-military actions.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>

Bullshit! You may "think" it works that way, but in
fact it does not. I have been in a few hot zones, and the
C.O. does what he wants in regard to comms, and I do
mean ANYTHING. Bureaucratic rules mean crap in
a hot combat zone. The military command can authorize

WHATEVER it wants, and it DOES play EXACTLY that
way. I've been there, done that, and seen it!!!!!!!!!!!!
In fact, an old crusty warrant officer I worked for used to
delight in taking FCC advisories we'd get in the Tonkin
Gulf and wipe his ass (symbolically) with them. Oh, I
DO agree with you on one point. The JAG show is a
farce. Oh yeah, we would run our ham/MARS gear
on board anyway it took to get messages through.
Arcane FCC rules were of no concern to us.

Jack

3079. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 17:02:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA18163.8E1984B3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65216

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 4/19/2003 1:12 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030419021211.18769.00000062@mb-m14.aol.com>
>
> >International Morse Code has no provision for syllabic languages
> > which are primary in Asia and the Middle East and some parts
> > of Africa.
>
> The standardized communications language is English. (ITU and ICAO refer)
>
> Why should "International Morse Code" have provisions for non-English
> language alphabets?
>

Not only that, to my knowledge, all languages are syllabic languages.
Maybe Leonard meant to write about languages which use inflections to
convey meanings.

The Russians have added additional characters to morse for use in their
langauge.

The Finns have added additional characters to morse for use in their
language.

I'm sure other linguistic groups have modified morse code similarly.

Dave K8MN

3080. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 17:03:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA181CE.D5602581@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65217

Brian wrote:

> He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.

He could have operated and just stated that his commander gave him
verbal permission...but he didn't.

Dave K8MN

3081. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 17:10:49 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419131049.18820.00000154@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 65218

>ULX claims to be a college graduate yet he cannot put together a
>grammatically correct sentence without spelling errors.
>No wonder he had to wait for the "dumbed downed" test to get his
>extra.
>

And you actually believe everything you read. No wonder you CBplussers are so
easy

3082. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 17:11:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA183A4.C7C0891C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65219

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9F8E69.FBEFBDB1@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9CC8CC.364D78AF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3E9C984F.C703F3F8@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > "Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> > > > > > > 2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> > > > > > > League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> > > > > > > British military personnel
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
> > > > > > > officer.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "There is precedent for this," Mills said, citing an operation during
> > > > > > > the 1991 Gulf War. "These operators will need written authorization to
> > > > > > > operate from their commanding officers
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I'm sitting here grinning from ear to ear. All of this, of course,
> > > > > > reminds me of lengthy tale of an alleged operation from Somalia.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > > > Not trying to be a smart alec here...but...since there is no actual
> > > > > government....and the only authority seems to be the US Military....I see no
> > > > > particular problem if the ham in question has a valid FCC license and the
> > > > > commander gives him the authority. Isnt the CO the defacto licensing
> > > > > authority in this case???
> > > >
> > > > That's the usual case, Dan. In N0IMD's case, he didn't think it
> > > > important to have the permission in writing for operating from Somalia.
> > > > He says he operated on a verbal OK.
> > >
> > > In K8MN's case, he said that no military commander can authorize any
> > > amateur radio activity. Just ask him if he said that. He will
> > > confirm it.

> >
> > Here you go, Brian. These quotes might jog your memory about what took
> > place.
> >
> > From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > Subject: Re: DSP vs human decoding of OOK CW
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Date: 2002-08-01 11:42:56 PST
> >
> > "Is it a lame assertion if your operation doesn't count toward DXCC and
> > the "authority" granting you permission to operate had no right to do
> > so? Surely you knew that as a self-proclaimed moral and ethical man
> > that your actions were neither moral nor ethical."
> >
> >
> > From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Date: 2002-08-03 06:20:14 PST
> >
> > "No, I say that a commander might grant authorization which is not his
> > to grant. I say that higher-ups might not approve of such
> > authorization. I say that the DXCC desk might not credit such operation.
> > What has the DXCC desk said about your operation from Somalia? Have you
> > found if it counts or not?"
> >
> > From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Date: 2002-08-09 22:05:19 PST
> >
> > "Ah Ah, Brian. I've questioned whether your commander had the authority
> > to do so. I've also asked if you obtained "written permission". So
> > far, you've just played dodge ball with the question. I've repeatedly
> > asked if your operation was accepted for DXCC credit."
>
> Yes, yes, Dave. This was all after I had to educate -you- on what was
> and is still posted on the ARRL web site, the very same people that
> have you grinning from ear to ear now. You might like to refresh you
> memory with a quick visit.
>
> Somalia:
> http://www.remote.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/io/recip-info_p.html#t5

Your mistake, then as now is, to assume that every detail about
operating from T5 was in the couple of lines from the ARRL web site.

Dave K8MN

3083. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 17:21:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA185E0.D4FC392C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65221

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3EA0CAE1.F2542A95@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <20030418151058.18783.00000044@mb-m27.aol.com>,
> >lenover21@aol.com
> >> (Len Over 21) writes:
> >>
> >> > Irrelevant and gratuitous snowjobbing by a morseman.
> >>
> >> What is a "morseman"?
> >>
> >I think they were the Mordic types who used their great kmowledge of
> >mavigation to visit Morth America in the Mimth or Temth cemtury.
> >>
> Imterestimg. But wouldm't such a persom be called a "morsemam"?
>
A valid poimt. I wom't speculate om that but perhaps the kimdly
mom-partipamt in amateur radio will emlightem us.

Dave K8MN

3084. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 17:24:01 UTC
From: Jack <Jack@rummysfieldclub.org>
Message-ID: <b7s0lg$hk1$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 65220

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hdi7r97.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Tue, 15 Apr 2003 19:00:16 -0500, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >Not trying to be a smart alec here...but...since there is no actual
> >government....and the only authority seems to be the US Military....I see
no
> >particular problem if the ham in question has a valid FCC license and the
> >commander gives him the authority. Isnt the CO the defacto licensing
> >authority in this case???
>
> Only if the "book" has been changed to give him/her unilateral
> authority to authorize non-military recreational radio use
> (i.e. ham or CB radio) by members of the military - emphasis on
> the non-military use.
>
> IIRC they did not have this authority when last I worked in that area
> of frequency coordination, hence the inquiry.
>
> Let's see what they say now......
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>

And your "inquiry" is not even on the radar screen!
Bureaucratic psycho-babble. If you watch TV lately,
there's a war on and concerns with homeland security.
Arcane bureaucratic rules are of no concern to
battlefield commanders. Get a clue!

Jack

3085. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 18:01:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdlit90.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 65222

On Sat, 19 Apr 2003 12:59:56 -0400, Jack wrote:

>Oh yeah, we would run our ham/MARS gear
>on board anyway it took to get messages through.

This was for a military purpose (which is authorized by DoD
regs), not for hamming/DX recreational purposes (which was NOT
authorized by DoD regs when I worked frequency coordination).

>Arcane FCC rules were of no concern to us.

I sure hope that the military regs to which I am referring
were of concern....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

3086. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 18:22:11 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EA193D3.1010801@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 65230

WA8ULX wrote:
>>ULX claims to be a college graduate yet he cannot put together a
>>grammatically correct sentence without spelling errors.
>>No wonder he had to wait for the "dumbed downed" test to get his
>>extra.
>>
>
>
> And you actually believe everything you read. No wonder you CBplussers are so
> easy

Your reading comprehension isn't very good either. I never said I
believed it, just said you claimed it. What I do not believe is
that you ever made it past the 6th grade.
Good thing they dumbed down the test or you would never have made
extra.

3087. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 19:01:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419150108.18863.00000363@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65223

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>Date: 4/19/2003 9:00 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <87y9268u5b.fld@barrow.com>

>Steve's comments on International Law, and the idea that
>deposing Hussein and liberating Iraq somehow is inconsistent
>with allowing recreational use of amateur radio by troops,
>indicates a bit of extreme naivete.

As usual, Floyd, you've got it screwed up.

I said that we went to Iraq to depose Saddam Hussein. We did that.

The PRESIDENT has stated that that, along with our seach for WMD, was our mission. He has repeatedly stated that Iraqis should govern Iraq, and has made it clear that Iraqis shall retain sovereignty.

There's nothing naieve about that. Those are facts.

I agree that a bit of "recreational radio operating" is not going to hurt anyone. My assertion was simply that if we are perceived as usurping this authority, however benign, it will be "evidence" that we do not intend to limit ourselves to the missions we insisted were our goals when we started this.

Do you suggest that we "signal" the Iraqis (and world opinion) that we have no intention of honoring our stated goals?

Steve, K4YZ

3088. Re: At The End Of The Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 19:03:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419150353.18863.00000365@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65224

>Subject: Re: At The End Of The Day
>From: You Gotta be Kidding ohno@notme.net
>Date: 4/19/2003 9:23 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <drm2av0npupvb9f7jbk3aa6k8oqtlscb10@4ax.com>

>Robeson you are truly an idiot. Don't you have a life?
>Why not scream this shit out your back door and not look
>like a fool to the rest of the world?

Perhaps. But at least I am not a spineless coward, unwilling to state my opinions with my name behind it.

Now...Mommy says come back to bed, you've been a bad boy and she want's to give you a licking...Don't mind Daddy...He's impotent...Like you.

Steve

3089. Re: At The End Of The Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 19:05:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419150528.18863.00000367@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65225

>Subject: Re: At The End Of The Day
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 4/19/2003 11:45 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030419124557.18821.00000076@mb-m10.aol.com>

>Not exactly, Steve.
>
>Plagiarism is the act of presenting the work of another as one's own,
>original
>work, without reference to the true source. That's why K8MN always frames
>that
>profile I wrote as a quote.

Close enough. The same conduct got Joe Biden in a bind for the same thing.
(Kinda funny seing him on the House Ethics Committee!)

Steve

3090. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 19:11:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419151102.18863.00000368@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65226

>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/19/2003 12:02 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EA18163.8E1984B3@earthlink.net>

>I'm sure other linguistic groups have modified morse code similarly.

Have you seen the Japanese list for Kanjii...???

Whew!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3091. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 19:17:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419151725.18971.00000438@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65227

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 4/19/2003 8:20 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304190520.244f98ea@posting.google.com>

>Len, speaking of books, I'm thinking of joining one of those book
>clubs that specialize in military subjects. Have you or anyone else
>ever belonged? If so, did you consider it worthwhile?

He obviously did. Where do you think he gets his "military experience"
from? Tuning those HF rigs in Japan?

73

Steve, K4YZ

3092. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 19:21:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419152118.18971.00000439@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65228

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 4/19/2003 8:25 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304190525.12a7c5@posting.google.com>
>

>OK, they went there and deposed the Saddam regime as ordered. Now
>some of our boys want to play radio. Where do they apply for
>licensing?
>
>State the Address of the Ministry of Communications, a point of
>contact, and what the fees are.

I would love to answer that question, Brian. I really would. But I am only surmsing that there are potential political ramifications if we go about the business of "issuing radio authorizations" for something that is clearly a civil action.

Personally, if I hear any of our guys/gals operating /YI, I'm gonna give em a shot...Sure likely that there won't be a bunch of IN's on the air any time soon.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3093. Re: "enhanced" SSB ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 19:29:45 UTC
From: Bo yawns <boyawns@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ea1a3ab@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 65229
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b7rq3g$17r$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> It is when you take twelve to twenty KHZ of AF and force it into your
> microphone input stage of the transmitter, which is designed to pass
> aproximately 300 to 3000 cycles.
>
> Adjust your carrier frequency of the transmitter to enable more 'LOW'
tones.
>
> Then listen to the results on the air.
>
> Can you say too wide?
>
> Dan/W4NTI

I think I'm startin to get it. Tell me, is this "mode" what most of
your KP4 and XE2 type stations seem to always run...?

3094. Re: Article in World RadioI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 20:36:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419163649.18769.00000045@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65239

In article <b7rsg3$3d9$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Im not directing those comments specifically to you Mike. Im just sick and
>tired of all this whinning about the CW.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. All of you who passed high-rate morse code tests
proclaim yourself "winners" and demand others be as good as
you. Then you put down others who don't care for morse code
modes and think that morse code testing should be eliminated
from license testing.

You might try a spelling checker. To complain without purpose
is "whining," from the word "whine."

Spelling it with two Ns makes it look like "winning" in that (if it
were a correct word) "whinning" would be pronounced the same.

Without the morse code test, olde-tyme hams would not have
that artificial trophy of "whinning" (winning) to claim their self-
righteous superiority over others. You would lose face (self-
esteem).

3095. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 20:36:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419163650.18769.00000046@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65240

In article <20030419084611.18842.00000177@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker, air ace) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/19/2003 1:12 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030419021211.18769.00000062@mb-m14.aol.com>
>
>>International Morse Code has no provision for syllabic languages
>> which are primary in Asia and the Middle East and some parts
>> of Africa.
>
> The standardized communications language is English. (ITU and ICAO
>refer)

Try to stay on focus, astigmatic amateur.

This is NOT a forum for the INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION.

It is NOT a forum for flying or the SPOKEN language used in international air traffic control.

SPOKEN LANGUAGES do not use or "refer" to on-off keying coding of International Morse Code.

ITU-R S25 in its entirety does NOT reference any ICAO standardization or regulation.

> Why should "International Morse Code" have provisions for non-English
>language alphabets?

Why do you ask? Can you connect all eight synapses to form a coherent thought and understand any answer?

Polish.

3096. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 20:36:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419163654.18769.00000048@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65237

In article <20030419124556.18821.00000074@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <d22b54c3.0304190254.31b53e1f@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
>(Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>(massive snippage of old stuff)
>
>>Heh. Jimmy trolled you into the irrational rant of all rants.
>
>Troll? I do not troll. I simply ask direct questions, state facts and some
>opinions, and sometimes point out obvious errors and inconsistencies in
>others' postings here.
>
>Unfortunately, some people just don't like that. Their opposition is often
>expressed by personal attacks and irrational behavior.

Radio gods get very upset when they aren't revered and
subjects of mindless worship. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>>Good show James.
>
>I am gratified if others find some benefit in my postings here.

Self-proclaimed Deities appear to have a heavenly club and
have chosen this forum as a divine hang-out.

3097. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 20:36:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419163654.18769.00000047@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65241

In article <20030419124555.18821.00000073@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>I do "talk shop" - but not in an amateur radio policy newsgroup. Since I do
not
>work for the FCC, ARRL, an amateur radio equipment manufacturer, or as a
>communications attorney, such "shop talk" is simply not relevant.

You do NOT work for the US government or in any possible
capacity for US foreign policy, yet you prattle endlessly
about those subjects which do NOT involve amateur radio.

You do NOT work for any railroad or have any stated work
experience in railroading, yet you have stated IN HERE that
you are an expert in knowledge of railroads. Railroads and
railroading are NOT amateur radio subjects nor is there any
reference to railroads and railroading in US amateur radio
regulations.

You have NEVER been a member of the United States
armed forces or any other military, yet you've implied that
you have expert knowledge of military policy, plans,
technology, and life as a military person.

You spout endlessly in a number of fields of work and
policy that have nothing at all to do with amateur radio.

You are not only irrelevant far surpassing most of the
readers in here, but you are misleading, misdirectioning,
and, in general, just a self-promoting bullshit artist.

>Besides, you would probably not understand my "shop talk" anyway, Len.

No one knows if that is true or false. You have NOT stated
anything the least specific on what your "shop" produces.

>> You don't out of fear.
>
>Not fear. Common sense.

FEAR, boy. That gives you an element of safety to be just
another bullshit artist.

>Not fear. Common sense.

FEAR, boy. That gives you an element of safety to be just
another bullshit artist.

>Not fear. Common sense.

FEAR, boy. That gives you an element of safety to be just
another bullshit artist.

>Besides, commercial radio experience is simply not relevant to amateur radio
>policy.

That is true but only for the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society.

That society thinks that amateur radio operates on different
principles of physics than the rest of the radio world.

>You haven't answered the question, Len. "References" is an ambiguous term.

Don't try more misdirection. You have NO authority to demand
answers.

>Not at all, Len. I'm simply refusing to answer your questions about my work
and
>work experience. Obviously that refusal infuriates you for some strange
reason.

You are playing a fantasy role of being an all-knowing, all-
seeing radio god. Radio gods don't have to answer
questions put to them by mortals. You are a false radio god.

Mortals don't like pretend gods.

>> Fakery is what you practice.
>
>Not at all. It's called common sense.

You've been FAKING most of what you state as to "experience"
in anything other than referencing old amateur radio subjects.

>Then there's no reason for me to answer any of your questions, Len.

You pretend to be a radio god, above mere mortals. Bullshit
artists do the same thing.

>You have
>just told us that no matter what qualifications I post, you will not accept
>them as proof of anything involving "the subject of communications outside of
>amateurism." So there's no point in giving you more information.

Mortals cannot debate anything with radio gods.

You should answer at least one question by a mortal to show
your sincerity. You don't. You dance and evade the subject and
try to misdirect into other topics. You are a bullshit artist.

>> You don't have any
>> such knowledge or experience on communications outside of
>> amateur radio.
>
>How do you know? You keep making that statement as if it's a fact, but you

have
>nothing to back it up but your own rejection of my already-stated
>qualifications and experience.

Everyone can KNOW. Your "already-stated qualifications and
experience" are so ambiguous and lacking of detail that it isn't
worth more effort. You are just a bullshit artist.

>Prove any what?

No one can "prove" the existance of nothing. It has no
reference. You are a bullshit artist with nothing tangible
to refer to.

>> you can't talk about it...
>
>Sure I can. I choose not to. Choice - what a concept.

You DO talk...about nothing. Bullshit.

Lots of words, nothing of substance except cribbings from
old amateur radio magazines.

You are trying to establish a persona of grand guru in radio
who knows all, sees all, has done everything, is the expert
judge of all others. In short a radio god. You are looking like
just another bullshit artist.

>Not me. This is an amateur radio newsgroup. I'm a radio amateur, talking about
>amateur radio policy and a few other subjects.

You talk about MANY MORE subjects that amateur radio.

Google has the evidence. Live with it.

The most talk you do is the portrayal-persona of the grand guru of
amateur radio and your REPUTATION as impeccable, unimpeachable
peachy-keen expert on everything in amateur radio. You are just a
pretend god, a bullshit artist.

>I have not made deliberate false
>statements here. Nor have I tried to mislead anyone.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...you've made so many misdirections and so many
statements of "experience" that you cannot prove, you are
beginning to look like a high-level staff member of the old Iraqi
Ministry of Information.

You are GOOD at misleading many. Bullshit artists do that.

>The only "Imperial" I know is an inexpensive margarine.

We can't believe you are buttering us up.

>> "That's all you need to know."
>

>That's correct. Live with it.

You are a bullshit artist. Live with that. Others have to live with
your bullshit about "need to know."

>Incorrect. There are some others here who know more about what I do for a
>living.

Irrelevant. Gods of radio congregate with other gods, cannot
bear to do so with ordinary mortals. Bullshit artists tend to
stay with their own kind.

>What experience have I claimed that is not true?

You haven't claimed any experience.

>Incorrect.

You are a null, a zero, have NO references yet insist that you
"have" experience. Illogical.

>> You DON'T have any such experience in radio communications
>> outside of amateur radio.
>
>Incorrect.

Prove it. Your "word" is no longer good enough. You are a
bullshit artist, a con-man, a grifter.

>> You cannot make a mistake.
>
>Sure I can. I've made plenty. Sope would say replying to your posts is a
>mistake.

Who is this "Sope?" Another radio god that you haven't mentioned
because us mere mortals have "no need to know?"

>> You cannot admit a mistake.
>
>Sure I can. You are the one who cannot, even when said mistake is pointed out
>repeatedly and carefully explained.

I've made no "mistake" about identifying you as just another
wanna-be radio god bullshit artist.

You CANNOT discuss any personal experience with radio
communications outside amateur radio so you MASK that
with the imperious "you don't have the need to know."

In short, just bullshit.

>> You keep trying to cover up with misdirections and those
>> terribly long posts where you get into all kinds of irrelevant
>> minutae in order to avoid answering the original subject.
>

>Here, Len, let me hold this mirror for ya....

All I see is the backside of YOUR mirror. You are busy
enjoying the sight of yourself preening in your own
reflection.

>> LIVE WITH IT, pedantic perfectionist.
>
>Seems like you're getting angry.

Not at all. Disgust, yes. I don't like poseurs or pretenders.
You are one of those with all the masking and misdirection.

>>>Incorrect. I just don't talk about my work here.
>>
>> Fear.
>
>No, just common sense.

FEAR, boy. Pretenders live in fear of being uncovered,
unmasked, shown what they really are.

>> "C-Systems" is/was a corporation. Not a big one.
>
>Never heard of it.

Imperious statement. "Never heard of it" therefore "it does
not exist."

>Others seem to have no problem having meaningful discussions with me. Look at
>the stick-shift anaogy discussion I had with Bill Sohl, K2UNK, for just one
>example.

This forum is NOT about vehicular operation or automotive
mechanics.

>> You could have said the same thing about any other active
>> device by simply looking it up from a tube chart.
>
>So could you, Len.

True...except I never mentioned any EIA tube numbers, just
that I operated using the mentioned multiplexer...and HAVE
the photographs of it, both personal and official US Army
Signal Corps photographs identified on the back (including
the photographer).

You attempted misdirection again. More masking by dropping
any discussion of time-division multiplexing systems (alluding
but never detailing "having worked with such things") and going
to specific tube numbers. I made no mention of specific tube
numbers, only that they were "7-pin miniatures." Actual tube
numbers are irrelevant to the discussion. That equipment I
described first saw communications service in about 1952.

Miccolis wasn't even born yet.

>The systems I refer to also had Dekatron counter tubes and a bunch of other
>specialized hardware. I could go on and on in great detail about that system,
>and many others. I choose not to.

More misdirection. You have not connected all that name- and
number-dropping to COMMUNICATIONS.

You are lost. You may have lost the way due to the scent of
all the bullshit.

>I never claimed to have worked on those particular multiplex systems, Len.
>They are not the only communications systems that used gas tubes, ya know.

Describe them. So far, you have described NOTHING but gas.

>Do you claim to know the location and removal date of every single
>communication system that ever used gas tubes?

Irrelevant. More misdirection. More gas, gas that is worse
than swamp gas.

Miccolis has only made vague allusions to some alleged
experience in some kind of "communications system" never
identified in any way.

Bullshit misdirection. Better bullshit than most in here, but
bullshit just the same.

>> You have become just an ordinary amateur grifter, a BS
>> flinger who can't provide any references for himself beyond
>> 1976 and outside of amateur radio.
>
>Not "can't". "Won't". Not to you, anyway.

More BS along with a radio god's imperious statement.

All of these PUBLIC VIEW messages are readable by anyone
with newsgroup access. You cannot tailor responses to
individuals...all readers see the same text.

>> You can't. The fear factor is too high for you.
>
>Not at all. Just common sense.

FEAR. Radio gods will, unfortunately for them, find out they
are merely mortal and do NOT know everything about
anything, regardless of their bullshit techniques in trying to
establish a reputation of grande guru of communications.

>So have you, Len. And when your mistakes have been pointed out, you refuse to
>acknowledge them.

The radio god continues to claim I "made mistakes" as a generality.

I have made typographical errors, true, and admitted those.

Beyond that, Miccolis's OPINION was elevated to Supreme
Judge of What Is Right and What Is Wrong. OPINION.
That's an excellent misdirection technique but it is still bullshit.
Such bullshit does not fertilize TRUTH, it only covers it up
and winds up smelling bad.

Miccolis is NOT a radio god who can command What Is Right
and What Is Wrong.

>If there's BS, it doesn't come from me. As for "Class A hypocrite", I recall
>recently reading a post of yours where you called someone unknown to you a
>"boy" and a "racial bigot" in the same post. Fascinating....

"Boy" is the word for a youngster, an under-teenage kid. That
applies to ALL races. I am only "guilty" of using "boy" in
regards to emotional puffery of Miccolis in claiming all that
non-amateur communications experience which has NEVER
BEEN IDENTIFIED by him.

I will amend "Class A hypocrite" to "Class-A Hypocrite with
Oak Leaf Clusters." That's a military service colloquialism.

>Be my guest. Then tell us again about your Extra still being in its box, and
>how all Technicians are not code tested.....

More misdirection, trying to lead off into message territory
already well travelled.

IDENTIFY all that non-amateur communications (systems or
equipment) Miccolis CLAIMS to have "experience" with.

>>The fear factor is too high for you.
>>
>Not fear. Common sense.

You FEAR talking about something you've never done...that
would lead to discovery by others that you never did such.
You would lose face, self-esteem, and the grande guru
reputation you are seeking.

>> We all have to live with what you DON'T say.
>
>Silence is golden.

Fool's gold. Worthless. Not even good fertilizer to grow the
flowers of Real Truth.

>> You can't absolve
>> yourself by being arrogant, imperious.
>
>This mirror is doing a good job...

You love your own reflection. I only see the BACK of your "mirror."

>>>Incorrect! I just haven't given the details you want. And I'm not going to.
>>
>> You can't.
>
>Sure I can.

Then DO so. Nobody can discuss vaporware...only bullshit artists.

>> See? Paranoia. Mindless, irrational paranoia. FEAR.
>
>Nope. COMMON SENSE.

Cowardice. Flim-flammery. Fear of discovery.

>Really? Let's see, here's how you've described me in some posts in this
>thread, Len. These are actual quotes from you, just from the post I am
replying to:

Tsk, tsk, tsk. I AM "guilty" of "irreverent behavior" toward a
self-acknowledged god of radio.

Shoot me down with a thunderbolt, mighty Thor.

Or are you tho thore in thoth fingers you can't type?

>After all that, what rational person would tell you anything about their work
>experience?

ANY rational person who has the COURAGE to engage in public
discussion who HAS experience and doesn't disguise it by
ambiguous, no-detail generalities.

Have you any idea of what the original thread subject was? It
was about "Max Morse speed?" Remember?

I made some comment on a COMPARISON of maximum morse
rates versus modern modem equivalent word-per-minute rates
and you took off on a whole LOT of misdirection and attacks on
personalities, NOT about maximum morse rates.

All you've done so far in here is to attempt denigration of
another's person by a lot of vaporware claims of your own.

Would you like another "profile" statement on you? :-)

3098. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 20:36:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419163655.18769.00000049@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65245

In article <20030419090535.19056.00000187@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>>Date: 4/19/2003 5:54 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0304190254.31b53e1f@posting.google.com>
>>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>
> (Excessive and overworked berating of Jim Miccolis snipped)
>
>>Heh. Jimmy trolled you into the irrational rant of all rants. Good
>>show James.
>>
>>Seldom in the history of mankind has anybody worked so hard for so
>>long to make complete asses of themselves in public as you have
>>Leonard. You've finally managed to set a high water mark in at least
>>some field, an achievement which has escaped you for your prior seven
>>decades of beavering away to become a somebody anybody anywhere.
>>
>>Congratultions ya pointless ZERO, you've arrived.
>
> When will this creep ever learn? Self-humiliation must be a "personal
>best" for Lennie. He does it well.
>
> What a scumbag...What a PUTZ!

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3099. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 20:36:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419163656.18769.00000050@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65242

In article <3EA14389.EA60B579@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030419021218.18769.00000065@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>> > In article <3EA0CAE1.F2542A95@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> > writes:
>> >
>> > >N2EY wrote:
>> > >>
>> > >> In article <20030418151058.18783.00000044@mb-m27.aol.com>,
>> > lenover21@aol.com
>> > >> (Len Over 21) writes:
>> >
>> > >> > Irrelevant and gratuitous snowjobbing by a morseman.
>> > >>
>> > >> What is a "morseman"?
>> > >
>> > >I think they were the Mordic types who used their great kmowledge of
>> > >mavigation to visit Morth America in the Mimth or Temth cemtury.
>> >
>> > No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> > government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
>> > if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
>> > be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling,
>put-
>> > downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
>> > importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
>> > very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.
>>
>> C'mon Len, that was actually the most profound thing that Dave has ever
>posted.
>
>Len's got his plagiarized statement down pat. He understands the
>theory. He is having trouble with the practical application.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a

very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.

3100. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 20:36:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419163657.18769.00000051@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65233

In article <f45722ac.0304190416.1cb47371@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030419021218.18769.00000065@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>> In article <3EA0CAE1.F2542A95@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >N2EY wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <20030418151058.18783.00000044@mb-m27.aol.com>,
>> lenover21@aol.com
>> >> (Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>> >> > Irrelevant and gratuitous snowjobbing by a morseman.
>> >>
>> >> What is a "morseman"?
>> >
>> >I think they were the Mordic types who used their great kmowledge of
>> >mavigation to visit Morth America in the Mimth or Temth cemtury.
>>
>> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
>> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
>> be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
>> downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
>> importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
>> very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.
>
>C'mon Len, that was actually the most profound thing that Dave has ever
>posted.

I apologize to you, Brian.

I stand corrected. Heil's impersonation of Otto Preminger playing a
Luftwaffe commandant is quite good. He needs to lose some
weight to better fit the polished jackboots.

He is tho thor he can't hurl thunderbolts now...

3101. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 20:36:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419163659.18769.00000052@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65236

In article <d22b54c3.0304190254.31b53e1f@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Heh. Jimmy trolled you into the irrational rant of all rants. Good
>show James.
>
>Seldom in the history of mankind has anybody worked so hard for so
>long to make complete asses of themselves in public as you have
>Leonard. You've finally managed to set a high water mark in at least
>some field, an achievement which has escaped you for your prior seven
>decades of beavering away to become a somebody anybody anywhere.
>
>Congratultions ya pointless ZERO, you've arrived.

I liked your secret agent stories better and the photos of bears.

Shoot those off your catapult next time, okay?

Oh, and tell us all about those "26" patents again. That's such a remarkable story! :-)

3102. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 20:37:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419163700.18769.00000054@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65232

In article <20030419083114.18842.00000174@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/18/2003 9:04 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030418220410.19022.00000117@mb-m16.aol.com>
>

> Care to try being an Emergency Nurse, Vipul? I'll show you what "hard"
>is in trying to stay fresh ! ! !

If you want to "stay fresh," take a Ba'ath...

Tell us all about the "hard work" you did in "engineering" while a purchasing agent (for less than a year).

That's such a heartwarming story...

3103. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 20:37:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419163700.18769.00000053@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65234

In article <3EA17E5D.B781EA9A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Dave doesn't try to deflect the description "flippant and arrogant."
>
>She doesn't argue about being a bubble head anymore either.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing an
imitation of Otto Preminger.

3104. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 20:37:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419163701.18769.00000055@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65235

In article <20030419082612.18842.00000173@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/18/2003 8:43 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030418214340.19022.00000115@mb-m16.aol.com>
>>
>>From K4YZ:
>>> I can't think of too many things in life that are a "do it once now or
>>>forget about it forever" situation.
>>
>>Unfortunately, thats the way the system works.
>
> That's the way the system works if you're just going to whine about it
and
>do nothing to position yourself for the next opportunity.
>
>>I may be getting out of the EE field soon and into something that makes more
>>money, and is a more stable field.
>
> I wholeheartedly recommend nursing, except in your case, Vipul.
>
>>I have one thing due at the end of this
>>month. If I can make that deadline, I will probably stay in EE (even at alot
>>less money).
>
> Why compromise? There is absolutely NO law that says once you are doing
>one thing you can't change to something else.
>
> Who knows, Vipul, maybe you'll find something you're good at.

Keep hunting, Steamy. Evidently you weren't good as a purchasing
agent. You weren't on that job long...

3105. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 20:37:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419163702.18769.00000056@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65231

In article <3EA161CC.6080107@mailcity.moc>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>ULX claims to be a college graduate yet he cannot put together a
>grammatically correct sentence without spelling errors.
>No wonder he had to wait for the "dumbed downed" test to get his
>extra.

He had to pay someone $250 to get it...

3106. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 20:37:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419163703.18769.00000057@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65244

In article <20030419084047.18842.00000176@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker, air ace, and Radio God) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/18/2003 10:12 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030418231259.19022.00000120@mb-m16.aol.com>
>
>
>>Tests are useful if they are relevant. Learning how to skate is relaevant to
>>learning hockey. Learning Morse code is not relavant to radio, including
>>amateur radio.
>
> In your opinion.
>
> At present it is VERY relevent since it is required by law to know it if
>you want to hold an HF-level Amatuer Radio license, Vipul.
>
> So sayeth the FCC.

Wrong. No "HF-level Amatuer Radio licenses" exist.

There exist two classes of US amateur radio licenses having below-30-MHz privileges: General and Amateur Extra.

The FCC "sayeth" something about "relevancy?" Not for morse code testing. Look in the entirety of Title 47 CFR, the Federal Register, or the reading room in DC for other FCC statements.

FCC has said in 1990 and 1999 that they do not consider morse code skill as anything to tell the regulators about an applicant's ability to be granted a license.

>>I resent Morse coders blocking the license class and taking over the hobby.
>
> Then you are a complete and utter fool, Vippy. No one is "blocking"
>anything and certainly NOT "taking over the hobby".

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has, if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

> If anything, the nuber of Amateurs with "current" Morse Code skills is
far
>less than it ever was, ergo any "taking over" is by anyone BUT "coders".

"Nubers?"

>>I don't envy Morse coders at all. I have tested for realtime encoding
>>abilities. I know I can do it. I don't want to waste my time learning the
>>whole
>>Morse code encoding scheme.
>
> Then you obviously don't want an HF-level Amateur Radio license bad
enough,
>so stop your snivvelling and whining.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

>>When such a non-useful skill is a barrier to a higher license class,
>>something
>>is very wrong with the hobby.
>
> You keep responding as if Morse Code proficiency is something new to
>Amateur Radio when afterall it is YOU who is new to Amateur Radio. Not that
>that is bad, but you are just one of those BK generation types who aren't
>satisfied until you are given everything for nothing, and then when you've
>got it, you either don't appreciate it, or try to spoil it for those who do.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3107. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 20:37:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419163704.18769.00000058@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65243

In article <f45722ac.0304190520.244f98ea@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030418151054.18783.00000041@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0304180301.441d2057@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >> If I gotta play by the book, ev'one gotta play by the book.
>> >
>> >Phil, if you wanna play at all, you've got to get yourself in the game.
>> >
>> >Go enlist, then volunteer for Iraq.
>>
>> He's waiting for the book to come out...
>
>Len, speaking of books, I'm thinking of joining one of those book
>clubs that specialize in military subjects. Have you or anyone else
>ever belonged? If so, did you consider it worthwhile?

I've never belonged to such book clubs. Don't know of any
ex-military friends who do, either...which includes an ex-CWO
(Army) who was a classmate in high school...and members
of the Association of Old Crows (professional group of
EW and ELINT workers).

Anyone who wants to keep up-to-date on military communications
on land can peruse the 300+ Field Manuals available free-for-
download at the General Dennis J. Reimer Army Training and
Doctrine Command digital library. That's an official US Army
website.

There are other documents also free for download, but only for
US Army as far as I know. One of those is the "AR" or Army
Regulation covering EM spectrum use and assignment, including
amateur radio operation outside of the USA. It was official as of
1997...at least insofar as the US Army is concerned...it hasn't
yet been ratified by ARRL and the JAG-gedy Oberst. :-)

US Army leads the branches again in historical documents, one
site being adjunct to West Point Military Academy. Another
one has complete chapters from hardcover books published by
book companies. The US Army Military Intelligence Center at
Fort Huachuca has an on-line museum of notable events and
people involved in communications, interception, and decrypting.

There's also the US Govenment Printing Office which has many catalogs free for the asking. They have an enormous title listing on many and varied subjects, including military history. Unlike ARRL, they do not charge shipping fees for USPS delivery. :-)

The "sale" section of Barnes & Noble, B. Dalton, and Borders book stores is a good place for low-cost soft- and hardcover books on military history and other subjects...all at reduced prices. Amazon-dot-com is another good place for bargains, browzeable with your computer...but apparently is undesired topic in here due to certain individual's enmity. Such sales aren't predictable and contents can vary from week to week.

I've not found most "book clubs" to be of great enough value for what I'm interested in. The same is true of other "clubs" offering recordings or various objects (art or otherwise). There's plenty of FREE information available over the 'net for the taking.

3108. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 20:37:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419163705.18769.00000059@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65238

In article <f45722ac.0304190500.7cfb962@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> For an example, his "combat experience" is alluded to by a
>> simple, no-details statement that he was in a country at war.
>> Vietnam, even just South Vietnam, is not a small place and
>> the ratio of supply/support personnel to active combat troops
>> in the US Army was then about 7:1. Heil claimed USAF
>> military service which had a higher ratio of support to active
>> combat personnel. Heil had NO identification of his unit or
>> geographic location or any statement of his duties. So far,
>> his "combat activity" statements are ambiguous...and begin
>> to look like just another snowjob.
>
>He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.

I'd heard he might have been a snow-removal supervisor for
the runways at Tan Son Hut...but that's probably just a rumor.

3109. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 20:47:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419164719.19114.00000247@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65246

>What I do not believe is
>that you ever made it past the 6th grade.

Well actually it was the 4th Grade

>Good thing they dumbed down the test or you would never have made
>extra.

No, it was a good thing I found 2 Dumb Cbplussers to pay me $250.00, or I would have never taken it. I dont use HF anyway so dont worry about it. And no I dont use " 2 Meter CB" either.

3110. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 20:49:52 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419164952.19114.00000249@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65247

>He had to pay someone $250 to get it...
>

You Dip Shit, you still havent gotten it right. I received $250.00 on a Bet I couldnt pass it. 2 Dumb Cbpluser almost as dumb as you paid me.

3111. Re: "enhanced" SSB ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 20:57:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EA1B84B.DD8EFC1A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 65248

tad danley wrote:

> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > It is when you take twelve to twenty KHZ of AF and force it into your
> > microphone input stage of the transmitter, which is designed to pass
> > aproximately 300 to 3000 cycles.
> >
> > Adjust your carrier frequency of the transmitter to enable more 'LOW' tones.

That's not it. You'd keep the carrier freq the same, but just widen the
bandpass filter on the modulator. So it modulates audio from 100Hz to
10KHz instead of the usual 300Hz to 3000KHz.

>
> >
> > Then listen to the results on the air.
> >
> > Can you say too wide?
>
> I haven't heard enhanced ssb (temporarily without an hf antenna,
> unfortunately). How does it differ in bandwidth from am, and might it be
> appropriate in the am "subbands"?
>

IIRC, RH said that if the band is not crowded, that wide SSB was okay.
From what I gather, enhanced SSB is just wideband audio. Something
like 100Hz to 10KHz. "HiFi SSB". Should be no worse a bandwidth
hog than AM. But don't operate it if the band is crowded.

3112. Re: "enhanced" SSB ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 21:24:51 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7sepm$j1t$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65249
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bo yawns" <boyawns@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3ea1a3ab@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b7rq3g$17r$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > It is when you take twelve to twenty KHZ of AF and force it into your
> > microphone input stage of the transmitter, which is designed to pass
> > aproximately 300 to 3000 cycles.
> >
> > Adjust your carrier frequency of the transmitter to enable more 'LOW'
> tones.
> >
> > Then listen to the results on the air.
> >
> > Can you say too wide?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> I think I'm startin to get it. Tell me, is this "mode" what most of
> your KP4 and XE2 type stations seem to always run...?
>
>

No, in their case there is NO attempt at enhancing their audio. They just
want to run everything to the right, processor on, and scream into the mike.
They all use those 'banana' style mics, most of them 12 inches long.

Dan/W4NTI

3113. Re: "enhanced" SSB ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 21:33:02 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7sf91$8v7$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65250

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EA1B84B.DD8EFC1A@ix.netcom.com...
> tad danley wrote:
>
> > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > > It is when you take twelve to twenty KHZ of AF and force it into your
> > > microphone input stage of the transmitter, which is designed to pass
> > > aproximately 300 to 3000 cycles.
> > >
> > > Adjust your carrier frequency of the transmitter to enable more 'LOW'
tones.
>
> That's not it. You'd keep the carrier freq the same, but just widen the
> bandpass filter on the modulator. So it modulates audio from 100Hz to
> 10KHz instead of the usual 300Hz to 3000KHz.
>
> >
> > >
> > > Then listen to the results on the air.
> > >
> > > Can you say too wide?
> >
> > I haven't heard enhanced ssb (temporarily without an hf antenna,
> > unfortunately). How does it differ in bandwidth from am, and might it
be
> > appropriate in the am "subbands"?
> >
>
> IIRC, RH said that if the band is not crowded, that wide SSB was okay.
> From what I gather, enhanced SSB is just wideband audio. Something
> like 100Hz to 10KHz. "HiFi SSB". Should be no worse a bandwidth
> hog than AM. But don't operate it if the band is crowded.
>

So thats what you and Wilkie do eh? Thanks..I'll pass that along for all
those interested.

Dan/W4NTI

3114. Re: Article in World Radiol

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 21:36:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7sff4phq1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65301

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030419163649.18769.00000045@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <b7rsg3$3d9$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Im not directing those comments specifically to you Mike. Im just sick
and
> >tired of all this whinning about the CW.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. All of you who passed high-rate morse code tests
> proclaim yourself "winners" and demand others be as good as
> you. Then you put down others who don't care for morse code
> modes and think that morse code testing should be eliminated
> from license testing.
>
> You might try a spelling checker. To complain without purpose
> is "whining," from the word "whine."
>
> Spelling it with two Ns makes it look like "winning" in that (if it
> were a correct word) "whinning" would be pronounced the same.
>
> Without the morse code test, olde-tyme hams would not have
> that artificial trophy of "whinning" (winning) to claim their self-
> righteous superiority over others. You would lose face (self-
> esteem).

You sure enjoy making all sorts of assumptions dont you 'Len over 21'. Did
I spell ASS right for you?

Dan/W4NTI

3115. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 21:39:28 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EA1C210.5090505@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 65311

WA8ULX wrote:
>>He had to pay someone $250 to get it...
>>
>
>
> You Dip Shit, you still havent gotten it right. I received $250.00 on a Bet I
> couldnt pass it. 2 Dumb Cbpluser almost as dumb as you paid me.

No, I think he did get it right.

3116. Re: Article in World Radiol

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 21:45:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EA1C386.8070107@adelphia.net>
Source record: 65302

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3EA09BAC.9090501@adelphia.net...
>
>>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>
>>>"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
>>>news:3EA061E8.B815AC06@crosslink.net...
>>>
>>>
>>>>Mike Coslo wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> ... I AM hearting impaired,...
>>>>>... I have tinnitus in both ears, a different frequency in each.
>>>>
>>>>I'm a tad worse off. I hear many tones at once, different in each ear,
>>>>that turn themselves on and off at random making it hard to tell them
>>>
>>>>from real dits and dahs.
>>>
>>>>> Tough! I passed the test, just like everyone else,.....
>>>>
>>>>By that logic everybody should share our hearing loss and my diabetes
>>>>and we should all have cancer.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Too many whiners these days!
>>>>
>>>>Naw, too many selfish people who think that everybody should suffer
>>>>every injustice and misery they did.
>>>>
>>>>K3DWW
>>>
>>>
>>>Are all you 'hearing handicapped' individuals also blind? Or can not
>>
> feel
>
>>>with ones fingers? Try blinking lights and finger sense.
>>>
>>>Sounds like a bunch of excuses to me.
>>
>>

>>What are you talking about Dan? I support testing and retaining the
>>test, and although I have some severe hearing problems, I was pointing
>>out that I overcame it to passs the test.
>>
>>I AM MAKING NO EXCUSES. IS THAT CLEAR?
>>
>>I bet you like kicking the canes out from under cripples.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Im not directing those comments specifically to you Mike. Im just sick and
> tired of all this whinning about the CW.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
Oops! Sorry about that Dan. Rereading your message, and reading what
you posted afterwards, I see I really went off base on that one. We
agree. <red faced me>

- Mike KB3EIA -

3117. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 22:26:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419182614.18828.00000165@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65304

In article <20030418231259.19022.00000120@mb-m16.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>
>>I think everyone should pass the the tests in life that we are given.

I think that's true IF the tests are relevant to the subject. Learning how to skate is relevant to hockey, learning how to swim isn't really relevant to hockey.

>>Let's take another of my hobbies, Ice Hockey. If someone wants to be on
>>my team, they need to know how to skate.
>
>Tests are useful if they are relevant.

Agreed!

>Learning how to skate is relaevant to
>learning hockey.

Agreed again!

>Learning Morse code is not relavant to radio, including
>amateur radio.
>
You were going good there, Vipul, then ya lost it.

Learning Morse code IS relevant to amateur radio. Anybody who says it isn't just doesn't know much about amateur radio at all.

Whether a separate Morse code test is needed, or beneficial, is another thing entirely.

>>My skills are just not good enough. I deal
>>with it though, and don't think the people playing in the NHL are
>>selfish. Rather, I admire them instead of resent and envy them.
>
>I certainly don't admire them learning a skill of little use.

True. But Morse code is of great use in amateur radio.
>
>I resent Morse coders blocking the license class and taking over the hobby.

I resent you saying Morse code is not relevant to amateur radio.
>
>I don't envy Morse coders at all. I have tested for realtime encoding
>abilities. I know I can do it. I don't want to waste my time learning the

>whole Morse code encoding scheme.

That's fine. You don't have to.
>
>>I enjoy the little challenges like learning Morse code while having a
>>problem that hinders it.
>
>Congratulations on learning Morse code.
>
>>Things that are just handed to us are seldom
>>appreciated. Of course in America these days, everything is owed to us.
>
>That argument would be useful if a USEFUL skill was tested to obtain a
>benefit.

Please explain why Morse code is not USEFUL to amateur radio operators. Not the
Morse code TEST, mind you, the skill itself.
>
>When such a non-useful skill is a barrier to a higher license class,
>something
>is very wrong with the hobby.

But the skill IS useful.

>I would be fine with a more useful practical
>skill or a more difficult written test, so the license class is not "just
>handed to us".

Give us some examples of a "more useful practical skill".

3118. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 22:26:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419182615.18828.00000166@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65303

In article <3EA0E4FB.D231EBCA@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:
>
>> N2EY wrote:
>> > Example: If everyone else calls a 2N2222 a transistor, and you insist on
>> > calling it a cheese sandwich, you're the one who is the cause of
>confusion.
>>
>> Apparently, there is some confusion here on what is a 2N2222 transistor,
>> compared to a cheese sandwich.
>>
>
>Sure don't taste like a cheese sandwich. Too crunchy.....
>
I didn't know the Whizzo Chocolate Company had branched out into
semiconductors!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3119. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 22:50:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419185042.08129.00000123@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65306

In article <20030419151725.18971.00000438@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>Date: 4/19/2003 8:20 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304190520.244f98ea@posting.google.com>
>
>>Len, speaking of books, I'm thinking of joining one of those book
>>clubs that specialize in military subjects. Have you or anyone else
>>ever belonged? If so, did you consider it worthwhile?
>
> He obviously did. Where do you think he gets his "military experience"
>from? Tuning those HF rigs in Japan?

Poor baby, get your "sensibilities" all a-twitter?

Before you were ever born, BOY, I was reading TMs and FMs about US Army signal equipment that I operated on HF, VHF, UHF, and microwave.

Let me amend that slightly. The microwave equipment required use of a 3-inch thick General Electric complete operation and maintenance manual since the AN/FRC-23 was a GE commercial microwave terminal with a Signal Corps sticker on each of its six rack doors. While you were a year old and soiling your diapers I had the responsibility of keeping 9 terminals up, operating, and regularly serviced to carry 207 full-duplex voice channels to four other locations.

After US Army active duty I was reading AND working on radio-electronics equipment, mostly for government contracts for the next 47 years...including college textbooks, having to work assigned problems in classes, both while holding down a regular day job. Much of that government contract work involved engineering design with all the design responsibility of a senior staff position. Further, most of that design work was done before I got my degree because I had demonstrated to others that I could successfully complete such work.

Robeson has NO idea of what electronic engineers HAVE to read and study to perform their job descriptions capably. Here's some of it - 8 monthly trade magazines (there are more but those are specialized), data manuals for components from the major manufacturers, EIA standards (dozens for one small area,

there are hundreds), FED standards by the dozens (with labels FED-STD-nnn), MIL standards by the dozens-plus (MIL-STD-nnn), ARINC standards (for civil aviation), individual field and technical manuals (TMs, FMs, plus the Navy BuShips and NavShips equivalents), the technical description of each electronic contract document (the half pertaining to hardware, bean counter types handling the financial half), textbooks of many different kinds for general circuit and system information, data catalogs by the hundreds, test equipment manuals to make certain one is using the test equipment correctly, all kinds of Application Notes that pertain to new instruments, new products, most of which are small tutorials in themselves, the appropriate city, county, state government regulations if that is required by a contract, the various computer-aided-design program manuals as used by a company, all the corporate manuals and documents as required for engineering personnel, professional association documents and information, city-county-state engineering regulations as they apply (location dependent), all kinds of new product announcements and bulletins...plus the CD-ROM versions of all the preceding as they are published.

No one has to memorize any of that in detail, but one MUST be able to know where to get detailed information required for a task. A requirement is to LEARN from past jobs and be able to apply such learning for better, more-competitive work in the future. Such learning INCLUDES the interpersonal relationship attitudes one must have in a larger group AND the proper attitude in meetings and design reviews with senior staff (who've been in the business longer than most of the junior staff). Bullshit lasts about as long as a manager can notify personnel to start termination...vague, ambiguous responses, or exaggerated knowledge or experience might keep such as long as a week in engineering...or they are shunted off to adminstrative tasks requiring only rote work (purchasing, stock inventory, etc.).

Responsibility is part of the job, responsibility proportional to staff position. The "approved" title block on drawings and documents MEANS something. No pretty certificate or award is going to take its place or ensure you CAN do the job assignment. A wall full of pretty paper things that impresses neighbors and family doesn't mean squat when it comes to keeping that salary check appearing regularly. Managers and senior staff KNOW who can do what and how well. There's a "test" every payday: If you've done the work required, you get paid; if you haven't it will be a termination check. No grades, no "classes."

Robeson can't understand any of the above. He is solely motivated by emotional things in a technological endeavor, certificates, awards, class of license, tenure in a hobby,

and above all the pretense of a better radioman because of demonstrated morse code ability. Robeson has NO demonstrated capability of actually LEARNING anything about radio or electronics...except maybe in memorizing sales phrases from radio ads in QST. He has demanded a special course in microwave techniques of me in here, yet has NO prerequisites of knowledge of fields and waves or even basic low-frequency impedance/admittance characteristics of circuits. Just the same, he thinks he has some sort of "right" to put down others who know more, have done more in radio-electronics.

Despite having a second career in the medical field as a caregiver, he turns around and does not care one bit about acting badly on a social level in this newsgroup. That is demonstrated sociopathy. It doesn't take any degree in psychology to see and understand his symptoms.

Because of that "don't care" attitude he gets the "profiling" as follows:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has, if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3120. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 22:50:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419185043.08129.00000124@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65305

In article <20030419150108.18863.00000363@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>>Date: 4/19/2003 9:00 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <87y9268u5b.fld@barrow.com>
>
>>Steve's comments on International Law, and the idea that
>>deposing Hussein and liberating Iraq somehow is inconsistent
>>with allowing recreational use of amateur radio by troops,
>>indicates a bit of extreme naivete.
>
> As usual, Floyd, you've got it screwed up.
>
> I said that we went to Iraq to depose Saddam Hussein. We did that.
>
> The PRESIDENT has stated that that, along with our seach for WMD, was our
>mission. He has repeatedly stated that Iraqis should govern Iraq, and has
made
>it clear that Iraqis shall retain sovereignty.
>
> There's nothing naieve about that. Those are facts.
>
> I agree that a bit of "recreational radio operating" is not going to hurt
>anyone. My assertion was simply that if we are perceived as usurping this
>authority, however benign, it will be "evidence" that we do not intend to
limit
>ourselves to the missions we insisted were our goals when we started this.
>
> Do you suggest that we "signal" the Iraqis (and world opinion) that we
>have no intention of honoring our stated goals?

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3121. Re: Article in World Radiol

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 23:31:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7sm82$j3u$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65307

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EA1C386.8070107@adelphia.net...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3EA09BAC.9090501@adelphia.net...
> >
> >>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >>
> >>>"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
> >>>news:3EA061E8.B815AC06@crosslink.net...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Mike Coslo wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>> ... I AM hearting impaired,...
> >>>>>... I have tinnitus in both ears, a different frequency in each.
> >>>>
> >>>>I'm a tad worse off. I hear many tones at once, different in each ear,
> >>>>that turn themselves on and off at random making it hard to tell them
> >>>
> >>>>from real dits and dahs.
> >>>
> >>>> Tough! I passed the test, just like everyone else,.....
> >>>>
> >>>>By that logic everybody should share our hearing loss and my diabetes
> >>>>and we should all have cancer.
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> Too many whiners these days!
> >>>>
> >>>>Naw, too many selfish people who think that everybody should suffer
> >>>>every injustice and misery they did.
> >>>>
> >>>>K3DWW
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Are all you 'hearing handicapped' individuals also blind? Or can not
> >>
> > feel
> >
> >>with ones fingers? Try blinking lights and finger sense.
> >>
> >>Sounds like a bunch of excuses to me.

> >>
> >>
> >>What are you talking about Dan? I support testing and retaining the
> >>test, and although I have some severe hearing problems, I was pointing
> >>out that I overcame it to passs the test.
> >>
> >>I AM MAKING NO EXCUSES. IS THAT CLEAR?
> >>
> >>I bet you like kicking the canes out from under cripples.
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >
> >
> > Im not directing those comments specifically to you Mike. Im just sick
and
> > tired of all this whinning about the CW.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> Oops! Sorry about that Dan. Rereading your message, and reading what
> you posted afterwards, I see I really went off base on that one. We
> agree. <red faced me>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
Don't worry about it Mike....I do the same thing sometimes...and no I dont
kick crutches out...hi.

Dan/W4NTI

3122. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 23:36:04 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7smfo$a8q$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65308

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030419185042.08129.00000123@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article <20030419151725.18971.00000438@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >>Date: 4/19/2003 8:20 AM Central Daylight Time
> >>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304190520.244f98ea@posting.google.com>
> >
> >>Len, speaking of books, I'm thinking of joining one of those book
> >>clubs that specialize in military subjects. Have you or anyone else
> >>ever belonged? If so, did you consider it worthwhile?
> >
> > He obviously did. Where do you think he gets his "military
experience"
> >from? Tuning those HF rigs in Japan?
>
> Poor baby, get your "sensibilities" all a-twitter?
>
> Before you were ever born, BOY, I was reading TMs and FMs
> about US Army signal equipment that I operated on HF, VHF,
> UHF, and microwave.
>
> Let me amend that slightly. The microwave equipment
> required use of a 3-inch thick General Electric complete
> operation and maintenance manual since the AN/FRC-23
> was a GE commercial microwave terminal with a Signal
> Corps sticker on each of its six rack doors. While you were
> a year old and soiling your diapers I had the responsibility
> of keeping 9 terminals up, operating, and regularly serviced
> to carry 207 full-duplex voice channels to four other
> locations.
>
> After US Army active duty I was reading AND working on radio-
> electronics equipment, mostly for government contracts for
> the next 47 years...including college textbooks, having to work
> assigned problems in classes, both while holding down a
> regular day job. Much of that government contract work
> involved engineering design with all the design responsibility
> of a senior staff position. Further, most of that design work
> was done before I got my degree because I had demonstrated
> to others that I could successfully complete such work.

>
> Robeson has NO idea of what electronic engineers HAVE to
> read and study to perform their job descriptions capably. Here's
> some of it - 8 monthly trade magazines (there are more but
> those are specialized), data manuals for components from the
> major manufacturers, EIA standards (dozens for one small area,
> there are hundreds), FED standards by the dozens (with labels
> FED-STD-nnn), MIL standards by the dozens-plus (MIL-STD-nnn),
> ARINC standards (for civil aviation), individual field and technical
> manuals (TMs, FMs, plus the Navy BuShips and NavShips
> equivalents), the technical description of each electronic contract
> document (the half pertaining to hardware, bean counter types
> handling the financial half), textbooks of many different kinds for
> general circuit and system information, data catalogs by the
> hundreds, test equipment manuals to make certain one is using
> the test equipment correctly, all kinds of Application Notes that
> pertain to new instruments, new products, most of which are
> small tutorials in themselves, the appropriate city, county, state
> government regulations if that is required by a contract, the
> various computer-aided-design program manuals as used by a
> company, all the corporate manuals and documents as
> required for engineering personnel, professional association
> documents and information, city-county-state engineering
> regulations as they apply (location dependent), all kinds of new
> product announcements and bulletins...plus the CD-ROM
> versions of all the preceding as they are published.
>
> No one has to memorize any of that in detail, but one MUST
> be able to know where to get detailed information required
> for a task. A requirement is to LEARN from past jobs and be
> able to apply such learning for better, more-competitive work
> in the future. Such learning INCLUDES the interpersonal
> relationship attitudes one must have in a larger group AND the
> proper attitude in meetings and design reviews with senior
> staff (who've been in the business longer than most of the
> junior staff). Bullshit lasts about as long as a manager can
> notify personnel to start termination...vague, ambiguous
> responses, or exaggerated knowledge or experience might
> keep such as long as a week in engineering...or they are
> shunted off to adminstrative tasks requiring only rote work
> (purchasing, stock inventory, etc.).
>
> Responsibility is part of the job, responsibility proportional to
> staff position. The "approved" title block on drawings and
> documents MEANS something. No pretty certificate or
> award is going to take its place or ensure you CAN do the
> job assignment. A wall full of pretty paper things that
> impresses neighbors and family doesn't mean squat when it
> comes to keeping that salary check appearing regularly.
> Managers and senior staff KNOW who can do what and how

> well. There's a "test" every payday: If you've done the work
> required, you get paid; if you haven't it will be a termination
> check. No grades, no "classes."
>
> Robeson can't understand any of the above. He is solely
> motivated by emotional things in a technological endeavor,
> certificates, awards, class of license, tenure in a hobby,
> and above all the pretense of a better radioman because of
> demonstrated morse code ability. Robeson has NO
> demonstrated capability of actually LEARNING anything
> about radio or electronics...except maybe in memorizing
> sales phrases from radio ads in QST. He has demanded
> a special course in microwave techniques of me in here,
> yet has NO prerequisites of knowledge of fields and waves
> or even basic low-frequency impedance/admittance
> characteristics of circuits. Just the same, he thinks he has
> some sort of "right" to put down others who know more,
> have done more in radio-electronics.
>
> Despite having a second career in the medical field as a
> caregiver, he turns around and does not care one bit about
> acting badly on a social level in this newsgroup. That is
> demonstrated sociopathy. It doesn't take any degree in
> psychology to see and understand his symptoms.
>
> Because of that "don't care" attitude he gets the "profiling"
> as follows:
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
> will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
> calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
> Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
> done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
> bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.
>

And all that means you are qualified to bitch and moan about CW in ham radio? Its to late to tell you to get a life....but give it a try...please.

Dan/W4NTI

3123. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 23:37:40 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7smim$kd4$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65309

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030419185043.08129.00000124@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article <20030419150108.18863.00000363@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
> >>Date: 4/19/2003 9:00 AM Central Daylight Time
> >>Message-id: <87y9268u5b.fld@barrow.com>
> >
> >>Steve's comments on International Law, and the idea that
> >>deposing Hussein and liberating Iraq somehow is inconsistent
> >>with allowing recreational use of amateur radio by troops,
> >>indicates a bit of extreme naivete.
> >
> > As usual, Floyd, you've got it screwed up.
> >
> > I said that we went to Iraq to depose Saddam Hussein. We did that.
> >
> > The PRESIDENT has stated that that, along with our seach for WMD,
was our
> >mission. He has repeatedly stated that Iraqis should govern Iraq, and
has
> made
> >it clear that Iraqis shall retain sovereignty.
> >
> > There's nothing naieve about that. Those are facts.
> >
> > I agree that a bit of "recreational radio operating" is not going to
hurt
> >anyone. My assertion was simply that if we are perceived as usurping
this
> >authority, however benign, it will be "evidence" that we do not intend to
> limit
> >ourselves to the missions we insisted were our goals when we started
this.
> >
> > Do you suggest that we "signal" the Iraqis (and world opinion) that
we
> >have no intention of honoring our stated goals?
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,

> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
> will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
> calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
> Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
> done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
> bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

Take a 'chill pill' before you hurt yourself.

Dan/W4NTI

3124. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-19 23:39:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419193944.18821.00000083@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 65310

In article <20030419003645.18771.00000040@mb-m23.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0304180838.3d3f31d4@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM >(N2EY) writes:
>
>>> Love your "I have a patent and you don't" routine, Leonard.
>>
>>A US patent granted in 1968 would have expired in 1985. Perhaps a more >>timely question would be "who has a current US patent?"
>
> Why is that "timely?" How does that apply to amateur radio?

You are usually critical of "old" things, Len. So a recent patent would be more valued by you than an old one.

>
> Last I looked, US patents had a "life" of 17 years and were
> renewable once for 17 more. Could have changed.

You should look again. To my knowledge US patents have never been renewable, and they are not renewable now. The 17 year term is old info.

The USA issues three kinds of patents: design, utility and plant. Design patents are generally in effect for 14 years, utility and plant patents for 20 years. While US patents are not renewable, but under certain circumstances the terms of relatively recent patents can be extended or adjusted. Failure to pay maintenance fees (when required) can result in early termination of a patent.

>
> My patent was granted in 1974.

Then it expired in 1991. 12 years ago.

> It was on a radio circuit and
> sub-system. You can look it up under the Delphion site
> searching by inventor's name. I was the sole inventor on that
> patent.

That's nice, Len. I'm happy for ya.

> It was assigned to RCA Corporation and up for renewal
> in 1991...but General Electric Company bought RCA Corp. then
> and may or may not have renewed it or had it reissued under a
> different patent number.

In most companies, part of an employee's or contractor's conditions of work are that all patents will be assigned to the employer. That's fair, because the company is footing the bill.

> No hu-hu on my part. I did it first.

That's nice, Len. I'm happy for ya.
>
> Does Miccolis have ANY sort of patent, in or out of electronics?

How does that apply to amateur radio?
>
> If not, why hasn't he done so? He's had 27 years since he got
> his EE degrees. Or, none of us "has the right to know what he
> did."

Gee, Len, you sure are critical. In all your years in "radio-electronics", you have exactly one patent, and yet you criticize me and assume I don't have any.

Please explain to us how your patent grant makes you some sort of an authority on amateur radio or amateur radio policy. Please explain how your 1974 patent proves that there should not be any code test - not even the current 5 wpm receiving test - for any amateur radio license.

Let's do a thought-experiment, folks. Suppose I did have a patent, or several. How would Len respond to that information? Would he say something like "That's nice, Jim, I'm happy for ya"? Would the existence of a patent, or several, cause him to stop the name-calling, insults, etc.?

Or would Len pick the patent(s) apart, criticizing my role in them, what they did, how they applied to "radio-electronics"? If they were assigned, and/or had co-inventors, what would Len say about who they were assigned to and the co-inventors?

Somehow I don't think Len would be very complimentary. Does anyone have a different opinion?

3125. Re: "enhanced" SSB ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 00:42:08 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <z1moa.5815$hT2.1753@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 65312

A proper AM signal will occupy a bandwidth of 6 KHz. I believe it was stated that some of these SSB signals were 10 KHz wide. I doubt folks would complain if they ran these up on 10 meters where there is plenty of space; certainly this is too much bandwidth for 20 meters and below. Then again, the article suggested that some of the signals were more than simply wide audio (perhaps overdriven amps) ... seems simply another facet of "I want everything my way". Oh well ...

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message news:3EA1B84B.DD8EFC1A@ix.netcom.com...
> tad danley wrote:
>
> > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > > It is when you take twelve to twenty KHZ of AF and force it into your
> > > microphone input stage of the transmitter, which is designed to pass
> > > aproximately 300 to 3000 cycles.
> > >
> > > Adjust your carrier frequency of the transmitter to enable more 'LOW' tones.
>
> That's not it. You'd keep the carrier freq the same, but just widen the
> bandpass filter on the modulator. So it modulates audio from 100Hz to
> 10KHz instead of the usual 300Hz to 3000KHz.
>
> >
> > >
> > > Then listen to the results on the air.
> > >
> > > Can you say too wide?
> >
> > I haven't heard enhanced ssb (temporarily without an hf antenna,
> > unfortunately). How does it differ in bandwidth from am, and might it be
> > appropriate in the am "subbands"?
> >
>
> IIRC, RH said that if the band is not crowded, that wide SSB was okay.
> From what I gather, enhanced SSB is just wideband audio. Something
> like 100Hz to 10KHz. "HiFi SSB". Should be no worse a bandwidth
> hog than AM. But don't operate it if the band is crowded.
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.473 / Virus Database: 271 - Release Date: 4/17/03

3126. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 00:45:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419204518.08129.00000126@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65314

In article <BAC6C36C.17347%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> Exactly! Once we start down the road of not
>> allowing nonviolent, legal dissent or protest
>> against govt. decisions in wartime, we can
>> easily wind up with results that essentially
>> eliminate the very freedoms that are being
>> defended. For example, maybe presidential
>> elections should be suspended in wartime,
>> because, by definition, anyone who runs against
>> an incumbent president disagrees with that
>> incumbent on some policy issues. Instead,
>> perhaps in wartime an incumbent president
>> should have the power to stay in office as
>> long as he/she feels up to the job, and then
>> to name his/her successor without an election.
>>
>> Or perhaps a wartime President should have
>> unilateral power to increase taxes and impose
>> new taxes during wartime. After all, dissent
>> about taxes would give aid and comfort to the
>> enemy, right?
>
>
> Actually, as I'm sure you know, the President already has the power to do
>exactly that. Under the old Marshall Plan, and the many more recent
>derivatives of it, the President has the authority to suspend elections,
>disband Congress, curtail Constitutional freedoms, raise taxes, make arrests
>without trial, execute prisoners, and so on. The sole trigger of that
>authority is an attack on this country.

Aw, Dwight, you're not supposed to give the punchline away!

>For example, the WTC attack
>triggered one aspect of that authority, which allowed the President to order
>all aircraft grounded and military personnel to airports. Wrapped in
>secrecy, we know very little about the full details of this authority -
>other than it appears to be fairly extensive.

True.

But has any President abused this authority? I don't recall President Bush ever
saying protest or dissent should be stifled in this country. Perhaps we should

all follow his lead on that.

Nonviolent protest and dissent actually make us stronger, not weaker, because the decision-makers are not sheltered from any views, no matter how different from their own.

> The Patriot Act has now extended some aspects of that authority to
>non-wartime situations, with some arguing other aspects should be added to
>that.

The concept of "wartime" is not the same as it was 60 years ago - that's part of the problem. When was the last time Congress actually declared war on another country? The trend since at least Vietnam (probably since Korea) has been for Congress to pass a resolution one way or another and toss the decision to the Commander in Chief.

Regarding MOAB: Sometimes the mere appearance of a weapon can have an effect. There's a long precedent for this, too: During the Berlin Airlift, the US reopened an airbase in England and sent some B-29s there. Made sure the Rooskies knew it, too. They knew the B-29 was the plane that delivered The Bomb to Japan, and that it had the range to reach Soviet territory. Of course no actual A-bombs were sent to England, but the Rooskies didn't know that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3127. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 00:45:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419204519.08129.00000127@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65313

In article <53E1CF3355AD25C4.81A9793EBE6CECA5.D248DC7287EA7A81@lp.airnews.net>,
"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030419082610.18775.00000100@mb-m02.aol.com...
>> In article
><81BD6DACD3EEC2EB.C999C620FC531C59.9B432F0625B1459B@lp.airnews.net>,
>> "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> >news:c2356669.0304180916.4a28633d@posting.google.com...
>> >> [SNIP]
>> >> But it's more important that the freedoms not be destroyed in the
>> >> process of defending them. As in "we destroyed the village in order to
>> >> save it".
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >>
>> >> "UN Secretary Kofi Annan said he thinks the arms inspectorsshould
>> >> resume looking for weapons in Iraq. Hey, forget arms in Iraq, how
>> >> about looking for some backbone in the UN?" - Jay Leno
>> >>
>> >> "There's now talk that US wants to spray the poppy fields of
>> >> Afghanistan in an effort to destroy the drug crop before it can be
>> >> harvested. If you thought Bush was unpopular in Hollywood
>> >> before......-Jay Leno
>> >>
>> >> "And now the really difficult part: We have to rebuild Iraq into a
>> >> strong and independent nation that will one day hate the United
>> >> States" - David Letterman
>> >>
>> >Oh man, so true, so true!!!
>> >
>> Kim,
>>
>> Guess who said this:
>>
>> "Of course the people don't want war. But after all, it's the leaders of
>the
>> country who determine the policy, and it's always a simple matter to drag
>the
>> people along whether it's a democracy, a fascist dictatorship, or a
>parliament,
>> or a communist dictatorship. Voice or no voice, the people can always be

>> brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is
>tell
>> them they are being attacked, and denounce the pacifists for lack of
>> patriotism, and exposing the country to greater danger."
>>
>> Hint: It's not an American
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Y'know what, Jim? Before I looked it up (and I did), your leading question
>and hint, with the aide of the phrase "denounce the pacifists," I truly
>thought it was going to be Hitler himself. Sure enough, when I looked it
>up, I find that it was indeed a "Hermann Goering, Nazi leader, at the
>Nuremberg Trials after World War II." (Source:
>http://www.bigmagic.com/pages/blackj/column78f.html)

Ding ding ding!

And the lady wins the Kewpie doll!!

Pretty scary, huh? The Snopes site sez that little speech was not in the
Nuremberg trial testimony, but rather part of an interview Goering gave when he
was being tried.
>
>It doesn't surprise me at all...

I thought you would find it interesting.
>
>I was checking out the Reuters website this morning. It's a true shame that
>"we" didn't think of how to address the problem of rebuilding
>Iraq--thoroughly--before going in.

I kind of think "we" did. However, the Iraqis may have had other plans!

> My prediction: we are not going to be
>able to "keep a handle on" the Iraqi people before we have to dodge or get
>out of there.
>
A valid concern! But that may be part of the plan. If "we" can honestly say
that the Iraqis are glad SH is gone but they don't want "our" help, "we" can
just leave and honestly say "we did the job we set out to do".

And would it be so bad to let somebody else foot the bill for a change?

I recall, early on, a figure of $100 billion being tossed out as the cost of
the war itself. Yesterday I heard that the cost so far was $20 billion. Now $20
billion is a heck of a lot of money, but if you're expecting $100 billion, $20
billion sounds like a real bargain.

I recall that one of the reasons for the war was Iraq's alleged WMDs, which
have not shown up yet. Another reason was alleged terrorist ties, which have
been validated by the discovery of a terrorist training camp in Iraq.

However, in the end all of that may pale in comparison to the horrible stories of death, torture, and other atrocities now coming out of Iraq. It is particularly interesting to hear and see even the most "liberal" media reporting these stories from the Iraqis who suffered them. If all the war did was to free Iraq from that horror, all the world (not just the US and UK) may well judge it to have been worthwhile.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3128. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 01:22:54 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419212254.18844.00000137@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 65315

>No, I think he did get it right.

No you just dont wont to except the truth.

3129. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 01:28:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419212832.18769.00000047@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 65316

In article <b7pqml$o9g$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>You can find me on about 7030 or so. Usually in the late afternoons. And if
>Im too fast, I'll slow down to what you like.

Dan,

7030? That's about where I hang out in the evenings!

Sometime we must cross paths outside a contest.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3130. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 01:28:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419212833.18769.00000048@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 65317

In article <3EA057A3.6E9FD3DA@crosslink.net>, Vito <vito@crosslink.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> Hearing impaired people have been passing the test for decades. Flashing
>light,
>> vibrating speaker cone, different tones and volumes, etc. All kinds of
>> accomodations are available.
>
>Yes indeed. A cripple could prolly get a wheel chair up the stairs to a
>rest room too, but we don't require it.

Instead, we build ramps and other accomodations. We don't cancel the test.

>It was a lot harder for me to
>get up to 15WPM than someone with good ears.

I'm sure it was.

But in 1990 the FCC reduced the code test to 5 wpm for anyone with a documented disability. Tinnitus would certainly qualify, in this layman's opinion. So the problem from 1990 on has been "how much trouble is 5 wpm?"

>Then all I could find were
>"standard" QSOs (name is, rig is, qth is ...). Boreing! When I dared
>tell one dude I'd been born in his QTH he went QRT! So I gave it up.

My experience has been very different. But that doesn't mean you must do what I did.
>>
>> The same can be said for the written test.
>
>Yes, IF it's prime purpose is to limit the number of hams; but I'm not
>sure that is true.

The prime purpose of the tests is not to limit the number of hams.

>Unlike Morse, a well thot out written exam could
>serve a good purpose.
>
What would constitute a well thought out written exam? How would it be different from today's writtens?

Consider this: I know a ham who took the old Advanced test nine times and passed it on the tenth. He had similar difficulty with the other writtens. He studied hard and knew the concepts, but he was simply not good with numbers and apparently had "test phobia". The Advanced written was much more difficult for

him than for most people who take it. He would have done fine on an open book test, but FCC exams are not open book.

Why did he have to go through all that?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3131. Re: Article in World RadioI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 02:38:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419223840.19043.00000274@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65318

>Subject: Re: Article in World RadioI
>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com
>Date: 4/19/2003 4:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <b7sff4phq1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>

>You sure enjoy making all sorts of assumptions dont you 'Len over 21'. Did
>I spell ASS right for you?

No...It's "L-E-N-N-I-E" in this forum, Dan.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3132. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 02:44:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419224433.19043.00000276@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65319

```
>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com
>Date: 4/19/2003 6:37 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <b7smim$kd4$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
>
>
>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030419185043.08129.00000124@mb-m01.aol.com...
>> In article <20030419150108.18863.00000363@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>> >>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>> >>Date: 4/19/2003 9:00 AM Central Daylight Time
>> >>Message-id: <87y9268u5b.fld@barrow.com>
>> >
>> >>Steve's comments on International Law, and the idea that
>> >>deposing Hussein and liberating Iraq somehow is inconsistent
>> >>with allowing recreational use of amateur radio by troops,
>> >>indicates a bit of extreme naivete.
>> >
>> > As usual, Floyd, you've got it screwed up.
>> >
>> > I said that we went to Iraq to depose Saddam Hussein. We did that.
>> >
>> > The PRESIDENT has stated that that, along with our seach for WMD,
>was our
>> >mission. He has repeatedly stated that Iraqis should govern Iraq, and
>has
>> made
>> >it clear that Iraqis shall retain sovereignty.
>> >
>> > There's nothing naieve about that. Those are facts.
>> >
>> > I agree that a bit of "recreational radio operating" is not going to
>hurt
>> >anyone. My assertion was simply that if we are perceived as usurping
>this
>> >authority, however benign, it will be "evidence" that we do not intend to
>> limit
>> >ourselves to the missions we insisted were our goals when we started
>this.
>> >
```

>> > Do you suggest that we "signal" the Iraqis (and world opinion) that
>we
>> >have no intention of honoring our stated goals?
>>
>> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
>> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
>> will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
>> calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
>> Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
>> done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
>> bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.
>
>Take a 'chill pill' before you hurt yourself.

Won't do any good, Dan...the damage's been done.

Plagiarized copy of N2EY's "Lennie Profile" noted.

Lack of any coherent, structured, responsible comment or reply also noted.

Typical Anderscum...Typical PUTZ.

Steve, K4YZ

3133. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 02:51:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419225153.19043.00000279@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65320

>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/19/2003 3:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030419163650.18769.00000046@mb-m21.aol.com>

>> The standardized communications language is English. (ITU and ICAO
>>refer)
>
> Try to stay on focus, astigmatic amateur.
>
> This is NOT a forum for the INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION
> ORGANIZATION.

It's "in" focus, Lennie.

The subject was non-English characters being represented in
"International" Morse Code.

You, the ever spineless and idiotic court jester, try to derail that in
favor of your own rants and ravings.

Didn't work.

>It is NOT a forum for flying or the SPOKEN language used in
> international air traffic control.

Sure it is. The title of the newsgroup is "rec.radio.amateur.POLICY".

>SPOKEN LANGUAGES do not use or "refer" to on-off keying
> coding of International Morse Code.

English was the subject. Not the manner in which it was employed.

>ITU-R S25 in its entirety does NOT reference any ICAO
> standardization or regulation.

Mutual agreement has put the same emphasis on English as the primary
(albiet certainly not sole...) language for Amatuer Radio communications.

If YOU were a licensed and experienced operator, you'd know this.

>Why do you ask? Can you connect all eight synapses to form a
> coherent thought and understand any answer?

Perhaps if YOU could get YOUR synapses in the right order, you wouldn't
have to keep a roll of toilet paper near by every time you opened your mouth,
Lennie.

Steve

3134. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 03:06:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAC78700.17472%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 65321

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Aw, Dwight, you're not supposed to give the punchline away!

Sorry about that. I should have known you were up to something. After all, I thought you had to know something about this. But, after watching you go on about it over several messages, I began to wonder. When it continued, I decided to say something just in case. In the future, I'll keep quiet until I see where you're going.

> But has any President abused this authority? I don't recall
> President Bush ever saying protest or dissent should be
> stifled in this country. Perhaps we should all follow his
> lead on that.
>
> Nonviolent protest and dissent actually make us stronger,
> not weaker, because the decision-makers are not sheltered
> from any views, no matter how different from their own.

No, President Bush hasn't said anything (at least publicly), but some of his supporters certainly have. And I likewise believe healthy protest and dissent makes us stronger as a nation.

> Regarding MOAB: Sometimes the mere appearance of a weapon
> can have an effect. (snip)

I thought about that too, but with the number of ships and planes in the region capable of delivering nuclear weapons, the US certainly didn't need to make a statement about its military might.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3135. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 03:25:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419232547.19043.00000280@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65322

>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/19/2003 3:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030419163654.18769.00000047@mb-m21.aol.com>

>You are not only irrelevant far surpassing most of the
> readers in here, but you are misleading, misdirectioning,
> and, in general, just a self-promoting bullshit artist

WHHHHHHOOOOOOOOA!

Lennie! Where do you find the Levi's to hold gonads THAT big that you'd make such an assertion against ANY one else...?!?!

You insuferable CREEP!

>FEAR, boy. That gives you an element of safety to be just
> another bullshit artist.

"FEAR"...?!?! The only one in any "fear" in THIS forum is YOU, you meaningless punk! Your life is nearing it's end, you are less than what you could have been, and you realize you blew more opportunities than you took on.

I'd be scared too!

"Boy"...?!?! Lennie, WHY is it you repeatedly berate others for slinging insults, names, etc, yet YOU are the Number One insult hurler in here?

Jim Miccolis has never ONCE called you "Lennie", "boy", or any other even REMOTELY insulting adjective, yet you constantly jab at him with such childish taunts.

Jim Miccolis is more man in a minute than you've been your whole life, and it just kills you, doesn't it...?!?!

>>You haven't answered the question, Len. "References" is an ambiguous term.
>
> Don't try more misdirection. You have NO authority to demand
> answers.

Oh...yeah...answering questions is "misdirection".

The FACT is that Leonard H. Anderson is a snivvelling coward for whom truth, respect and dignity are meaningless terms. His is, most assuredly, a person without Honor.

>>Not at all, Len. I'm simply refusing to answer your questions about my work
>and
>>work experience. Obviously that refusal infuriates you for some strange

>reason.
>
> You are playing a fantasy role of being an all-knowing, all-
> seeing radio god. Radio gods don't have to answer
> questions put to them by mortals. You are a false radio god.
>
> Mortals don't like pretend gods.

I'd say Jim hit it on the nose...Fear, anger and jealousy are just seething from your retorts, Lennie. If it wasn't, you'd be able to answer the questions and move on. Instead you resort to this "radio god" silliness.

How pathetic. How absolutely pathetic.

> You pretend to be a radio god, above mere mortals. Bullshit
> artists do the same thing.

Even more profanity from a person alleged to be a college educated professional. Used up all your other options, Lennie?

>You should answer at least one question by a mortal to show
> your sincerity. You don't. You dance and evade the subject and
> try to misdirect into other topics. You are a bullshit artist.

For not wanting to subject himself to the same slurs and denigrations you've heaped on everyone else...?!?! HARDLY!

>You are trying to establish a persona of grand guru in radio
> who knows all, sees all, has done everything, is the expert
> judge of all others. In short a radio god. You are looking like
> just another bullshit artist.

A-N-G-E-R M-A-N-A-G-E-M-E-N-T. Lennie, this is REALLY getting you down. Maybe your correspondence course psychologist wifey can give you some "therapy"...?!?!

>You talk about MANY MORE subjects that amateur radio.
>
> Google has the evidence. Live with it.

So do YOU, Lennie, despite your frequent attempts to redirect others who are not playing by YOUR rules.

Live with THAT, Your Sulkingness.

>You are just a pretend god, a bullshit artist.

As opposed to a REAL god such as yourself, Lennie...?!?!

And MORE profanity. Guess those years in night school were wasted, eh?

>You are GOOD at misleading many. Bullshit artists do that.

Yes they do...Like trying to hide behind the KIA's of an Army unit you joined three years and 500 miles away from the battle.

>I've made no "mistake" about identifying you as just another
> wanna-be radio god bullshit artist.

>You CANNOT discuss any personal experience with radio
> communications outside amateur radio so you MASK that
> with the imperious "you don't have the need to know."

Jim has very accurately discussed a number of technical aspects of radio
without once needing to retell the tale of how he used to do it in
1950-something.

>In short, just bullshit.

Getting really boring, Your Scuminess.

>>> LIVE WITH IT, pedantic perfectionist.
>>
>>Seems like you're getting angry.
>
> Not at all. Disgust, yes. I don't like poseurs or pretenders.
> You are one of those with all the masking and misdirection.

Nope. You're mad...blue-in-the-face, screaming, slamming your fist on the
table mad that you aren't getting your way. And it's a RIOT!

>>No, just common sense.
>
> FEAR, boy. Pretenders live in fear of being uncovered,
> unmasked, shown what they really are.

Then I can understand why you act the way YOU do in this forum, Lennie.

>You are lost. You may have lost the way due to the scent of
> all the bullshit.

Even more profanity. Still unable to move forward, eh?

>Bullshit misdirection. Better bullshit than most in here, but
> bullshit just the same.

Three times in two sentences.

>>After all that, what rational person would tell you anything about their
>work
>>experience?
>
> ANY rational person who has the COURAGE to engage in public
> discussion who HAS experience and doesn't disguise it by
> ambiguous, no-detail generalities.

In otherwords, someone who enjoys bragging as much as Lennie seems to
do...

>Would you like another "profile" statement on you?

It wouldn't be accurate, Lennie, so why waste the bandwidth?

Steve

3136. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 03:26:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA21361.D7CEBB84@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65323

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030419124555.18821.00000073@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >I do "talk shop" - but not in an amateur radio policy newsgroup. Since I do
> not
> >work for the FCC, ARRL, an amateur radio equipment manufacturer, or as a
> >communications attorney, such "shop talk" is simply not relevant.
>
> You do NOT work for the US government or in any possible
> capacity for US foreign policy, yet you prattle endlessly
> about those subjects which do NOT involve amateur radio.
>
> You do NOT work for any railroad or have any stated work
> experience in railroading, yet you have stated IN HERE that
> you are an expert in knowledge of railroads. Railroads and
> railroading are NOT amateur radio subjects nor is there any
> reference to railroads and railroading in US amateur radio
> regulations.
>
> You have NEVER been a member of the United States
> armed forces or any other military, yet you've implied that
> you have expert knowledge of military policy, plans,
> technology, and life as a military person.
>
> You spout endlessly in a number of fields of work and
> policy that have nothing at all to do with amateur radio.

I seem to remember you doing those things, Len. Of course, you may feel
free to correct me if I'm mistaken.

> You are not only irrelevant far surpassing most of the
> readers in here, but you are misleading, misdirectioning,
> and, in general, just a self-promoting bullshit artist.

Gee, Leonard, you aren't involved in amateur radio in the tiniest way
and you haven't let that slow you down a bit. I guess that'd make you a
self-promoting...well, you know the rest.

I've saved you the embarrassment of seeing the rest of your wild ravings
again by snipping the balance.

Dave K8MN

3137. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 03:32:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA214A5.999E7538@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65324

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0304190500.7cfb962@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

> >He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.
>
> I'd heard he might have been a snow-removal supervisor for
> the runways at Tan Son Hut...but that's probably just a rumor.

Just for the record, Len, where is Tan Son Hut?

Dave K8MN

3138. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 03:35:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EA2158A.7EA888A6@att.net>
Source record: 65325

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> >
> >>Marvy. What can you tell us about Morse as a growth industry?
> >
> >
> > Far as anyone here can determine it's impossible to tell you anything.
>
> Slam! Ya gotta admit it Dick. He does a pretty good job as your straight
> man! Maybe we need a rrap retort of the week contest. Whaaya think?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Hey Mike, long as Slim keeps it up grabbing the brass ring would be a cinch!

3139. Re: "enhanced" SSB ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 03:37:36 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <873ckd96v3.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 65326
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
>"Bo yawns" <boyawns@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
>> I think I'm startin to get it. Tell me, is this "mode" what most of
>> your KP4 and XE2 type stations seem to always run...?
>>
>>
>
>No, in their case there is NO attempt at enhancing their audio. They just
>want to run everything to the right, processor on, and scream into the mike.
>They all use those 'banana' style mics, most of them 12 inches long.

Your racism is noted.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

3140. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 03:40:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419234043.19043.00000282@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65327

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/19/2003 5:50 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030419185042.08129.00000123@mb-m01.aol.com>

>Before you were ever born, BOY...(SNIP)

Whew! had to emphasize that one, eh, Oh Meaningless One?

Got ALL THAT KNOWLEDGE, yet no one will kneel before the Enlightened One
and bear him tribute.

Now you're mad...too bad...so sad...

>Let me amend that slightly. The microwave equipment...(SNIP)

...has WHAT to do with Amateur Radio policy, Lennie?

>After US Army active duty I was...(SNIP)

...still a meaningless twit, only now a CIVILIAN meaningless twit.

>Robeson has NO idea of what electronic engineers HAVE to
> read and study to perform their job descriptions capably.

Yes I do...More than you know. Too bad for you you had to resort to
slurs, name-calling, threats and child like behaviour way before you ever got
the chance to know anything about me.

Your loss.

>No one has to memorize any of that in detail, but one MUST
> be able to know where to get detailed information required
> for a task.

Well zippity-doo-dah, Lennie. That's one of the most basic
troubleshooting skills the Armed Forces taught. Am I to be impressed now, or
is there something enlightening yet to come...?!?!

>Responsibility is part of the job, responsibility proportional to
> staff position.

And that's different from any other professional job, Lennie?

>The "approved" title block on drawings and documents MEANS something.

Not in the "rec.radio.amateur.policy" newsgroup it doesn't, Lennie.

>Despite having a second career in the medical field as a
> caregiver, he turns around and does not care one bit about

> acting badly on a social level in this newsgroup

Sorry, Lennie. If calling a putz a putz disturbs you, then STOP ACTING
LIKE A PUTZ!

>Because of that "don't care" attitude he gets the "profiling"
> as follows:
>
> No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

A plagiarizing putz, at that.

Sheeesh.

Steve

3141. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 03:44:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419234455.19043.00000284@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65328

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com
>Date: 4/19/2003 6:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <b7smfo$a8q$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>

>Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030419185042.08129.00000123@mb-m01.aol.com

Yet another self-appreciating diatribe on non-Amateur Radio related stuff snipped.

>And all that means you are qualified to bitch and moan about CW in ham
>radio? Its to late to tell you to get a life....but give it a
>try...please.

Let's change tack and give the old guy a break, Dan. He's lonely, he's dying and he's missed out on many opportunities in life and his impending mortality has hit him.

It's natural to lash out like that...Like a dog who nips at his master's hand after being hit by a car as his master tries to comfort him. Only this old dog speaks English.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3142. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 03:45:35 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EA217DF.3060401@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 65332

WA8ULX wrote:
>>No, I think he did get it right.
>
>
> No you just dont wont to except the truth.

Coming from you it would be very difficult to determine the truth.
I still agree with the other poster, you probably paid some cber
$250 to take the test for you.

3143. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 03:47:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030419234714.19043.00000285@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65329

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/19/2003 10:32 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EA214A5.999E7538@earthlink.net>

>Len Over 21 wrote:

>> I'd heard he might have been a snow-removal supervisor for
>> the runways at Tan Son Hut...but that's probably just a rumor.
>
>Just for the record, Len, where is Tan Son Hut?

Kaaaaaa-BAM!

Nice one, Dave ! !

73

Steve, K4YZ

3144. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 04:34:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030420003406.18769.00000152@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 65330

In article <20030419163654.18769.00000047@mb-m21.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030419124555.18821.00000073@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:

>>I do "talk shop" - but not in an amateur radio policy newsgroup. Since I do
>>not work for the FCC, ARRL, an amateur radio equipment manufacturer, or as
>>a communications attorney, such "shop talk" is simply not relevant.
>
> You do NOT work for the US government or in any possible
> capacity for US foreign policy,

Neither do you, Len.

> yet you prattle endlessly
> about those subjects which do NOT involve amateur radio.

So do you, Len. It's called free speech. Do you want to censor what I post?
Seems like it.

If I "do NOT work for the US government or in any possible capacity for US
foreign policy" then my talking about same isn't "shop talk".
>
> You do NOT work for any railroad or have any stated work
> experience in railroading, yet you have stated IN HERE that
> you are an expert in knowledge of railroads.

Whoa!

Where have I ever stated that I am an "expert" at anything? Produce the post. I
don't think you can.

> Railroads and railroading are NOT amateur radio subjects nor is there any
> reference to railroads and railroading in US amateur radio regulations.

If I "do NOT work for any railroad or have any stated work experience in
railroading" then my talking about same isn't "shop talk".
>
> You have NEVER been a member of the United States
> armed forces or any other military,

I have never claimed to be.

> yet you've implied that
> you have expert knowledge of military policy, plans,
> technology, and life as a military person.

No, you inferred that. I did not imply it. Where have I ever claimed to be an expert at anything? Produce the post. Back up your claims. I don't think you can.

If I "have NEVER been a member of the United States armed forces or any other military" then my talking about same isn't "shop talk".

> You spout endlessly in a number of fields of work and
> policy that have nothing at all to do with amateur radio.

So do you, Len. At greater length, and at greater frequency, than I.
>
> You are not only irrelevant far surpassing most of the
> readers in here, but you are misleading, misdirectioning,
> and, in general, just a self-promoting

[expletive deleted]

> artist.

That's 1.
>
>>Besides, you would probably not understand my "shop talk" anyway, Len.
>
> No one knows if that is true or false.

I do. It's true. Live with it.

> You have NOT stated
> anything the least specific on what your "shop" produces.

Sure I have. Electrical engineering.

>>> You don't out of fear.

>>Not fear. Common sense.
>
> FEAR, boy.

Common sense, girlfriend ;-)

> That gives you an element of safety to be just
> another

[expletive deleted]

> artist.

That's 2
>
>>Not fear. Common sense.
>
> FEAR, boy.

Common sense, girlfriend ;-)

> That gives you an element of safety to be just
> another

[expletive deleted]

> artist.

That's 3
>
>>Not fear. Common sense.
>
> FEAR, boy.

Common sense, girlfriend ;-)

> That gives you an element of safety to be just
> another

[expletive deleted]

> artist.

That's 4.

>>Besides, commercial radio experience is simply not relevant to amateur radio
>>policy.
>
> That is true but only for the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society.

Who would that be?
>
> That society thinks that amateur radio operates on different
> principles of physics than the rest of the radio world.

How does physics determine radio policy?

>>You haven't answered the question, Len. "References" is an ambiguous term.
>
> Don't try more misdirection. You have NO authority to demand
> answers.

Neither do you, Len.
>
>>Not at all, Len. I'm simply refusing to answer your questions about my work
>>and work experience. Obviously that refusal infuriates you for some strange
>>reason.
>
> You are playing a fantasy role of being an all-knowing, all-
> seeing radio god.

No, I just refuse to answer some of your questions. Live with it.

>>Then there's no reason for me to answer any of your questions, Len.
>
> You pretend to be a radio god, above mere mortals.

[expletive deleted]

> artists do the same thing.

That's 5
>
>>You have
>>just told us that no matter what qualifications I post, you will not accept
>>them as proof of anything involving "the subject of communications outside
>>of amateurism." So there's no point in giving you more information.
>
> Mortals cannot debate anything with radio gods.

> You should answer at least one question by a mortal to show
> your sincerity. You don't.

I answer all sorts of questions, Len. Just not the ones you want me to answer.
Here are your own words right back atcha: "You have NO authority to demand
answers."

> You dance and evade the subject and
> try to misdirect into other topics. You are a

[expletive deleted]

>artist.

That's 6
>
>>> You don't have any
>>> such knowledge or experience on communications outside of
>>> amateur radio.
>>
>>How do you know? You keep making that statement as if it's a fact, but you
>>have nothing to back it up but your own rejection of my already-stated
>>qualifications and experience.
>
> Everyone can KNOW.

How?

> You are just a

[expletive deleted]

> artist.

That's 7
>
>>Prove any what?
>
> No one can "prove" the existance of nothing. It has no
> reference. You are a

[expletive deleted]

> artist with nothing tangible
> to refer to.
>
That's 8

>>> you can't talk about it...
>>
>>Sure I can. I choose not to. Choice - what a concept.
>
> You DO talk...about nothing.

[expletive deleted]

That's 9
>
> Lots of words, nothing of substance except cribbings from
> old amateur radio magazines.
>
> You are trying to establish a persona of grand guru in radio
> who knows all, sees all, has done everything, is the expert
> judge of all others. In short a radio god.

Where DO you get these ideas, Len? I just post what I know. Sometimes there are mistakes in what I post, and when proven, I acknowledge those mistakes. I can't help it if I know more than you in some areas.

> You are looking like
> just another

[expletive deleted]

>artist.

That's 10
>
>>Not me. This is an amateur radio newsgroup. I'm a radio amateur, talking
>>about
>>amateur radio policy and a few other subjects.
>
> You talk about MANY MORE subjects that amateur radio.

So do you, Len. Is that wrong? Do you want to censor what I post? Seems like it.

> Google has the evidence. Live with it.

> You are just a
> pretend god, a

[expletive deleted]

> artist.

That's 11
>
>>I have not made deliberate false

>>statements here. Nor have I tried to mislead anyone.

[expletive deleted]

> artists do that.

That's 12

>>> "That's all you need to know."
>>
>>That's correct. Live with it.
>
> You are a

[expletive deleted]

> artist.

That's 13

> Live with that. Others have to live with
> your

[expletive deleted]

> about "need to know."
>
That's 14

>>Incorrect. There are some others here who know more about what I do for a
>>living.
>
> Irrelevant. Gods of radio congregate with other gods, cannot
> bear to do so with ordinary mortals.

Really? Then I must be an ordinary mortal.

[expletive deleted]

> artists tend to stay with their own kind.

That's 15.

Hmm...if I'm the kind of artist you keep saying I am, and you keep replying to
my posts, that would make you the same kind of artist, Len. Only with far more
skill and experience......
>
>What experience have I claimed that is not true?
>
> You haven't claimed any experience.

Then what's the problem?
>
>>Incorrect.
>
> You are a null, a zero, have NO references yet insist that you

> "have" experience. Illogical.

First you say I haven't claimed any experience, then you say I have. You're being illogical, Len.

>>> You DON'T have any such experience in radio communications
>>> outside of amateur radio.
>>
>>Incorrect.
>
> Prove it.

There is no proof that would satisfy you. We all know that from experience.

> Your "word" is no longer good enough.

It never was - for you.

> You are a

[expletive deleted]

> artist, a con-man, a grifter.

That's 16

>>> You cannot make a mistake.
>>
>>Sure I can. I've made plenty. Sope would say replying to your posts is a
>>mistake.
>
> Who is this "Sope?"

That's a typo - a mistake. Was supposed to be "some people".
>
>>> You cannot admit a mistake.

I just did. Which proves you wrong.

>>Sure I can. You are the one who cannot, even when said mistake is pointed
>>out repeatedly and carefully explained.
>
> I've made no "mistake" about identifying you as just another
> wanna-be radio god

[expletive deleted]

>artist.

That's 17
>
> You CANNOT discuss any personal experience with radio
> communications outside amateur radio

Sure I can. I just don't do it here.

> In short, just
.
[expletive deleted]

That's 18

>>> "C-Systems" is/was a corporation. Not a big one.
>>
>>Never heard of it.
>
> Imperious statement. "Never heard of it" therefore "it does
> not exist."

That's your own bias showing through. "Never heard of it" means "never heard of
it" not "it doesn't exist".
>
>>Others seem to have no problem having meaningful discussions with me. Look
>>at the stick-shift anaogy discussion I had with Bill Sohl, K2UNK, for just
one
>>example.
>
> This forum is NOT about vehicular operation or automotive
> mechanics.

We talked about them anyway.

>>> You could have said the same thing about any other active
>>> device by simply looking it up from a tube chart.
>>
>>So could you, Len.
>
> True...except I never mentioned any EIA tube numbers, just
> that I operated using the mentioned multiplexer...and HAVE
> the photographs of it, both personal and official US Army
> Signal Corps photographs identified on the back (including
> the photographer).

I've got photos of the system I was talking about, too. I took them myself.
Tri-X, 35 mm.
>
> You attempted misdirection again. More masking by dropping
> any discussion of time-division multiplexing systems (alluding
> but never detailing "having worked with such things") and going
> to specific tube numbers.

You really do need to read what people actually write.

> I made no mention of specific tube
> numbers, only that they were "7-pin miniatures."

Is not the 5823 a 7 pin miniature cold-cathode gas tube?

> Actual tube
> numbers are irrelevant to the discussion.

Not when you're trying to get a system working again.

> That equipment I
> described first saw communications service in about 1952.

So what? I never claimed to have worked on it. The system I was describing
first went into service about 1956, yet I worked on it. Professionally.
>
>>The systems I refer to also had Dekatron counter tubes and a bunch of other
>>specialized hardware. I could go on and on in great detail about that
>>system, and many others. I choose not to.
>
> More misdirection. You have not connected all that name- and
> number-dropping to COMMUNICATIONS.

I choose not to. Live with it.
>
> You are lost.

Not at all. I know exactly where I am.

> You may have lost the way due to the scent of all the

[expletive deleted]

That's 19

If there's such a scent, it did not come from me ;-)
>
>>I never claimed to have worked on those particular multiplex systems, Len.
>>They are not the only communications systems that used gas tubes, ya know.
>
> Describe them.

Gas tubes? Well, the 5823 is a cold-cathode tube with three electrodes. 7 pin
miniature, about the size of a 6AU6....

Oh you mean the system I was talking about? Well, it's been a few years.

19" rack mounted, powered by 110 AC and 24 volts DC. Various modules in the
main cabinet: Power supply, receiver, transmitter, units station counter, tens
station counter, bit counter, control unit, diode module.

Sound familiar?
>
>>Do you claim to know the location and removal date of every single
>>communication system that ever used gas tubes?
>
> Irrelevant.

No, it's quite relevant. First you tell me what I cannot have done, then you
say it's irrelevant.
>
(N2EY)

> has only made vague allusions to some alleged experience in some kind of
> "communications system" never identified in any way.

Because I choose not to. Do you know what a Dekatron tube is? How about an LCS
unit?

[expletive deleted]

>misdirection.

That's 20

> Better

[expletive deleted]

than most in here, but

[expletive deleted]

> just the same.
>
That's 21 and 22

> All of these PUBLIC VIEW messages are readable by anyone
> with newsgroup access. You cannot tailor responses to
> individuals...all readers see the same text.

Thank you, Captain Obvious ;-)
>
>>> You can't. The fear factor is too high for you.
>>
>>Not at all. Just common sense.
>
> FEAR.

COMMON SENSE.

> Radio gods will, unfortunately for them, find out they
> are merely mortal and do NOT know everything about
> anything, regardless of their

[expletive deleted]

> techniques in trying to establish a reputation of grande guru of
communications.

That's 23

>>So have you, Len. And when your mistakes have been pointed out, you refuse
>>to acknowledge them.
>
> The radio god continues to claim I "made mistakes" as a generality.

> I have made typographical errors, true, and admitted those.

More than typos. Errors in logic, errors in facts. Like the claim you made that no Technicians have HF privileges, with or without CSCEs.

All there in Google.
>
> Beyond that,

(N2EY's)

> OPINION was elevated to Supreme
> Judge of What Is Right and What Is Wrong. OPINION.
> That's an excellent misdirection technique but it is still

[expletive deleted]

That's 24

> Such

[expletive deleted]

> does not fertilize TRUTH, it only covers it up and winds up smelling bad.
>
That's 25

(N2EY)
> is NOT a radio god who can command What Is Right and What Is Wrong.

Never claimed to be.
>
>>If there's BS, it doesn't come from me. As for "Class A hypocrite", I recall
>>recently reading a post of yours where you called someone unknown to you a
>>"boy" and a "racial bigot" in the same post. Fascinating....
>
> "Boy" is the word for a youngster, an under-teenage kid.

I'm 48, Len. You know that because you looked me up in the database. Is there some reason you call a 48-year-old "boy" ? Does it make you feel important?

> That applies to ALL races.

It is also a derogative, racist term. Would you call a black man "boy"?

Just to be clear, I'm not saying I am black. I'm just asking the question. I don't address anyone as "boy". It's not good manners, regardless of race or age.

> IDENTIFY all that non-amateur communications (systems or
> equipment)

(N2EY)

>CLAIMS to have "experience" with.

Why? You would not recognize them anyway. Besides, you have no authority to DEMAND anything from me.

Let's see: 25 repetitions of the same expletive deleted in a single post. Must be a new record.

Now here's a few for you, Len.

Tell us about your actual experience with Morse code radio operation. Not what the Army did, or what you've seen others do, or a long diatribe about how old the mode is, the theory behind it, the history, yada yada yada. Just tell us your personal experience actually using the mode.

Also explain to us how your experience in NON-amateur radio somehow makes you more knowledgeable about what's best for the amateur radio service than those who have experience in amateur radio.

Finally, produce the post where I claim to be an "expert" on any subject.

Then we'll see who the

[expletive deleted]

artist really is.

3145. Re: "enhanced" SSB ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 05:21:45 UTC
From: L L O Y D D A V I E S <firebottle@n0vfp.cm>
Message-ID: <3ea22a6d_2@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 65331
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message
news:873ckd96v3.fld@barrow.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
> >"Bo yawns" <boyawns@yahoo.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> I think I'm startin to get it. Tell me, is this "mode" what most of
> >> your KP4 and XE2 type stations seem to always run...?
> >>
> >>
> >
> >No, in their case there is NO attempt at enhancing their audio. They
just
> >want to run everything to the right, processor on, and scream into the
mike.
> >They all use those 'banana' style mics, most of them 12 inches long.
>
> Your racism is noted.
>

Now, now Floyd, dont lose a nights sleep over it, will you?

--
Lloyd/N0VFP
"Finest No-Coder to key up a handie talkie"
Ft-817, ATS 909

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3146. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 08:43:51 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304200043.722d6165@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65333

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdk68ah.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 18 Apr 2003 12:57:01 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >As far as the FCC goes they can't even be bothered enforcing the laws
> >against blatently illegal activities like freebanding & such in their
> >own back yard. I seriously doubt that they'll be particulary
> >interested in extending their reach to Iraq to whack a few guys who
> >are most likely operating legally by not only ITU but also under U.S.
> >technical & operating regs. Nobody dies, nobody gets hurt, nobody
> >suffers illegal interfernce. Lotta pedantic blather. But then this is
> >RRAP huh . . ?
>
> All depends on whose ox is gored, right?

Who's ox could possibly be gored by a few Yanks who get on the ham
radio bands off-watch in Iraq? What's the point to making a legal
hoopla over one of most victimless "crimes" I can imagine? When does
common sense, against all odds, finally transcend The Law? When de
Judge throws the case out as too trivial to bother with.

> And what do I advise
> a client who wants to know if it's really legal or not?
>
> One of the principles by which I practice law and advise
> clients is to be clear what the WORST case is, not what they
> can get away with (I chase a higher class of ambulance, right?).
> My usual statement is "if you get caught, what defense can you
> offer" based on two principles - ignorance does not cut it, and
> the "dude" defense ("some other dude did it") is not applicable
> to these sort of things.

Wherein lies the brilliance of whoever came up with this bush-league
scam, "My C.O. sed it wuz OK to operate, here's my written permission
to do so." How many "war criminals" have gotten off the hook by
hanging it on their C.O.s? Ref: Nurenburg. For openers.

> If the regs have changed to permit a commander to issue ham
> operating permission, so be it (I think that would be a bad
> move if it was so).
>
> We will see.

. . . keep us posted.

w3rv

3147. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 11:04:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030420070438.19041.00000279@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 65334

>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 4/19/2003 11:34 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030420003406.18769.00000152@mb-m13.aol.com>

>Where have I ever stated that I am an "expert" at anything? Produce the post.
>I
>don't think you can.

You're certainly not going to hold your breath waiting on THAT, are you,
Jim...?!?!

>No, you inferred that. I did not imply it. Where have I ever claimed to be an
>expert at anything? Produce the post. Back up your claims. I don't think you
>can.

He seems to like to "infer" a lot in order to have some "point" to
make...He has a real hard time just accepting what's in black and white.

>Let's see: 25 repetitions of the same expletive deleted in a single post.
>Must
>be a new record.

A new record LOW for an alleged professional trying to express himself,
I'd say.

>Now here's a few for you, Len.
>
>Tell us about your actual experience with Morse code radio operation. Not
>what
>the Army did, or what you've seen others do, or a long diatribe about how old
>the mode is, the theory behind it, the history, yada yada yada. Just tell us
>your personal experience actually using the mode.
>
>Also explain to us how your experience in NON-amateur radio somehow makes you
>more knowledgeable about what's best for the amateur radio service than those
>who have experience in amateur radio.
>
>Finally, produce the post where I claim to be an "expert" on any subject.
>
>Then we'll see who the
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>artist really is.

Indeed.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3148. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 12:19:55 UTC
From: Jack <Jack@nowherexanon.org>
Message-ID: <b7u37h$th4$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 65335

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0304200043.722d6165@posting.google.com...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdk68ah.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > On 18 Apr 2003 12:57:01 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > >As far as the FCC goes they can't even be bothered enforcing the laws
> > >against blatently illegal activities like freebanding & such in their
> > >own back yard. I seriously doubt that they'll be particulary
> > >interested in extending their reach to Iraq to whack a few guys who
> > >are most likely operating legally by not only ITU but also under U.S.
> > >technical & operating regs. Nobody dies, nobody gets hurt, nobody
> > >suffers illegal interfernce. Lotta pedantic blather. But then this is
> > >RRAP huh . . ?
> >
> > All depends on whose ox is gored, right?
>
> Who's ox could possibly be gored by a few Yanks who get on the ham
> radio bands off-watch in Iraq? What's the point to making a legal
> hoopla over one of most victimless "crimes" I can imagine? When does
> common sense, against all odds, finally transcend The Law? When de
> Judge throws the case out as too trivial to bother with.
>
>
> > And what do I advise
> > a client who wants to know if it's really legal or not?
> >
> > One of the principles by which I practice law and advise
> > clients is to be clear what the WORST case is, not what they
> > can get away with (I chase a higher class of ambulance, right?).
> > My usual statement is "if you get caught, what defense can you
> > offer" based on two principles - ignorance does not cut it, and
> > the "dude" defense ("some other dude did it") is not applicable
> > to these sort of things.
>
> Wherein lies the brilliance of whoever came up with this bush-league
> scam, "My C.O. sed it wuz OK to operate, here's my written permission
> to do so." How many "war criminals" have gotten off the hook by
> hanging it on their C.O.s? Ref: Nurenburg. For openers.
>
>
> > If the regs have changed to permit a commander to issue ham
> > operating permission, so be it (I think that would be a bad
> > move if it was so).

> >
> > We will see.
>
> . . . keep us posted.
>
> w3rv

The George W. Bush haters are down to grasping
at straws and looking for gold at the end of rainbows.

"Liberals are at their funniest, when they are out
of power." --- Rush Limbaugh

3149. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 13:32:39 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030420093239.18876.00000413@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 65336

>Coming from you it would be very difficult to determine the truth.

REALLY

>I still agree with the other poster, you probably paid some cber
>$250 to take the test for you.

Since thats probably how you got your "No-Code Tech- CBplusser License" you
probably think thats the Norm.

3150. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 14:13:58 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <F51F21B547797E37.57F9F29AC92F6EAD.17D8C811071A921C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65337

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030419204519.08129.00000127@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article
<53E1CF3355AD25C4.81A9793EBE6CECA5.D248DC7287EA7A81@lp.airnews.net>,
> "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030419082610.18775.00000100@mb-m02.aol.com...
> >> In article
> ><81BD6DACD3EEC2EB.C999C620FC531C59.9B432F0625B1459B@lp.airnews.net>,
> >> "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >> >news:c2356669.0304180916.4a28633d@posting.google.com...
> >> >> [SNIP]
> >> >> But it's more important that the freedoms not be destroyed in the
> >> >> process of defending them. As in "we destroyed the village in order
to
> >> >> save it".
> >> >>
> >> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >> >>
> >> >> "UN Secretary Kofi Annan said he thinks the arms inspectorsshould
> >> >> resume looking for weapons in Iraq. Hey, forget arms in Iraq, how
> >> >> about looking for some backbone in the UN?" - Jay Leno
> >> >>
> >> >> "There's now talk that US wants to spray the poppy fields of
> >> >> Afghanistan in an effort to destroy the drug crop before it can be
> >> >> harvested. If you thought Bush was unpopular in Hollywood
> >> >> before.....-Jay Leno
> >> >>
> >> >> "And now the really difficult part: We have to rebuild Iraq into a
> >> >> strong and independent nation that will one day hate the United
> >> >> States" - David Letterman
> >> >
> >> >Oh man, so true, so true!!!
> >> >
> >> Kim,
> >>
> >> Guess who said this:
> >>
> >> "Of course the people don't want war. But after all, it's the leaders
of
> >the

> >> country who determine the policy, and it's always a simple matter to
drag
> >the
> >> people along whether it's a democracy, a fascist dictatorship, or a
> >parliament,
> >> or a communist dictatorship. Voice or no voice, the people can always
be
> >> brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do
is
> >tell
> >> them they are being attacked, and denounce the pacifists for lack of
> >> patriotism, and exposing the country to greater danger."
> >>
> >> Hint: It's not an American
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Y'know what, Jim? Before I looked it up (and I did), your leading
question
> >and hint, with the aide of the phrase "denounce the pacifists," I truly
> >thought it was going to be Hitler himself. Sure enough, when I looked it
> >up, I find that it was indeed a "Hermann Goering, Nazi leader, at the
> >Nuremberg Trials after World War II." (Source:
> >http://www.bigmagic.com/pages/blackj/column78f.html)
>
> Ding ding ding!
>
> And the lady wins the Kewpie doll!!
>
> Pretty scary, huh? The Snopes site sez that little speech was not in the
> Nuremberg trial testimony, but rather part of an interview Goering gave
when he
> was being tried.
> >
> >It doesn't surprise me at all...
>
> I thought you would find it interesting.
> >
> >I was checking out the Reuters website this morning. It's a true shame
that
> >"we" didn't think of how to address the problem of rebuilding
> >Iraq--thoroughly--before going in.
>
> I kind of think "we" did. However, the Iraqis may have had other plans!
>
> > My prediction: we are not going to be
> >able to "keep a handle on" the Iraqi people before we have to dodge or
get
> >out of there.
> >

> A valid concern! But that may be part of the plan. If "we" can honestly
say
> that the Iraqis are glad SH is gone but they don't want "our" help, "we"
can
> just leave and honestly say "we did the job we set out to do".
>
> And would it be so bad to let somebody else foot the bill for a change?
>
> I recall, early on, a figure of $100 billion being tossed out as the cost
of
> the war itself. Yesterday I heard that the cost so far was $20 billion.
Now $20
> billion is a heck of a lot of money, but if you're expecting $100 billion,
$20
> billion sounds like a real bargain.
>
> I recall that one of the reasons for the war was Iraq's alleged WMDs,
which
> have not shown up yet. Another reason was alleged terrorist ties, which
have
> been validated by the discovery of a terrorist training camp in Iraq.
>
> However, in the end all of that may pale in comparison to the horrible
stories
> of death, torture, and other atrocities now coming out of Iraq. It is
> particularly interesting to hear and see even the most "liberal" media
> reporting these stories from the Iraqis who suffered them. If all the war
did
> was to free Iraq from that horror, all the world (not just the US and UK)
may
> well judge it to have been worthwhile.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Oh, absolutely: on having Iraq set its ownself up again and getting us out of having to foot the bill. The only is, do you really think the US Gov't. is going to be satisfied with that (having "others" do the job) and, my fear is that it will be so unsatisfactory that we (the world) are here again in another 20 years...

Kim W5TIT

3151. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 15:13:49 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304200713.6c451ea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65338

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030418231708.19022.00000121@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
> >> Technically, Morse code is a digital mode.
> >
> >It's actually a digitized language .
>
> Morse code is NOT a language. English is a language. Morse code is an encoding
> scheme.
>
> Morse code is an encoding scheme, used in the On-Off Keying (OOK) digital mode.

Of course it is from the "engineering" perspective, you're quite
correct, not even a discussion. But that's not my point. My point is
that beyond the technical aspects of Morse, the definitions, etc.
comes the real-world application of Morse as it's used specifically in
ham radio and became a widely used language in the Amateur Service
globally.

There are huge differences between the purposes and usefulness of
Morse as it is still used in ham radio and how it has been used by a
myriad of commercial, government and military entities over the years.
The professional users of the mode had entirely different priorities
and missions to accomplish than hams had and still have except under
very unusual circumstances. Hams have taken Morse in an entirely
different direction and developed it into a particularly effective and
affordable international language for socializing and info swapping
amongst themselves, not for simply passing hard copy around to their
employers and/or their military command structures as was the case in
the professional Morse days. Which is exactly why Morse survives today
in volume on the ham bands but virtually nowhere else. This is also
why the arguments we hear about Morse being "obsolete" today because,
say, the Coast Guard no longer uses Morse is simply bogus nonsense.

As far as the mechanics of the mode go, yes, it's very much a language
but only in the hands of those experienced in it's use. Cutting to the
quick here Morse goes in the ears of the users and comes out of the
mind as a flow of words, phrases and thoughts, not as just streaming
dots and dashes. Therefore Morse is just as legitimately a language as
is any other language. The only differerence between Morse and the
spoken languages is the manner in which it is processed in the mind.

To those who don't have the ability to use Morse of course it's only
another indecipherable encoding scheme, not so different from RTTY in

this respect. This is why those non-users of Morse who diss the mode are the same flavor of nit-wits who bitch about French when they can't speak a word of French. Or any of the plethora of variations on the theme we've seen posted here by the clueless.

By the way none of the above has anything to do with code tests.

w3rv

3152. Re: "enhanced" SSB ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 16:41:44 UTC
From: railroad sccannerman <krackers11@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ea2ce5e@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 65339
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b7sepm$j1t$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Bo yawns" <boyawns@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:3ea1a3ab@snipnews.snip.net...
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:b7rq3g$17r$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > It is when you take twelve to twenty KHZ of AF and force it into your
> > > microphone input stage of the transmitter, which is designed to pass
> > > aproximately 300 to 3000 cycles.
> > >
> > > Adjust your carrier frequency of the transmitter to enable more 'LOW'
> > tones.
> > >
> > > Then listen to the results on the air.
> > >
> > > Can you say too wide?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > I think I'm startin to get it. Tell me, is this "mode" what most of
> > your KP4 and XE2 type stations seem to always run...?
> >
> >
>
> No, in their case there is NO attempt at enhancing their audio. They
just
> want to run everything to the right, processor on, and scream into the
mike.
> They all use those 'banana' style mics, most of them 12 inches long.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

ROTFLMAO !!!!!!!!!!!!
```

3153. Re: "enhanced" SSB ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 16:44:13 UTC
From: railroad sccannerman <krackers11@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ea2ce60@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 65340
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"L L O Y D D A V I E S" <firebottle@n0vfp.cm> wrote in message
news:3ea22a6d_2@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com...
> "Floyd Davidson" <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message
> news:873ckd96v3.fld@barrow.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
> > >"Bo yawns" <boyawns@yahoo.com> wrote:
> > >>
> > >> I think I'm startin to get it. Tell me, is this "mode" what most of
> > >> your KP4 and XE2 type stations seem to always run...?
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> > >No, in their case there is NO attempt at enhancing their audio. They
> just
> > >want to run everything to the right, processor on, and scream into the
> mike.
> > >They all use those 'banana' style mics, most of them 12 inches long.
> >
> > Your racism is noted.
> >
>
> Now, now Floyd, dont lose a nights sleep over it, will you?

he wont, he's probably the type of guy that parks his vfo on 14313 all
day long to play "frequency cop", and everyone still laughs
at him. ;)

3154. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 18:44:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdnav10.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 65341

On Sun, 20 Apr 2003 08:19:55 -0400, Jack wrote:

>> > If the regs have changed to permit a commander to issue ham
>> > operating permission, so be it (I think that would be a bad
>> > move if it was so).
>> >
>> > We will see.
>>
>> . . . keep us posted.

And if my source realizes that this "fly on the wall" has
caught them with the hand in the cookie jar, we may never get
a reply, no matter how "insignificant" the cookie. I do not
consider proper "by the book" license issuance procedure as
"insignificant" but then again I'm a pro in that business so
what do I know, right, "Jack"?

> The George W. Bush haters are down to grasping
>at straws and looking for gold at the end of rainbows.

I cannot talk for others, but although I do not respect an
awful lot of things that Our Prezident and his bag-carrier the
Attorney General have done and want to do to the American
public, there is a vast difference between disrepect and hate.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

3155. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 18:56:48 UTC
From: Ray Early <none@noneearlyanon.com>
Message-ID: <b7uqg0hfk0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 65342

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hdnav10.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Sun, 20 Apr 2003 08:19:55 -0400, Jack wrote:
>
> >> > If the regs have changed to permit a commander to issue ham
> >> > operating permission, so be it (I think that would be a bad
> >> > move if it was so).
> >> >
> >> > We will see.
> >>
> >> . . . keep us posted.
>
> And if my source realizes that this "fly on the wall" has
> caught them with the hand in the cookie jar, we may never get
> a reply, no matter how "insignificant" the cookie. I do not
> consider proper "by the book" license issuance procedure as
> "insignificant" but then again I'm a pro in that business so
> what do I know, right, "Jack"?
>
> > The George W. Bush haters are down to grasping
> >at straws and looking for gold at the end of rainbows.
>
> I cannot talk for others, but although I do not respect an
> awful lot of things that Our Prezident and his bag-carrier the
> Attorney General have done and want to do to the American
> public, there is a vast difference between disrepect and hate.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>

I heard our military guys operating from Iraq on
20 meters today. They gave out their operating sked
and described the unusual conditions they are operating
out of. They've even had some qsl cards made up.

Ray

3156. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 19:04:18 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EA2EF32.3080105@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 65343

WA8ULX wrote:
>>Coming from you it would be very difficult to determine the truth.
>
>
> REALLY
>
>
>>I still agree with the other poster, you probably paid some cber
>>$250 to take the test for you.
>
>
> Since thats probably how you got your "No-Code Tech- CBplusser License" you
> probably think thats the Norm.

Hate to disappoint you brucieboy, but I sat in front of an FCC
examiner at the FCC field office for my Advance class ticket.

3157. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 22:12:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304201412.23daeff5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65344

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA181CE.D5602581@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.
>
> He could have operated and just stated that his commander gave him
> verbal permission...but he didn't.
>
> Dave K8MN

But you said that you asked for permission and it was denied.

3158. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 22:19:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304201419.23ee3389@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65345

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA18089.68A200CB@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA088A4.B011F968@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA00DCE.6709A863@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdi8aza.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > > > > > > On 16 Apr 2003 18:56:22 -0700, Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >> I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
> > > > > > > >> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
> > > > > > > >> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
> > > > > > > >> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
> > > > > > > >> to standing procedures binding upon the military.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >It's nice to see an amateur atempting to squash the spirit of amateur radio.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >Probably an attorney.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > One of the better communications attornies around if I say so
> > > > > > > myself. Rule compliance is my specialty and I've been on the
> > > > > > > prosecution side as well as the defense side.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > If I gotta play by the book, ev'one gotta play by the book.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Phil, if you wanna play at all, you've got to get yourself in the game.
> > > > >
> > > > On the face of it, your comment was the usual, silly Brian Burke stuff.
> > > > The more I thought it about it, the more I saw some logic in it. To
> > > > extend your idea, if Len Anderson wants to play, he has to get in the
> > > > game.
> > > >
> > > That's what you've been saying all along.
> > >
> > > Why is it bad when I adopt that theology?
> > >
> > I didn't say it was bad. You only thought that because of your poor
> > reading comprehension. I think it was good and I'm glad that you're the

> > > one who wrote it. I'm afraid though that you've aroused the ire of your
> > > mentor.
> >
> > Then you agree that Phil needs to get into the game before he can have
> > a valid opinion on the subject?
>
> Sure I do. Further, I think he's already in the game.

You think Phil's in the service and you think he's deployed to Iraq?
You might want to check with him on that.

> > And I don't think Phil considers himself my mentor.
>
> I don't consider Phil as your mentor either. Phil is a rational man.
> Your mentor is the non-participant in amateur radio who frequently posts
> here.

Then you need to make yourself clear.

> > > > > > Go enlist, then volunteer for Iraq.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Why would Phil do that?
> >
> > > > > So he could properly frame the written permission required by deployed
> > > > > amateurs. Sure would be nice for those deployed commanders and
> > > > > amateurs to have some professional legal advice, instead of a bunch of
> > > > > armchair warriors and codester lawyers.
> > > >
> > > > Seems to me that in past applicable situations, most have figured it out
> > > > without the assistance of an attorney. You, for example, seem to be the
> > > > only guy in Somalia who had trouble with the concept.
> > >
> > > Dave, don't just blow, blow harder. You'll need to do a bit of
> > > research before anyone with at least half a brain would buy into that.
> > >
> > > Name all the "guys" in Somalia.
> > > Name all the "guys" in Somalia that were amateur radio operators.
> > > Name all of those "guys" in Somalia that were amateur radio operators
> > > and obtained permission to operate.
> > >
> > > And you've left out all the "gals" that were sent as well.
> >
> > I didn't have the impression that everyone in Somalia wanted to operate
> > an amateur radio station. Those who didn't operate on the ham bands had
> > no problem. Those who operated legally had written permission. Then
> > there's you.

Dave, I had no trouble. I operated legally.

3159. Re: "enhanced" SSB ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 22:32:22 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7v749$p0a$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65346
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message
news:873ckd96v3.fld@barrow.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
> >"Bo yawns" <boyawns@yahoo.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> I think I'm startin to get it. Tell me, is this "mode" what most of
> >> your KP4 and XE2 type stations seem to always run...?
> >>
> >>
> >
> >No, in their case there is NO attempt at enhancing their audio. They
just
> >want to run everything to the right, processor on, and scream into the
mike.
> >They all use those 'banana' style mics, most of them 12 inches long.
>
> Your racism is noted.
>
> --
> Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
> Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

Tell me dear Floyd....how does my saying the TRUTH indicate racism? Please help me, as I have just signed up to the Bill and Hillary school of political correctness.

Dan/W4NTI

3160. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 22:35:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304201435.21afa293@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65347

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030419150108.18863.00000363@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
> >Date: 4/19/2003 9:00 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <87y9268u5b.fld@barrow.com>
>
> >Steve's comments on International Law, and the idea that
> >deposing Hussein and liberating Iraq somehow is inconsistent
> >with allowing recreational use of amateur radio by troops,
> >indicates a bit of extreme naivete.
>
> As usual, Floyd, you've got it screwed up.
>
> I said that we went to Iraq to depose Saddam Hussein. We did that.
>
> The PRESIDENT has stated that that, along with our seach for WMD, was our
> mission. He has repeatedly stated that Iraqis should govern Iraq, and has made
> it clear that Iraqis shall retain sovereignty.
>
> There's nothing naieve about that. Those are facts.
>
> I agree that a bit of "recreational radio operating" is not going to hurt
> anyone. My assertion was simply that if we are perceived as usurping this
> authority, however benign, it will be "evidence" that we do not intend to limit
> ourselves to the missions we insisted were our goals when we started this.
>
> Do you suggest that we "signal" the Iraqis (and world opinion) that we
> have no intention of honoring our stated goals?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, you forgot to say where our troops are supposed to go to apply
for permission to operate in Iraq.

3161. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 22:42:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304201442.4871b750@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65348

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA183A4.C7C0891C@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9F8E69.FBEFBDB1@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9CC8CC.364D78AF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:3E9C984F.C703F3F8@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > "Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> > > > > > > > 2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> > > > > > > > League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> > > > > > > > British military personnel
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
> > > > > > > > officer.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > "There is precedent for this," Mills said, citing an operation during
> > > > > > > > the 1991 Gulf War. "These operators will need written authorization to
> > > > > > > > operate from their commanding officers
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I'm sitting here grinning from ear to ear. All of this, of course,
> > > > > > > > reminds me of lengthy tale of an alleged operation from Somalia.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Not trying to be a smart alec here...but...since there is no actual
> > > > > > > government....and the only authority seems to be the US Military....I see no
> > > > > > > particular problem if the ham in question has a valid FCC license and the
> > > > > > > commander gives him the authority. Isnt the CO the defacto licensing
> > > > > > > authority in this case???
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That's the usual case, Dan. In N0IMD's case, he didn't think it
> > > > > > important to have the permission in writing for operating from Somalia.
> > > > > > He says he operated on a verbal OK.
> > > >
> > > > In K8MN's case, he said that no military commander can authorize any
> > > > amateur radio activity. Just ask him if he said that. He will

> > > > confirm it.
> > >
> > > Here you go, Brian. These quotes might jog your memory about what took
> > > place.
> > >
> > > From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > > Subject: Re: DSP vs human decoding of OOK CW
> > > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > Date: 2002-08-01 11:42:56 PST
> > >
> > > "Is it a lame assertion if your operation doesn't count toward DXCC and
> > > the "authority" granting you permission to operate had no right to do
> > > so? Surely you knew that as a self-proclaimed moral and ethical man
> > > that your actions were neither moral nor ethical."
> > >
> > >
> > > From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > > Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
> > > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > Date: 2002-08-03 06:20:14 PST
> > >
> > > "No, I say that a commander might grant authorization which is not his
> > > to grant. I say that higher-ups might not approve of such
> > > authorization. I say that the DXCC desk might not credit such operation.
> > > What has the DXCC desk said about your operation from Somalia? Have you
> > > found if it counts or not?"
> > >
> > > From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > > Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
> > > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > Date: 2002-08-09 22:05:19 PST
> > >
> > > "Ah Ah, Brian. I've questioned whether your commander had the authority
> > > to do so. I've also asked if you obtained "written permission". So
> > > far, you've just played dodge ball with the question. I've repeatedly
> > > asked if your operation was accepted for DXCC credit."
> > >
> > Yes, yes, Dave. This was all after I had to educate -you- on what was
> > and is still posted on the ARRL web site, the very same people that
> > have you grinning from ear to ear now. You might like to refresh you
> > memory with a quick visit.
> >
> > Somalia:
> > http://www.remote.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/io/recip-info_p.html#t5
>
> Your mistake, then as now is, to assume that every detail about
> operating from T5 was in the couple of lines from the ARRL web site.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, it wasn't my mistake. I knew nothing about about what might
have been on the ARRL web site in December 1992. However, -You- knew
nothing about what was on the ARRL website until I showed you in 2002.

3162. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 22:49:48 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304201449.18821ac8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65349

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA17E5D.B781EA9A@earthlink.net>...

> She doesn't argue about being a bubble head anymore either.
>
> Dave K8MN

I didn't realize that Kim has pulled Navy sub duty.

3163. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 23:00:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030420190020.19055.00000299@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 65350

>Hate to disappoint you brucieboy, but I sat in front of an FCC
>examiner at the FCC field office for my Advance class ticket.

Yea sure you did. You may have been in an FCC Office, but probably for some CB violation. You are not smart enough to have an Advanced

3164. Re: "enhanced" SSB ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-20 23:01:39 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030420190139.19055.00000300@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 65351

>Please
>help me, as I have just signed up to the Bill and Hillary school of
>political correctness.
>
>Dan/W4NT

Dan Please tell me thats a lie.

3165. Re: "enhanced" SSB ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 01:50:04 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b7vimt$3pk$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65352

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030420190139.19055.00000300@mb-m17.aol.com...
> >Please
> >help me, as I have just signed up to the Bill and Hillary school of
> >political correctness.
> >
> >Dan/W4NT
>
> Dan Please tell me thats a lie.

ROFLMAO!!!! Of course not.

Dan/W4NTI

3166. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 02:16:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA354D2.28616C52@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65353

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA181CE.D5602581@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.
> >
> > He could have operated and just stated that his commander gave him
> > verbal permission...but he didn't.

>
> But you said that you asked for permission and it was denied.

...and?

Dave K8MN

3167. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 02:22:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA355AE.9FE825E9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65354

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA18089.68A200CB@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA088A4.B011F968@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA00DCE.6709A863@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdi8aza.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > > > > > > > On 16 Apr 2003 18:56:22 -0700, Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >> I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
> > > > > > > > >> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
> > > > > > > > >> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
> > > > > > > > >> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
> > > > > > > > >> to standing procedures binding upon the military.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >It's nice to see an amateur atempting to squash the spirit of amateur
radio.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >Probably an attorney.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > One of the better communications attornies around if I say so
> > > > > > > > myself. Rule compliance is my specialty and I've been on the
> > > > > > > > prosecution side as well as the defense side.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > If I gotta play by the book, ev'one gotta play by the book.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Phil, if you wanna play at all, you've got to get yourself in the game.
> > > > > >
> > > > > On the face of it, your comment was the usual, silly Brian Burke stuff.
> > > > > The more I thought it about it, the more I saw some logic in it. To
> > > > > extend your idea, if Len Anderson wants to play, he has to get in the
> > > > > game.
> > > > >
> > > > That's what you've been saying all along.
> > > > >

> > > > > Why is it bad when I adopt that theology?
> > > >
> > > > I didn't say it was bad. You only thought that because of your poor
> > > > reading comprehension. I think it was good and I'm glad that you're the
> > > > one who wrote it. I'm afraid though that you've aroused the ire of your
> > > > mentor.
> > >
> > > Then you agree that Phil needs to get into the game before he can have
> > > a valid opinion on the subject?
> >
> > Sure I do. Further, I think he's already in the game.
>
> You think Phil's in the service and you think he's deployed to Iraq?
> You might want to check with him on that.

I don't think he's in the military or in Iraq.

> > > And I don't think Phil considers himself my mentor.
> >
> > I don't consider Phil as your mentor either. Phil is a rational man.
> > Your mentor is the non-participant in amateur radio who frequently posts
> > here.
>
> Then you need to make yourself clear.

I did. You needed clarification due to your reading comprehension
difficulty.

> > > > > > > Go enlist, then volunteer for Iraq.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Why would Phil do that?
> > >
> > > > > > So he could properly frame the written permission required by deployed
> > > > > > amateurs. Sure would be nice for those deployed commanders and
> > > > > > amateurs to have some professional legal advice, instead of a bunch of
> > > > > > armchair warriors and codester lawyers.
> > > > >
> > > > > Seems to me that in past applicable situations, most have figured it out
> > > > > without the assistance of an attorney. You, for example, seem to be the
> > > > > only guy in Somalia who had trouble with the concept.
> > > >
> > > > Dave, don't just blow, blow harder. You'll need to do a bit of
> > > > research before anyone with at least half a brain would buy into that.
> > > >
> > > > Name all the "guys" in Somalia.
> > > > Name all the "guys" in Somalia that were amateur radio operators.
> > > > Name all of those "guys" in Somalia that were amateur radio operators
> > > > and obtained permission to operate.
> > > >
> > > > And you've left out all the "gals" that were sent as well.
> > >

> > I didn't have the impression that everyone in Somalia wanted to operate
> > an amateur radio station. Those who didn't operate on the ham bands had
> > no problem. Those who operated legally had written permission. Then
> > there's you.
>
> Dave, I had no trouble. I operated legally.

So you say. No one has stepped up to confirm the tale of your alleged operation.

Dave K8MN

3168. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 02:25:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA3568F.982906ED@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65355

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > Somalia:
> > > http://www.remote.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/io/recip-info_p.html#t5
> >
> > Your mistake, then as now is, to assume that every detail about
> > operating from T5 was in the couple of lines from the ARRL web site.

> Dave, it wasn't my mistake. I knew nothing about about what might
> have been on the ARRL web site in December 1992. However, -You- knew
> nothing about what was on the ARRL website until I showed you in 2002.

Of course you'll have something to offer as proof of your last
statement. It'll likely take the form of the proof of your alleged
operation from T5.

Dave K8MN

3169. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 02:30:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EA357A0.497273A1@att.net>
Source record: 65356

Brian wrote:

> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA181CE.D5602581@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.
> >
> > He could have operated and just stated that his commander gave him
> > verbal permission...but he didn't.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> But you said that you asked for permission and it was denied.

Yeah, and your T5 story has a strong stench to it. You claim your life
and that of your entire unit was in jeopardy during the whole operation
yet your military commander gave your verbal permission to operate
{somebody's}hobby equipment in a recreational radio service.

Sorry, that story just doesn't land on it's feet. Any military commander
worth his bars wouldn't do any such thing until hostilities were well past
both for the personnel involved and the entire surrounding region.
Since our Somalia operation was always quite small and
we left with the rear guard protecting our retreat, no such time ever came
for the relatively tiny contingent. Something smells. Care to explain?

3170. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 02:32:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA358AE.1DB292B3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65357

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030419084611.18842.00000177@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy
> Stalker, air ace) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>Date: 4/19/2003 1:12 AM Central Daylight Time
> >>Message-id: <20030419021211.18769.00000062@mb-m14.aol.com>
> > >
> > >>International Morse Code has no provision for syllabic languages
> > >> which are primary in Asia and the Middle East and some parts
> > >> of Africa.
> > >
> > > The standardized communications language is English. (ITU and ICAO
> > >refer)
>
> Try to stay on focus, astigmatic amateur.
>
> This is NOT a forum for the INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION
> ORGANIZATION.
>
> It is NOT a forum for flying or the SPOKEN language used in
> international air traffic control.
>
> SPOKEN LANGUAGES do not use or "refer" to on-off keying
> coding of International Morse Code.
>
I'd like to hear more of your yarns of "syllabic languages", Len.

Dave K8MN

3171. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 02:52:21 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EA35CE5.4030401@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 65361

WA8ULX wrote:
>>Hate to disappoint you brucieboy, but I sat in front of an FCC
>>examiner at the FCC field office for my Advance class ticket.
>
>
> Yea sure you did. You may have been in an FCC Office, but probably for some CB
> violation. You are not smart enough to have an Advanced

Come on over, I'll show you the license hanging on the wall above
the KWM-2 station. Unlike you I never operated cb and anyone
facing a violation won't be called to appear in an FCC office, so
you aren't so smart yourself.
Was it worth paying a cber $250 to get your extra ticket for you?

3172. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 03:09:51 UTC
From: Bobby Joe Hayseed <bjoe@hayseedsjoes.org>
Message-ID: <b7vnbs$5ft$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 65358

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message >

> I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
> to standing procedures binding upon the military.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>

Troll, Troll, Troll your boat....

3173. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 03:25:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030420232508.19008.00000558@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65359

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 4/20/2003 5:35 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304201435.21afa293@posting.google.com>

>Steve, you forgot to say where our troops are supposed to go to apply
>for permission to operate in Iraq.

You're right. I didn't. Do I need to go through the previous post letter-by-letter and re-express my concerns that if we usurp civil authority where we insist that we have no interest, we will be seen as invaders rather than liberators?

Was that too intense for you?

Steve, K4YZ

3174. Re: "enhanced" SSB ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 04:31:12 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421003112.18830.00000278@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65360

>ROFLMAO!!!! Of course not.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Wow, you had me scared Dan, I was beginning to think they had gotten to you.

3175. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 05:38:25 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b80rn9$502rd$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 65370

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3FBC1C7E7C4E3716.ADD562C6E9C93C00.D3E88E6BD256C498@lp.airnews.net...
> "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b7huij$16ad2$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> > Well, basically like I said, I support your actions as a soldier over
> there,
> > but do not necessarily agree with the idiots that sent all of the
soldiers
> > out there..... Fortunately that is a right that I have to say that, and
> > that is part of what you guys were fighting for.
> >
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF/MFR
> > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> > God Bless Our Soldiers!
> >
>
> Absolutely, Ryan. However <sigh> there are those who 1) equate that
dissent
> as non-American; 2) can't get that one can fully support our men and women
> in battle yet not support a war; and 3) actually enjoy being in the trench
> their train-of-thought is in and won't tolerate your opinion.
>

Having an opinion and a constitutional right to be able to voice that
opinion is American. Isn't what they have been fighting for, for over 200
years??

> What they don't/choose not to realize is that it is no different than
"doing
> your job" every day. I don't totally agree with everything my employer
> does, says, etc. But, I do the job I am expected to do and reckon myself
> with that. I know soldiers who wholeheartedly disagreed with some of the
> things they are/were involved with--but it was their job to be involved
with
> it and they gave every ounce of their being to it.
>
That is still defined as honor and integrity in my opinion. To do a job, to
the best of a person's abilities and scope of control to completion is
honorable to me. Whether or not they agree with their "bosses" is up to
them.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3176. Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 09:25:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421052553.18987.00000362@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65362

Issued between 01 April 2003 and 15 April 2003 were K6ASS and N8SEX.

Neither call went to an operator with those initials.

I'll bet neither of these guys is worried about his mother hearing him on
the radio using these calls, eh...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3177. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 10:21:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304210221.57871943@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65363

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030420232508.19008.00000558@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 4/20/2003 5:35 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0304201435.21afa293@posting.google.com>
>
> >Steve, you forgot to say where our troops are supposed to go to apply
> >for permission to operate in Iraq.
>
> You're right. I didn't.

Correct.

Do I need to go through the previous post
> letter-by-letter and re-express my concerns that if we usurp civil authority
> where we insist that we have no interest, we will be seen as invaders rather
> than liberators?

No. You need to tell American and Allied troops where to go to get
licensed. State the address and department where they should apply
to. A point of Contact would be nice.

> Was that too intense for you?

You're too intense for me.

3178. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 10:23:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304210223.429898bd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65364

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030419234455.19043.00000284@mb-m03.aol.com>...

> Let's change tack and give the old guy a break, Dan. He's lonely, he's
> dying and he's missed out on many opportunities in life and his impending
> mortality has hit him.
>
> It's natural to lash out like that...Like a dog who nips at his master's
> hand after being hit by a car as his master tries to comfort him. Only this
> old dog speaks English.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, I hadn't heard that he was dying. What from?

3179. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 10:25:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421062550.08129.00000152@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65365

In article <20030420070438.19041.00000279@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 20 Apr 2003 11:04:38 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>Date: 4/19/2003 11:34 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030420003406.18769.00000152@mb-m13.aol.com>
>
>>Where have I ever stated that I am an "expert" at anything? Produce
>>the post. I don't think you can.
>
> You're certainly not going to hold your breath waiting on THAT, are you,
>Jim...?!?!
>
Of course not! But when someone keeps demanding "references", they can reasonably be expected to provide some of their own, right?

>>No, you inferred that. I did not imply it. Where have I ever claimed to be
>>an expert at anything? Produce the post. Back up your claims. I don't think
>>you can.
>
> He seems to like to "infer" a lot in order to have some "point" to
>make...He has a real hard time just accepting what's in black and white.

Which is why I ask for (not DEMAND) an actual post, not an interpretation.

Besides, any interested party can just go to google and do a search by certain words and author. So it should be a simple task to find the post - if it exists. Which I very much doubt.
>
>>Let's see: 25 repetitions of the same expletive deleted in a single post.
>>Must be a new record.
>
> A new record LOW for an alleged professional trying to express himself,
>I'd say.

Which tells you something.
>
>>Now here's a few for you, Len.
>>
>>Tell us about your actual experience with Morse code radio operation. Not
>>what the Army did, or what you've seen others do, or a long diatribe about

how
>>old the mode is, the theory behind it, the history, yada yada yada. Just tell
us
>>your personal experience actually using the mode.

I do recall a claim to having built a decoder. Nothing else.
>>
>>Also explain to us how your experience in NON-amateur radio somehow makes
>>you more knowledgeable about what's best for the amateur radio service than
>>those who have experience in amateur radio.
>>
>>Finally, produce the post where I claim to be an "expert" on any subject.
>>
>>Then we'll see who the
>>
>>[expletive deleted]
>>
>>artist really is.
>
> Indeed.
>
Well, there you have it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3180. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 10:28:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304210228.144b9aaf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65366

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030419152118.18971.00000439@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 4/19/2003 8:25 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0304190525.12a7c5@posting.google.com>
> >
>
> >OK, they went there and deposed the Saddam regime as ordered. Now
> >some of our boys want to play radio. Where do they apply for
> >licensing?
> >
> >State the Address of the Ministry of Communications, a point of
> >contact, and what the fees are.
>
> I would love to answer that question, Brian. I really would. But I am
> only surmsing that there are potential political ramifications if we go about
> the business of "issuing radio authorizations" for something that is clearly a
> civil action.
>
> Personally, if I hear any of our guys/gals operating /YI, I'm gonna give
> em a shot...Sure likely that there won't be a bunch of IN's on the air any time
> soon.

So you'll engage in radio activity that you believe our troops
shouldn't be engaged in?

3181. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 10:43:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304210243.54574beb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65367

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA08AF9.38BB2099@earthlink.net>...

> > You said that a commander could not grant permission to operate
> > amateur radio under any circumstance.
>
> Where's that quote, Brian?

Dunno.

> > Now you say that he has to put it in writing.
>
> I've said all along that you needed it in writing. Are you still having
> trouble with the concept?

No. You didn't.

> > Why would he put it in writing if you say he could not grant it?
>
> See the above request for a quote.

> > > > Your first pass at it
> > > > claimed a commander had no authority to authorize anything to do with
> > > > amateur radio.
> > >
> > > You continue to have difficulty with reading comprehension. You
> > > overlook the key word "if". I questioned your "commander's" authority
> > > to issue such permission, especially when he doesn't issue it writing.
> >
> > Why would you question a commander's authority? Oh, forgot. You were
> > in Vietnam.
>
> As stated previously, the permission may not have been his to give. You
> may not have gone high enough in the command chain.

How high is high enough? Please let the UCMJ be your guide.

> > > I still question it.
> >
> > Marvy. Take it up with GW, the Joint Chiefs, and the Judge Advocate.
>
> None of them alleged permission for amateur radio operation from
> Somalia. You did. I'm taking it up with you.

They are responsible for the rules in effect. You don't like the
rules.

> > > You seem to think that the term "commander" means
> > > anybody anywhere up the chain of command from you.
> >
> > Obviously not. These and other misconceptions you have about the
> > military in general, and the Air Force in particular are staggering
> > considering that you once served in the Air Force. Oh, forgot. You
> > were in Vietnam.
>
> You seem to be the only fellow "staggered".

You, like Steve, see a commander behind every pair of bars.

> > I don't see it that
> > > way. You haven't offered what position your "commander" occupied.
> >
> > He occupied a command position.
>
> That's a non-answer.

See what I mean? There is no answer which will satisfy you.

> > > > Keep giggling, it makes you look even more simple.
> > >
> > > I'm not the one left holding the the empty bag of alleged T5
> > > permissions.
> >
> > You have a full bag of T5 permissions? Wow!!! Who granted them?
>
> You might qualify for a disability for that reading comprehension
> difficulty.

You'll get over it. Or you won't.

> > Amateur radio operation was one of the few enjoyable things about
> > serving in Somalia. I don't regret any part of it.
>
> That has been apparent. That doesn't prove that your operation was a
> legal one.

There is no answer which will satisfy you.

> > > > Better yet, why
> > > > not go work some more Frenchmen (out of band) on 6M?
> > >
> > > I was never out of band when working French stations on 6m from
> > > Tanzania. These days, I'm not even hearing any Frenchmen.
> >
> > Those frenchmen were out of band. Another Frenchman here confirmed it
> > in a post directly to you, and which you replied to, and which I
> > reposted due to your loss of memory. Later, Ferguson confirmed it
> > with a post from the French telecommunications website, so it wasn't
> > just heresay.
>
> As indicated to you in quite a number of previous posts, I'm not

> responsible for the actions of French hams. I'm only responsible for
> operating my station in accordance with the regs of the country in which
> I reside.

You're responsible for replying to out of band frenchmen calling you
on 6M.

> > You said that you would keep operating regardless, couldn't be
> > concerned with knowing anything about another country's regulations.
> > You didn't mind helping others violote regulations as long as you were
> > on frequency.
>
> No help from me was required. Each station who keys a transmitter is
> responsible for his own actions. "I couldn't help calling that P5 on
> 14.110 because he enticed me with his presence" isn't an excuse.

Your replying to them, even after being told that they were out of
band is where it was under your control. You chose to make the
contacts.

> > > Did you do any studying on those questions about your alleged T5
> > > operation posed to you by N2EY and me?
> >
> > Those were some pretty hard questions, most of which had been answered
> > prior to the latest iteration of Jim and you asking them.
>
> ...not by you, they've not been answered.
>
> > You guys really do need to work on your reading comprehension.
>
> You've evolved into a being who delivers a simultaneous straight line
> and punch line.

There is no answer which will satisfy you.

3182. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 10:49:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304210249.1420b33a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65368

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA3568F.982906ED@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > Somalia:
> > > > http://www.remote.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/io/recip-info_p.html#t5
> > >
> > > Your mistake, then as now is, to assume that every detail about
> > > operating from T5 was in the couple of lines from the ARRL web site.
>
> > Dave, it wasn't my mistake. I knew nothing about about what might
> > have been on the ARRL web site in December 1992. However, -You- knew
> > nothing about what was on the ARRL website until I showed you in 2002.
>
> Of course you'll have something to offer as proof of your last
> statement. It'll likely take the form of the proof of your alleged
> operation from T5.
>
> Dave K8MN

There is no answer which will satisfy you.

3183. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 11:19:17 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b80k3h$cd9$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65369

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> Issued between 01 April 2003 and 15 April 2003 were K6ASS and N8SEX.
>
> Neither call went to an operator with those initials.
>
> I'll bet neither of these guys is worried about his mother hearing him on
> the radio using these calls, eh...?!?!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I don't get it. Why don't you go YZ yourself, you elitist motherYZer!
What the YZ gives you the right to call someone else's suffix obscene?
YZ *that* noise. If those calls are good enough for the Federal
Communi-YZ'n-cations Commission, that's YZ'n good enough for me.

73 Corry K4DOH

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/

"Guess what? I got a fever - and the only prescription is more cowbell."
- Christopher Walken on SNL

3184. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 13:59:40 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421095940.02146.00000300@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65371

>I'll show you the license hanging on the wall above
>the KWM-2 station.

Pictures dont count. Is that your Dream Station, keep dreaming maybe one of these days you will be able to afford 1.

>Unlike you I never operated cb

Yea right, you probably still do.

>Was it worth paying a cber $250 to get your extra ticket for you

Wouldnt know, is that what you did?

3185. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 14:27:36 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421102736.18950.00000185@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 65375

>Difference is the spectrum I want to use is public property

Yea I know, all you want is a FREE HANDOUT.

3186. ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 14:38:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EA4026D.9050608@psu.edu>
Source record: 65378

An amateur I know caught an ad for the ARS on a Pittsburgh television station over the weekend. I didn't see it, and am relaying what he told me.

The ad was about a young lady who is shaken out of sleep in the middle of the night by the rumbling of an earthquake. She immediately grabs her HT, which is located on the nightstand beside her bed, and starts calling. He didn't get all the details, as just like the Spanish inquisition, he wasn't expecting an ad for the ARS.

According to the gentleman, the commercial was well done and a very decent advertisement for the ARS.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3187. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 15:11:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EA40A34.8010308@psu.edu>
Source record: 65380

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>
>
>>I think everyone should pass the the tests in life that we are given.
>>Let's take another of my hobbies, Ice Hockey. If someone wants to be on
>>my team, they need to know how to skate.
>
>
> Tests are useful if they are relevant. Learning how to skate is relaevant to
> learning hockey. Learning Morse code is not relavant to radio, including
> amateur radio.

If I see a test, I take it. It appears that if you see a test, you
passively avoid it if you think it is too hard or irrevelent.

That's too bad. Too many people think that way, and all they end up
with is a litany of excuses for not getting anywhere.

It certainly IS much easier to generate excuses for not doing something
than it is to just buckle down and do something.

>
>>My skills are just not good enough. I deal
>>with it though, and don't think the people playing in the NHL are
>>selfish. Rather, I admire them instead of resent and envy them.
>
>
> I certainly don't admire them learning a skill of little use.
>
> I resent Morse coders blocking the license class and taking over the hobby.

Then you get to sit there with your resentment. Too bad. I bet you
might have something to offer the hobby if you tried, but you just want
to resent things.

> I don't envy Morse coders at all. I have tested for realtime encoding
> abilities. I know I can do it. I don't want to waste my time learning the whole
> Morse code encoding scheme.

Take the total time you have spent posting to rrap. You almost
certainly have spent more time on that than you would learning Morse Code.

>
>>I enjoy the little challenges like learning Morse code while having a
>>problem that hinders it.
>

>
> Congratulations on learning Morse code.

Thanks. The trouble it took has been paid back tenfold or more by the
enjoyment I get from the hobby.

>>Things that are just handed to us are seldom
>>appreciated. Of course in America these days, everything is owed to us.
>
>
> That argument would be useful if a USEFUL skill was tested to obtain a benefit.
>
> When such a non-useful skill is a barrier to a higher license class, something
> is very wrong with the hobby. I would be fine with a more useful practical
> skill or a more difficult written test, so the license class is not "just
> handed to us".

You don't know Morse Code, yet you "know" it isn't a useful skill.

You aren't on HF, yet you still know Morse isn't a useful skill?

It very much is a useful skill. Perhaps if you passed the test and got
your ticket, you might find it is a useful skill, or at least you could
then decry it as useless with some authority.

Finally, even if it wasn't such a useful skill, it's part of the test.
Don't wanna learn it? fine, then don't. Enjoy what you don't get by
refusing to learn it.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3188. Re: "enhanced" SSB ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 15:30:40 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b812ph$7e4$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65381

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030421003112.18830.00000278@mb-m24.aol.com...
> >ROFLMAO!!!! Of course not.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Wow, you had me scared Dan, I was beginning to think they had gotten to
you.

Not a chance...not a chance.

Dan/W4NTI

3189. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 15:35:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EA40F93.137DB5F0@att.net>
Source record: 65382

Vito wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > The prime purpose of the tests is not to limit the number of hams.
> >
>
> That's the *only* thing you said I disagree with. Commercial licenses
> used to be "radiotelephone" and "radiotelegraph". Passing a code test to
> get a radiotelegraph license was entirely reasonable. Having to do so to
> get a radiotelephone license would not have been, nor did FCC require
> it. Not even 5 WPM.
>

Since a ham radio license (excluding Tech of course) authorizes operation
on radiotelegraphy, as a large part of ham radio today,
why wouldn't a test of radiotelegraphy ability be in order?
No one requires a ham do use any mode, nor to even own any gear or get on
the air at all. Otherwise in the past there would have had to be parallel
licensing
systemsone with code and one without.
This was once a serious proposal which was
dropped by FCC, evidently as too costly of their resources and unneeded since
they knew that historicallyanyone who wanted to become a ham would find it
within
their reach if they really wanted to do so. Seems the barrier of code was mostly

a phenomena described by your posts above. Many with far more serious
physical poroblems have made it. Mental barriers can be worse than physical.

>
> A code test before being allowed to operate in the CW bands would be
> equally reasonable. However, to require Morse proficiency before being
> allowed to use the voice bands has ever had only one purpose: to keep
> out the dreaded CBrs. You may not feel that way but ULX's derogatory
> referrals to "CBplussers" sadly reflects the more prevalent attitude.

As for keeping CBers out, that wasn't the idea at all, despite all you've read
here,
some of which I wrote. I've helped so many CBers become licensed hams I
couldn't begin to name them, as a longtime VE and before that in giving Novice
exams.
The idea as far as I was concerned was to keep out CB/freebanders who couldn't
care less about learning and just wanted to memorize the tests and who also
couldn't care less about causing all the trouble they could cause.
THAT was indeed an issue, and AFAIC still is. FCC couldn't care less at this

point.

3190. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 15:37:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EA41000.E7FE43EB@att.net>
Source record: 65383

Vito wrote:

> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > Are all you 'hearing handicapped' individuals also blind? Or can not feel
> > with ones fingers? Try blinking lights and finger sense.
>
> Why? Why Morse at all? Why not something useful like tap code? Again, by
> that logic, you should share my diabetes and my neighbors cancer.

Vito if you believe that Morse is useless and tap code is useful that
really illustrates the depth of your lack of knoweldge on the subject.

3191. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 16:06:30 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304210806.19fb8712@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65384

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030421052553.18987.00000362@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> Issued between 01 April 2003 and 15 April 2003 were

[actual calls deleted]
>
> Neither call went to an operator with those initials.

...two more steps closer to extinction?
>
> I'll bet neither of these guys is worried about his mother hearing him on
> the radio using these calls, eh...?!?!

Prolly not. But perhaps we could refrain from giving them more publicity?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3192. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 16:15:40 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304210815.5d963e7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65385

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304200713.6c451ea@posting.google.com>...
> vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030418231708.19022.00000121@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> > From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
> >
> > >> Technically, Morse code is a digital mode.
> > >
> > >It's actually a digitized language .
> >
> > Morse code is NOT a language. English is a language. Morse code is an encoding
> > scheme.
> >
> > Morse code is an encoding scheme, used in the On-Off Keying (OOK) digital mode.
>
> Of course it is from the "engineering" perspective, you're quite
> correct, not even a discussion. But that's not my point. My point is
> that beyond the technical aspects of Morse, the definitions, etc.
> comes the real-world application of Morse as it's used specifically in
> ham radio and became a widely used language in the Amateur Service
> globally.
>
> There are huge differences between the purposes and usefulness of
> Morse as it is still used in ham radio and how it has been used by a
> myriad of commercial, government and military entities over the years.
> The professional users of the mode had entirely different priorities
> and missions to accomplish than hams had and still have except under
> very unusual circumstances. Hams have taken Morse in an entirely
> different direction and developed it into a particularly effective and
> affordable international language for socializing and info swapping
> amongst themselves, not for simply passing hard copy around to their
> employers and/or their military command structures as was the case in
> the professional Morse days. Which is exactly why Morse survives today
> in volume on the ham bands but virtually nowhere else. This is also
> why the arguments we hear about Morse being "obsolete" today because,
> say, the Coast Guard no longer uses Morse is simply bogus nonsense.
>
> As far as the mechanics of the mode go, yes, it's very much a language
> but only in the hands of those experienced in it's use. Cutting to the
> quick here Morse goes in the ears of the users and comes out of the
> mind as a flow of words, phrases and thoughts, not as just streaming
> dots and dashes. Therefore Morse is just as legitimately a language as
> is any other language. The only differerence between Morse and the
> spoken languages is the manner in which it is processed in the mind.

> To those who don't have the ability to use Morse of course it's only
> another indecipherable encoding scheme, not so different from RTTY in
> this respect. This is why those non-users of Morse who diss the mode
> are the same flavor of nit-wits who bitch about French when they can't
> speak a word of French. Or any of the plethora of variations on the
> theme we've seen posted here by the clueless.
>
> By the way none of the above has anything to do with code tests.
>
> w3rv

Beautiful, just beautiful. Clearly says in a few paragraphs what some of us have been trying to say for years. Can I quote the above?

Only thing I could even try to add is a comparison to ASL and other sign languages used by the deaf (and some non-deaf folks). At a basic level, fingerspelling could be considered an "encoding scheme" for the alphabet and numbers, while the word signs could be considered an "encoding scheme" for common words. But ASL and other sign languages are much more than encoding schemes.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3193. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 16:22:37 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304210822.394e8bd7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65386

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304181516.72d2bc90@posting.google.com>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0304180825.25d5028e@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304180255.47558d1@posting.google.com>...
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9F868F.E926046@earthlink.net>...

(big snip of old stuff)

> > > Len states that he was stationed in Japan, and Huffy calls him a REMF.
> >
> > Brian,
> >
> > Who is "Huffy"?

Well? Is "Huffy" meant to be Dave, K8MN?
> >
> > I've read Dave's posts, looked back through this thread, and even
> > searched Google, but I cannot find the post where Dave calls Len an
> > "REMF".

I did find a post where Hans called Len an REMF, but no post where
Dave called anyone an REMF.
> >
> > Could you point us to it, please?

Well?
> >
> > > Huffy then makes claims that he is/was a warrior, but cannot
> > > reference any of it.
> >
> > Can not or will not?
>
> Jim, please don't quote "REMF" as it isn't polite.

It's not? Then why did you use it in your post?

Brian, in this thread it appears that you're the first person to use
the term "REMF". You claim that someone called "Huffy" called Len an
REMF. But you cannot point us to the post where that was done, nor
explain who "Huffy" is.

Fascinating.

3194. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 16:59:40 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA4237C.1B2D91C5@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65372

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >I simply resent having had to copy Morse by hand to do
> >these things then have people with good ears tell me how easy it is.
>
> Yea I know what you mean. I want Millions of dollars, and I resent these fools
> that tell me I have to work for it, what a bunch of BS. Im a nice guy why cant
> someone just give me a Million.

Difference is the spectrum I want to use is public property and working
for $$$ implies some worthwhile service to your employer.

3195. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:05:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421130512.19078.00000390@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65387

>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>From: Unclaimed Mysteries k4doh@mindspring.com
>Date: 4/21/2003 6:19 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <b80k3h$cd9$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>

>I don't get it. Why don't you go YZ yourself, you elitist motherYZer!

Corry, Corry, CORRY!

Don't go "Lennie" on us, OK? If you don't agree, just say so. You don't have to act like Lennie to get your point across.

>What the YZ gives you the right to call someone else's suffix obscene?

Did I say they were obscene? No, I did not. They are, however, at the very least, embarrassing.

>If those calls are good enough for the Federal
>Communi-YZ'n-cations Commission, that's YZ'n good enough for me.

If you're satisfied with the least-common denominator, that's your business, Corry.

Now..Are we over our temper tantrum?

73

Steve, K4YZ

3196. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:06:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421130632.19078.00000391@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65388

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 4/21/2003 5:21 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304210221.57871943@posting.google.com>

>You're too intense for me.

No doubt Dagwood Bumstead is too intense for you.

Steve

3197. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:07:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421130729.19078.00000392@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65389

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 4/21/2003 5:23 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304210223.429898bd@posting.google.com>

>Steve, I hadn't heard that he was dying. What from?

I didn't tell you?

Steve

3198. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:09:15 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304210909.18baec65@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65390

Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA42B8C.AEBAF4EF@crosslink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > The prime purpose of the tests is not to limit the number of hams.
> >
>
> That's the *only* thing you said I disagree with.

Well, then we have a point of disagreement.

From where I sit, it seems that the prime purpose of the license tests
is to insure that hams have the appropiate knowledge and skills to be
amateur radio operators.

> Commercial licenses
> used to be "radiotelephone" and "radiotelegraph". Passing a code test to
> get a radiotelegraph license was entirely reasonable. Having to do so to
> get a radiotelephone license would not have been, nor did FCC require
> it. Not even 5 WPM.

Different situation entirely. Commercial operator licenses covered a
wide variety of radio services, such as radar, broadcasting, public
safety, etc. And they were only operator licenses - none of them
authorized the holder to have a station.
>
> A code test before being allowed to operate in the CW bands would be
> equally reasonable.

OK, let's go down that path a bit. CW/Morse is allowed on all amateur
frequencies except 219-220 MHz, so the "CW bands" could logically be
considered to be all amateur bands except 219-220 MHz.

> However, to require Morse proficiency before being
> allowed to use the voice bands has ever had only one purpose: to keep
> out the dreaded CBrs.

I can see where some folks might think that way. But here are some
more considerations:

- The only Morse test left is 5 wpm, and 5 wpm isn't "proficiency" by
any stretch of the word. 5 wpm is "basic skill". Been that way since
April of 2000 for everyone, and since 1990 for anyone with a
documentable disability.

- Keeping out those who won't follow the rules (not necessarily cbers)
is not the same thing as limiting the number of hams.

- Almost all FCC enforcement actions involving amateur radio operating violations involve amateurs using voice modes. Most of these are not technical in nature (poor signal quality, spurious emissions, etc.) but rather involve jamming, obscenity/profanity, failure to ID, repeater coordination, etc. These are all "cockpit trouble" issues, totally under the control of the operators involved. While code testing does not guarantee these violations won't happen, they sure are rare among hams USING code and other digital modes.

- The dropping of the code test from the Technician class license requirement in 1991 and the restructuring of 2000 did not result in a massive wave of growth. Compare the growth in US amateur radio from 1991 to the present to the growth in an equal period before 1991. So the code test has not been very effective in limiting the number of hams, because when it was reduced and/or eliminated, the growth trend did not change much. Heck, in the 3 years since restructuring, US ham radio has grown by about 11,000. And that was after both code and written testing were reduced.

> You may not feel that way but ULX's derogatory
> referrals to "CBplussers" sadly reflects the more prevalent attitude.

I don't think his attitude is very prevalent. In my experience, very very few hams, regardless of license class or time licensed, have such negative attitudes.

--

I'll toss one other idea out for your consideration, Vito:

Seems to me that one of the biggest headaches FCC has in the area of noncommercial radio is the issue of freebanders and those who abuse cb.

FCC enforcement of these problems is hampered by the need to locate and identify the violators, as well as to develop evidence to warrant a search. IOW the FCC can't just knock on anyone's door and demand to check for an illegal radio installation.

OTOH, when someone applies for an amateur license, they give FCC all sorts of info about themselves and also agree to allow FCC folks to inspect their stations at any reasonable time AND whenever the station is in operation. FCC CAN knock on a ham's door and demand to inspect the ham's station. Much less work for FCC to check out a ham's QTH than that of an unlicensed freebander.

So maybe, just maybe, FCC wants to make amateur radio licenses easier to get so as to fight the freeband problem. If FCC could get all of the freebanders licensed as hams, enforcement would be much easier.

Note that FCC has recently sent out warning notices to several hams suspected of operation around 26 MHz.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3199. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:09:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421130929.19078.00000393@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65391

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 4/21/2003 5:28 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304210228.144b9aaf@posting.google.com>

>So you'll engage in radio activity that you believe our troops
>shouldn't be engaged in?

Brain, it's a shame you try to engage in a conversation for the purpose of being argumentative rather than discussing a concept...But then you ARE "Son of Lennie", so what could I expect...?!?!

Steve

3200. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:14:20 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA426EC.D58052E@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65373

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> My ex had a 70% hearing loss in each ear, severe ringing in the ears (I
> can't spell the technical term either), and could not wear hearing aids. He
> passed the 5 words per minute by adjusting the pitch so it was very
> different from the ringing and adjusting the volume so it was loud enough to
> drown out the ringing. Of course I could not stay in the same room unless
> he was wearing headphones to practice.

Me too, maybe worse. That luxury wasn't allowed when I passed my novice
5 WPM. In those days, Morse was sent from a machine in the front of a
classroom full of testees. Worse, while local ham could administer
novice tests, one had to go to an FCC office or a few hamfests to take
more advanced tests. That meant I had to drive to Norfolk or DC, stay in
a hotel, take a day off work, then drive home. Really sucked.

73, K3DWW

3201. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:15:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421131500.19078.00000394@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65392

>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 4/21/2003 5:25 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030421062550.08129.00000152@mb-m01.aol.com>

>>>Tell us about your actual experience with Morse code radio operation. Not
>>>what the Army did, or what you've seen others do, or a long diatribe about
>how
>>>old the mode is, the theory behind it, the history, yada yada yada. Just
>tell
>us
>>>your personal experience actually using the mode.
>
>I do recall a claim to having built a decoder. Nothing else.

To eavesdrop on us, no doubt, to see if we are talking about him on the
radio! Matter of fact, let's fire up on the low end of one band and do EXACTLY
that! I'll call in the black helicopters and park the "carpet cleaning" truck
across from his house, too!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3202. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:19:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421131902.18769.00000191@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 65393

In article <b7smim$kd4$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Take a 'chill pill' before you hurt yourself.

Sorry, I can't take that ride. Morsemen have taken too many
"chill pills" and have become brain dead to both logic and
the wishes of the majority of amateur radio hobbyists.

I have NO desire to become one with the morseodists. :-)

3203. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:19:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421131903.18769.00000192@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 65395

In article <b7smfo$a8q$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>And all that means you are qualified to bitch and moan about CW in ham
>radio? Its to late to tell you to get a life....but give it a
>try...please.

Dan, I have a very nice life. I'm retired with a comfortable income,
am married to my high school sweetheart, served the Army of
the United States honorably during a wartime, and have worked in
and with radio-electronics for over 50 years.

I am far more "qualified" to evaluate modulations/modes for radio
communication than you could possibly imagine. I've been paid
fairly well to do just that and have never received any negative
comments on that while working regular (and some irregular)
hours.

However, once I entered into an amateur radio newsgroup, I've
encountered any number of oxymoronic ignorant "experts" who've
touted on-off keying codings as being the ultimate achievement in
amateur radio. They have all the appearance and trappings of
morse code cultists, militant cultists who seek to keep US law
fixed for their little minority group's personal wishes.

I DO hope you attended Easter services at the Great Temple of
Morse in your community.

3204. Re: Article in World RadioI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:19:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421131904.18769.00000194@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 65394

In article <b7sff4phq1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>You sure enjoy making all sorts of assumptions dont you 'Len over 21'. Did
>I spell ASS right for you?

"ASS" is the acronym for the "Amatur SchutzStaffel," a bund
of militant Prussian-inspired morse worshippers seeking to
convert the entire amateur radio world to their standards of life
by being arrogant, argumentative, antagonistic, and generally
nasty.

Did you just join that bund or have you been a long-time
member?

3205. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:19:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421131904.18769.00000193@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 65396

In article <20030419193944.18821.00000083@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Let's do a thought-experiment, folks. Suppose I did have a patent, or several.
>How would Len respond to that information? Would he say something like "That's
>nice, Jim, I'm happy for ya"? Would the existence of a patent, or several,
cause
>him to stop the name-calling, insults, etc.?
>
>Or would Len pick the patent(s) apart, criticizing my role in them, what they
>did, how they applied to "radio-electronics"? If they were assigned, and/or
>had co-inventors, what would Len say about who they were assigned to and the
>co-inventors?
>
>Somehow I don't think Len would be very complimentary. Does anyone have a
>different opinion?

Somehow I think that Jimmie Miccolis got all upset by not being revered as a sterling radio guru ne god. Poor baby. :-)

[Paul, it's not the British coming this time, just some amateur from Pennsylvania, no relation to the kite-flyer]

Oh, my, ego-wounded profiler Miccolis really DOES have a need to be stroked, admired, worshipped for all his self-perceived greatness. Failure to do so results in some of the above character assassination attempts quoted above. He perceives himself as perfect as any radio god and unhesitatingly attacks any mere mortal who says the least thing negative about his divine intellect...and then irritates all readers about his terrible message wounds of the past, grinding out massive missives of pedantic prose attempting to misdirect everything to his line of thought, away from the negatives to him but severely attacking the character and person of his critics.

That is amateur radio "leadership" for you. Do as he says and okay. Cross the poor baby and the character assassination of his critics goes on for years. :-)

Remember, none of you others have any "need to know" what he is doing or what his experience was...he needs only to say undetailed ambiguous statements to be Absolutely Right Without Question!

3206. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:19:27 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA4281F.2C357F5E@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65374

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> With all due respect Vito...you should have checked it out a bit longer. I
> have NO PROBLEM finding interesting QSOs on CW on a DAILY basis.
>
I agree and may try again when I retire. At the time (circa 1980) I was
too busy fighting 'gaitors.

73 and tnx fr the reminder.

3207. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:20:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421132000.19078.00000396@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65397

>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 4/21/2003 11:15 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0304210815.5d963e7

W3RV says:

>> To those who don't have the ability to use Morse of course it's only
>> another indecipherable encoding scheme, not so different from RTTY in
>> this respect. This is why those non-users of Morse who diss the mode
>> are the same flavor of nit-wits who bitch about French when they can't
>> speak a word of French. Or any of the plethora of variations on the
>> theme we've seen posted here by the clueless.
>>
>> By the way none of the above has anything to do with code tests.

To which N2EY responded:

>Beautiful, just beautiful. Clearly says in a few paragraphs what some
>of us have been trying to say for years. Can I quote the above?
>
>Only thing I could even try to add is a comparison to ASL and other
>sign languages used by the deaf (and some non-deaf folks). At a basic
>level, fingerspelling could be considered an "encoding scheme" for the
>alphabet and numbers, while the word signs could be considered an
>"encoding scheme" for common words. But ASL and other sign languages
>are much more than encoding schemes.

Ditto, BK...well said!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3208. Ham Radio's Most wanted - New Ham Award!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:20:34 UTC
From: L L O Y D D A V I E S <firebottle@n0vfp.cm>
Message-ID: <3ea42477_2@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 65398
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Do you know that person on 20 and 75 meters, that does his best to make his mark on the world? Is he not getting the recognition he deserves? Well, here is an upcoming award for him/her/it!

Nominate your favorite ham radio op for the "Ham Radio's most wanted"!

This award give the proper recognition for outstanding QRM'ing! Wheather the QRMing be for 75 and 20 meters, 30 meter CW or 2 meter repeaters, this is the one!

We will take things for, but not limited to:

Wide SSB
Music
Starting bulletins services on top of QSO's
no call signs
roger beeps
just plain being annoying!

people from the past and Present are welcome!

e-mail your nominations to lloyd_vfp@msn.com

You have till the monday before Dayton Hamvention. I will announce via newsgroup post who the winners are, at high noon on Friday of the Dayton Hamvention.

The winner gets a certificate, sutiable for framing in his shack.

--
Lloyd/N0VFP
"Finest No-Coder to key up a handie talkie"
Ft-817, ATS 909

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3209. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:34:04 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA42B8C.AEBAF4EF@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65376

N2EY wrote:
>
> The prime purpose of the tests is not to limit the number of hams.
>

That's the *only* thing you said I disagree with. Commercial licenses used to be "radiotelephone" and "radiotelegraph". Passing a code test to get a radiotelegraph license was entirely reasonable. Having to do so to get a radiotelephone license would not have been, nor did FCC require it. Not even 5 WPM.

A code test before being allowed to operate in the CW bands would be equally reasonable. However, to require Morse proficiency before being allowed to use the voice bands has ever had only one purpose: to keep out the dreaded CBrs. You may not feel that way but ULX's derogatory referrals to "CBplussers" sadly reflects the more prevalent attitude.

73, K3DWW

3210. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:38:39 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA42C9F.B1F3727C@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65377

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> Are all you 'hearing handicapped' individuals also blind? Or can not feel
> with ones fingers? Try blinking lights and finger sense.

Why? Why Morse at all? Why not something useful like tap code? Again, by
that logic, you should share my diabetes and my neighbors cancer.

K3DWW

3211. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:48:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421134842.18882.00000526@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65399

>You may not feel that way but ULX's derogatory
>referrals to "CBplussers" sadly reflects the more prevalent attitude.
>
>73, K3DWW

Did I hurt your Silly Little LIEEEBERAL fellings to BAD.

3212. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:50:49 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA42F79.3CCFED6E@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65379

Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> > By that logic everybody should share our hearing loss and my diabetes
> > and we should all have cancer.
>
> I don't know where you get that as my logic, Vito. My point is that in
> the card game of life, we are all dealt different hands. We have to work
> with what we have. It took me over six months to learn Morse code well
> enough to pass the test that some people here say can be learned in
> weekend. Should I have just given up because they are so much better
> than me? Thing one is they aren't better, thing two is I wanted the
> ticket, so I learned Morse Code. Simple.

So did I. Difference is, I don't think everybody else should have to
suffer thru it just because we did. That's not whining, that's being
unselfish.

>
> >> Too many whiners these days!
> >
> > Naw, too many selfish people who think that everybody should suffer
> > every injustice and misery they did.
>
> Let's take another of my hobbies, Ice Hockey. If someone wants to be on
> my team, they need to know how to skate. ...

But skating ability is essential to hockey, Morse is not essential to
radio communications, it isn't even very useful. Fun maybe, useful - no.

73, K3DWW

3213. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 17:51:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421135121.18882.00000527@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65400

>Why? Why Morse at all?

So we can keep you and your kind out

3214. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 18:29:14 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b81d9r$cq0$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65401

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>>From: Unclaimed Mysteries k4doh@mindspring.com
>>Date: 4/21/2003 6:19 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <b80k3h$cd9$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
>
>
>>I don't get it. Why don't you go YZ yourself, you elitist motherYZer!
>
>
> Corry, Corry, CORRY!
>

I appreciate the attention to the spelling at least. I used to complain about my name to my parents. One day when I was about 13 or so, they sat me down and solemnly told me how close they came to naming me Fitzhugh Lee. I sat in stunned silence. A multitude of alternate realities flashed through my mind, all ending up with me getting the ever-loving YZ kicked out of me at school. I never complained again.

> Don't go "Lennie" on us, OK? If you don't agree, just say so. You don't
> have to act like Lennie to get your point across.
>

I think I have much better material than Lennie.

>
>>What the YZ gives you the right to call someone else's suffix obscene?
>
>
> Did I say they were obscene? No, I did not. They are, however, at the
> very least, embarrassing.
>

Actually I *agree* that they are distracting. But suggestive, distracting, even embarrassing call signs spit out of the FCC computer is not the most pressing issue in ham radio. No one cares anymore that I bought a vanity call a few years ago honoring the Simpsons.

At least no one cares enough. (sniff, sniff)

>
>>If those calls are good enough for the Federal
>>Communi-YZ'n-cations Commission, that's YZ'n good enough for me.
>
>

> If you're satisfied with the least-common denominator, that's your
> business, Corry.
>

I'm all about the LCD. That's where the fun is. Oh, wait, you said
L*C*D. Was that an insult?

> Now..Are we over our temper tantrum?
>

"Moth crystals are getting more out life than you are." -M' O'Donoghue

73 Corry K4DOH
--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/

3215. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 19:15:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421151537.18769.00000096@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65404

In article <20030421130512.19078.00000390@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>>From: Unclaimed Mysteries k4doh@mindspring.com
>>Date: 4/21/2003 6:19 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <b80k3h$cd9$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
>
>>I don't get it. Why don't you go YZ yourself, you elitist motherYZer!
>
> Corry, Corry, CORRY!
>
> Don't go "Lennie" on us, OK? If you don't agree, just say so. You
>don't
>have to act like Lennie to get your point across.
>
>>What the YZ gives you the right to call someone else's suffix obscene?
>
> Did I say they were obscene? No, I did not. They are, however, at the
>very least, embarrassing.
>
>>If those calls are good enough for the Federal
>>Communi-YZ'n-cations Commission, that's YZ'n good enough for me.
>
> If you're satisfied with the least-common denominator, that's your
>business, Corry.
>
> Now..Are we over our temper tantrum?

Robeson isn't.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3216. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 19:15:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421151537.18769.00000097@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65406

In article <c2356669.0304210806.19fb8712@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(Prissy Purebody) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
>news:<20030421052553.18987.00000362@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>> Issued between 01 April 2003 and 15 April 2003 were
>
>[actual calls deleted]
>>
>> Neither call went to an operator with those initials.
>
>...two more steps closer to extinction?

No, just the Amatur Schutz Staffel "in action." :-)

>> I'll bet neither of these guys is worried about his mother hearing him
on
>> the radio using these calls, eh...?!?!
>
>Prolly not. But perhaps we could refrain from giving them more publicity?

No one forced Prissy Purebody from commenting in here. :-)

You frustrated prissies neet to get lives. :-)

3217. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 19:15:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421151538.18769.00000098@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65403

In article <20030421052553.18987.00000362@mb-m16.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> Issued between 01 April 2003 and 15 April 2003 were K6ASS and N8SEX.
>
> Neither call went to an operator with those initials.
>
> I'll bet neither of these guys is worried about his mother hearing him on
>the radio using these calls, eh...?!?!

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3218. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 19:15:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421151539.18769.00000099@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65408

In article <20030421131500.19078.00000394@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>Date: 4/21/2003 5:25 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030421062550.08129.00000152@mb-m01.aol.com>
>
>>>>Tell us about your actual experience with Morse code radio operation. Not
>>>>what the Army did, or what you've seen others do, or a long diatribe about
>how
>>>>old the mode is, the theory behind it, the history, yada yada yada. Just
>>tell
>>us
>>>>your personal experience actually using the mode.
>>
>>I do recall a claim to having built a decoder. Nothing else.
>
> To eavesdrop on us, no doubt, to see if we are talking about him on the
>radio! Matter of fact, let's fire up on the low end of one band and do
EXACTLY
>that! I'll call in the black helicopters and park the "carpet cleaning" truck
>across from his house, too!

Okay, that makes EIGHT "hostile actions" for the battle hero.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, USMC kicked him out ahead of time.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3219. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 19:15:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421151541.18769.00000100@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65415

In article <20030419232547.19043.00000280@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/19/2003 3:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030419163654.18769.00000047@mb-m21.aol.com>
>
>>You are not only irrelevant far surpassing most of the
>> readers in here, but you are misleading, misdirectioning,
>> and, in general, just a self-promoting bullshit artist
>
> WHHHHHHOOOOOOOOA!
>
> Lennie! Where do you find the Levi's to hold gonads THAT big that you'd
>make such an assertion against ANY one else...?!?!
>
> You insuferable CREEP!
>
>>FEAR, boy. That gives you an element of safety to be just
>> another bullshit artist.
>
> "FEAR"...?!?! The only one in any "fear" in THIS forum is YOU, you
>meaningless punk! Your life is nearing it's end, you are less than what you
>could have been, and you realize you blew more opportunities than you took
>on.
>
> I'd be scared too!
>
> "Boy"...?!?! Lennie, WHY is it you repeatedly berate others for
>slinging
>insults, names, etc, yet YOU are the Number One insult hurler in here?
>
> Jim Miccolis has never ONCE called you "Lennie", "boy", or any other
>even
>REMOTELY insulting adjective, yet you constantly jab at him with such
>childish
>taunts.
>
> Jim Miccolis is more man in a minute than you've been your whole life,
>and
>it just kills you, doesn't it...?!?!
>
>>>You haven't answered the question, Len. "References" is an ambiguous term.

>>
>> Don't try more misdirection. You have NO authority to demand
>> answers.
>
> Oh...yeah...answering questions is "misdirection".
>
> The FACT is that Leonard H. Anderson is a snivvelling coward for whom
>truth, respect and dignity are meaningless terms. His is, most assuredly, a
>person without Honor.
>
>>>Not at all, Len. I'm simply refusing to answer your questions about my work
>>and
>>>work experience. Obviously that refusal infuriates you for some strange
>>reason.
>>
>> You are playing a fantasy role of being an all-knowing, all-
>> seeing radio god. Radio gods don't have to answer
>> questions put to them by mortals. You are a false radio god.
>>
>> Mortals don't like pretend gods.
>
> I'd say Jim hit it on the nose...Fear, anger and jealousy are just
>seething from your retorts, Lennie. If it wasn't, you'd be able to answer
>the
>questions and move on. Instead you resort to this "radio god" silliness.
>
> How pathetic. How absolutely pathetic.
>
>> You pretend to be a radio god, above mere mortals. Bullshit
>> artists do the same thing.
>
> Even more profanity from a person alleged to be a college educated
>professional. Used up all your other options, Lennie?
>
>>You should answer at least one question by a mortal to show
>> your sincerity. You don't. You dance and evade the subject and
>> try to misdirect into other topics. You are a bullshit artist.
>
> For not wanting to subject himself to the same slurs and denigrations
>you've heaped on everyone else...?!?! HARDLY!
>
>>You are trying to establish a persona of grand guru in radio
>> who knows all, sees all, has done everything, is the expert
>> judge of all others. In short a radio god. You are looking like
>> just another bullshit artist.
>
> A-N-G-E-R M-A-N-A-G-E-M-E-N-T. Lennie, this is REALLY getting you
>down.
>Maybe your correspondence course psychologist wifey can give you some
>"therapy"...?!?!

>
>>You talk about MANY MORE subjects that amateur radio.
>>
>> Google has the evidence. Live with it.
>
> So do YOU, Lennie, despite your frequent attempts to redirect others who
>are not playing by YOUR rules.
>
> Live with THAT, Your Sulkingness.
>
>>You are just a pretend god, a bullshit artist.
>
> As opposed to a REAL god such as yourself, Lennie...?!?!
>
> And MORE profanity. Guess those years in night school were wasted, eh?
>
>>You are GOOD at misleading many. Bullshit artists do that.
>
> Yes they do...Like trying to hide behind the KIA's of an Army unit you
>joined three years and 500 miles away from the battle.
>
>>I've made no "mistake" about identifying you as just another
>> wanna-be radio god bullshit artist.
>
>>You CANNOT discuss any personal experience with radio
>> communications outside amateur radio so you MASK that
>> with the imperious "you don't have the need to know."
>
> Jim has very accurately discussed a number of technical aspects of radio
>without once needing to retell the tale of how he used to do it in
>1950-something.
>
>>In short, just bullshit.
>
> Getting really boring, Your Scuminess.
>
>
>>>> LIVE WITH IT, pedantic perfectionist.
>>>
>>>Seems like you're getting angry.
>>
>> Not at all. Disgust, yes. I don't like poseurs or pretenders.
>> You are one of those with all the masking and misdirection.
>
> Nope. You're mad...blue-in-the-face, screaming, slamming your fist on
>the
>table mad that you aren't getting your way. And it's a RIOT!
>
>>>No, just common sense.
>>

>> FEAR, boy. Pretenders live in fear of being uncovered,
>> unmasked, shown what they really are.
>
> Then I can understand why you act the way YOU do in this forum, Lennie.
>
>>You are lost. You may have lost the way due to the scent of
>> all the bullshit.
>
> Even more profanity. Still unable to move forward, eh?
>
>>Bullshit misdirection. Better bullshit than most in here, but
>> bullshit just the same.
>
> Three times in two sentences.
>
>>>After all that, what rational person would tell you anything about their
>>work
>>>experience?
>>
>> ANY rational person who has the COURAGE to engage in public
>> discussion who HAS experience and doesn't disguise it by
>> ambiguous, no-detail generalities.
>
> In otherwords, someone who enjoys bragging as much as Lennie seems to
>do...
>
>>Would you like another "profile" statement on you?
>
> It wouldn't be accurate, Lennie, so why waste the bandwidth?

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3220. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 19:15:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421151546.18769.00000101@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65412

In article <d22b54c3.0304200713.6c451ea@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
>news:<20030418231708.19022.00000121@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>>
>> >> Technically, Morse code is a digital mode.
>> >
>> >It's actually a digitized language .
>>
>> Morse code is NOT a language. English is a language. Morse code is an encoding
>> scheme.
>>
>> Morse code is an encoding scheme, used in the On-Off Keying (OOK) digital mode.
>
>Of course it is from the "engineering" perspective, you're quite
>correct, not even a discussion. But that's not my point. My point is
>that beyond the technical aspects of Morse, the definitions, etc.
>comes the real-world application of Morse as it's used specifically in
>ham radio and became a widely used language in the Amateur Service
>globally.

From the COMMUNICATIONS sense, the social sense, the language sense, the political sense, as well as the "engineering sense," Kelly's commentary boils down to just ADVERTISING COPY in promotion of that mode. In the basics of this so-called "morse code" it can be stated that it is:

1. One of the simplest of communications methods possible in the primitive electrical technology of the 1840s.

2. It is organized as an encoding of the letters, numbers, and punctuation of the English language.

3. The first "morse code" was just an encoding of numbers and a few symbols. Number combinations had to be used to represent common English words and phrases. Samuel Morse's sponsor and financial backer, Alfred Vail, is the one who suggested the dot-dash encoding to encompass all letters of the English language. In either form, "morse code" is still an encoding scheme to represent written English letters, numbers, and punctuation marks.

4. It is the first widely-used "all-weather, instant" communications scheme as compared to much earlier semaphore and fire systems previously used in Europe. It was not affected by day or night, clouds or rain.

5. It was worked out on landlines, evolving close to the present form in 52 years of commercial service before the first demonstration of radio waves for communication in 1896.

6. It is solely an ON-OFF coding, easily adapted by primitive radio technology of the previous turning of the century.

7. In the first 52 years of "morse code" there is no known entirely-amateur use of the method/mode. The first half-century of "morse code" use was sponsored and developed by commercial and government users.

Critique of Kelly's statements now follows:

>There are huge differences between the purposes and usefulness of
>Morse as it is still used in ham radio and how it has been used by a
>myriad of commercial, government and military entities over the years.
>The professional users of the mode had entirely different priorities
>and missions to accomplish than hams had and still have except under
>very unusual circumstances.

That is mostly untrue. In the beginning of radio, on-off codings were the only possible means of communication for ALL users. The first use of radio was as a COMMUNICATIONS MEDIUM that was quicker and more weather-proof than all previous communicatons methods. ALL users of radio used it for communications.

The information being communicated is not related to the method, medium, or mode of "morse code."

>Hams have taken Morse in an entirely
>different direction and developed it into a particularly effective and
>affordable international language for socializing and info swapping
>amongst themselves, not for simply passing hard copy around to their
>employers and/or their military command structures as was the case in
>the professional Morse days.

Again, mostly incorrect.

As already stated, the first half century of "morse code" use was done by professional users for commercial and government communications. One of those commercial uses was "common carrier communications service" where customers could send "telegrams" to family and friends. As a part of that, telegrapher's abbreviations in communications evolved the double-number groups such as "73" and "88" which survive today.

The word "telegram" was already in the English language by the first radio-as-communications-medium was demonstrated in 1896. While telegrams had high relative cost versus ordinary mail, they

were used by family members and friends for both familial and social communications, being far faster than conventional mail. Considering the rather victorian social mores of the latter 1800s, it is doubtful that male telegraphers exchanged chit-chat with a salutation of "love and kisses" (number pair 88)

International adoption of "morse code" evolved because the basic system of wireline communications represented by the Morse-Vail Telegraphic Apparatus patent of 1844 was economically viable. That was due to the innovative unattended "relay" apparatus of a solenoid (representing the normal sounder) mechanically coupled but electrically isolated contact (representing a key). This increased the wire length range up to four times farther than a single attended-at-both-ends telegraphic circuit. It was probably the birth of the term "relay" in electrical apparatus which itself evolved into a myriad of electric and electronic applications having nothing in common with "morse code."

>Which is exactly why Morse survives today
>in volume on the ham bands but virtually nowhere else. This is also
>why the arguments we hear about Morse being "obsolete" today because,
>say, the Coast Guard no longer uses Morse is simply bogus nonsense.

Kelly is considered quite wrong there. Commercial and government users of "morse code" dropped its use for the following reasons:

1. Manual telegraphy by "morse code" was slower than telegraphy by teleprinting apparatus and subject to interruptions from normal human telegrapher needs and abilities.

2. Manual telegraphy by "morse code" was subject to human errors in communication possible at each end of a circuit that had nothing to do with what was being communicated. Known methods of "error correction" by re-sending resulted in longer times for communication, adding to (1) above.

3. Manual telegraphy by "morse code" required a telegrapher specialist at each end of the circuit. Even at 12-hour work days, a communications carrier for twenty-four hour service required two such specialists paid more than average clerical workers. Teleprinters could operate essentially unattended, needing just ordinary clerical help to enter and retrieve messages.

4. Communications security was lessened by manual telegraphy from reasons of (2) and (3) above plus requiring all security specialists to tailor their encryption-decryption methods to that which could be transmitted by "morse code." Teleprinters were adaptable to on-line encryption-decryption in many forms of such cryptography and entered communications in the 1930s. Teleprinter cryptographic apparatus could be quickly destroyed in case of capture, not true of human telegraphers or crypto-graphic specialists.

5. Mechanical telegraphy at high sustained communications times (underwater cable telegraphy) could generate transmissions at high rate but reception required different specialists and forms of recording (pen-ink traces on paper, phonography by disk impression or magnetic means). Mechanical "morse code" transmission survived only as forms of short automatic identification of certain radio transmitters.

6. While radio communication in any form was a godsend to the maritime world at the previous turn of the century, "morse code" had nothing to do it, only the fact of radio as a medium that could reach beyond the visible horizon was the key to aid. The maritime world had been inhibited to the visible horizon for rapid communication before radio. Radio liberated mariners. They could now communicate quickly to far distant locations. "Morse code" already had a half-century of existance and widespread, international use on land and trained manual telegraphers in commercial and government communications were available and into 2nd and 3rd generations. Any other on-off coding would have sufficed for communication mode but the key to maritime distress and safety communications was the medium of radio physics, not the way communications was done.

7. The maritime world itself adopted the present-day international Global Marine Distress and Safety System or GMDSS. GMDS communications does not require manual telegraphy specialists available at any time while enroute at sea. Anyone on shipboard having relatively simple training can begin GMDS transmissions which carry both a ship identification and a ship's position automatically derived from GPSS or other automatic positioning system). While that puts a damper on emotion-laden stories of heroism at sea by "sparkies," it is many magnitudes better for Safety Of Life At Sea (SOLAS). SOLAS is not kept to preserve wonderful myths alive, its purpose is to keep people alive.

>As far as the mechanics of the mode go, yes, it's very much a language
>but only in the hands of those experienced in it's use.

So is "rap" music with its "lyrics." :-)

Such boosterism for "morse code" is stretching a point beyond normal bounds of linguistic studies. "Morse code" is based on the English language, always has been. It was first devised and used in the United States, the telegraphic system spreading to inter-national wireline use by those countries whose primary language was of alphabetic form, not syllabic or ideographic..

The majority of the world's population has syllabic or ideographic primary languages. If they wish to use "morse codes" in any form, they are required to adapt to English-like alphabetic forms of phrases...or to change the on-off coding to be representative of their primary language. To them, learning "International Morse

Code" literally requires learning a new language.

International Morse Code evolved as a standard in communications due to the burgeoning of various versions of "morse code" in use by the end of World War One. So many versions made it difficult for international telegraphic communications exchanges that a standard was adopted by the CCITT. That standard was based on the most-used version of "morse code" which, at that time, was the representation of letters for English. Standards are done for overall economic considerations, not for linguistic perfection in the case of a communications tool.

It is arrogant, presumptuous, and disingenuous for those having English as a primary language to say that "morse code" is any kind of "universal language." International Morse Code is still a representation of the English language alphabet, punctuation, and "western" numeric characters. Abbreviations used by telegraphers are based on English words. While "CQ" is given semi-official status as "calling all stations" it is still based loosely on the word "seek you." To communicate "FB OM" is based on the English English "Fine Business (good, okay), Old Man (familar form of old friend)." To send "U R 599" is for the complimentary "You Are (received as) <good signal>."

In one way, the abbreviations become associations in the mind similar to a foreign language but they are most certainly of English language origin...and sometimes of local dialects... and sometimes just holdovers from long-ago days of wireline telegraphy shorthand ("R" for affirmative, "73" for best regards).

It would be safe to say "morse code" is an extreme dialect of English which also combines jargon. It isn't a separate language any more than modern-day "technospeak" using English words is a "separate language." To speak "Paralleling the collector load of Q4 with 50 puffs or more will make your highs roll off too fast," would sound like so much gibberish to someone not versed in wideband circuit design. It is perfectly understandable, comprehensible to us involved in circuit design. We don't describe it as any "separate language" or ascribe mythical qualities of anything based on past glories of circuit design...it is just jargon at work, common everyday speech in the laboratories.

>Cutting to the
>quick here Morse goes in the ears of the users and comes out of the
>mind as a flow of words, phrases and thoughts, not as just streaming
>dots and dashes. Therefore Morse is just as legitimately a language as
>is any other language. The only differerence between Morse and the
>spoken languages is the manner in which it is processed in the mind.

The extreme dialect of English with jargon that is "everyday morse code" among amateurs also has the following qualities:

1. It is totally without the normal tonalities, inflections, nuances
of regional dialect found in aural speech of humans. At best,
experienced telegraphers can infer some things about the
distant operator through rhythm, dot-dash spacings, and
some variation on abbreviations. Gender or age identification
is almost entirely missing.

2. Communications rate by "morse code" is, at most, one-fifth
the rate of spoken English for the same text, even giving
"morse code" users all the benefit of prosigns, abbreviations
and other niceties. That is by comparison of slow "morse
code" users with slow speakers...or...comparison of fast
code users with fast speakers. Code users may say that is
"inaccurate" but it is true for text beyond a brief contact
with signal quality exaggeration and "weather report."

3. There is an absence of human emotion conveyed by
"morse code." Laughter is replaced by "HI HI" which
probably accounts for the lack of normal sense of humor
found among code devotees. Expressions of grief or
sorrow must be replaced by trite phrases of emotion,
that carried over to written English by some code
devotees. It might, but not necessarily so, explain
why some alleged code "experts" become over-
emotional in written English communications.

4. "Universality" of International Morse Code is by treaty, not
based on any linguistic study towards perfection. All code
signals have the same tone frequency determined by
receiver tuning, not that of the transmitter. All signals are
monotonic. They could be generated by humans or robots
with little difference (bounded random errors of dot, dash,
and spacing can be introduced in electronic keyers to
simulate human manual sending).

5. "Morse code" requires humans to have some aptitude for
quick association of on-off monotonic sounds with
representation of written characters of a language. This
is not a universal aptitude but is a minority one existing in
about one-fifth of the population. Spoken and written
languages are comprehended much faster by nearly all in
a population.

>To those who don't have the ability to use Morse of course it's only
>another indecipherable encoding scheme, not so different from RTTY in
>this respect.

Teleprinter signals were never intended to be directly interpreted
by humans. Humans have the inherent ability to read familiar
languages and comprehend them visually at rates of 100 to 1000
words per minute equivalent rate. Teleprinters, whether on wire-
line or radio, were designed and intended to convey written
languages directly without need of "signal interpreter" specialists.

Television signals requiring MegaHertz of bandwidth were never
intended to be directly comprehended by humans...yet they are
watched regularly by all ages and genders at 30 complete
images per second.

>This is why those non-users of Morse who diss the mode
>are the same flavor of nit-wits who bitch about French when they can't
>speak a word of French. Or any of the plethora of variations on the
>theme we've seen posted here by the clueless.

The "dissing" of "morse code" users is done for their personal
arrogance and presumption of superiority in a radio hobby when
they put on their (invisible) emperor's new clothes so often. :-)

Many words of French are common in the English vocabulary.
The international spoken form of distress call is "mayday,"
a very close Anglicized version of the French word for "help
me." It is fairly easy to pronounce French, more difficult to
spell it or use it correctly. :-)

If "morse code" mode had any redeeming qualities for radio
communications, it would not have been dropped by all other
radio services or never be considered from the beginning. It
remains only in amateur radio used by a minority who
consider themselves "superior" for possessing a singular
skill of little or no use elsewhere.

>By the way none of the above has anything to do with code tests.

Neither did my critique... :-)

3221. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 19:15:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421151547.18769.00000103@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65407

In article <20030421130929.19078.00000393@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>Date: 4/21/2003 5:28 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304210228.144b9aaf@posting.google.com>
>
>>So you'll engage in radio activity that you believe our troops
>>shouldn't be engaged in?
>
> Brain, it's a shame you try to engage in a conversation for the purpose
>of
>being argumentative rather than discussing a concept...But then you ARE "Son
>of
>Lennie", so what could I expect...?!?!

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has, if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3222. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 19:15:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421151547.18769.00000102@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65409

In article <20030419225153.19043.00000279@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/19/2003 3:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030419163650.18769.00000046@mb-m21.aol.com>
>
>>> The standardized communications language is English. (ITU and ICAO
>>>refer)
>>
>> Try to stay on focus, astigmatic amateur.
>>
>> This is NOT a forum for the INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION
>> ORGANIZATION.
>
> It's "in" focus, Lennie.
>
> The subject was non-English characters being represented in
>"International" Morse Code.
>
> You, the ever spineless and idiotic court jester, try to derail that in
>favor of your own rants and ravings.
>
> Didn't work.
>
>>It is NOT a forum for flying or the SPOKEN language used in
>> international air traffic control.
>
> Sure it is. The title of the newsgroup is "rec.radio.amateur.POLICY".
>
>>SPOKEN LANGUAGES do not use or "refer" to on-off keying
>> coding of International Morse Code.
>
> English was the subject. Not the manner in which it was employed.
>
>>ITU-R S25 in its entirety does NOT reference any ICAO
>> standardization or regulation.
>
> Mutual agreement has put the same emphasis on English as the primary
>(albiet certainly not sole...) language for Amatuer Radio communications.
>
> If YOU were a licensed and experienced operator, you'd know this.
>

>>Why do you ask? Can you connect all eight synapses to form a
>> coherent thought and understand any answer?
>
> Perhaps if YOU could get YOUR synapses in the right order, you wouldn't
>have to keep a roll of toilet paper near by every time you opened your mouth,
>Lennie.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3223. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 19:15:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421151548.18769.00000104@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65402

In article <20030421130729.19078.00000392@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>Date: 4/21/2003 5:23 AM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304210223.429898bd@posting.google.com>
>
>>Steve, I hadn't heard that he was dying. What from?
>
> I didn't tell you?

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has, if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3224. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 19:15:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421151549.18769.00000105@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65405

In article <f45722ac.0304210223.429898bd@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
>news:<20030419234455.19043.00000284@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>
>> Let's change tack and give the old guy a break, Dan. He's lonely,
>he's
>> dying and he's missed out on many opportunities in life and his impending
>> mortality has hit him.
>>
>> It's natural to lash out like that...Like a dog who nips at his
master's
>> hand after being hit by a car as his master tries to comfort him. Only this
>> old dog speaks English.
>>
>> 73
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Steve, I hadn't heard that he was dying. What from?

Boredom. Waiting for the olde-tymers to outgrow their fascination
with 1930s standards and practices in an amateur hobby.

3225. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 19:15:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421151549.18769.00000106@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65410

In article <20030419234455.19043.00000284@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com
>>Date: 4/19/2003 6:36 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <b7smfo$a8q$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
>
>>Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20030419185042.08129.00000123@mb-m01.aol.com
>
> Yet another self-appreciating diatribe on non-Amateur Radio related
>stuff
>snipped.
>
>>And all that means you are qualified to bitch and moan about CW in ham
>>radio? Its to late to tell you to get a life....but give it a
>>try...please.
>
> Let's change tack and give the old guy a break, Dan. He's lonely, he's
>dying and he's missed out on many opportunities in life and his impending
>mortality has hit him.
>
> It's natural to lash out like that...Like a dog who nips at his master's
>hand after being hit by a car as his master tries to comfort him. Only this
>old dog speaks English.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

Polish.

3226. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 19:15:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421151551.18769.00000107@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65411

In article <20030419234043.19043.00000282@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/19/2003 5:50 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030419185042.08129.00000123@mb-m01.aol.com>
>
>>Before you were ever born, BOY...(SNIP)
>
> Whew! had to emphasize that one, eh, Oh Meaningless One?
>
> Got ALL THAT KNOWLEDGE, yet no one will kneel before the Enlightened One
>and bear him tribute.
>
> Now you're mad...too bad...so sad...
>
>>Let me amend that slightly. The microwave equipment...(SNIP)
>
> ...has WHAT to do with Amateur Radio policy, Lennie?
>
>>After US Army active duty I was...(SNIP)
>
> ...still a meaningless twit, only now a CIVILIAN meaningless twit.
>
>>Robeson has NO idea of what electronic engineers HAVE to
>> read and study to perform their job descriptions capably.
>
> Yes I do...More than you know. Too bad for you you had to resort to
>slurs, name-calling, threats and child like behaviour way before you ever got
>the chance to know anything about me.
>
> Your loss.
>
>>No one has to memorize any of that in detail, but one MUST
>> be able to know where to get detailed information required
>> for a task.
>
> Well zippity-doo-dah, Lennie. That's one of the most basic
>troubleshooting skills the Armed Forces taught. Am I to be impressed now, or
>is there something enlightening yet to come...?!?!
>
>>Responsibility is part of the job, responsibility proportional to
>> staff position.

>
> And that's different from any other professional job, Lennie?
>
>>The "approved" title block on drawings and documents MEANS something.
>
> Not in the "rec.radio.amateur.policy" newsgroup it doesn't, Lennie.
>
>>Despite having a second career in the medical field as a
>> caregiver, he turns around and does not care one bit about
>> acting badly on a social level in this newsgroup
>
> Sorry, Lennie. If calling a putz a putz disturbs you, then STOP ACTING
>LIKE A PUTZ!
>
>>Because of that "don't care" attitude he gets the "profiling"
>> as follows:
>>
>> No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>
> A plagiarizing putz, at that.
>
>Sheeesh.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

Polish.

3227. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 19:15:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421151552.18769.00000108@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65416

In article <20030419224433.19043.00000276@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com
>>Date: 4/19/2003 6:37 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <b7smim$kd4$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
>>
>>
>>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20030419185043.08129.00000124@mb-m01.aol.com...
>>> In article <20030419150108.18863.00000363@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>>>
>>> >>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>> >>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>>> >>Date: 4/19/2003 9:00 AM Central Daylight Time
>>> >>Message-id: <87y9268u5b.fld@barrow.com>
>>> >
>>> >>Steve's comments on International Law, and the idea that
>>> >>deposing Hussein and liberating Iraq somehow is inconsistent
>>> >>with allowing recreational use of amateur radio by troops,
>>> >>indicates a bit of extreme naivete.
>>> >
>>> > As usual, Floyd, you've got it screwed up.
>>> >
>>> > I said that we went to Iraq to depose Saddam Hussein. We did that.
>>> >
>>> > The PRESIDENT has stated that that, along with our seach for WMD,
>>was our
>>> >mission. He has repeatedly stated that Iraqis should govern Iraq, and
>>has
>>> made
>>> >it clear that Iraqis shall retain sovereignty.
>>> >
>>> > There's nothing naieve about that. Those are facts.
>>> >
>>> > I agree that a bit of "recreational radio operating" is not going to
>>hurt
>>> >anyone. My assertion was simply that if we are perceived as usurping
>>this
>>> >authority, however benign, it will be "evidence" that we do not intend to
>>> limit

>>> >ourselves to the missions we insisted were our goals when we started
>>this.
>>> >
>>> > Do you suggest that we "signal" the Iraqis (and world opinion) that
>>we
>>> >have no intention of honoring our stated goals?
>>>
>>> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>>> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
>>> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
>>> will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
>>> calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
>>> Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
>>> done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
>>> bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.
>>
>>Take a 'chill pill' before you hurt yourself.
>
> Won't do any good, Dan...the damage's been done.
>
> Plagiarized copy of N2EY's "Lennie Profile" noted.
>
> Lack of any coherent, structured, responsible comment or reply also
>noted.
>
> Typical Anderscum...Typical PUTZ.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

Polish.

3228. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 19:15:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421151554.18769.00000109@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65414

In article <c2356669.0304210909.18baec65@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3EA42B8C.AEBAF4EF@crosslink.net>...
>> N2EY wrote:
>> >
>> > The prime purpose of the tests is not to limit the number of hams.
>> >
>>
>> That's the *only* thing you said I disagree with.
>
>Well, then we have a point of disagreement.
>
>From where I sit, it seems that the prime purpose of the license tests
>is to insure that hams have the appropiate knowledge and skills to be
>amateur radio operators.

You are a Commissioner in the FCC? :-)

>> Commercial licenses
>> used to be "radiotelephone" and "radiotelegraph". Passing a code test to
>> get a radiotelegraph license was entirely reasonable. Having to do so to
>> get a radiotelephone license would not have been, nor did FCC require
>> it. Not even 5 WPM.
>
>Different situation entirely. Commercial operator licenses covered a
>wide variety of radio services, such as radar, broadcasting, public
>safety, etc. And they were only operator licenses - none of them
>authorized the holder to have a station.

Ooooo! What does Jimmie's AMATEUR license certificate say?
OPERATOR.

>> A code test before being allowed to operate in the CW bands would be
>> equally reasonable.
>
>OK, let's go down that path a bit. CW/Morse is allowed on all amateur
>frequencies except 219-220 MHz, so the "CW bands" could logically be
>considered to be all amateur bands except 219-220 MHz.

Jimmie has lots of OPERATING experience above 220? :-)

>> However, to require Morse proficiency before being
>> allowed to use the voice bands has ever had only one purpose: to keep
>> out the dreaded CBrs.

>
>I can see where some folks might think that way. But here are some
>more considerations:

Jimmie does morse, therefore morse is GOOD, useful, necessary.

Evident.

>- The only Morse test left is 5 wpm, and 5 wpm isn't "proficiency" by
>any stretch of the word. 5 wpm is "basic skill". Been that way since
>April of 2000 for everyone, and since 1990 for anyone with a
>documentable disability.

Then why keep an unncessary law cluttering up the place?

The FCC MUST do so because a morseman has spoken.

All who are not morsemen are, by implication, "disabled."

>- Keeping out those who won't follow the rules (not necessarily cbers)
>is not the same thing as limiting the number of hams.
>
>- Almost all FCC enforcement actions involving amateur radio operating
>violations involve amateurs using voice modes. Most of these are not
>technical in nature (poor signal quality, spurious emissions, etc.)
>but rather involve jamming, obscenity/profanity, failure to ID,
>repeater coordination, etc. These are all "cockpit trouble" issues,
>totally under the control of the operators involved. While code
>testing does not guarantee these violations won't happen, they sure
>are rare among hams USING code and other digital modes.
>
>- The dropping of the code test from the Technician class license
>requirement in 1991 and the restructuring of 2000 did not result in a
>massive wave of growth. Compare the growth in US amateur radio from
>1991 to the present to the growth in an equal period before 1991.

Nah...only a couple hundred thousand. Drop in the bucket.

Too low a number to see. :-)

>> You may not feel that way but ULX's derogatory
>> referrals to "CBplussers" sadly reflects the more prevalent attitude.
>
>I don't think his attitude is very prevalent. In my experience, very
>very few hams, regardless of license class or time licensed, have such
>negative attitudes.

"Hear no evil, see no evil." Brass monkey negation.

>Seems to me that one of the biggest headaches FCC has in the area of
>noncommercial radio is the issue of freebanders and those who abuse
>cb.

As a Commissioner at the FCC you have a right to send a memo
to your Chairman. Please do so.

>FCC enforcement of these problems is hampered by the need to locate
>and identify the violators, as well as to develop evidence to warrant
>a search. IOW the FCC can't just knock on anyone's door and demand to
>check for an illegal radio installation.

That will change when the Amatur Schutz Staffel has more power.

No warrant, no problem.

Show your morse keys or into the trucks with you!

>OTOH, when someone applies for an amateur license, they give FCC all
>sorts of info about themselves and also agree to allow FCC folks to
>inspect their stations at any reasonable time AND whenever the station
>is in operation. FCC CAN knock on a ham's door and demand to inspect
>the ham's station. Much less work for FCC to check out a ham's QTH
>than that of an unlicensed freebander.

Borrow Steamy Stalker's pickup truck...you know, the "carpet
cleaner" one. Park it "across their street." Have some "hostile
action" if they don't show their morse keys.

>So maybe, just maybe, FCC wants to make amateur radio licenses easier
>to get so as to fight the freeband problem. If FCC could get all of
>the freebanders licensed as hams, enforcement would be much easier.

No, no, no! Get that Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society PR
machine GOING! Have those lobbyists in DC earn their
retainers! Buttonhole, lobby, argue for the kode keyers!

>Note that FCC has recently sent out warning notices to several hams
>suspected of operation around 26 MHz.

Obviously those hams were not code tested! Shame on them!

Kill for kode! :-)

3229. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 19:15:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421151555.18769.00000110@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65413

In article <3EA40A34.8010308@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:
>> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>
>>
>>>I think everyone should pass the the tests in life that we are given.
>>>Let's take another of my hobbies, Ice Hockey. If someone wants to be on
>>>my team, they need to know how to skate.
>>
>> Tests are useful if they are relevant. Learning how to skate is relaevant to
>> learning hockey. Learning Morse code is not relavant to radio, including
>> amateur radio.
>
> If I see a test, I take it. It appears that if you see a test, you
>passively avoid it if you think it is too hard or irrevelent.

See the hoop. Mike sees the hoop. Mike jumps through hoop.

Mike happy. See Mike happy. Happy, Mike, happy.

> That's too bad. Too many people think that way, and all they end up
>with is a litany of excuses for not getting anywhere.

See the morseman. Mike sees the morseman. Mike becomes
morseman. See Mike very proud. Beep, Mike, beep.

> It certainly IS much easier to generate excuses for not doing something

>than it is to just buckle down and do something.

See buckle. Buckle is down. Mike bends, buckles down.
Buckled is Mike.

>>>My skills are just not good enough. I deal
>>>with it though, and don't think the people playing in the NHL are
>>>selfish. Rather, I admire them instead of resent and envy them.
>>
>> I certainly don't admire them learning a skill of little use.
>>
>> I resent Morse coders blocking the license class and taking over the hobby.
>
> Then you get to sit there with your resentment. Too bad. I bet you
>might have something to offer the hobby if you tried, but you just want
>to resent things.

See the sneer. Mike sneers the sneer. Mike feels good.

> > I don't envy Morse coders at all. I have tested for realtime encoding
>> abilities. I know I can do it. I don't want to waste my time learning the
>whole
>> Morse code encoding scheme.
>
> Take the total time you have spent posting to rrap. You almost
>certainly have spent more time on that than you would learning Morse Code.

See Wynsocki. Wynsocki buckles down. Buckle down,
Wynsocki, buckle down.

> You don't know Morse Code, yet you "know" it isn't a useful skill.

See rest of radio world. Mike looks. Mike not see rest of
radio world. Rest of radio world not use beeping morse.
Early radio world abandoned morse. Morsemanship not
useful skill in rest of radio world.

> You aren't on HF, yet you still know Morse isn't a useful skill?

See rest of radio world on HF. Rest of radio world dropped morse.
Rest of radio world said morse not useful. Rest of radio world on
HF still there on HF.

> It very much is a useful skill. Perhaps if you passed the test and got
>your ticket, you might find it is a useful skill, or at least you could
>then decry it as useless with some authority.

See law of radio regulations. Mike waves law papers. Obey, Mike,
obey. Do not change!

> Finally, even if it wasn't such a useful skill, it's part of the test.
>Don't wanna learn it? fine, then don't. Enjoy what you don't get by
>refusing to learn it.

See the sneer. Mike sneers. Mike happy.

3230. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 19:25:58 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421152558.19006.00000446@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 65417

(Steve
Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>> Issued between 01 April 2003 and 15 April 2003 were K6ASS and N8SEX.
>>
>> Neither call went to an operator with those initials.
>>
>> I'll bet neither of these guys is worried about his mother hearing him
>on
>>the radio using these calls, eh...?!?!

I'll bet they use Morse code call sign IDs so non-Hams would not know.

3231. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 19:27:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA44693.AD0EC8E7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65418

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030419193944.18821.00000083@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >Let's do a thought-experiment, folks. Suppose I did have a patent, or several.
> >How would Len respond to that information? Would he say something like "That's
> >nice, Jim, I'm happy for ya"? Would the existence of a patent, or several,
> cause
> >him to stop the name-calling, insults, etc.?
> >
> >Or would Len pick the patent(s) apart, criticizing my role in them, what they
> >did, how they applied to "radio-electronics"? If they were assigned, and/or
> >had co-inventors, what would Len say about who they were assigned to and the
> >co-inventors?
> >
> >Somehow I don't think Len would be very complimentary. Does anyone have a
> >different opinion?

Len doesn't disagree as evidenced by his remarks below.

> Somehow I think that Jimmie Miccolis got all upset by not being revered
> as a sterling radio guru ne god. Poor baby. :-)

I think I'll do a response in your style, Leonard.

> [Paul, it's not the British coming this time, just some amateur from
> Pennsylvania, no relation to the kite-flyer]

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor baby Anderson (or is it Amdersom?) has gone
apoplectic over lack of reverence for his years of Teletype tickling
escapades. His tail feathers are ruffled. Ruffles have ridges :-) :-)

[Byard, that's not mineral water. Some blow hard from Caiforney went and
fell in the reservoir.]

> Oh, my, ego-wounded profiler Miccolis really DOES have a need to be
> stroked, admired, worshipped for all his self-perceived greatness. Failure
> to do so results in some of the above character assassination attempts
> quoted above. He perceives himself as perfect as any radio god and
> unhesitatingly attacks any mere mortal who says the least thing
> negative about his divine intellect...and then irritates all readers about
> his terrible message wounds of the past, grinding out massive missives
> of pedantic prose attempting to misdirect everything to his line of
> thought, away from the negatives to him but severely attacking the
> character and person of his critics.

Oh deary dear. Ludicrous Lennie sees himself as superior to any mere radio AMATEUR and quite predictably takes the course of action which all of the readers could see coming. Amdersom's bile takes the form of lengthy electronic epistles, attacking both the character and person of his perceived tormentor.

> That is amateur radio "leadership" for you. Do as he says and okay.
> Cross the poor baby and the character assassination of his critics
> goes on for years. :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Is this the way a PROFESSIONAL in radio and electronics for over fifty years leads others? Your character assassination of Miccolis replaces the civil debate of the removal of the morse code TEST. Why do you do it? It can only be FEAR and EMBARRASSMENT. Not only has Amdersom not convinced readers that he is correct about removing morse testing and eliminating the licensing of mere CHILDREN in the amateur radio service in which he plays no part, his hysterogenic ramblings have earned him no respect among the readers of this newsgroup.

> Remember, none of you others have any "need to know" what he is
> doing or what his experience was...he needs only to say undetailed
> ambiguous statements to be Absolutely Right Without Question!

The poor baby is upset that no one will fill him in on the work activities of Miccolis. He reveals more of his frustration with each post. Miccolis must be immune to Anderson's venom. :-) :-)

Now go don your uniform--yes, nylon windbreaker, striped polo shirt, plaid trousers and white sneakers--and go marching off for a walk around the mall with all the other geezers with empty lives.

Herra Amdersom on pikku paskianen!

...and in that manner dost thou grate upon the literati of this newsgroup.

Dave K8MN

3232. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 20:02:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EA44E1C.A7C28AE2@att.net>
Source record: 65420

N2EY wrote:

> Fascinating.

As usual, you're much too kind. I'd tend to use another descriptive.

3233. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 20:10:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EA4500A.79D3BF92@att.net>
Source record: 65421

Dave Heil wrote:

> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <20030419193944.18821.00000083@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > writes:
> >
> > >Let's do a thought-experiment, folks. Suppose I did have a patent, or several.
> > >How would Len respond to that information? Would he say something like "That's
> > >nice, Jim, I'm happy for ya"? Would the existence of a patent, or several,
> > cause
> > >him to stop the name-calling, insults, etc.?
> > >
> > >Or would Len pick the patent(s) apart, criticizing my role in them, what they
> > >did, how they applied to "radio-electronics"? If they were assigned, and/or
> > >had co-inventors, what would Len say about who they were assigned to and the
> > >co-inventors?
> > >
> > >Somehow I don't think Len would be very complimentary. Does anyone have a
> > >different opinion?
>
> Len doesn't disagree as evidenced by his remarks below.
>
>
> > Somehow I think that Jimmie Miccolis got all upset by not being revered
> > as a sterling radio guru ne god. Poor baby. :-)
>
> I think I'll do a response in your style, Leonard.
>
> > [Paul, it's not the British coming this time, just some amateur from
> > Pennsylvania, no relation to the kite-flyer]
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor baby Anderson (or is it Amdersom?) has gone
> apoplectic over lack of reverence for his years of Teletype tickling
> escapades. His tail feathers are ruffled. Ruffles have ridges :-) :-)
>
> [Byard, that's not mineral water. Some blow hard from Caiforney went and
> fell in the reservoir.]
>
> > Oh, my, ego-wounded profiler Miccolis really DOES have a need to be
> > stroked, admired, worshipped for all his self-perceived greatness. Failure
> > to do so results in some of the above character assassination attempts
> > quoted above. He perceives himself as perfect as any radio god and
> > unhesitatingly attacks any mere mortal who says the least thing

> > negative about his divine intellect...and then irritates all readers about
> > his terrible message wounds of the past, grinding out massive missives
> > of pedantic prose attempting to misdirect everything to his line of
> > thought, away from the negatives to him but severely attacking the
> > character and person of his critics.
>
> Oh deary dear. Ludicrous Lennie sees himself as superior to any mere
> radio AMATEUR and quite predictably takes the course of action which all
> of the readers could see coming. Amdersom's bile takes the form of
> lengthy electronic epistles, attacking both the character and person of
> his perceived tormentor.
>
> > That is amateur radio "leadership" for you. Do as he says and okay.
> > Cross the poor baby and the character assassination of his critics
> > goes on for years. :-)
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Is this the way a PROFESSIONAL in radio and electronics
> for over fifty years leads others? Your character assassination of
> Miccolis replaces the civil debate of the removal of the morse code
> TEST. Why do you do it? It can only be FEAR and EMBARRASSMENT. Not
> only has Amdersom not convinced readers that he is correct about
> removing morse testing and eliminating the licensing of mere CHILDREN in
> the amateur radio service in which he plays no part, his hysterogenic
> ramblings have earned him no respect among the readers of this
> newsgroup.
>
> > Remember, none of you others have any "need to know" what he is
> > doing or what his experience was...he needs only to say undetailed
> > ambiguous statements to be Absolutely Right Without Question!
>
> The poor baby is upset that no one will fill him in on the work
> activities of Miccolis. He reveals more of his frustration with each
> post. Miccolis must be immune to Anderson's venom. :-) :-)
>
> Now go don your uniform--yes, nylon windbreaker, striped polo shirt,
> plaid trousers and white sneakers--and go marching off for a walk around
> the mall with all the other geezers with empty lives.
>
> Herra Amdersom on pikku paskianen!
>
> ...and in that manner dost thou grate upon the literati of this
> newsgroup.
>
> Dave K8MN

:-) :-) :-) If the bustard doesn't have a bloody nose by now it's panther
pi$$ that courses his veins.

3234. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 20:11:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EA4505F.660D4227@att.net>
Source record: 65422

Vshah101 wrote:

> (Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
> >> Issued between 01 April 2003 and 15 April 2003 were K6ASS and N8SEX.
> >>
> >> Neither call went to an operator with those initials.
> >>
> >> I'll bet neither of these guys is worried about his mother hearing him
> >on
> >>the radio using these calls, eh...?!?!
>
> I'll bet they use Morse code call sign IDs so non-Hams would not know.

Whatever you wagered you lost. Like TIT none has that much sense.

3235. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 20:12:25 UTC
From: L L O Y D D A V I E S <firebottle@n0vfp.cm>
Message-ID: <3ea44cbe_3@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 65423

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030421052553.18987.00000362@mb-m16.aol.com...
> Issued between 01 April 2003 and 15 April 2003 were K6ASS and N8SEX.
>
> Neither call went to an operator with those initials.
>
> I'll bet neither of these guys is worried about his mother hearing
him on
> the radio using these calls, eh...?!?!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Well Stevie boy,

Maybe you can nominate them for my new ham award!

==========
Do you know that person on 20 and 75 meters, that does his best to make his mark on the world? Is he not getting the recognition he deserves? Well, here is an upcoming award for him/her/it!

Nominate your favorite ham radio op for the "Ham Radio's most wanted"!

This award give the proper recognition for outstanding QRM'ing! Wheather the QRMing be for 75 and 20 meters, 30 meter CW or 2 meter repeaters, this is the one!

We will take things for, but not limited to:

Wide SSB
Music
Starting bulletins services on top of QSO's
no call signs
roger beeps
just plain being annoying!

people from the past and Present are welcome!

e-mail your nominations to lloyd_vfp@msn.com

You have till the monday before Dayton Hamvention. I will announce via newsgroup post who the winners are, at high noon on Friday of the Dayton Hamvention.

The winner gets a certificate, sutiable for framing in his shack.

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3236. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 20:14:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EA45119.7162FA15@att.net>
Source record: 65424

Len Over 21 wrote:

> >Steve, I hadn't heard that he was dying. What from?
>
> Boredom. Waiting for the olde-tymers to outgrow their fascination
> with 1930s standards and practices in an amateur hobby.

You might as well just go ahead and kick the bucket, Clyde, you ain't gonna last anywhere near that long anyway.

3237. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 20:19:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EA4521C.AA46C05@att.net>
Source record: 65425

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <20030421130729.19078.00000392@mb-m03.aol.com>,

(and repeatedly misused)

>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
> will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
> calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
> Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
> done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
> bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

Hmmmm, N2EY could add that paragraph to his profile of Lame Lennie
and it would fit right along with the earlier denominators.

It isn't that often you see one writing his own sorry description then attributing

its content to others. That all fits Lennie like a comfortable old shoe.

3238. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 20:32:41 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421163241.19006.00000448@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 65426

From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>If I see a test, I take it. It appears that if you see a test, you
>passively avoid it if you think it is too hard or irrevelent.
>

I have taken tests. I don't avoid tests. My good grades in <hard> rf courses show I can pass tests.

Morse code IS irrelevant. Amateur radio licensed Comm Theory Prof apparently agrees. The other rf Profs do not even have amateur radio license, not even the antenna Prof!

>Too many people think that way, and all they end up
>with is a litany of excuses for not getting anywhere.

To many people use Morse to block the real talent in the hobby.

They use an easily (but time consuming) learnable skill as some kind of proof of achievement. Even real emergency comm skills would be more useful than Morse code.

The skill has no use outside amateur radio or anywhere. Its "usefulness" is only to those that made a social agreement that "Morse code will be useful". Juggling(Morse code) is a skill - Outside of the circus(Ham radio), it has little use.

>It certainly IS much easier to generate excuses for not doing something
>than it is to just buckle down and do something.

From a small sample, I know have the ability to learn real-time encoding. Therefore, one cannot say that I cannot do Morse code. I did not make an excuse that I cannot learn it. I made a decision that the limited benefit was not worth the time to learn it.

>I bet you
>might have something to offer the hobby if you tried, but you just want
>to resent things.

Hams only are interested in their aspects. The aspects I would offer, Hams would not be interested in.

Hams like contesting, chasing DX, antennas. Hams have little in common with electronic hobbyists.

>Take the total time you have spent posting to rrap. You almost
>certainly have spent more time on that than you would learning Morse Code.

Just getting the coded license shows you wasted time learning code.

>You don't know Morse Code, yet you "know" it isn't a useful skill.
>
> You aren't on HF, yet you still know Morse isn't a useful skill?

Outside of Ham radio, Morse is not useful. Hospitals, firefighters, etc do not use Morse code. Chasing DX is not valued outside Ham radio.

Morse code is used because of a social agreement in the Ham culture that it is desirable to learn Morse code.

>Perhaps if you passed the test and got
>your ticket, you might find it is a useful skill, or at least you could
>then decry it as useless with some authority.

No, if I learned the code, I would not "decry" it. I would do everything to defend it, since I made the effort to learn it. Much like how I know I won't enjoy a Hamfest, but I try to convince that there will be something useful there.

And relative has discouraged me from going to Hamfests and told me that Hams are old, often non EE people.

>Enjoy what you don't get by
>refusing to learn it.

Its not code so much as Hams focus on contesting, antennas, chasing wallpaper, and other boring activities.

3239. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 20:34:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EA455A5.244DE485@att.net>
Source record: 65427

Len Over 21 wrote:

> You don't know Morse Code, yet you "know" it isn't a useful skill.

>
> See rest of radio world. Mike looks. Mike not see rest of
> radio world. Rest of radio world not use beeping morse.
> Early radio world abandoned morse. Morsemanship not
> useful skill in rest of radio world.
>
> > You aren't on HF, yet you still know Morse isn't a useful skill?
>
> See rest of radio world on HF. Rest of radio world dropped morse.
> Rest of radio world said morse not useful. Rest of radio world on
> HF still there on HF.

Loose Lennie is determined to give a whole new meaning to the term
Limp Node. Last decade he couldn't even spell it, now he R one.
Surely his mama, 'bout eight decades ago, was frightened by some
neighborhood ham running a spark rig. Ah, 'twas the ozone!

Clearly it's useless attempting to set him straight on the simple direct fact
that ham radio is NOT the rest of the world of radio, and never will be.
But one might draw the assumption that he already knew that, so
we can further assume that he's doing all this out of pure spite toward
any and all radio amateurs. (we can exclude Slim Burke, doesn't look much
like he's any better informed than Licenseless Lennie, his minstrations
notwithstanding, nor his intentions any more pure.)

So like a bad example of the Energizer Bunnie riding a stuck record, round and
round and round they go, they just keep going, and going, and going......

3240. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 20:35:28 UTC
From: davidlee375@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <2b933e90.0304211235.6eef42e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65428

Someone wrote:

I received this from a retired Navy buddy who lives in Alabama.

Last week, the Shelby County Alabama Legislative Delegation hosted a "Stand Up for America Rally." More than 1,200 people attended including featured speakers Chief Justice Roy Moore, Adjutant General Mark Bowen and Alabama State Auditor Beth Chapman.

Attached is a copy of Mrs. Chapman's speech, which resulted in five standing ovations, tremendous applause and an encore. It's a short read and well worth it.

Stand Up for America Rally Speech By: Beth Chapman

I'm here tonight because men and women of the United States military have given their lives for my freedom. I am not here tonight because Sheryl Crowe , Rosie O'Donnell, Martin Sheen, George Clooney, Jane Fonda or Phil Donahue, sacrificed their lives for me.

ME:
How profound and moving! As if Sheryl Crowe, George Clooney, Martin Sheen, et al., believed they were somehow responsible for her right to speak unopposed and before an adoring crowd.

I certainly don't owe my right to speak to the Sean Hannity's and the Ann Coulter's of the world as well as the conservative spin-meister's who love to demonize a whole group of people (the much maligned and hated liberals).The conservative version of political correctness would prohibit anyone's right to speak out on a war they may seem as immoral, if the right-wingers knew they could get away with it. Right now they know they cannot, so they pay lip service to free speech yippie do-dah dah.

Chapman:
If my memory serves me correctly, it was not movie stars or musicians, but the United States Military who fought on the shores of Iwo Jima, the jungles of Vietnam, and the beaches of Normandy.

Me:
How a mature adult could make such an asinine statement as above puzzles me. Does she really think anyone though otherwise? Is this the kind of nutty, self-serving rhetoric we can continue to expect from the lunatic fringe of the conservative party? Note that I am not labeling all conserva-tives as lunatic. I am labeling a select group of conservatives as such.

Chapman:
Tonight, I say we should support the President of the United States and the U.S. Military and tell the liberal,tree-hugging, Birkenstock-wearing, hippy, tie-dyed liberals...

Me:
Yes, the inevitable put downs and insults coming from a small mind that cannot argue a case intelligently but only resort to extremely popular, stock putdowns that occur frequently whenever a few of these nutcases are gathered together. She equates liberal with anti everything American and poisons the well with her childish name calling.

Message:
....to go make their movies and music and whine somewhere else.

Me:
It seems to me the whining is coming from you my dear. The whole world is against you poor, poor, conservatives, isn't it? The mean old god-hating liberals are just gosh-darned determined to wreck your little pathetic world where you gather from time to time to moan about this cruel planet and this mean, old, bad bad bad liberal country. If you don't like America the way it is, leave it. Uh, why are you still here? Oh, I see, you want to "change it" rather than leave it, right? Well, please grant those you despise the same right to try to right a preceived injustice, rather YOU agree with it or not. Jove help us if your ilk ever seized full control of this country. YOU and your conservative co-horts could oppose anything your black hearts desired but you would make certain that those hated liberals would lose their rights to protest anything you are for.

Chapman:
After all, if they lived in Iraq, they wouldn't be allowed the freedom of speech they're being given here today.

Me:
Which the conservatives, if they were honest, would rip away from the liberals in a New York minute if they had sufficent power to do so. After all, they already demonize those who protested the war, and used their god-given right to protest, even in a time of war. Demonization is the first step toward dehuminization, and the next step after that is to strip the dehumanized ones of their rights and then come the stench of the ovens. I hope it never gets that far.

Chapman:
Ironically, they would be put to death at the hands of Sadam Husssein or Osama Bin Laden.

Me:
And in the near future perhaps put to death by a majority of radical conservative myrmidons in the U.S.A. who would do it with a smile on their faces, thinking they were doing God a service?

Chapman:
I want to know how the very people who are against war because of the

loss of life, can possibly be the same people who are for abortion?

Me:
Another canard that needs to be put to rest. Not all those who protest the war are for abortion. Not all who want the woman to decide on the issue of abortion are against the war. This kind of statement does get the party faithful stirred up however and it makes nice rhetoric. I bet the crowd roared on this one.

Chapman:
They are the same people who are for animal rights but against the rights of the unborn.

Me:
Another generalization that reveals the speaker's stupidity and/or a deliberate deception on her part to elicit more applause from her adoring fold. Again, not everyone who believes a woman should decide whether to terminate her preganancy is against the war. Furthermore, those who raise their voices loudly about animal rights are a diverse lot, some with families, some chuchgoers,others even who voted for Bush in 2000. It is a fallacy to believe that all those who cry out about animal rights agree 100% in every other political or religious belief.

You would never know this by reading the biased conservative op-ed pieces and the tendentious talking heads on Radio. The speaker loves to issue all black-white statements that paint the issue as "we conservatives are all good" and "the liberals are all bad." She should try to obtain a good book on logic and learn that generalizations such as she makes makes her look very uneducated. Really, she is just another conservative wrapping herself in the flag, using it to further her own agendas and reveling in the adulations of her comrades.

Chapman:
The movie stars say they want to go to Iraq and serve as "human shields" for the Iraqis. I say let them buy a one-way ticket and go.

Me:
Even though I did not oppose the ousting of Sadaam Hussein by force, I see this statement as one of pure meanness, a cold hearted statement from one who despises those who oppose her views. I really believe this woman would be a danger to society should she ever achieve a status of power much like that of the president.

Chapman:
No one likes war. I hate war!

Me:
How nice of her to say so.

Chapman:
But the one thing I hate more is the fact that this country has been forced into war-innocent people have lost their lives- - and there but for the grace of God, it could have been my brother, my

husband, or even worse my own son.

Me:
The ubiquitous God word is used, no doubt with great effect on the audience. I have no problem with someone mentioning God, but when people begin to play games with His name by using it in speeches merely to win points or playing political football with it or for pure rhetorical it does become tiresome.

Chapman:
On December 7, 1941, there are no records of movie stars treading the blazing waters of Pearl Harbor.

Me:
Neither is there a record of right-wing talking heads and writers like Ann Coulter, Bill O'Reilly, Jack Kinsella, and many others of the same ilk treading the waters of Pearl. But I know that the conservative pundits of today would have remained safely ensconced behind their microphones and computers (typrwriters) railing against the dangerous liberals rather than standing tall and enlisting in the armed forces to fight the real enemy.

Chapman:
On September 11, 2001; there are no photos of movie stars stand ing as "human shields" against the debris and falling bodies ascending from the World Trade Center.

Me:
There are no photos of the Sean Hannity's, Ann Coulter's, Bill O'Relly's, Pat Robertson's, Jerry Falwell's, Jack Kinsella's, etc., standing there as "human shields" either. Hmmmm.

Chapman:
There were only policemen and firemen - - underpaid civil servants who gave their all with nothing expected in return.

Me:
Yes, and no thanks to conservative blowhards like this speaker, who talks the talk, but I doubt could even walk half the walk in the shoes of those brave people who died September 11, 2001.

Chapman:
When the USS Cole was bombed, there were no movie stars guarding the ship - - where were the human shields then?

Me:
Probably the same place she and the conservative talk-show hosts were-sitting on their buns mouthing off about the mean old liberals and how poorly the conservatives are being treated in this society. Why didn't one of them go over there and act as a human shield?

Chapman:
If America's movie stars want to be human shields, let them shield the gang -ridden streets of Los Angeles, or New York City, let them shield the lives

of the children of North Birmingham whose mothers lay them down to sleep on the floor each night to shelter them from stray bullets.

Me:
Well, this is brilliant! Using this profound logic, everytime someone wanted to protest a conservative presidents' war, and they wanted to offer themselves as shields, showing a willingness to die for their beliefs, they would have to justify doing so by first going to the places mentioned by the speaker above, thus rendering their goal useless. I tell you what, let the conservative talking heads put their buns where their mouth is- let them shield those areas above before they use it as a political football and rhetorical tool. The statement above is unadulterated stupidity.

Chapman:
If they want to be human shields, I say let them shield the men and women of honesty and integrity that epitomizes courage and embody the spirit of freedom by wearing the proud uniforms of the United States Military.

Me:
And this should include, again, Neil Boortz, Larry Elder,
Sean Hannity, Ann Coulter, Jack Kinsella, all conservative op-ed writers, then maybe, just maybe, I would begin to see some consistency in the requests of the conservative writers and speakers.

Chapman:
Those are the people who have earned and deserve shielding!

Me:
This is probably the only sensible statement made so far. But, if we shielded them, we would be in bad shape, wouldn't we? Our troops are the finest in the world. They don't, and will never need, shielding from the likes of us.

Chapman:
Throughout the course of history, this country has remained free, not because of movie stars and liberal activists,

Me:
And definitely not because of talk-show hosts and radical right-wing speakers like this one,

Chapman:
but because of brave men and women who hated war too. However, they lay down their lives so that we all may live in freedom. After all - "What greater love hath no man, that he lay down his life for his friend," or in this case a country.

Me:
Yes, a bible quote. This stamps the speaker as "authentic". It's getting to the point if you don't at least once quote the bible in a patriotic speech some in the audience begin to doubt your sincerity. Keep in mind the man who made this quote. He laid down his life, but took it back about 3 days later. The young men who die, providing cover for a comrade, or the

man who throws himself on a grenade, has offered far more than that. If they only could take back their lives after three days!

Chapman:
We should give our military honor and acknowledgement and not let their lives be in vain. If you want to see true human shields, walk through Arlington Cemetery. There lie human shields, heroes, and the BRAVE Americans who didn't get on television and talk about being a human shield - they were human shields.

Me:
I wonder how many right-wing talk-show hosts and op-ed writers are at Arlington? How many bellicose conservative-spouting talk-the-talk but cannot-walk-the-walk rhetoricians are there?

Chapman:
I thank God tonight for freedom - - those who bought and paid for it with their lives in the past - - those who will protect it in the present and defend it in the future.

Me:
I thank the proud men of the U.S. Military, whether Army, Navy, Air-Force or Marines. They are the ones bleeding and dying, not God. Again, she uses God as a rhetorical tool. This no doubt gets the crowd worked up in a frenzy, but I prefer to give the credit to who the credit is due.

Chapman:
America has remained silent too long! God-fearing people have remained silent too long!

Me:
Bulls@#t. For the last 30 years of my life I have heard this trite phrase hundreds, if not thousands, of times. Our radio waves are filled with christian radio stations, Sunday morning tv is an exercise in homilies and liberal bashing. The mail pouches of our mail delivery men and women bulge with religious periodicals berating evolutionists, abortionists, humanists, and they have been doing this for at least 30 years. Judging by copies of religious Journals from the 1950's it was pretty much the same. This message of urgency has been roaring since I was a little child. Revivals, Christian Rock-concerts, Pizza-Bashes at the local church are all used as evangelizing tools as well as opportunities to malign Humanism and Secularism, Evolution and Homosexuality.The above statement is simply warmed over rhetoric from an individual who had great difficulty in finding anything original to say.

Chapman:
We must lift our voices united in a humble prayer to God for guidance and the strength and courage to sustain us throughout whatever the future may hold.

Me:
Yes, the stamp of authenticity. Mention God, prayer, and you receive the "seal of approval." I wonder what God thinks of Himself being used as a

political football. I hope to ask him one day.

Chapman:
After the tragic events of Sept. 11th, my then eleven -year-old son said terrorism is a war against them and us and if you're not one of us, then you're one of them.

Me:
Hitler said this same thing to the German people when it came time to purge the party of some of its more liberal elements. This either-or bifurication is a common tool among right-wing demagogues. Hitler used it with great effect, and his references to God and Jesus Christ were interesting. He made it a crime to protest a war, namely, any war he waged. His evil war on the Jews and on the rest of Europe went virtually unopposed because he made it where you couldn't do it, even if your conscience was against it. God help this country if the ultra-conservatives ever get their way.

It would be only a matter of time before it was illegal to protest a war in process. Then, give it a couple of generations, maybe 3 or 4, and a real demagogue rises to power and unleashes an unholy war on the inhabitants of this earth. What will those whose consciences rebel at the very thought of this war do? They will be helpless to protest, or if they do, it will be at their own peril, because of wishes of the modern day right-wing fanatics. Once a war is in progress, any protest will be seen as "putting our troops in peril".

This phrase was also used by the Nazis in 1943. There was a group of anti-war protestors in Nazi-Germany, who, shortly after the fall of Stalingrad in January 1943, began printing anti-war leaflets and distributing them at the University in Munich. The group was known as the "Weisse Rose" or "White Rose". They saw Hitler as anti-Christian and his war as an unholy war. But thanks to some really handy german laws against protesting the war when a war was in progress, this was a capital offense. The "White Rose" was caught in February 1943 and its members were promptly executed. Two of them were no older than 22. And all of this because a law had been passed at one time that considered any protests in wartime as "putting troops at risk". I find it remarkable the right uses the same expressions today. Incidentally, many Germans today consider the "White Rose" members as heroes against an evil regime.

Chapman:
So in closing tonight, let us be of one accord, let us stand proud, and let us be the human shields of prayer,

Me:
More religious rhetoric. I am not against religion in the public arena, but when it is so obviously done to win brownie points with the adoring flock I cannnot help wonder if God is offended at his name being used in such a vain manner. I don't know what to make of all this ostentatious displays of religion. These people should know this doesn't make you a better christian or a better human being even. It's not what comes out

of your mouth but what emanates from your life 24-7. That is what counts most, in my opinion. Send the troops a letter of encouragement instead, or a box of goodies one can eat and share with his comrades.
They will appreciate this just as much as your prayers. If you are a good christian you don't need to be told to pray. You will do it anyway without a word being spoken.

Chapman:
encouragement and support for the President, our troops and their families and our country.

May God bless America, the land of the free, the home of the brave and the greatest country on the face of this earth!

Me:
Yes, this is the greatest country on the face of the earth. I would have no other. This country is great because men died for this precious freedom and this includes the freedom to dissent. The founding fathers were dissenters of the greatest human king and kingdom of that time. Dissent is one of the greatest freedoms we have and needs to be protected from those who want to make dissent an illegal activity, even if its only during wartime. We or our grandchildren will one day need this freedom to oppose a tyrant who would oppose his will on the world. While this isn't the case with the present adminsitration, the way to a dark, Nazi-like era in American history will be paved by the likes of this speaker in Alabama.

3241. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 20:41:49 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421164149.19057.00000271@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 65429

>Free? I paid income taxes on over $100,000 this year and I'm
>semi-retired;

How impressive NOT

>I
>passed my General back when I had to draw circuits and work equations
>and guess what: I missed one question.

Big deal, I didnt miss any from Novice to EXTRA

> What did you pay?

Well I made more than 100, but I sure didnt pay Taxes on 100.

>Is that why you are so selfish that
>you want everybody to suffer just because you had to suffer?

I didnt suffer, I enjoyed the Process, and probably learned a little in the
Process.

>that in reality you are a CBr who managed
>to learn Morse while on welfare so Uncle Charlie wouldn't confiscate
>your killerwatt linear.
>10-4 Good Buddy?

As expect you have it wrong again. Never been on Welfare, never been on CB,
never a Killerwatt linear"what ever that is", I guess its some CB Term.
'10-4 Good Buddy' Is this the way you end all of your QSOs?
Oh by the way, are you a recent graduate of one of Hillarys or Willys Classes?

3242. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 20:42:51 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EA457CB.9090107@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 65447

WA8ULX wrote:

>
> Big deal, I didnt miss any from Novice to EXTRA

Yea right, NOT!

>
>
>>What did you pay?
>
>
> Well I made more than 100, but I sure didnt pay Taxes on 100.

Yea right, NOT!

3243. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 20:45:00 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EA4584C.1040402@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 65448

Vshah101 wrote:

>
> HAM radio is boring <to me>. The rest of amateur radio can be interesting.

Could you please explain the difference between ham radio and
amateur radio?

3244. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 20:49:41 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421164941.19006.00000450@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 65430

>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>An amateur I know caught an ad for the ARS on a Pittsburgh television
>station over the weekend.

Who paid for the "ARS ad"?

>The ad was about a young lady who is shaken out of sleep in the middle
>of the night by the rumbling of an earthquake. She immediately grabs her
>HT, which is located on the nightstand beside her bed, and starts
>calling.

That HT could be very useful if there was an earthquake. Funny, I know someone that survived an earthquake. I did not hear them say "I wish I had a radio".

> he wasn't expecting an ad for the ARS.

And it went unnoticed by anyone that was not already a Ham.

>According to the gentleman, the commercial was well done and a very
>decent advertisement for the ARS.

Did he see the whole ad? Perhaps, HT emergency Comm was part of the humor in a larger ad, such as an ad for potato chips. (When you want one, even an earthquake will not stop you). Sillier ads have been done.

The ad for Rochester Hamfest SAYS "latest communications techniques", but then SHOWS Morse code keys. Morse code is not one of the latest communication techniques.

My ad idea is to have a PBS special on Hamfests. They had one on sandwiches, one on flea markets, so why not Hamfests? Hamfest is one kind of flea market.

Problem is how can they show Hams without coming across as weird, older, less fit group?

3245. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 21:08:04 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421170804.19078.00000413@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65431

>To many people use Morse to block the real talent in the hobby.
>
>

Are you talking about all the knuckle Dragging Cbplussers, that have entered Ham Radio?

> I did not make an excuse
>that I cannot learn it. I made a decision that the limited benefit was not
>worth the time to learn it.

Well then stop whinning about it.

>Just getting the coded license shows you wasted time learning code.

Yep and hes on HF and your not.

>And relative has discouraged me from going to Hamfests and told me that Hams
>are old, often non EE people.
>

Oh my GOD non EEs are Hams, why in the world would you want to waste your time getting a License than. If I was you I would run, not walk, as fast as I could from Ham Radio.

>Its not code so much as Hams focus on contesting, antennas, chasing
>wallpaper,
>and other boring activities.

Oh no, it cant be. Why would you want to waste your time with Boring Ham Radio?

3246. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 21:13:45 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421171345.19078.00000414@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65432

>Who paid for the "ARS ad"?

What do you care, it didnt come out of your pocket.

>And it went unnoticed by anyone that was not already a Ham.

And you have the facts to back this up?

>Problem is how can they show Hams without coming across as weird, older, less
>fit group?
>
>
>

I guess they could show you, typical Whinner, Dork, Lieeeberal, heck they
could even show your Tatto of Hillary and Billy Boy.

3247. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 21:16:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421171657.18755.00000191@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 65433

Let's check out a rumor:

Are WA8ULX and K4YZ brother and sister? :-)

3248. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 21:20:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421172042.18755.00000192@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 65434

In article <20030421171345.19078.00000414@mb-m03.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

> I guess they could show you, typical Whinner, Dork, Lieeeberal, heck they >could even show your Tatto of Hillary and Billy Boy.

Okay, let's verify the rumor:

Are you and K4YZ really brother and sister?

3249. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 21:20:51 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421172051.18985.00000291@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 65435

> Let's check out a rumor:
>
> Are WA8ULX and K4YZ brother and sister? :-)

Well that rumors FALSE, but the REAL QUESTION is, are you Brian LOVERS?

3250. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 21:21:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421172100.18755.00000193@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 65436

In article <20030421171345.19078.00000414@mb-m03.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

> I guess they could show you, typical Whinner, Dork, Lieeeberal, heck they >could even show your Tatto of Hillary and Billy Boy.

Okay, let's verify the rumor:

Are you and K4YZ really brother and sister?

3251. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 21:43:35 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421174335.18985.00000292@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 65437

>Okay, let's verify the rumor:

Whats a matter you affraid to admit to it.

> Are you and K4YZ really brother and sister?
>

No thats not true, but the real rumor is that you are living proof that
Monkeys and Humans have, well you know.

3252. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 22:12:51 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421181251.19006.00000451@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 65438

From (WA8ULX)

>>To many people use Morse to block the real talent in the hobby.

> Are you talking about all the knuckle Dragging Cbplussers, that have entered
>Ham Radio?
>

Of course not. You have such a limited view, you cannot see anything else but "CBplussers".Even the code loving Hams in my local clubs don't complain about CBers interfering like you do. (They do have a cult-like obcession of CBers, however).

Code can also block those that want to experiment on those freqs. Morse does not keep dummies from entering the hobby. You are a good example of that.

>>And relative has discouraged me from going to Hamfests and told me that Hams
>>are old, often non EE people.
>>
>
>Oh my GOD non EEs are Hams, why in the world would you want to waste your
>time
>getting a License than. If I was you I would run, not walk, as fast as I
>could
>from Ham Radio.

Relative has objection that Hams are weird, old - not that they are not EEs.

> Why would you want to waste your time with Boring Ham Radio?

HAM radio is boring <to me>. The rest of amateur radio can be interesting.

3253. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 22:16:24 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b81qia$4al$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65439

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030421172100.18755.00000193@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <20030421171345.19078.00000414@mb-m03.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com
> (WA8ULX) writes:
>
> > I guess they could show you, typical Whinner, Dork, Lieeeberal, heck
they
> >could even show your Tatto of Hillary and Billy Boy.
>
> Okay, let's verify the rumor:
>
> Are you and K4YZ really brother and sister?

I never would have believed it Bruce....you have 'Len the lid' tongue tied.

Dan/W4NTI

3254. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 22:21:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421182118.18878.00000607@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 65440

>(They do have a cult-like obcession of CBers,
>however).

Of course and you should hear what they say behind your back

>Code can also block those that want to experiment on those freqs.

Your right code is not required for experimenting, the License already is there . Oh I know they cant experiment on VHF and UHF, they have to have HF first. Sounds like Karls big complaint when he was whinning about lowereing the Requirment for CW.

3255. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 22:22:00 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421182200.18878.00000608@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 65441

>The rest of amateur radio can be interesting.

What portion of Ham Radio is that?

3256. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 22:23:15 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421182315.19006.00000452@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 65442

From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)

>>Who paid for the "ARS ad"?
>
>What do you care, it didnt come out of your pocket.

If the ARRL contributed to it, then my money was spent towards the ad.

>>And it went unnoticed by anyone that was not already a Ham.
>
>And you have the facts to back this up?

There are plenty of facts to back this up.

Positive publicity for Ham radio is Ham's responsibility.
Even I have (reluctantly) helped by mentioning a Hamfest to one person and loaning a copy of my ARRL handbook to another. Have you done even that? Seems like you aren't doing your part.

3257. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 22:27:22 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421182722.18878.00000609@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 65443

>I never would have believed it Bruce....you have 'Len the lid' tongue tied.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Of couse Dan, he just doesnt want to admit the Truth. I bet you he has a
Picture of Bill and Hillary over his Bed. He probably went out and bought the
same Cigars that Bill uses. The Cigars probably make him feel a STUD.

3258. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 22:32:47 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421183247.19006.00000453@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 65445

From: "L L O Y D D A V I E S" firebottle@n0vfp.cm

>Well Stevie boy,
>
>Maybe you can nominate them for my new ham award!

If using words like "putz", "creep" are included, then we should nominate K4YZ.

3259. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 22:33:02 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421183302.18878.00000610@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 65444

>If the ARRL contributed to it, then my money was spent towards the ad.
>

Well maybe you should tell ARRL not to spend your money without your approval

>There are plenty of facts to back this up.

Well then present them

>Even I have (reluctantly) helped by mentioning a Hamfest to one person and
>loaning a copy of my ARRL handbook to another. Have you done even that?

Are you serious, if a new person ask me about Ham radio I tell them not waste there time. I also explain to them that Ham Radio is nothing more than CB. That usually sends them running.

> Seems
>like you aren't doing your part.
>

And what part is that?

3260. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 22:35:15 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Dm_oa.8330$K_4.1983@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 65446

Hmmmm .... wish I had a radio. Weird. Anyone care to inform this guy just what a cell phone is? Soon as you bubble wrap something and put it in phosphorescent colors, suddenly it isn't 'geek', it's 'chick'. I remember the ice storm back in the late 90s - and cell phones were down as were telephones and power lines in a fair chunk of the North East. Seems to me that one of the amateur repeaters was set up for the police since they lost their repeater. Please go back to your padded cell and shut the door quietly.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030421164941.19006.00000450@mb-m05.aol.com...
> >From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
> >An amateur I know caught an ad for the ARS on a Pittsburgh television
> >station over the weekend.
>
> Who paid for the "ARS ad"?
>
> >The ad was about a young lady who is shaken out of sleep in the middle
> >of the night by the rumbling of an earthquake. She immediately grabs her
> >HT, which is located on the nightstand beside her bed, and starts
> >calling.
>
> That HT could be very useful if there was an earthquake. Funny, I know
someone
> that survived an earthquake. I did not hear them say "I wish I had a
radio".
>
> > he wasn't expecting an ad for the ARS.
>
> And it went unnoticed by anyone that was not already a Ham.
>
> >According to the gentleman, the commercial was well done and a very
> >decent advertisement for the ARS.
>
> Did he see the whole ad? Perhaps, HT emergency Comm was part of the humor
in a
> larger ad, such as an ad for potato chips. (When you want one, even an
> earthquake will not stop you). Sillier ads have been done.
>
> ---
> The ad for Rochester Hamfest SAYS "latest communications techniques", but

then
> SHOWS Morse code keys. Morse code is not one of the latest communication
> techniques.
>
> My ad idea is to have a PBS special on Hamfests. They had one on
sandwiches,
> one on flea markets, so why not Hamfests? Hamfest is one kind of flea
market.
>
> Problem is how can they show Hams without coming across as weird, older,
less
> fit group?
>
>
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.474 / Virus Database: 272 - Release Date: 4/18/03

3261. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 22:47:38 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA4750A.23803BF7@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65419

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >Difference is the spectrum I want to use is public property
>
> Yea I know, all you want is a FREE HANDOUT.

Free? I paid income taxes on over $100,000 this year and I'm semi-retired; and I have been paying taxes since I was 13 years old. I passed my General back when I had to draw circuits and work equations and guess what: I missed one question. What did you pay? Learned Morse too? You must be a pretty pitiful specimen if your only claim to fame is learning Morse and denigrating CBrs. Is that why you are so selfish that you want everybody to suffer just because you had to suffer?

Methinks you protest too much; that in reality you are a CBr who managed to learn Morse while on welfare so Uncle Charlie wouldn't confiscate your killerwatt linear.
10-4 Good Buddy?
K3DWW

3262. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 23:24:08 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421192408.18970.00000339@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65449

From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net

>Hmmmm .... wish I had a radio. Weird. Anyone care to inform this guy just
>what a cell phone is?

A cell phone is not an AMATEUR radio, like the ad supposedly said.

>Seems to me
>that one of the amateur repeaters was set up for the police since they lost
>their repeater.

So, how does that example advocate amateur radio?

>Please go back to your padded cell and shut the door
>quietly.
>

How would you know its padded?

3263. Re: Ham Radio's Most wanted - New Ham Award!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-21 23:46:08 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421194608.18970.00000342@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65450

From: "L L O Y D D A V I E S" firebottle@n0vfp.cm

>Nominate your favorite ham radio op for the "Ham Radio's most wanted"!
>
>This award give the proper recognition for outstanding QRM'ing! Wheather
>the QRMing be for 75 and 20 meters, 30 meter CW or 2 meter repeaters, this
>is the one!

Having such an award would not be good for amateur radio. Radio amateurs want to show amateur radio in a positive way. Listing such an award would not do that.

Also, this would damage the person "voted for". I'm not sure this type of "award" is legal. It is surely unethical.

3264. Re: Echolink - Remove your Radio Award

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 00:14:37 UTC
From: 14313 funtime <ballbags@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ea4896f@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 65501
Cross-posted to: aus.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"sandman" <sandman@sandbox.com> wrote in message
news:3ea39fc4@news.comindico.com.au...
> IRLP never had a chance as you cant throw away your Amateur Radio and use
a
> headset instead. I wonder what ramification this has on equipment
> manufacturers. What incentive do radio manufacturers have when 50% of
> those on echolink use headsets ?? Amateur Radio can pat itself on the
back
> and be proud it has a technology that makes Radio equipment obsolete and
> then the ARRL pats HIM on the back.....what a weird world we live in !

No, what a weird world you live in. It's backwards-minded
people like you, what have held this hobby back and resisted
change for YEARS. First it was CW, then it was "no-code"
now it's Echolink. Hams with mindsets resistant to change
like U are why we are not ahead in the technology game anymore.

3265. Re: Ham Radio's Most wanted - New Ham Award!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 00:28:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421202803.19079.00000368@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65502

>Having such an award would not be good for amateur radio.

Get real

>Radio amateurs want
>to show amateur radio in a positive way. Listing such an award would not do
>that.

Whats positive about Ham radio anymore?

3266. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 00:36:46 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <166F4C38A3097456.7632E638E8040EAC.4C213D75B6691012@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65505

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030421052553.18987.00000362@mb-m16.aol.com...
> Issued between 01 April 2003 and 15 April 2003 were K6ASS and N8SEX.
>
> Neither call went to an operator with those initials.
>
> I'll bet neither of these guys is worried about his mother hearing
him on
> the radio using these calls, eh...?!?!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Hmmm, why would one worry about who hears them on the air with their callsign? My dad's a ham and when I was on the air, we talked in the round table every morning and my mom would often get on and say howdy! ;) If someone's going to be embarrassed about a callsign, they either need to change it or not get it to begin with...

Kim W5TIT

3267. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 00:38:55 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <D96DF4232772A7E8.F50C050C06F35285.A7A7DE3570A407BD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65506

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030421130512.19078.00000390@mb-m03.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
> >From: Unclaimed Mysteries k4doh@mindspring.com
> >Date: 4/21/2003 6:19 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <b80k3h$cd9$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
>
> >I don't get it. Why don't you go YZ yourself, you elitist motherYZer!
>
> Corry, Corry, CORRY!
>
> Don't go "Lennie" on us, OK? If you don't agree, just say so. You
don't
> have to act like Lennie to get your point across.
>

REALLY!!! Agree with ya, Steve!

> >What the YZ gives you the right to call someone else's suffix obscene?
>
> Did I say they were obscene? No, I did not. They are, however, at
the
> very least, embarrassing.
>

Don't agree with ya, Steve...LOL ;o

> >If those calls are good enough for the Federal
> >Communi-YZ'n-cations Commission, that's YZ'n good enough for me.
>
> If you're satisfied with the least-common denominator, that's your
> business, Corry.
>
> Now..Are we over our temper tantrum?
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

Aren't temper tantrums so useless?

Kim W5TIT

3268. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 00:44:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421204401.18769.00000207@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 65503

In article <20030421171345.19078.00000414@mb-m03.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

> I guess they could show you, typical Whinner, Dork, Lieeeberal, heck they >could even show your Tatto of Hillary and Billy Boy.

Okay, let's verify the rumor:

Are you and K4YZ really brother and sister?

3269. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 00:54:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421205450.19079.00000370@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65504

>Okay, let's verify the rumor:
>
> Are you and K4YZ really brother and sister?
>

I will verify as soon as you tell the truth about the Tattoo. Another question, is the Tattoo on more than just one part of your Body? Dont be shy, just tell us, I promise No-one will laugh. Dan has even promised not to laugh. If you want, you can just go ahead and Post a picture, what ever is easiest for you.

3270. Re: Echolink - Remove your Radio Award

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 01:29:05 UTC
From: sandman <sandman@sandbox.com>
Message-ID: <3ea49ae0@news.comindico.com.au>
Source record: 65507
Cross-posted to: aus.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

14313 funtime wrote:

>

> No, what a weird world you live in. It's backwards-minded
> people like you, what have held this hobby back and resisted
> change for YEARS. First it was CW, then it was "no-code"
> now it's Echolink. Hams with mindsets resistant to change
> like U are why we are not ahead in the technology game anymore.

eh eh , now that you gave me a nice belly laugh. When there is a radio at each end, we're using the internet as a long haul medium and I have NO problems with that so you dont have to go down the path.We're amatuer RADIO operators, we like to propogate data or voice onto our allocated spectrum. ECHOlink should receive an INTERNET award for VOIP usage, whats Amateur Radio got to do with 2 headsets talking to each other ? I simply have a MAJOR issue with ECHOlink and its PC connectivity.

Go and read the threads in the ECHOlink e-group and look at the talk about PIRACY. It has a piss poor validation system, has users on it from the iLink days where there was NO validation. IRLP doesnt allow PC connectivity exactly for this reason.....can't smell the flowers yet ?

In using a PC to communicate instead, what benefit is there for yaesu, kenwood, icom, jrl, hro, gigaparts etc etc etc to stay in the amateur market. Time for them to sell PC's maybe ?

50% of echolink users use their PC's.....WHere is the spectrum in that? I thought this was Amateur Radio ? From the threads, its highly suspicios that many of them are probably not even Amateurs and here is the ARRL rewarding this behaviour....

Oh, sorry I'm backward minded...

Sandman

3271. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 01:32:49 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EA49BC1.6090606@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 65514

WA8ULX wrote:
>>Difference is the spectrum I want to use is public property
>
>
> Yea I know, all you want is a FREE HANDOUT.

The only thing you get for free nowadays are AOL cd's.

3272. Re: When is a 2N2222 transistor a cheese sandwich?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 01:38:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030421213831.18769.00000170@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 65508

In article <20030421131904.18769.00000193@mb-m13.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030419193944.18821.00000083@mb-m10.aol.com
>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:
>
>>Let's do a thought-experiment, folks. Suppose I did have a patent, or
>>several. How would Len respond to that information? Would he say
>>something like "That's nice, Jim, I'm happy for ya"? Would the existence
>>of a patent, or several, cause him to stop the name-calling, insults, etc.?
>>
>>Or would Len pick the patent(s) apart, criticizing my role in them, what
>>they did, how they applied to "radio-electronics"? If they were assigned,
>>and/or had co-inventors, what would Len say about who they were assigned
>>to and the co-inventors?
>>
>>Somehow I don't think Len would be very complimentary. Does anyone have a
>>different opinion?

It is interesting to note that nobody has expressed a dissenting opinion....
>
> Somehow I think that

(N2EY)

> got all upset by not being revered as a sterling radio guru ne god.

You're mistaken, Len.

btw, what is a "sterling radio guru ne god."

Are you one of the "Knights Who Say 'Ne'"? ;-) ;-)

> [Paul, it's not the British coming this time, just some amateur from
> Pennsylvania, no relation to the kite-flyer]

"That dog, I say, that dog reminds me of Paul Revere's ride - a little light in the belfry..." - Foghorn Leghorn ;-) ;-) ;-)
>
> Oh, my, ego-wounded profiler

(N2EY)

> really DOES have a need to be
> stroked, admired, worshipped for all his self-perceived greatness.

Nope. Not at all.

> Remember, none of you others have any "need to know" what he is
> doing or what his experience was...

Not true, Len. You're the one who doesn't have the "need to know", not everyone.

3273. Re: Echolink - Remove your Radio Award

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 02:30:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EA4A985.9020500@adelphia.net>
Source record: 65509
Cross-posted to: aus.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

14313 funtime wrote:
> "sandman" <sandman@sandbox.com> wrote in message
> news:3ea39fc4@news.comindico.com.au...
>
>>IRLP never had a chance as you cant throw away your Amateur Radio and use
>
> a
>
>>headset instead. I wonder what ramification this has on equipment
>>manufacturers. What incentive do radio manufacturers have when 50% of
>>those on echolink use headsets ?? Amateur Radio can pat itself on the
>
> back
>
>>and be proud it has a technology that makes Radio equipment obsolete and
>>then the ARRL pats HIM on the back.....what a weird world we live in !
>
>
> No, what a weird world you live in. It's backwards-minded
> people like you, what have held this hobby back and resisted
> change for YEARS. First it was CW, then it was "no-code"
> now it's Echolink. Hams with mindsets resistant to change
> like U are why we are not ahead in the technology game anymore.

Mistake #1 is thinking that Echolink is "hi-tech". If you like it,
fine, but it is pretty much a chat room with radio links. It would work
better if the whole thing was carried over the internet.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3274. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 02:43:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EA4AC8C.8050108@adelphia.net>
Source record: 65510

Vshah101 wrote:
>>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
>
>>An amateur I know caught an ad for the ARS on a Pittsburgh television
>>station over the weekend.
>
>
> Who paid for the "ARS ad"?

He thought it was the ARRL. They certainly would be the most likely
candidate

>>The ad was about a young lady who is shaken out of sleep in the middle
>>of the night by the rumbling of an earthquake. She immediately grabs her
>>HT, which is located on the nightstand beside her bed, and starts
>>calling.
>
>
> That HT could be very useful if there was an earthquake. Funny, I know someone
> that survived an earthquake. I did not hear them say "I wish I had a radio".

If a person was trapped, it might come in handy. If they were trying
to get help with telephones and cellulars out of commision, they might
think otherwise

>>he wasn't expecting an ad for the ARS.
>
>
> And it went unnoticed by anyone that was not already a Ham.

How did you know that?

>
>>According to the gentleman, the commercial was well done and a very
>>decent advertisement for the ARS.
>
>
> Did he see the whole ad? Perhaps, HT emergency Comm was part of the humor in a
> larger ad, such as an ad for potato chips. (When you want one, even an
> earthquake will not stop you). Sillier ads have been done.

Ummm, really had to dig for that one, dinchya?

> ---
> The ad for Rochester Hamfest SAYS "latest communications techniques", but then
> SHOWS Morse code keys. Morse code is not one of the latest communication

> techniques.

Hmm, I might do such a thing if I were trying to appeal to a broad
range of interests.

> My ad idea is to have a PBS special on Hamfests. They had one on sandwiches,
> one on flea markets, so why not Hamfests? Hamfest is one kind of flea market.

Nice fixation on hamfests, Vipul!

> Problem is how can they show Hams without coming across as weird, older, less
> fit group?

You probably remember my last report on the attendees at a recent fest
in my area. The only obese and probable social misfit there was the
computer salesman.

Its a pity you don't have more compassion for those who may not be as
lucky as you.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3275. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 02:54:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EA4AEF0.1040204@adelphia.net>
Source record: 65511

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>
>
>>Hmmmm .... wish I had a radio. Weird. Anyone care to inform this guy just
>>what a cell phone is?
>
>
> A cell phone is not an AMATEUR radio, like the ad supposedly said.

DId you see the ad? I posted the original and nowhere did anything I
posted or read for that matter say that! You wouldn't be fibbin' wouldya?

>
>>Seems to me
>>that one of the amateur repeaters was set up for the police since they lost
>>their repeater.
>
>
> So, how does that example advocate amateur radio?

Vipul, are you maybe lonely and like the attention you get by posting
this sort of thing? And even though it is all negative attention, it is
better than just being lonely? Otherwise I can't figure why you post
that sort of comment. I'll bet the police found it handy that they could
communicate with each other during the crisis (please don't try to
downplay that-the only thing that kept it from being a first class
disaster was that the temperatures were relatively moderate for that
time of year after the power went out)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3276. Re: internet voice gateways - taking your handheld overseas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 02:58:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EA4AFF5.3060806@adelphia.net>
Source record: 65512

g3zhi wrote:
> --
> Internet Radio Linking Project

Cut out the rf part of this, and you might just have something!

Or if you had to have an rf link, put cell phones into the system.

Ham radio without internet linking is like a fish without a banjo.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3277. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 03:09:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EA4B291.4010305@adelphia.net>
Source record: 65513

Vito wrote:
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>>>By that logic everybody should share our hearing loss and my diabetes
>>>and we should all have cancer.
>>
>> I don't know where you get that as my logic, Vito. My point is that in
>>the card game of life, we are all dealt different hands. We have to work
>>with what we have. It took me over six months to learn Morse code well
>>enough to pass the test that some people here say can be learned in
>>weekend. Should I have just given up because they are so much better
>>than me? Thing one is they aren't better, thing two is I wanted the
>>ticket, so I learned Morse Code. Simple.
>
>
> So did I. Difference is, I don't think everybody else should have to
> suffer thru it just because we did. That's not whining, that's being
> unselfish.

I don't recall it as suffering. A challenge, you bet. Difficult? For me certainly. But I don't factor ease into my hobbies. I like to learn.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3278. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 03:42:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EA4BA49.6050000@adelphia.net>
Source record: 65515

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
>
>>If I see a test, I take it. It appears that if you see a test, you
>>passively avoid it if you think it is too hard or irrevelent.
>>
>
>
> I have taken tests. I don't avoid tests. My good grades in <hard> rf courses
> show I can pass tests.
>
> Morse code IS irrelevant. Amateur radio licensed Comm Theory Prof apparently
> agrees. The other rf Profs do not even have amateur radio license, not even the
> antenna Prof!

Good for you, you must be happy.

>>Too many people think that way, and all they end up
>>with is a litany of excuses for not getting anywhere.
>
>
> To many people use Morse to block the real talent in the hobby.
>
> They use an easily (but time consuming) learnable skill as some kind of proof
> of achievement. Even real emergency comm skills would be more useful than Morse
> code.

> >It certainly IS much easier to generate excuses for not doing something
>
>>than it is to just buckle down and do something.
>
>
> From a small sample, I know have the ability to learn real-time encoding.
> Therefore, one cannot say that I cannot do Morse code. I did not make an excuse
> that I cannot learn it. I made a decision that the limited benefit was not
> worth the time to learn it.

It certainly IS much easier to generate excuses for not doing something
than it is to just buckle down and do something.

>
>>I bet you
>>might have something to offer the hobby if you tried, but you just want
>>to resent things.
>

> Hams only are interested in their aspects. The aspects I would offer, Hams
> would not be interested in.
>
> Hams like contesting, chasing DX, antennas. Hams have little in common with
> electronic hobbyists.

http://home.earthlink.net/~hamkitbuilder/
http://physics.iisc.ernet.in/~ham/brew.htm
http://www.dxzone.com/catalog/Technical_Reference/Homebrew/
http://www.njqrp.org/data/links.html
http://www.geocities.com/CapeCanaveral/Hall/8701/hamlynx/hamhomeb.htm
http://dmoz.org/Recreation/Radio/Amateur/Homebrew/
http://www.fpqrp.com/fpelmer.html
http://members.xoom.virgilio.it/ik3oil/
http://www.uksmg.org/k5amhomebrew.htm
http://directory.google.com/Top/Recreation/Radio/Amateur/Homebrew/
http://users.zoominternet.net/~otoole/ham-weblog/1-15-01index.html
http://www.arrl.org/news/features/2002/12/27/1/?nc=1
http://www.seboldt.net/k0jd/
http://www.geocities.com/SiliconValley/Way/9229/hamradio_node10.html
http://www.nuclear-diagnostics.com/Recreation/Radio/Amateur/Homebrew/
http://www.arts-entertainment-recreation.com/Recreation/Amateur_Radio/Homebrew/

This is a batch of working links I found in about ten minutes sufing.
Kind of flies in the face of your statement.
>
>>Take the total time you have spent posting to rrap. You almost
>>certainly have spent more time on that than you would learning Morse Code.
>
>
> Just getting the coded license shows you wasted time learning code.

Just posting to rrap whining about Morse code is wasted time.

>>You don't know Morse Code, yet you "know" it isn't a useful skill.
>>
>> You aren't on HF, yet you still know Morse isn't a useful skill?
>
>
> Outside of Ham radio, Morse is not useful. Hospitals, firefighters, etc do not
> use Morse code. Chasing DX is not valued outside Ham radio.

Hmmm, relavency not needed eh?

>
> Morse code is used because of a social agreement in the Ham culture that it is
> desirable to learn Morse code.

>
>>Perhaps if you passed the test and got
>>your ticket, you might find it is a useful skill, or at least you could
>>then decry it as useless with some authority.

>
>
> No, if I learned the code, I would not "decry" it. I would do everything to
> defend it, since I made the effort to learn it. Much like how I know I won't
> enjoy a Hamfest, but I try to convince that there will be something useful
> there.
>
> And relative has discouraged me from going to Hamfests and told me that Hams
> are old, often non EE people.
>
>
>>Enjoy what you don't get by
>>refusing to learn it.
>
>
> Its not code so much as Hams focus on contesting, antennas, chasing wallpaper,
> and other boring activities.

But you find great enjoyment in trolling rrap. Go figure

- Mike KB3EIA -

3279. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 04:11:29 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422001129.19072.00000278@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 65516

From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net

>> A cell phone is not an AMATEUR radio, like the ad supposedly said.
>
>
> DId you see the ad? I posted the original and nowhere did anything I
>posted or read for that matter say that!

You say just that in the next quote below. You say that radio will come in handy when cell phone does not.

>I did not hear them say "I wish I had a radio".
>
> If a person was trapped, it might come in handy. If they were trying
>to get help with telephones and cellulars out of commision, they might
>think otherwise

How do you know that? Do you work for FEMA?

Why would repeaters last any longer than cell phone towers? Plus all repeater users would share one freq. Not practical in an emergency.

>> And it went unnoticed by anyone that was not already a Ham.
>
> How did you know that?

Awareness of the existance of Hams is low.

>> The ad for Rochester Hamfest SAYS "latest communications techniques", but
>then
>> SHOWS Morse code keys. Morse code is not one of the latest communication
>> techniques.
>
> Hmm, I might do such a thing if I were trying to appeal to a broad
>range of interests.

The latest Comm techniques is NOT shown in the ad. Morse code is. The ad says "for amateur radio, MORSE CODE is the latest communications technique".

>Nice fixation on hamfests, Vipul!

How else will non-Hams learn about Ham radio?

>>>Seems to me
>>>that one of the amateur repeaters was set up for the police since they lost
>>>their repeater.
> I'll bet the police found it handy that they could
>communicate with each other during the crisis

>Otherwise I can't figure why you post
>that sort of comment.

One repeater is just is useful as another. I fail to see how the amateur repeater had a benefit in a way that praises the benefits of amateur radio.

Amateur radio is not good for:
Emergency communications

Amateur radio is good for:
International goodwill

Too much "Ham" can be harmful to your health.

3280. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 04:17:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422001726.18767.00000113@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 65517

In article <20030420003406.18769.00000152@mb-m13.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (Prissy Parson) writes:

>In article <20030419163654.18769.00000047@mb-m21.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20030419124555.18821.00000073@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>
>>>I do "talk shop" - but not in an amateur radio policy newsgroup. Since I do
>>>not work for the FCC, ARRL, an amateur radio equipment manufacturer, or as
>>>a communications attorney, such "shop talk" is simply not relevant.
>>
>> You do NOT work for the US government or in any possible
>> capacity for US foreign policy,
>
>Neither do you, Len.

Why do you talk like you do that?

>> yet you prattle endlessly
>> about those subjects which do NOT involve amateur radio.
>
>So do you, Len. It's called free speech. Do you want to censor what I post?
>Seems like it.

You don't like free speech negative to your personal preferences.

>If I "do NOT work for the US government or in any possible capacity for US
>foreign policy" then my talking about same isn't "shop talk".
>>
>> You do NOT work for any railroad or have any stated work
>> experience in railroading, yet you have stated IN HERE that
>> you are an expert in knowledge of railroads.
>
>Whoa!

It's in Google archives. :-)

>Where have I ever stated that I am an "expert" at anything? Produce the post.
>I don't think you can.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. You've had all that non-amateur radio experience
and you refuse to state where, when, what, how and any
bona fides. You are an expert in subterfuge; i.e. a con-man,
but an amateur con-man.

>> Railroads and railroading are NOT amateur radio subjects nor is there any
>> reference to railroads and railroading in US amateur radio regulations.
>
>If I "do NOT work for any railroad or have any stated work experience in
>railroading" then my talking about same isn't "shop talk".

You are man with one-track mind: Morse code.

Famous Chinese philosopher Confusion say: "Man with one-
track mind often get train of thought derailed."

>> You have NEVER been a member of the United States
>> armed forces or any other military,
>
>I have never claimed to be.

You claim vast wisdom of military life, weapons systems,
warfare. Many statements in this newsgroup expounding on
what "is correct, what should be done." QED.

>No, you inferred that. I did not imply it. Where have I ever claimed to be an
>expert at anything? Produce the post. Back up your claims. I don't think you
>can.

Okay, I concede: You are expert at NOTHING. :-)

>If I "have NEVER been a member of the United States armed forces or any other
>military" then my talking about same isn't "shop talk".

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Don't worry, mighty military affairs knowitall, nobody will ever
accuse you of hiding any military medical discharge. :-)

>> You spout endlessly in a number of fields of work and
>> policy that have nothing at all to do with amateur radio.
>
>So do you, Len. At greater length, and at greater frequency, than I.

I've worked on RF at 24 GHz tops. You work higher than that?
I don't think so.

>> You are not only irrelevant far surpassing most of the
>> readers in here, but you are misleading, misdirectioning,
>> and, in general, just a self-promoting
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>> artist.

[expletive] = bullshit. Prissy Parsons can't stand ordinary
male talk. Not good for children of morse.

"Bandini is the word for fertilizer!" [Bandini radio ad]

Since cowshit is about the same as bullshit, I must not be
gender specific lest the Prissy Parson have a stroke.

All future references to bullshit will be changed to "Bandini."

>>>Besides, you would probably not understand my "shop talk" anyway, Len.
>>
>> No one knows if that is true or false.
>
>I do. It's true. Live with it.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. More Bandini.

>> You have NOT stated
>> anything the least specific on what your "shop" produces.
>
>Sure I have. Electrical engineering.

Bad English. Bad, sit in corner.

Your stealth factory produces "engineerings?"

Is that a ring for enginees?

>> FEAR, boy.
>
>Common sense, girlfriend ;-)

You are transgendered and trying to make out? Bad, boy, bad,
sit in corner.

>> That gives you an element of safety to be just
>> another
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>> artist.
>
>That's 2

Prissy Parson counting down? He'll never get to "599." :-)

>>>Not fear. Common sense.
>>
>> FEAR, boy.
>
>Common sense, girlfriend ;-)

You are really Steven Cojocaru in drag?

>> That gives you an element of safety to be just
>> another
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>> artist.

>
>That's 3

Wow, Drexel really did you a favor on remedial arithmetic!

>>>Not fear. Common sense.
>>
>> FEAR, boy.
>
>Common sense, girlfriend ;-)

Now, now, Steven, don't be such an [explitive].

>> That gives you an element of safety to be just
>> another
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>> artist.
>
>That's 4.

Misdirecting like there's no tomorrow.

>> That is true but only for the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society.
>
>Who would that be?

You don't know?

>> That society thinks that amateur radio operates on different
>> principles of physics than the rest of the radio world.
>
>How does physics determine radio policy?

SHAME! Get thee to remedial Basic Radio classes.

You FAIL obvious things about EM propagation!

>>>You haven't answered the question, Len. "References" is an ambiguous term.
>>
>> Don't try more misdirection. You have NO authority to demand
>> answers.
>
>Neither do you, Len.

You keep demanding answers to your questions.

Sit on them.

>>>Not at all, Len. I'm simply refusing to answer your questions about my work
>>>and work experience. Obviously that refusal infuriates you for some strange
>>>reason.
>>
>> You are playing a fantasy role of being an all-knowing, all-

>> seeing radio god.
>
>No, I just refuse to answer some of your questions. Live with it.

You are still a Bandini artist. Everyone lives with your "artistry."

>>>Then there's no reason for me to answer any of your questions, Len.
>>
>> You pretend to be a radio god, above mere mortals.
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>> artists do the same thing.
>
>That's 5

You are a Bandini artist well over five times.

>> Mortals cannot debate anything with radio gods.
>
>> You should answer at least one question by a mortal to show
>> your sincerity. You don't.
>
>I answer all sorts of questions, Len. Just not the ones you want me to
>answer.
>Here are your own words right back atcha: "You have NO authority to demand
>answers."

Bandini artist 6 !

>> You dance and evade the subject and
>> try to misdirect into other topics. You are a
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>>artist.
>
>That's 6

You are still a Bandini artist.

>That's 7

You are still a Bandini artist.

>>>Prove any what?
>>
>> No one can "prove" the existance of nothing. It has no
>> reference. You are a
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>> artist with nothing tangible

>> to refer to.
>>
>That's 8

All you've proved is ability to count as far as 8. Two left.

Anymore and you have to take off your shoes.

>>>> you can't talk about it...
>>>
>>>Sure I can. I choose not to. Choice - what a concept.
>>
>> You DO talk...about nothing.
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>That's 9

One finger left.

>Where DO you get these ideas, Len? I just post what I know. Sometimes there
are
>mistakes in what I post, and when proven, I acknowledge those mistakes. I
can't
>help it if I know more than you in some areas.

You can't help much.

>> You are looking like
>> just another
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>>artist.
>
>That's 10

Shoes off yet?

>> You talk about MANY MORE subjects that amateur radio.
>
>So do you, Len. Is that wrong? Do you want to censor what I post? Seems like
>it.

Not I the censor. Jimmie (Prissy Parson) Miccolis the CENSOR.

[explitive deleted]

>> Google has the evidence. Live with it.
>
>> You are just a
>> pretend god, a
>
>[expletive deleted]

>
>> artist.
>
>That's 11

Yup, shoes are off.

>>>I have not made deliberate false
>>>statements here. Nor have I tried to mislead anyone.
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>> artists do that.
>
>That's 12

Only 8 more.

>>>> "That's all you need to know."
>>>
>>>That's correct. Live with it.
>>
>> You are a
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>> artist.
>
>That's 13

Seven more.

>> Live with that. Others have to live with
>> your
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>> about "need to know."
>>
>That's 14

Six more.

>>>Incorrect. There are some others here who know more about what I do for a
>>>living.
>>
>> Irrelevant. Gods of radio congregate with other gods, cannot
>> bear to do so with ordinary mortals.
>
>Really? Then I must be an ordinary mortal.
>
>[expletive deleted]
>

>> artists tend to stay with their own kind.
>
>That's 15.

Five more.

>Hmm...if I'm the kind of artist you keep saying I am, and you keep replying to
>my posts, that would make you the same kind of artist, Len. Only with far more
>skill and experience......

Tsk, tsk, tsk. That's 15!

>>What experience have I claimed that is not true?
>>
>> You haven't claimed any experience.
>
>Then what's the problem?

You claim "experience." You refuse to detail it, establish bona
fides, third-party disinterested referfences. You are Bandini artist.

>First you say I haven't claimed any experience, then you say I have. You're
>being illogical, Len.

You are babbling. Put shoes back on. Must be foot odor.

>There is no proof that would satisfy you. We all know that from experience.

You have no experience. You cannot have it and not have it.

You are confused, getting irrational. Use a better foot powder.

>> Your "word" is no longer good enough.
>
>It never was - for you.

I supply references of corporations, individuals.

Prissy Parson supplies only "[explitive deleted]."

>> You are a
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>> artist, a con-man, a grifter.
>
>That's 16

Only four more.

>> Who is this "Sope?"
>
>That's a typo - a mistake. Was supposed to be "some people".

Unacceptible. Stop misdirecting.

>>>> You cannot admit a mistake.
>
>I just did. Which proves you wrong.

Manufactured "mistake." [explitive deleted]

>>>Sure I can. You are the one who cannot, even when said mistake is pointed
>>>out repeatedly and carefully explained.
>>
>> I've made no "mistake" about identifying you as just another
>> wanna-be radio god
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>>artist.
>
>That's 17

Only three more. Get to the little piggy that went to market yet?

>> You CANNOT discuss any personal experience with radio
>> communications outside amateur radio
>
>Sure I can. I just don't do it here.
>
>> In short, just
>.
>[expletive deleted]
>
>That's 18

Two toes left.

>>>Never heard of it.
>>
>> Imperious statement. "Never heard of it" therefore "it does
>> not exist."
>
>That's your own bias showing through. "Never heard of it" means "never heard
of
>it" not "it doesn't exist".

We've never heard of most of your references. Do you exist?

>> This forum is NOT about vehicular operation or automotive
>> mechanics.
>
>We talked about them anyway.

Double standard of [explitive deleted] extras.

>I've got photos of the system I was talking about, too. I took them myself.
>Tri-X, 35 mm.

No photos here. You lose again.

>>
>> You attempted misdirection again. More masking by dropping
>> any discussion of time-division multiplexing systems (alluding
>> but never detailing "having worked with such things") and going
>> to specific tube numbers.
>
>You really do need to read what people actually write.

Still misdirecting. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>> I made no mention of specific tube
>> numbers, only that they were "7-pin miniatures."
>
>Is not the 5823 a 7 pin miniature cold-cathode gas tube?

Not relevant. Still misdirecting. "Morse speed" is not
measured/gauged/quanitified by tube types.

>> Actual tube
>> numbers are irrelevant to the discussion.
>
>Not when you're trying to get a system working again.

Misdirection. Not relevant to discussion.

>> That equipment I
>> described first saw communications service in about 1952.
>
>So what? I never claimed to have worked on it. The system I was describing
>first went into service about 1956, yet I worked on it. Professionally.

You have no proof. Bandini again.

>>>The systems I refer to also had Dekatron counter tubes and a bunch of other
>>>specialized hardware. I could go on and on in great detail about that
>>>system, and many others. I choose not to.
>>
>> More misdirection. You have not connected all that name- and
>> number-dropping to COMMUNICATIONS.
>
>I choose not to. Live with it.

Misdirection to Jimmie's ego. Not relevant. Stay forcussed.

>> You are lost.
>
>Not at all. I know exactly where I am.

You lost us. Stay focussed.

>> You may have lost the way due to the scent of all the
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>That's 19

Only one left, Bandini artist.

>If there's such a scent, it did not come from me ;-)

Misdirection. "Morse speed" is thread, not odor.

>>>I never claimed to have worked on those particular multiplex systems, Len.
>>>They are not the only communications systems that used gas tubes, ya know.
>>
>> Describe them.
>
>Gas tubes? Well, the 5823 is a cold-cathode tube with three electrodes. 7 pin
>miniature, about the size of a 6AU6....

Misdirection. Not relevant to discussion.

>Oh you mean the system I was talking about? Well, it's been a few years.
>
>19" rack mounted, powered by 110 AC and 24 volts DC. Various modules in the
>main cabinet: Power supply, receiver, transmitter, units station counter,
>tens station counter, bit counter, control unit, diode module.
>
>Sound familiar?

More misdirection. Give name, location where used, particulars.

Too much ambiguity. Bandini.

>>>Do you claim to know the location and removal date of every single
>>>communication system that ever used gas tubes?
>>
>> Irrelevant.
>
>No, it's quite relevant. First you tell me what I cannot have done, then you
>say it's irrelevant.

You have no identification. You try to misdirect, again citing
irritation to your sensibilities. Bandini.

>(N2EY)
>
>> has only made vague allusions to some alleged experience in some kind of
>> "communications system" never identified in any way.
>
>Because I choose not to. Do you know what a Dekatron tube is? How about an
>LCS unit?

Irrelevant. More misdirection. Bandini.

>[expletive deleted]
>
>>misdirection.
>
>That's 20
>

>> Better
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>than most in here, but
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>> just the same.
>>
>That's 21 and 22

Strange feet.

>> All of these PUBLIC VIEW messages are readable by anyone
>> with newsgroup access. You cannot tailor responses to
>> individuals...all readers see the same text.
>
>Thank you, Captain Obvious ;-)

Bandini.

>>>> You can't. The fear factor is too high for you.
>>>
>>>Not at all. Just common sense.
>>
>> FEAR.
>
>COMMON SENSE.

Fear. No guts.

>> Radio gods will, unfortunately for them, find out they
>> are merely mortal and do NOT know everything about
>> anything, regardless of their
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>> techniques in trying to establish a reputation of grande guru of
>communications.
>
>That's 23

Prissy Parson using another's fingers.

>>>So have you, Len. And when your mistakes have been pointed out, you refuse
>>>to acknowledge them.
>>
>> The radio god continues to claim I "made mistakes" as a generality.
>
>> I have made typographical errors, true, and admitted those.
>
>More than typos. Errors in logic, errors in facts. Like the claim you made

>that no Technicians have HF privileges, with or without CSCEs.
>
>All there in Google.

Google has all Miccolis' misdirections. Truckloads of Bandin.

>> Beyond that,
>
>(N2EY's)
>
>> OPINION was elevated to Supreme
>> Judge of What Is Right and What Is Wrong. OPINION.
>> That's an excellent misdirection technique but it is still
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>That's 24

Misdirection. Not relevant.

>> Such
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>> does not fertilize TRUTH, it only covers it up and winds up smelling bad.
>>
>That's 25

Bandini has odor. Helps plants grow. Prissy Parson Bandini helps
only Prissy Parson inflate ego.

>(N2EY)
>> is NOT a radio god who can command What Is Right and What Is Wrong.
>
>Never claimed to be.

All Miccolis statements based on being radio god.

>> "Boy" is the word for a youngster, an under-teenage kid.
>
>I'm 48, Len. You know that because you looked me up in the database. Is there
>some reason you call a 48-year-old "boy" ? Does it make you feel important?

Relative comparison. Miccolis feels hurt. TS. Bandini.

>> That applies to ALL races.
>
>It is also a derogative, racist term. Would you call a black man "boy"?

Gross misdirection. Racial bigotry not issue. Morse speed is
under discussion.

>Just to be clear, I'm not saying I am black. I'm just asking the question. I
>don't address anyone as "boy". It's not good manners, regardless of race or

>age.

Not good manners to call anyone "girlfriend" who is not girlfriend.

>> IDENTIFY all that non-amateur communications (systems or
>> equipment)
>
>(N2EY)
>
>>CLAIMS to have "experience" with.
>
>Why? You would not recognize them anyway. Besides, you have no authority to
>DEMAND anything from me.

Miccolis demands other answer his questions or misdirects.

Bad form.

>Let's see: 25 repetitions of the same expletive deleted in a single post.
>Must be a new record.

"Bandini is the word for fertilizer."

>Now here's a few for you, Len.
>
>Tell us about your actual experience with Morse code radio operation. Not what
>the Army did, or what you've seen others do, or a long diatribe about how old
>the mode is, the theory behind it, the history, yada yada yada. Just tell us
>your personal experience actually using the mode.

More misdirection. Not relevant to comparison of systems.

Large load of [explitive] Bandini.

Miccolis has no "need to know."

Rest of radio world abandon morse code as communications medium.

Miccolis cannot grow with times, must continue to tout old
systems. Bad form.

>Also explain to us how your experience in NON-amateur radio somehow makes you
>more knowledgeable about what's best for the amateur radio service than those
>who have experience in amateur radio.

Personal experience not necessary to use in comparing communications
systems. Already done long time ago by acknowledged experts.
Morse code lost. Too bad. Boo hoo. Bye bye.

>Finally, produce the post where I claim to be an "expert" on any subject.
>
>Then we'll see who the
>
>[expletive deleted]
>

>artist really is.

Everyone can see you are the one.

So it is said on Babylon.

5

3281. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 04:35:51 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422003551.18835.00000288@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 65518

>How do you know that? Do you work for FEMA?
>

Sure do

>The ad says
>"for amateur radio, MORSE CODE is the latest communications technique".

Well your right its not the newest, I guess what they meant to say waS, the only real device you need for real comunications. You know Vipul its the mode that separates the Men from the Boys, CBers from real HAMS. But you dont have to worry about it, you will never be a real Ham anyway.

3282. Re: internet voice gateways - taking your handheld overseas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 05:11:24 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422011124.18809.00000429@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 65519

From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net

>Or if you had to have an rf link, put cell phones into the system.
>

I agree with you there. The development is rf. The application is not.

>Ham radio without internet linking is like a fish without a banjo.

The phrase is "fish without a bicycle".

3283. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 07:37:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BACA6982.17636%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 65520

"David Lee" wrote:

> Yes, this is the greatest country on the face
> of the earth. I would have no other. This
> country is great because men died for this
> precious freedom and this includes the freedom
> to dissent. The founding fathers were dissenters
> of the greatest human king and kingdom of that
> time. Dissent is one of the greatest freedoms
> we have and needs to be protected from those
> who want to make dissent an illegal activity,
> even if its only during wartime.

I agree, David. Sadly, this country is moving in the opposite direction. A local professor, Dr. Danial Abel, has received death threats as a result of two sentences opposing the war in an area newspaper. Three of those treats were phoned in and mailed in to the school itself. Clearly, when considering Rights, some simply don't see past the Second Amendment.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3284. Re: Echolink - Remove your Radio Award

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 09:14:05 UTC
From: Matt <piss.off@spammers.com>
Message-ID: <Ky7pa.19986$1s1.299460@newsfeeds.bigpond.com>
Source record: 65521
Cross-posted to: aus.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"14313 funtime" <ballbags@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3ea4896f@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> "sandman" <sandman@sandbox.com> wrote in message
> news:3ea39fc4@news.comindico.com.au...
> > IRLP never had a chance as you cant throw away your Amateur Radio and
use
> a
> > headset instead. I wonder what ramification this has on equipment
> > manufacturers. What incentive do radio manufacturers have when 50% of
> > those on echolink use headsets ?? Amateur Radio can pat itself on the
> back
> > and be proud it has a technology that makes Radio equipment obsolete and
> > then the ARRL pats HIM on the back.....what a weird world we live in !
>
> No, what a weird world you live in. It's backwards-minded
> people like you, what have held this hobby back and resisted
> change for YEARS. First it was CW, then it was "no-code"
> now it's Echolink. Hams with mindsets resistant to change
> like U are why we are not ahead in the technology game anymore.

Backwards minded?? As outlined by Sandman, there are problems with
echolink - not with amateur radio using the internet - the main one being
that there are serious authentication issues with it - I mean how in the
hell can we allow a system where it is so easy to get a logon for the system
when you are not a licenced amateur, and yet could access amateur freqs with
it.
Whilst some of the users have RF gateways, many use the system only use
chatrooms - what sort of amateur radio is that where we chat away on the net
rather than chatting away on RF - if we don't use it (the RF), then we could
well loose it as a result of the commercial pressure to grab our freqs.
I would hardly call sandman backwards - he is one of the leading lights in
VK for IRLP, and that is certainly a lot more progressive than plug and play
headset technology. Wake up and smell the roses sunshine.

Matt

3285. Re: Ham Radio's Most wanted - New Ham Award!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 10:27:33 UTC
From: nm5k@wt.net
Message-ID: <25eb70d7.0304220227.2d3f80de@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65522
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"L L O Y D D A V I E S" <firebottle@n0vfp.cm> wrote in message
news:<3ea42477_2@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>...
> Do you know that person on 20 and 75 meters, that does his best to make his
> mark on the world? Is he not getting the recognition he deserves? Well,
> here is an upcoming award for him/her/it!
>
> Nominate your favorite ham radio op for the "Ham Radio's most wanted"!
>
> This award give the proper recognition for outstanding QRM'ing! Wheather
> the QRMing be for 75 and 20 meters, 30 meter CW or 2 meter repeaters, this
> is the one!

There are no wankers in the 30m band. Most QRM'ers of any real stature
are too brain dead to be able to work CW at a usable speed. I've never
heard one on that band. Maybe thats why 30m is such a good band. :/ I
ignore QRM'ers on the other bands. I'm not into listening to braying
jackasses. MK

3286. Re: Echolink - Remove your Radio Award

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 10:35:15 UTC
From: Spiro <dice@fuzzy.net>
Message-ID: <%K8pa.20065$1s1.299693@newsfeeds.bigpond.com>
Source record: 65523
Cross-posted to: aus.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

LOL!!
Hear hear.

Face it, anyone who calls themself "sandman" and has a childish "welcome to the sandpit" theme on their website has to questioned.

This fool can't even get "ARRL" correct, and yes, we've all noted his overly defensive nature on many of his posts. Dare anyone say anything against his precious IRLoserP.

What do expect from some sicko that has a history of stalking others on the internet? Ohh, you're not aware of that one either?

SV

"14313 funtime" <ballbags@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3ea4896f@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> "sandman" <sandman@sandbox.com> wrote in message
> news:3ea39fc4@news.comindico.com.au...
>
> No, what a weird world you live in. It's backwards-minded
> people like you, what have held this hobby back and resisted
> change for YEARS. First it was CW, then it was "no-code"
> now it's Echolink. Hams with mindsets resistant to change
> like U are why we are not ahead in the technology game anymore.
>
>
>

3287. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 11:05:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304220305.707d52f4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65524

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3EA357A0.497273A1@att.net>...

> Yeah, and your T5 story has a strong stench to it.

True. The dead donkey that grew bigger and bigger each day finally
exploded. There was a tremendous stench.

You claim your life
> and that of your entire unit was in jeopardy during the whole operation
> yet your military commander gave your verbal permission to operate
> {somebody's}hobby equipment in a recreational radio service.

Dick, apparently you've never been to where the rubber meets the road.

> Sorry, that story just doesn't land on it's feet. Any military commander
> worth his bars wouldn't do any such thing until hostilities were well past
> both for the personnel involved and the entire surrounding region.
> Since our Somalia operation was always quite small and
> we left with the rear guard protecting our retreat, no such time ever came
> for the relatively tiny contingent. Something smells. Care to explain?

Dick, you'll not be satisfied with any answer, in which case you're
welcome to remain ignorant. I think its what you do best.

3288. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 11:29:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422072926.18912.00000429@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 65525

>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>From: Unclaimed Mysteries k4doh@mindspring.com
>Date: 4/21/2003 1:29 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <b81d9r$cq0$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>

>> Don't go "Lennie" on us, OK? If you don't agree, just say so. You
>don't
>> have to act like Lennie to get your point across.
>>
>
>I think I have much better material than Lennie

It's not the material...It's how it's presented.

Lennie could have made his "point" a lot easier by NOT calling myself (and others) Nazis, jackbooted thugs, "morseodists", etc etc.

>Actually I *agree* that they are distracting. But suggestive,
>distracting, even embarrassing call signs spit out of the FCC computer
>is not the most pressing issue in ham radio.

Did I say it WAS "the most pressing issue"...?!?!

>No one cares anymore that I
>bought a vanity call a few years ago honoring the Simpsons.

I do, but it's not offensive or embarrassing. It's cute.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3289. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 11:30:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422073033.18912.00000430@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 65526

>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030421151537.18769.00000097@mb-m24.aol.com>

>You frustrated prissies neet to get lives.

What does hair-removing cream have to do with it?

Steve

3290. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 11:32:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422073202.18912.00000431@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 65527

>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030421151538.18769.00000098@mb-m24.aol.com>

>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views...(SNIP)

Plagiarized response by allegedly published professional who should know
better noted.

Steve

3291. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 11:33:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422073326.18912.00000432@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 65528

>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030421151537.18769.00000096@mb-m24.aol.com>

>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views...(SNIP)

REPEAT of plagiarized comments noted.

Some "professional", eh...?!?!

Steve

3292. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 11:35:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422073559.18912.00000433@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 65529

>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/21/2003 5:32 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030421183247.19006.00000453@mb-m05.aol.com>

>If using words like "putz", "creep" are included, then we should nominate
>K4YZ.

As well we should nominate KB1HMW for saying he "supports" Amateur Radio
then makes denigrating comments in the CB NG...

Or perhaps for his frequent use of terms like "cult" and assertions of
racism and sexism...?!?!

That list could get real long, Vippy..Ya sure ya wanna go there?

Steve

3293. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 11:39:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422073938.18912.00000434@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 65530

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 4/22/2003 6:05 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304220305.707d52f4@posting.google.com>

>True. The dead donkey that grew bigger and bigger each day finally
>exploded. There was a tremendous stench.

...But it seems you made it home OK, Brain...

So all the kings horses and all the kings men DID put you together again,
huh...?!?!

Welcome home.

Steve

3294. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 11:42:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422074203.18912.00000435@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 65531

>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030421151547.18769.00000102@mb-m24.aol.com>

>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views...(SNIP)

That's the same plagaiarized retort three time's today, and I haven't even
got started reading posts...

Sheesh, Lennie...where's the originality?

Steve

3295. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 13:35:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304220535.3f45a546@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65532

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030421151546.18769.00000101@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0304200713.6c451ea@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>

(Snipped mother of all furious disconnected rants)

> If "morse code" mode had any redeeming qualities for radio
> communications, it would not have been dropped by all other
> radio services or never be considered from the beginning. It
> remains only in amateur radio used by a minority who
> consider themselves "superior" for possessing a singular
> skill of little or no use elsewhere.

Especially for you huh? Amusing actually. You're not a ham of any
persuasion or inclination, ya can't speak the language Putz, Morse or
otherwise but particularly Morse and that's your inescapable bottom
line and the end of any relevance you might have to ham radio in
general much less to the application and use of Morse in the hobby.

> >By the way none of the above has anything to do with code tests.
>
> Neither did my critique... :-)

Lotta folk churn out "critiques" Putz, yours remind me of those David
Duke has produced. At least Duke has a following, but you on the other
hand . . ?

Tsk, tsk. :-)

But then maybe it's time to reward you for all the years of effort
you've faithfully put into all the "critiques" and other contributions
to the hobby you've blessed us with.

Guys: I submit that we can't let the pore thing just peter out into
oblivion without having at least one piece any piece of recognition in
his "CV". That's all he's been looking for over the years, WTF, let's
toss him a bone.

Motion: I hereby nominate Sweet Lenny to the office of "Exhalted Grand
Wizard of RRAP"

Do we have a second?

w3rv

(PS: I'll donate the white sheet)

3296. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 14:19:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EA54F60.EC087B1@att.net>
Source record: 65533

Brian Kelly wrote:

>
> Motion: I hereby nominate Sweet Lenny to the office of "Exhalted Grand
> Wizard of RRAP"
>
> Do we have a second?
>

I dunno, Brian, I think he'd fit even better as the Withered Wizer Geezerputz of rrap. And of ALL radio in general. His skills are far more obsolete than anything he can lay onto Morse code. At least *it* is still useful *somewhere* to *somebody*.

w0ex

3297. Re: Ham Radio's Most wanted - New Ham Award!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 14:22:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EA54FEF.90A4E5DE@att.net>
Source record: 65534
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Mark Keith wrote:

> . I'm not into listening to braying
> jackasses.

Mark, then you'll want to avoid Loyd's stuff.

3298. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 14:24:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EA55079.D5D8BE66@att.net>
Source record: 65535

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3EA357A0.497273A1@att.net>..

> >. Something smells. Care to explain?
>
> Dick, you'll not be satisfied with any answe

At least none that you can put forth, as clearly shown in the past year or so
of postings you've hung up on rrap. Nothing new here.

3299. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 16:52:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422125242.19022.00000286@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65538

>yes, but my novice exam was tougher than your extra exam.

I completely agree, the EXTRA was a JOKE. I had a hard time beliving it was the EXTRA EXAM. Actually the test was the easist one for Ham Radio I had ever taken.

3300. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 16:56:57 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422125657.19022.00000287@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65540

>If you had hurt my feelings you'd be
>on your way to the ER by now. 10-4 good buddy?
>K3DWW

I cant stop laughing. Yea your right, I probably would fell obligated to haul your Butt into ER, just to see if they could save your BUTT.

3301. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 17:50:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422135020.18912.00000244@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 65542

>getting
>accepted into Boozefighters MC by Wino Willy hisself,

How impressive.

3302. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 19:24:02 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA596D2.3137B8C3@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65536

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> Big deal, I didnt miss any from Novice to EXTRA

yes, but my novice exam was tougher than your extra exam.

3303. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 19:27:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304221127.67a7ba0c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65543

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3EA54F60.EC087B1@att.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >
> > Motion: I hereby nominate Sweet Lenny to the office of "Exhalted Grand
> > Wizard of RRAP"
> >
> > Do we have a second?
> >
>
> I dunno, Brian, I think he'd fit even better as the Withered Wizer Geezerputz
> of rrap.

Sure, that would work. "Withered Lizard . . ?" Something.

> And of ALL radio in general. His skills are far more obsolete than
> anything he can lay onto Morse code.

Of course, that's why he's down to hanging out in RRAP as his last
gasp at having any relevance and getting any recognition in radio
circles. Imagine how far he'd get with his same old same old
troglodyte BS if he hung out in any of the professional radio groups
instead of here. Being the radio "engineering professional" he'd like
the snooker the world into thinking he is. Was. He actually got stupid
enough to dip a toe into dot antennas a piece back and even the
amateur pros over there cut it off on the spot.

> At least *it* is still useful *somewhere*
> to *somebody*.

Morse? All over the planet 24/365, galls him no end.

Maybe he is actually useful to somebody somewhere, maybe he hauls the
trash out to the curb. We don't know.

>
> w0ex

w3rv

w3rv

3304. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 19:33:00 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA598EC.501621D@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65537

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >You may not feel that way but ULX's derogatory
> >referrals to "CBplussers" sadly reflects the more prevalent attitude.
> >
> >73, K3DWW
>
> Did I hurt your Silly Little LIEEEBERAL fellings to BAD.

FWIW I am a Goldwater Republican. If you had hurt my feelings you'd be
on your way to the ER by now. 10-4 good buddy?
K3DWW

3305. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 19:52:46 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA59D8E.3F67AAA6@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65539

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Vito if you believe that Morse is useless and tap code is useful that
> really illustrates the depth of your lack of knoweldge on the subject.

Well then, please educate me. I didn't say Morse was useless - it obviously has great recreational value, as witness all the people who enjoy it. Perhaps I will too someday. But whatever practical value it has escapes me, as it has for more than 40 years. There are many things I don't yet know so if you can give me any logical reason(s) why people should have to pass a Morse test to use SSB, et cetera, I'll be glad to have that information and perhaps change my mind.

If I were stuck in a mine or submarine, or ???, I could bang out tap code on a pipe or a wall or whatever but I couldn't send Morse because I'd have no way to make "dahs" vs "dits". OTOH one can send tap code with a Morse key. So, tap code is more versatile. It is also easier to learn/use.
K3DWW

3306. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 20:31:28 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0304221231.30166900@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65544

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030414221120.15625.00000245@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0304130444.43023c10@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> Well, who said that Morse Code was a growth industry? Granted, there
> seem to be more products for helping people learn the Morse Code now
> than at any other time in history. As another poster observed, the
> interest in QRP caused by new, off-the-shelf QRP rigs like the Yaesu
> FT-817 is making CW more popular than ever. And now that we're on
> the downside of the current solar cycle, using these rigs will be more
> dependant on CW than ever.

Nah - the FT-817 makes a GREAT 6m rig... and CW on 6m is about as
popular as a stinky sock.

- Stewart
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

3307. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 20:35:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8491k$7gg$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65545

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030422135020.18912.00000244@mb-m25.aol.com...
> >getting
> >accepted into Boozefighters MC by Wino Willy hisself,
>
> How impressive.

Especially from a vanity call K3....

Have you ever wondered why so many folks with call signs actually seem to
dislike ham radio? Why are they still here then?

Dan/W4NTI

3308. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 20:39:28 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA5A880.CF4D553C@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65541

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> I don't recall it as suffering. ....

Different folks, different strokes, Mike. I was too "challenged" trying to get some major Navy systems off the ground and out to sea, and figure out what Ivan was going to do to counter them to want anything but recreation and utility out of amateur radio. I'd worked microwave, multiplex, and ship-shore systems for Ma Bell before that, not to mention Army COMINTEL intercept systems, so Amateur technology wasn't exactly challenging. Nor has this been my main hobby. Learning to hold 5 out of 5 in the ten ring with a .45 was more challenging than Morse; ditto learning to shoot over 95% at trap consistantly and racing bikes and cars at the old Riverside, and Willow Springs Ca tracks, getting accepted into Boozefighters MC by Wino Willy hisself, and riding coast to coast a dozen times meant more to me than any QSO - except maybe the ones I got along the way (c:.

Practicing code was a tedious chore to me because it kept me from things I *really* liked doing. Naturally YMMV, as will mine as I age.
73, K3DWW

3309. Re: internet voice gateways - taking your handheld overseas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 20:44:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EA5A9C2.2000808@psu.edu>
Source record: 65547

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>
>
>>Or if you had to have an rf link, put cell phones into the system.
>>
>
>
> I agree with you there. The development is rf. The application is not.
>
>
>>Ham radio without internet linking is like a fish without a banjo.
>
>
> The phrase is "fish without a bicycle".

So the fish really does need a banjo? 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3310. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 20:45:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA5AA14.9ADF2A1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65546

stewart wrote:
>
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030414221120.15625.00000245@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0304130444.43023c10@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > Well, who said that Morse Code was a growth industry? Granted, there
> > seem to be more products for helping people learn the Morse Code now
> > than at any other time in history. As another poster observed, the
> > interest in QRP caused by new, off-the-shelf QRP rigs like the Yaesu
> > FT-817 is making CW more popular than ever. And now that we're on
> > the downside of the current solar cycle, using these rigs will be more
> > dependant on CW than ever.
>
> Nah - the FT-817 makes a GREAT 6m rig... and CW on 6m is about as
> popular as a stinky sock.

You must not be active on 6m, Stew. There is plenty of CW activity on
six.

Dave K8MN

3311. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 20:50:52 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422165052.18806.00000267@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65548

>Have you ever wondered why so many folks with call signs actually seem to
>dislike ham radio? Why are they still here then?
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Dan the only reason they have vanity calls is there trying to make real Hams,
think they are real Hams.

3312. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 20:53:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EA5ABE4.2070302@psu.edu>
Source record: 65549

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>
>
>>>A cell phone is not an AMATEUR radio, like the ad supposedly said.
>>
>>
>> DId you see the ad? I posted the original and nowhere did anything I
>>posted or read for that matter say that!
>
>
> You say just that in the next quote below. You say that radio will come in
> handy when cell phone does not.

Note that there is a big difference between what I said the ad
consisted of, and my opinions and facts stated later.

>
>>I did not hear them say "I wish I had a radio".
>>
>> If a person was trapped, it might come in handy. If they were trying
>>to get help with telephones and cellulars out of commision, they might
>>think otherwise
>
>
> How do you know that? Do you work for FEMA?

I work with them if need be.

> Why would repeaters last any longer than cell phone towers? Plus all repeater
> users would share one freq. Not practical in an emergency.

Are you serious? hint:
the repeaters often have emergency generators

The amateurs often have mobile rigs and/or battery powered ht's or home
staions that can go off the power grid. You specifically *want* everyone
on one frequency in an emergency. Not practical? Eminently practical!

>>>And it went unnoticed by anyone that was not already a Ham.
>>
>> How did you know that?
>
>
> Awareness of the existance of Hams is low.

So now some more people are aware.

>>>The ad for Rochester Hamfest SAYS "latest communications techniques", but
>>
>>then
>>
>>>SHOWS Morse code keys. Morse code is not one of the latest communication
>>>techniques.
>>
>> Hmm, I might do such a thing if I were trying to appeal to a broad
>>range of interests.
>
>
> The latest Comm techniques is NOT shown in the ad. Morse code is. The ad says
> "for amateur radio, MORSE CODE is the latest communications technique".

Ummmm of course! How you going to illustrate the latest techniques?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3313. The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 21:00:13 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0304221300.3996b651@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65550

As the number of Novice Class license-holders dwindles down to a handful, and the elimination of this class of Amateurs seems inevitbable; it seems a good time to reflect on what this means to the US Amateur Radio Service...

Let's look at the term "Novice" itself... the word Novice is derived from the Middle English word "novis" - which means, literally "No Vice"... so, what this means in terms of the rest of the Amateur classes, is that these Novices are the only Operators having "No Vice"... the rest of us have this "vice" of ham radio... some to more degree than others... but, in all cases, we "have the vice"... or, in other words, are "of the vicious"... this can clearly be seen here on this Usenet group, where all of these Non-Novices, fight their vicious battles everyday... yes, the Novices will be missed - as all we will be is "pure vice".

3314. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 21:22:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422172257.18755.00000178@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65454

In article <20030422073559.18912.00000433@mb-m14.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker, the Anger Management Class Drop-Out) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/21/2003 5:32 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030421183247.19006.00000453@mb-m05.aol.com>
>
>>If using words like "putz", "creep" are included, then we should nominate
>>K4YZ.
>
> As well we should nominate KB1HMW for saying he "supports" Amateur Radio
>then makes denigrating comments in the CB NG...
>
> Or perhaps for his frequent use of terms like "cult" and assertions of
>racism and sexism...?!?!
>
> That list could get real long, Vippy..Ya sure ya wanna go there?

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3315. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 21:22:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422172258.18755.00000180@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65451

In article <20030422073202.18912.00000431@mb-m14.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030421151538.18769.00000098@mb-m24.aol.com>
>
>>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
>> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views...(SNIP)
>
> Plagiarized response by allegedly published professional who should know
>better noted.

Strike "alleged," you poor thing. See HAM RADIO Magazine
of the 1980s and late 1970s.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3316. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 21:22:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422172258.18755.00000179@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65452

In article <20030422073326.18912.00000432@mb-m14.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker the Carbon Copy) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030421151537.18769.00000096@mb-m24.aol.com>
>
>>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
>> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views...(SNIP)
>
> REPEAT of plagiarized comments noted.
>
> Some "professional", eh...?!?!

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3317. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 21:22:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422172259.18755.00000182@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65453

In article <20030422072926.18912.00000429@mb-m14.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Stalker and self-proclaimed Cutie Pie) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>>From: Unclaimed Mysteries k4doh@mindspring.com
>>Date: 4/21/2003 1:29 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <b81d9r$cq0$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
>
>>> Don't go "Lennie" on us, OK? If you don't agree, just say so. You don't
>>> have to act like Lennie to get your point across.
>>
>>I think I have much better material than Lennie
>
> It's not the material...It's how it's presented.
>
> Lennie could have made his "point" a lot easier by NOT calling myself (and
>others) Nazis, jackbooted thugs, "morseodists", etc etc.
>
>>Actually I *agree* that they are distracting. But suggestive,
>>distracting, even embarrassing call signs spit out of the FCC computer
>>is not the most pressing issue in ham radio.
>
> Did I say it WAS "the most pressing issue"...?!?!
>
>>No one cares anymore that I
>>bought a vanity call a few years ago honoring the Simpsons.
>
> I do, but it's not offensive or embarrassing. It's cute.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has, if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3318. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 21:23:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422172300.18755.00000183@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65455

In article <d22b54c3.0304221127.67a7ba0c@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
>news:<3EA54F60.EC087B1@att.net>...
>> Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>> > Motion: I hereby nominate Sweet Lenny to the office of "Exhalted Grand
>> > Wizard of RRAP"
>> >
>> > Do we have a second?
>>
>> I dunno, Brian, I think he'd fit even better as the Withered Wizer
>Geezerputz
>> of rrap.
>
>Sure, that would work. "Withered Lizard . . ?" Something.
>
>> And of ALL radio in general. His skills are far more obsolete than
>> anything he can lay onto Morse code.
>
>Of course, that's why he's down to hanging out in RRAP as his last
>gasp at having any relevance and getting any recognition in radio
>circles. Imagine how far he'd get with his same old same old
>troglodyte BS if he hung out in any of the professional radio groups
>instead of here.

Go on into homebrew and "critique" the results in there. :-)

Go over to PGMTT hang-outs, big whiz of radio. Show 'em
what you got.

>Being the radio "engineering professional" he'd like
>the snooker the world into thinking he is.

I accept money for services performed. That's the primary
definition of "professional."

Kellie is welcome to question any of the references I've
provided in here. He doesn't dare for he will be proven wrong
in his loud-mouth name-calling.

>Was. He actually got stupid
>enough to dip a toe into dot antennas a piece back and even the
>amateur pros over there cut it off on the spot.

Me? Tsk, tsk, tsk. Try rec.radio.amateur.homebrew.

No "amateur pros" or other oxymorons "cut me off," sweetums.

>> At least *it* is still useful *somewhere*
>> to *somebody*.
>
>Morse? All over the planet 24/365, galls him no end.

Kellie is hearing things again. Poor thing. Must be a side effect
of his other age-related ailments.

>Maybe he is actually useful to somebody somewhere, maybe he hauls the
>trash out to the curb. We don't know.

I took out the Kellie yesterday. Monday is our trash pickup day
over here. I'll take out the Kellie next Monday, too. :-)

I won't have to worry about taking out any Kellie from any
professional groups or any amateur radio newsgroups which
talk about radio physics. No Kellie there to take out.

Leonard H. Anderson
Life Member IEEE

3319. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 21:23:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422172306.18755.00000184@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65456

In article <d22b54c3.0304220535.3f45a546@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030421151546.18769.00000101@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0304200713.6c451ea@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>
>(Snipped mother of all furious disconnected rants)
>
>> If "morse code" mode had any redeeming qualities for radio
>> communications, it would not have been dropped by all other
>> radio services or never be considered from the beginning. It
>> remains only in amateur radio used by a minority who
>> consider themselves "superior" for possessing a singular
>> skill of little or no use elsewhere.
>
>Especially for you huh? Amusing actually. You're not a ham of any
>persuasion or inclination, ya can't speak the language Putz, Morse or
>otherwise but particularly Morse and that's your inescapable bottom
>line and the end of any relevance you might have to ham radio in
>general much less to the application and use of Morse in the hobby.

Kellie is getting angry again. Not unusual in a "Type A" personality.
Those are the first to go from heart and stroke problems.

None of the FCC staff and commissioners need have any sort of
amateur radio license to regulate US amateur radio and all the rest
of US civil radio.

FCC can and does TELL HAMS WHAT TO DO.

Laws of the United States of America may be commented on by
any citizen of the USA. No one group of citizens has "more right"
to say something than all others.

>> >By the way none of the above has anything to do with code tests.
>>
>> Neither did my critique... :-)
>
>Lotta folk churn out "critiques" Putz, yours remind me of those David
>Duke has produced. At least Duke has a following, but you on the other
>hand . . ?

All that Kellie can do is loud-mouth a lot of personal pejoratives
without saying one thing relevant on the subject.

The above is typical. Attempt at humiliation of another. Doesn't
work.

>But then maybe it's time to reward you for all the years of effort
>you've faithfully put into all the "critiques" and other contributions
>to the hobby you've blessed us with.

Kellie is confused again. I never "blessed him or other licensees
with the ham radio hobby." :-)

>Guys: I submit that we can't let the pore thing just peter out into
>oblivion without having at least one piece any piece of recognition in
>his "CV". That's all he's been looking for over the years, WTF, let's
>toss him a bone.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Kellie wants more than a pound of flesh.

In that case, here's the entire critque all over again -

From the COMMUNICATIONS sense, the social sense, the
language sense, the political sense, as well as the "engineering
sense," Kelly's commentary boils down to just ADVERTISING
COPY in promotion of that mode. In the basics of this so-called
"morse code" it can be stated that it is:

1. One of the simplest of communications methods possible in
the primitive electrical technology of the 1840s.

2. It is organized as an encoding of the letters, numbers, and
punctuation of the English language.

3. The first "morse code" was just an encoding of numbers and
a few symbols. Number combinations had to be used to
represent common English words and phrases. Samuel
Morse's sponsor and financial backer, Alfred Vail, is the
one who suggested the dot-dash encoding to encompass
all letters of the English language. In either form, "morse
code" is still an encoding scheme to represent written
English letters, numbers, and punctuation marks.

4. It is the first widely-used "all-weather, instant" communications
scheme as compared to much earlier semaphore and fire
systems previously used in Europe. It was not affected by
day or night, clouds or rain.

5. It was worked out on landlines, evolving close to the present
form in 52 years of commercial service before the first
demonstration of radio waves for communication in 1896.

6. It is solely an ON-OFF coding, easily adapted by primitive
radio technology of the previous turning of the century.

7. In the first 52 years of "morse code" there is no known
entirely-amateur use of the method/mode. The first half-
century of "morse code" use was sponsored and
developed by commercial and government users.

Critique of Kelly's statements now follows:

>There are huge differences between the purposes and usefulness of
>Morse as it is still used in ham radio and how it has been used by a
>myriad of commercial, government and military entities over the years.
>The professional users of the mode had entirely different priorities
>and missions to accomplish than hams had and still have except under
>very unusual circumstances.

That is mostly untrue. In the beginning of radio, on-off codings were
the only possible means of communication for ALL users. The
first use of radio was as a COMMUNICATIONS MEDIUM that was
quicker and more weather-proof than all previous communicatons
methods. ALL users of radio used it for communications.

The information being communicated is not related to the method,
medium, or mode of "morse code."

>Hams have taken Morse in an entirely
>different direction and developed it into a particularly effective and
>affordable international language for socializing and info swapping
>amongst themselves, not for simply passing hard copy around to their
>employers and/or their military command structures as was the case in
>the professional Morse days.

Again, mostly incorrect.

As already stated, the first half century of "morse code" use was
done by professional users for commercial and government
communications. One of those commercial uses was "common
carrier communications service" where customers could send
"telegrams" to family and friends. As a part of that, telegrapher's
abbreviations in communications evolved the double-number groups
such as "73" and "88" which survive today.

The word "telegram" was already in the English language by the
first radio-as-communications-medium was demonstrated in 1896.
While telegrams had high relative cost versus ordinary mail, they
were used by family members and friends for both familial and
social communications, being far faster than conventional mail.
Considering the rather victorian social mores of the latter 1800s,
it is doubtful that male telegraphers exchanged chit-chat with a
salutation of "love and kisses" (number pair 88)

International adoption of "morse code" evolved because the basic
system of wireline communications represented by the Morse-Vail
Telegraphic Apparatus patent of 1844 was economically viable.
That was due to the innovative unattended "relay" apparatus of
a solenoid (representing the normal sounder) mechanically

coupled but electrically isolated contact (representing a key).
This increased the wire length range up to four times farther
than a single attended-at-both-ends telegraphic circuit. It was
probably the birth of the term "relay" in electrical apparatus
which itself evolved into a myriad of electric and electronic
applications having nothing in common with "morse code."

>Which is exactly why Morse survives today
>in volume on the ham bands but virtually nowhere else. This is also
>why the arguments we hear about Morse being "obsolete" today because,
>say, the Coast Guard no longer uses Morse is simply bogus nonsense.

Kelly is considered quite wrong there. Commercial and government
users of "morse code" dropped its use for the following reasons:

1. Manual telegraphy by "morse code" was slower than telegraphy
by teleprinting apparatus and subject to interruptions from
normal human telegrapher needs and abilities.

2. Manual telegraphy by "morse code" was subject to human
errors in communication possible at each end of a circuit that
had nothing to do with what was being communicated. Known
methods of "error correction" by re-sending resulted in longer
times for communication, adding to (1) above.

3. Manual telegraphy by "morse code" required a telegrapher
specialist at each end of the circuit. Even at 12-hour work days,
a communications carrier for twenty-four hour service required
two such specialists paid more than average clerical workers.
Teleprinters could operate essentially unattended, needing
just ordinary clerical help to enter and retrieve messages.

4. Communications security was lessened by manual telegraphy
from reasons of (2) and (3) above plus requiring all security
specialists to tailor their encryption-decryption methods to that
which could be transmitted by "morse code." Teleprinters
were adaptable to on-line encryption-decryption in many forms
of such cryptography and entered communications in the 1930s.
Teleprinter cryptographic apparatus could be quickly destroyed
in case of capture, not true of human telegraphers or crypto-
graphic specialists.

5. Mechanical telegraphy at high sustained communications times
(underwater cable telegraphy) could generate transmissions at
high rate but reception required different specialists and forms of
recording (pen-ink traces on paper, phonography by disk
impression or magnetic means). Mechanical "morse code"
transmission survived only as forms of short automatic
identification of certain radio transmitters.

6. While radio communication in any form was a godsend to the
maritime world at the previous turn of the century, "morse
code" had nothing to do it, only the fact of radio as a medium

that could reach beyond the visible horizon was the key to aid. The maritime world had been inhibited to the visible horizon for rapid communication before radio. Radio liberated mariners. They could now communicate quickly to far distant locations. "Morse code" already had a half-century of existance and widespread, international use on land and trained manual telegraphers in commercial and government communications were available and into 2nd and 3rd generations. Any other on-off coding would have sufficed for communication mode but the key to maritime distress and safety communications was the medium of radio physics, not the way communications was done.

7. The maritime world itself adopted the present-day international Global Marine Distress and Safety System or GMDSS. GMDS communications does not require manual telegraphy specialists available at any time while enroute at sea. Anyone on shipboard having relatively simple training can begin GMDS transmissions which carry both a ship identification and a ship's position automatically derived from GPSS or other automatic positioning system). While that puts a damper on emotion-laden stories of heroism at sea by "sparkies," it is many magnitudes better for Safety Of Life At Sea (SOLAS). SOLAS is not kept to preserve wonderful myths alive, its purpose is to keep people alive.

>As far as the mechanics of the mode go, yes, it's very much a language
>but only in the hands of those experienced in it's use.

So is "rap" music with its "lyrics." :-)

Such boosterism for "morse code" is stretching a point beyond normal bounds of linguistic studies. "Morse code" is based on the English language, always has been. It was first devised and used in the United States, the telegraphic system spreading to inter-national wireline use by those countries whose primary language was of alphabetic form, not syllabic or ideographic..

The majority of the world's population has syllabic or ideographic primary languages. If they wish to use "morse codes" in any form, they are required to adapt to English-like alphabetic forms of phrases...or to change the on-off coding to be representative of their primary language. To them, learning "International Morse Code" literally requires learning a new language.

International Morse Code evolved as a standard in communications due to the burgeoning of various versions of "morse code" in use by the end of World War One. So many versions made it difficult for international telegraphic communications exchanges that a standard was adopted by the CCITT. That standard was based on the most-used version of "morse code" which, at that time, was the representation of letters for English. Standards are done for overall economic considerations, not for linguistic perfection in

the case of a communications tool.

It is arrogant, presumptuous, and disingenuous for those having English as a primary language to say that "morse code" is any kind of "universal language." International Morse Code is still a representation of the English language alphabet, punctuation, and "western" numeric characters. Abbreviations used by telegraphers are based on English words. While "CQ" is given semi-official status as "calling all stations" it is still based loosely on the word "seek you." To communicate "FB OM" is based on the English English "Fine Business (good, okay), Old Man (familar form of old friend)." To send "U R 599" is for the complimentary "You Are (received as) <good signal>."

In one way, the abbreviations become associations in the mind similar to a foreign language but they are most certainly of English language origin...and sometimes of local dialects... and sometimes just holdovers from long-ago days of wireline telegraphy shorthand ("R" for affirmative, "73" for best regards).

It would be safe to say "morse code" is an extreme dialect of English which also combines jargon. It isn't a separate language any more than modern-day "technospeak" using English words is a "separate language." To speak "Paralleling the collector load of Q4 with 50 puffs or more will make your highs roll off too fast," would sound like so much gibberish to someone not versed in wideband circuit design. It is perfectly understandable, comprehensible to us involved in circuit design. We don't describe it as any "separate language" or ascribe mythical qualities of anything based on past glories of circuit design...it is just jargon at work, common everyday speech in the laboratories.

>Cutting to the
>quick here Morse goes in the ears of the users and comes out of the
>mind as a flow of words, phrases and thoughts, not as just streaming
>dots and dashes. Therefore Morse is just as legitimately a language as
>is any other language. The only differerence between Morse and the
>spoken languages is the manner in which it is processed in the mind.

The extreme dialect of English with jargon that is "everyday morse code" among amateurs also has the following qualities:

1. It is totally without the normal tonalities, inflections, nuances of regional dialect found in aural speech of humans. At best, experienced telegraphers can infer some things about the distant operator through rhythm, dot-dash spacings, and some variation on abbreviations. Gender or age identification is almost entirely missing.

2. Communications rate by "morse code" is, at most, one-fifth the rate of spoken English for the same text, even giving

"morse code" users all the benefit of prosigns, abbreviations
and other niceties. That is by comparison of slow "morse
code" users with slow speakers...or...comparison of fast
code users with fast speakers. Code users may say that is
"inaccurate" but it is true for text beyond a brief contact
with signal quality exaggeration and "weather report."

3. There is an absence of human emotion conveyed by
"morse code." Laughter is replaced by "HI HI" which
probably accounts for the lack of normal sense of humor
found among code devotees. Expressions of grief or
sorrow must be replaced by trite phrases of emotion,
that carried over to written English by some code
devotees. It might, but not necessarily so, explain
why some alleged code "experts" become over-
emotional in written English communications.

4. "Universality" of International Morse Code is by treaty, not
based on any linguistic study towards perfection. All code
signals have the same tone frequency determined by
receiver tuning, not that of the transmitter. All signals are
monotonic. They could be generated by humans or robots
with little difference (bounded random errors of dot, dash,
and spacing can be introduced in electronic keyers to
simulate human manual sending).

5. "Morse code" requires humans to have some aptitude for
quick association of on-off monotonic sounds with
representation of written characters of a language. This
is not a universal aptitude but is a minority one existing in
about one-fifth of the population. Spoken and written
languages are comprehended much faster by nearly all in
a population.

>To those who don't have the ability to use Morse of course it's only
>another indecipherable encoding scheme, not so different from RTTY in
>this respect.

Teleprinter signals were never intended to be directly interpreted
by humans. Humans have the inherent ability to read familiar
languages and comprehend them visually at rates of 100 to 1000
words per minute equivalent rate. Teleprinters, whether on wire-
line or radio, were designed and intended to convey written
languages directly without need of "signal interpreter" specialists.

Television signals requiring MegaHertz of bandwidth were never
intended to be directly comprehended by humans...yet they are
watched regularly by all ages and genders at 30 complete
images per second.

>This is why those non-users of Morse who diss the mode
>are the same flavor of nit-wits who bitch about French when they can't

>speak a word of French. Or any of the plethora of variations on the
>theme we've seen posted here by the clueless.

The "dissing" of "morse code" users is done for their personal
arrogance and presumption of superiority in a radio hobby when
they put on their (invisible) emperor's new clothes so often. :-)

Many words of French are common in the English vocabulary.
The international spoken form of distress call is "mayday,"
a very close Anglicized version of the French word for "help
me." It is fairly easy to pronounce French, more difficult to
spell it or use it correctly. :-)

If "morse code" mode had any redeeming qualities for radio
communications, it would not have been dropped by all other
radio services or never be considered from the beginning. It
remains only in amateur radio used by a minority who
consider themselves "superior" for possessing a singular
skill of little or no use elsewhere.

There, maybe Kellie can start concentrating on the SUBJECT
instead of his usual personal insults. He can return the white
sheet to his solitary bed...hopefully after laundering it...

3320. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 21:31:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EA5B498.E1F55C0C@att.net>
Source record: 65457

Dave Heil wrote:

> stewart wrote:
> >
> > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030414221120.15625.00000245@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> > > In article <f45722ac.0304130444.43023c10@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > Well, who said that Morse Code was a growth industry? Granted, there
> > > seem to be more products for helping people learn the Morse Code now
> > > than at any other time in history. As another poster observed, the
> > > interest in QRP caused by new, off-the-shelf QRP rigs like the Yaesu
> > > FT-817 is making CW more popular than ever. And now that we're on
> > > the downside of the current solar cycle, using these rigs will be more
> > > dependant on CW than ever.
> >
> > Nah - the FT-817 makes a GREAT 6m rig... and CW on 6m is about as
> > popular as a stinky sock.
>
> You must not be active on 6m, Stew. There is plenty of CW activity on
> six.

Dave, are you *really* surprised that he doesn't know that?

3321. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 21:34:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EA5B580.3C3003AD@att.net>
Source record: 65458

stewart wrote:

> As the number of Novice Class license-holders dwindles down to a
> handful, and the elimination of this class of Amateurs seems
> inevitbable; it seems a good time to reflect on what this means to the
> US Amateur Radio Service...
>
> Let's look at the term "Novice" itself... the word Novice is derived
> from the Middle English word "novis" - which means, literally "No
> Vice"... so, what this means in terms of the rest of the Amateur
> classes, is that these Novices are the only Operators having "No
> Vice"... the rest of us have this "vice" of ham radio... some to more
> degree than others... but, in all cases, we "have the vice"... or, in
> other words, are "of the vicious"... this can clearly be seen here on
> this Usenet group, where all of these Non-Novices, fight their vicious
> battles everyday... yes, the Novices will be missed - as all we will
> be is "pure vice".

So far all we've seen from your direction is pure BS.

3322. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 21:38:22 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdr6hkb.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 65459

On 21 Apr 2003 10:09:15 -0700, N2EY wrote:

>Seems to me that one of the biggest headaches FCC has in the area of
>noncommercial radio is the issue of freebanders and those who abuse
>cb.
>
>FCC enforcement of these problems is hampered by the need to locate
>and identify the violators, as well as to develop evidence to warrant
>a search. IOW the FCC can't just knock on anyone's door and demand to
>check for an illegal radio installation.

FCC enforcement agents could - and did - knock on the door and
-request- to make an inspection but do not have the authority to
enter by force if refused. It takes a court order (warrant) for
that to happpen. If there is evidence of operation in violation
of law or rules, the FCC has the authority to issue a monetary
penalty (administrative version of a fine) against the operator.

>OTOH, when someone applies for an amateur license, they give FCC all
>sorts of info about themselves and also agree to allow FCC folks to
>inspect their stations at any reasonable time AND whenever the station
>is in operation. FCC CAN knock on a ham's door and demand to inspect
>the ham's station.

Again, the FCC cannot enter by force if refused, but the "hook"
that the FCC has is much easier - it can suspend/revoke the
amateur license as well as issue a monetary penalty.

>Much less work for FCC to check out a ham's QTH
>than that of an unlicensed freebander.

>So maybe, just maybe, FCC wants to make amateur radio licenses easier
>to get so as to fight the freeband problem. If FCC could get all of the
>freebanders licensed as hams, enforcement would be much easier.

Another way of looking at it is that the courts and The
Congress take the easy way out and try to define what they
consider the "root problem" (whether that is the problem or
not). In the case of a freebander, the issue is that the
operator did not have a license. How to solve that - change
the rules so that s/he gets licensed or can legally operate
without one. Problem solved (??) and case closed.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

3323. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 21:38:23 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdr6xjc.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 65460

On Mon, 21 Apr 2003 15:35:12 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:

> Since a ham radio license (excluding Tech of course) authorizes
> operation on radiotelegraphy, as a large part of ham radio
> today, why wouldn't a test of radiotelegraphy ability be in
> order?

Even a tech licensee can operate (manual Morse) radiotelegraphy
- just not on the HF bands.

"Is it OK to wear jeans to the office? Yes, it's OK to wear
jeans to the office, just not to THIS office"...
(paraphrase of 1970s cartoon)

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

3324. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 21:41:14 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0304222132400.108@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 65461

On Tue, 22 Apr 2003, stewart wrote:
> As the number of Novice Class license-holders dwindles down to a
> handful, and the elimination of this class of Amateurs seems
> inevitbable; it seems a good time to reflect on what this means to the
> US Amateur Radio Service...
>
> Let's look at the term "Novice" itself... the word Novice is derived
> from the Middle English word "novis" - which means, literally "No
> Vice"... so, what this means in terms of the rest of the Amateur
> classes, is that these Novices are the only Operators having "No
> Vice"... the rest of us have this "vice" of ham radio... some to more
> degree than others... but, in all cases, we "have the vice"... or, in
> other words, are "of the vicious"... this can clearly be seen here on
> this Usenet group, where all of these Non-Novices, fight their vicious
> battles everyday... yes, the Novices will be missed - as all we will
> be is "pure vice".

I can't believe how stupid you are.

Novice is actually derrived from the latin adjective NOVUS which means new,
plus the noun suffix -ICE, meaning "possessing a state or quality." Therefore,
the combined defintion is "[a person] possessing the quality of being new."

3325. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 21:41:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EA5B70C.F3E7025@att.net>
Source record: 65462

Hey, youse guys lay off my bud Vito, his bona fides are all there. He can't help it
if he never5 got around to appreciating CW, and he's already said he may just find
the time to do it in his upcoming retirement. I can accept that. If I've learned
anything in life it IS "different strokes for different folks" has to be the key to
survival of us all, or at least hopefully most of us- some strokes out there just
caused the strokers to "get stroked" bigtime in the past year or so, and that's
the way it has to be. The survivors gotta live with it.

But let Vito enjoy the hobby as he can and will, and do so yourself. And if I had
a KA3--- callsign that I could trade in for the same suffix as K3--- for 12 bucks
a ten year term, I'd do it in a flash, as surely you'all would too.

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030422135020.18912.00000244@mb-m25.aol.com...
> > >getting
> > >accepted into Boozefighters MC by Wino Willy hisself,
> >
> > How impressive.
>
> Especially from a vanity call K3....
>
> Have you ever wondered why so many folks with call signs actually seem to
> dislike ham radio? Why are they still here then?
>
> Dan/W4NTI

3326. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 21:41:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422174141.18769.00000107@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 65463

In article <5f4fe4c2.0304221300.3996b651@posting.google.com>,
horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:

>As the number of Novice Class license-holders dwindles down to a
>handful, and the elimination of this class of Amateurs seems
>inevitbable; it seems a good time to reflect on what this means to the
>US Amateur Radio Service...
>
>Let's look at the term "Novice" itself... the word Novice is derived
>from the Middle English word "novis" - which means, literally "No
>Vice"... so, what this means in terms of the rest of the Amateur
>classes, is that these Novices are the only Operators having "No
>Vice"... the rest of us have this "vice" of ham radio... some to more
>degree than others... but, in all cases, we "have the vice"... or, in
>other words, are "of the vicious"... this can clearly be seen here on
>this Usenet group, where all of these Non-Novices, fight their vicious
>battles everyday... yes, the Novices will be missed - as all we will
>be is "pure vice".

Vinny, vice, video... (film at 11...)

Dwight, someone will make you an "offer" you can't refuse!

:-)

3327. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 22:34:10 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b84fvf$i9f$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65464

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0304221231.30166900@posting.google.com...
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030414221120.15625.00000245@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0304130444.43023c10@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > Well, who said that Morse Code was a growth industry? Granted, there
> > seem to be more products for helping people learn the Morse Code now
> > than at any other time in history. As another poster observed, the
> > interest in QRP caused by new, off-the-shelf QRP rigs like the Yaesu
> > FT-817 is making CW more popular than ever. And now that we're on
> > the downside of the current solar cycle, using these rigs will be more
> > dependant on CW than ever.
>
> Nah - the FT-817 makes a GREAT 6m rig... and CW on 6m is about as
> popular as a stinky sock.
>
> - Stewart

Oh really ???? The explain all the CW contacts Ive had in the last two
E-skip seasons on six meters. Try listening before inserting stinky sock in
your mouth.

Dan/W4NTI

3328. Re: internet voice gateways - taking your handheld overseas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 23:17:24 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422191724.19022.00000493@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 65468

From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>>>Ham radio without internet linking is like a fish without a banjo.
>>
>> The phrase is "fish without a bicycle".
>
> So the fish really does need a banjo? 8^)
>

No, thats the known phrase.

3329. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 23:27:45 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422192745.19022.00000494@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 65470

From K4YZ:

> That list could get real long, Vippy..Ya sure ya wanna go there?

No. Sorry for the unrelated comment.

3330. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 23:27:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304221527.4f25ab14@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65469

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0304210815.5d963e7@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304200713.6c451ea@posting.google.com>...

. . . . .

> > To those who don't have the ability to use Morse of course it's only
> > another indecipherable encoding scheme, not so different from RTTY in
> > this respect. This is why those non-users of Morse who diss the mode
> > are the same flavor of nit-wits who bitch about French when they can't
> > speak a word of French. Or any of the plethora of variations on the
> > theme we've seen posted here by the clueless.
> >
> > By the way none of the above has anything to do with code tests.
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Beautiful, just beautiful. Clearly says in a few paragraphs what some
> of us have been trying to say for years. Can I quote the above?

Go for it.

> Only thing I could even try to add is a comparison to ASL and other
> sign languages used by the deaf (and some non-deaf folks). At a basic
> level, fingerspelling could be considered an "encoding scheme" for the
> alphabet and numbers, while the word signs could be considered an
> "encoding scheme" for common words. But ASL and other sign languages
> are much more than encoding schemes.

When one gets right down to it ASL, Morse, handwriting and all the
rest are simply langauges which use an assortment of different
input/output "devices" to communcate with the base language. For
example: In this country the base language is American English.
Thoughts, concepts & data are created in the mind in base English. To
be able to transmit the thoughts, concepts and data to other users of
the base language one engages whichever of what I call the
"communications languages" gets the job done given specific situations
and the available communications assets. These range from speaking &
hearing, ASL, Morse, reading & writing, and who knows how many others
and they can obviously be mixed.

Comes the question of whether my "communications languages" are
encoding schemes or are actually languages. I don't know nor do I care
because that's an exercise in semantics circle-jerking which is not my
schtick. What I do know for certain is that if Morse is defined as an

encoding scheme then so are all the rest of the mechanisms we use to communicate with each other.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3331. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 23:40:19 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422194019.19022.00000495@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 65471

From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>> Why would repeaters last any longer than cell phone towers? Plus all
>repeater
>> users would share one freq. Not practical in an emergency.
>
> Are you serious? hint:
>the repeaters often have emergency generators

Thats not enough. Local repeater went down and there was no storm. Can you cite specific examples where amateur repeaters are better than non-amateur repeaters?

>Hmm, I might do such a thing if I were trying to appeal to a broad
>>>range of interests.

Showing Morse code keyers would make those that were interested in the <lastest> communications techniques less interested in amateur radio.

>How you going to illustrate the latest techniques?

There are ways. Show Walsh codes or Turbo codes as numbers running across. Have a bunch of waveforms, etc.

There actually was something at a Hamfest/Convention. A setup was there where someone used a network analyzer and some patch antennas. This kind of stuff is <rarely> there. (It is usually the exception, not the rule at Hamfests). This is the stuff that should be mentioned in ad, not Morse code keyers.

Or show people using microwave equipment. Show radio amateurs using them.

3332. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 23:42:50 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <_rkpa.1535$Bk5.1290088@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65465

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EA42F79.3CCFED6E@crosslink.net...
> But skating ability is essential to hockey, Morse is not essential to
> radio communications, it isn't even very useful. Fun maybe, useful - no.
>
> 73, K3DWW

Useful? Definitely yes. I've seen several occasions when the HF bands were in too poor a condition to support understandable voice communications but the people on CW/Morse were having plenty of good, readable QSOs. While some of the other digital modes would also work, all the other digital modes require that you have a computer hooked into your radio.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

3333. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 23:45:15 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422194515.19022.00000496@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 65473

From N2EY

> At a basic
>level, fingerspelling could be considered an "encoding scheme" for the
>alphabet and numbers, while the word signs could be considered an
>"encoding scheme" for common words.

There's anohter example of symbol encoding.

>But ASL and other sign languages
>are much more than encoding schemes.

Like how?

Also note, there is a need for sign language. It is used to communicate for handicapped people. Morse code has not such use. Also, hardware can encode and decode Morse code symbols so people don't have to.

3334. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-22 23:57:12 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <sFkpa.1537$Bk5.1301656@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65466

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030421163241.19006.00000448@mb-m05.aol.com...
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
> >If I see a test, I take it. It appears that if you see a test, you
> >passively avoid it if you think it is too hard or irrevelent.
> >
>
> I have taken tests. I don't avoid tests. My good grades in <hard> rf
courses
> show I can pass tests.
>
> Morse code IS irrelevant. Amateur radio licensed Comm Theory Prof
apparently
> agrees. The other rf Profs do not even have amateur radio license, not
even the
> antenna Prof!

That is one person's opinion. There are other people with equal credentials that believe just the opposite. Besides until you've been on HF (i.e. shortwave) and had the band deteriorate to the point where voice signals were unintelligible, you don't have the background to evaluate the relevancy of Morse code. And don't rant about the other digital modes. All the other digital modes require that a computer be hooked into the radio.

>
> >Too many people think that way, and all they end up
> >with is a litany of excuses for not getting anywhere.
>
> To many people use Morse to block the real talent in the hobby.

Nobody is using Morse to block the real talent. It only keeps out the uninterested.

>
> They use an easily (but time consuming) learnable skill as some kind of
proof
> of achievement. Even real emergency comm skills would be more useful than
Morse
> code.
>
> The skill has no use outside amateur radio or anywhere. Its "usefulness"
is
> only to those that made a social agreement that "Morse code will be
useful".

> Juggling(Morse code) is a skill - Outside of the circus(Ham radio), it has
> little use.

But one can use that argument in reverse. Inside the circus (Ham radio),
juggling (Morse code) is very useful.

>
> >It certainly IS much easier to generate excuses for not doing something
> >than it is to just buckle down and do something.
>
> From a small sample, I know have the ability to learn real-time encoding.
> Therefore, one cannot say that I cannot do Morse code. I did not make an
excuse
> that I cannot learn it. I made a decision that the limited benefit was not
> worth the time to learn it.
>

You are not qualified to judge its benefit so how can you possibly judge
whether it is worthwhile.

> >I bet you
> >might have something to offer the hobby if you tried, but you just want
> >to resent things.
>
> Hams only are interested in their aspects. The aspects I would offer, Hams
> would not be interested in.
>
> Hams like contesting, chasing DX, antennas. Hams have little in common
with
> electronic hobbyists.
>

Then why do you keep blathering on about amateur radio as if you had an
interest in it. It has become quite apparent that you are only interested
in electronics. Therefore amateur radio probably isn't for you.

> And relative has discouraged me from going to Hamfests and told me that
Hams
> are old, often non EE people.

Why should ham radio be limited to EE people? Why should they even be in
the majority? Several developments in ham radio were made by people who
had no EE background whatsoever. Ham radio is intended for anyone who has
sufficient interest in learning the basic knowledge required for operating,
maintaining a legal functioning set up, and many other aspects of ham radio.
I know doctors, lawyers, truck drivers, engineers, and people in just about
every career you can name who are amateur radio operators and that's the way
it was intended to be and should be.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

3335. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:01:55 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <TJkpa.1539$Bk5.1305755@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65467

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:3EA4584C.1040402@mailcity.moc...
>
>
> Vshah101 wrote:
>
> >
> > HAM radio is boring <to me>. The rest of amateur radio can be
interesting.
>
> Could you please explain the difference between ham radio and
> amateur radio?
>

From Vshah101's many previous postings it can be deduced that his divisions
goes like this:
Everything Vshah101 likes (which is only electronics) is amateur radio
Everything Vshah101 dislikes (which is all other aspects) is ham radio.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

3336. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:06:05 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EA5D8ED.8090905@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 65560

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:3EA4584C.1040402@mailcity.moc...
>
>>
>>Vshah101 wrote:
>>
>>
>>>HAM radio is boring <to me>. The rest of amateur radio can be
>>
> interesting.
>
>>Could you please explain the difference between ham radio and
>>amateur radio?
>>
>
>
> From Vshah101's many previous postings it can be deduced that his divisions
> goes like this:
> Everything Vshah101 likes (which is only electronics) is amateur radio
> Everything Vshah101 dislikes (which is all other aspects) is ham radio.
>

Vshah101 needs to go back to Basics 101.

3337. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:24:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304221624.1e8710f8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65475

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<A%boa.9$Bk5.24038@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0304190403.3041a07a@posting.google.com...
> > [snip]
> >When I see a benefit to upgrading to
> > extra, I will do so. I don't collect licenses, nor plaster my wall
> > with superfluous achievements.
>
> Here were my reasons to upgrade to Extra (in no particular order).

My reasons respect to your reasons

> 1) To see if I could do it.

I've done it before, don't have anything to prove, and don't have a
lot of free time.

> 2) So I didn't have to remember so many different frequencies for my
> privilege limits. i.e. I only have to remember the top of the band, bottom
> of the band, and split between voice and CW for some bands rather than the
> tops and bottoms of the General or Advanced subbands.

That would be a good reason if you didn't live in a restricted
development. I'm now a SW listener.

> 3) To participate fully as a VE

Thank you for serving.

> 4) A significant percentage of the most interesting DX on HF hangs out in
> what are the Extra class portions of our bands.

Probably.

Brian

3338. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:26:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304221626.10f3e6f5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65476

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b7rqic$96g$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030419101829.18793.00000266@mb-m04.aol.com...
> > >I just got a promotion at work.
> >
> > Oh good, are you now the Head Fry cook?
> >
> > >I don't collect licenses, nor plaster my wall
> > >with superfluous achievement
> >
> > Well then turn in your General
>
> Thats right....using his logic....since he is now a SWL...he don't even need
> the General. Turn it in.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

You can turn in your brain now.

3339. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:26:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422202617.18755.00000241@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 65477

In article <20030422001726.18767.00000113@mb-m15.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

> (Prissy Parson)

> Tsk, tsk, tsk.

> "Bandini is the word for fertilizer!" [Bandini radio ad]

> "Bandini."

> Bandini.

> Prissy Parson

> [explitive].

> Sit on them.

> Bandini

> Bandini

> Bandini

> Bandini

> Bandini

> (Prissy Parson)

> Tsk, tsk, tsk.

> Bandini

> Prissy Parson

> "[explitive deleted]."

> Unacceptible.

> [explitive deleted]

> [explitive deleted]

> Tsk, tsk, tsk.

> Bandini

> Stay forcussed.
>
> Stay focussed.

> Bandini .

> Bandini.

> Bandini.

> Bandini.

> Bandini.

> Fear.

> Prissy Parson

> Truckloads of Bandin.

> Bandini

> Prissy Parson Bandini

> Prissy Parson

> TS. Bandini.

> "Bandini is the word for fertilizer."

> Large load of [explitive] Bandini.

Well, there you have it ;-)

3340. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:27:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304221627.45b9e697@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65478

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3EA55079.D5D8BE66@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3EA357A0.497273A1@att.net>..
>
> > >. Something smells. Care to explain?
> >
> > Dick, you'll not be satisfied with any answe
>
> At least none that you can put forth, as clearly shown in the past year or so
> of postings you've hung up on rrap. Nothing new here.

Are you still a donkey?

You act more like a mule.

3341. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:29:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304221629.1e1848e1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65479

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030422073938.18912.00000434@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 4/22/2003 6:05 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0304220305.707d52f4@posting.google.com>
>
> >True. The dead donkey that grew bigger and bigger each day finally
> >exploded. There was a tremendous stench.
>
> ...But it seems you made it home OK, Brain...
>
> So all the kings horses and all the kings men DID put you together again,
> huh...?!?!
>
> Welcome home.
>
> Steve

Steve, its DICK that claims he's also a donkey.

3342. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:31:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304221631.49eeded1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65480

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA354D2.28616C52@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA181CE.D5602581@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.
> > >
> > > He could have operated and just stated that his commander gave him
> > > verbal permission...but he didn't.
>
> >
> > But you said that you asked for permission and it was denied.
>
> ...and?
>
> Dave K8MN

If your permission was denied then you couldn't operate.

3343. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:32:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304221632.59448c91@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65481

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA17EE9.186D6088@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA08B39.5D963178@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA00D1B.4C785DDD@earthlink.net>...
> > > >
> > > > > I haven't stated a goal here.
> > > >
> > > > You don't need to. It's obvious.
> > >
> > > Then, pray tell, why are you wasting my time in asking me for a stated
> > > goal?
> >
> > I was curious if you knew.
>
> No, I had no idea why you were wasting my time. That's why I posed the
> question.
>
What did you learn?

3344. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:34:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hdri14h.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 65482

[No readable article body recovered]

3345. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:35:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304221635.5f79eb06@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65483

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0304210822.394e8bd7@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304181516.72d2bc90@posting.google.com>...
> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0304180825.25d5028e@posting.google.com>...
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304180255.47558d1@posting.google.com>...
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E9F868F.E926046@earthlink.net>...
>
> (big snip of old stuff)
>
> > > > Len states that he was stationed in Japan, and Huffy calls him a REMF.
> > >
> > > Brian,
> > >
> > > Who is "Huffy"?
>
> Well? Is "Huffy" meant to be Dave, K8MN?
> > >
> > > I've read Dave's posts, looked back through this thread, and even
> > > searched Google, but I cannot find the post where Dave calls Len an
> > > "REMF".
>
> I did find a post where Hans called Len an REMF, but no post where
> Dave called anyone an REMF.
> > >
> > > Could you point us to it, please?
>
> Well?
> > >
> > > > Huffy then makes claims that he is/was a warrior, but cannot
> > > > reference any of it.
> > >
> > > Can not or will not?
> >
> > Jim, please don't quote "REMF" as it isn't polite.
>
> It's not? Then why did you use it in your post?
>
> Brian, in this thread it appears that you're the first person to use
> the term "REMF". You claim that someone called "Huffy" called Len an
> REMF. But you cannot point us to the post where that was done, nor

> explain who "Huffy" is.
>
> Fascinating.

You ask a lot of questions for a guys who's mind is already made up.

3346. Re: Echolink - Remove your Radio Award

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:36:11 UTC
From: Kjay <jayb100001@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ea5dffb@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 65484
Cross-posted to: aus.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I too suspect this "sandy" guy was nothing more
than an elaborate troll. Probably one of these
clowns who runs low-power during DX contests
and bootlegs rare-dx callsigns?

I too use Echolink and I have
yet to find a SINGLE INSTANCE of a
non-Amateur licenced bootlegger using the same.

Thanks for the heads-up Spiro

Jay
"Spiro" <dice@fuzzy.net> wrote in message
news:%K8pa.20065$1s1.299693@newsfeeds.bigpond.com...
> LOL!!
> Hear hear.
>
> Face it, anyone who calls themself "sandman" and has a childish "welcome
to the
> sandpit" theme on their website has to questioned.
>
> This fool can't even get "ARRL" correct, and yes, we've all noted his
overly
> defensive nature on many of his posts. Dare anyone say anything against
his
> precious IRLoserP.
>
> What do expect from some sicko that has a history of stalking others on
the
> internet? Ohh, you're not aware of that one either?
>
> SV
>
>
> "14313 funtime" <ballbags@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:3ea4896f@snipnews.snip.net...
> >
> > "sandman" <sandman@sandbox.com> wrote in message
> > news:3ea39fc4@news.comindico.com.au...
> >
> > No, what a weird world you live in. It's backwards-minded
> > people like you, what have held this hobby back and resisted
> > change for YEARS. First it was CW, then it was "no-code"
> > now it's Echolink. Hams with mindsets resistant to change

> > like U are why we are not ahead in the technology game anymore.
> >
> >
> >
>

3347. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:38:05 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Nflpa.11$X32.10662@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65472

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030422001129.19072.00000278@mb-m10.aol.com...
>
> How do you know that? Do you work for FEMA?
>
> Why would repeaters last any longer than cell phone towers? Plus all
repeater
> users would share one freq. Not practical in an emergency.
>

You show your ignorance about emergency communications. There was an excellent article in QST about the major contribution in communications support made by the ham radio operators at the World Trade Center disaster site. There are emergencies on a regular basis where amateur radio has been the only way to get enough communications into and out of an area.

Why do repeaters last longer? Simple. There are many INDENDENT repeaters. If one goes down, the others are still accessible. With cell phones, if one tower goes down, you've lost communications in a wide area. Also hams can, on fairly short notice, dismantle their repeater and move it to a more suitable location as was done for the 9/11 disaster. Even if the repeaters are unavailable, many amateur radio operators (you do have to study the techniques) also know how to effectively and accurately relay messages from one operator to another to get to it's final destination.

Cell phone systems and regular phone systems are only designed to handle normal traffic loads with only small margins for typical peak usage. They are very short of capacity when major disasters occur. Phone calls, both cellular and regular, were taking over 1/2 hour or more to get through for days after the World Trade Centers fell.

When an emergency is declared, the FCC can and does allocate certain frequencies for usage during the emergency. Those not involved in those communications are required to stay off those frequencies. This was done for the 9/11 disaster and is frequently done for hurricanes and has been done just this past winter for a major ice storm.

The group handling the communications has procedures to move "traffic" as it is called smoothly and effectively. There is a "net control" who directs the communications. The other operators can only speak when directed to do so by the net control unless an immediate threat to life or limb occurs and then there is a procedure to immediately break in and get the critical message transmitted.

>
> Amateur radio is not good for:

> Emergency communications
>

Amateur radio has proven its worth many times over for emergency communications. Time and again they have provided vital emergency communications. ARRL, a major organization for amateur radio, makes available extensive training courses on emergency preparedness and radio procedures.

Emergency preparedness groups for the nation, cities, states, and counties factor the availability of amateur radio into their emergency plans. They know, even if you do not, that neither commercial communications (phones and cell phones) nor standard emergency communications (police, fire, etc) have the capacity to handle even a medium sized disaster let alone a large scale emergency.

> Amateur radio is good for:
> International goodwill

And it's also good for international goodwill.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3348. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:38:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304221638.19a8b4ce@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65485

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3EA44E1C.A7C28AE2@att.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > Fascinating.
>
> As usual, you're much too kind. I'd tend to use another descriptive.

DICK

3349. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:50:24 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <krlpa.12$X32.14100@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65474

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030422194019.19022.00000495@mb-m11.aol.com...
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
> Thats not enough. Local repeater went down and there was no storm. Can you
cite
> specific examples where amateur repeaters are better than non-amateur
> repeaters?

The World Trade Center disaster.
The ice storms in some parts of this country this past winter
Almost every major hurricane over the last several decades.

Plus amateurs have message relay techniques, if they care to study them,
that enable them to get messages in and out without a repeater anyway.

>
>
> Showing Morse code keyers would make those that were interested in the
> <lastest> communications techniques less interested in amateur radio.
>
> >How you going to illustrate the latest techniques?
>
> There are ways. Show Walsh codes or Turbo codes as numbers running across.
Have
> a bunch of waveforms, etc.

These things are meaningless to someone who hasn't studied them. How would
it then intrigue a prospective ham when they don't know what they are?

>
> There actually was something at a Hamfest/Convention. A setup was there
where
> someone used a network analyzer and some patch antennas. This kind of
stuff is
> <rarely> there. (It is usually the exception, not the rule at Hamfests).
This
> is the stuff that should be mentioned in ad, not Morse code keyers.
>
> Or show people using microwave equipment. Show radio amateurs using them.

To the non-ham, they wouldn't be able to tell the difference between
microwave equipment and other radio equipment.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3350. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:51:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304221651.799558b2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65486

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA214A5.999E7538@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <f45722ac.0304190500.7cfb962@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> > >He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.
> >
> > I'd heard he might have been a snow-removal supervisor for
> > the runways at Tan Son Hut...but that's probably just a rumor.
>
> Just for the record, Len, where is Tan Son Hut?
>
> Dave K8MN

Most people would say its in Vietnam (Ho Chi Minh City/Tan Son Nhat).

Where do you and Wonder Boy put it?

3351. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:56:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304221656.77da5b32@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65487

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030419234714.19043.00000285@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >Date: 4/19/2003 10:32 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3EA214A5.999E7538@earthlink.net>
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> >> I'd heard he might have been a snow-removal supervisor for
> >> the runways at Tan Son Hut...but that's probably just a rumor.
> >
> >Just for the record, Len, where is Tan Son Hut?
>
> Kaaaaaa-BAM!
>
> Nice one, Dave ! !
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Ka-Bloooie!!!

Yee-Haw!!!

Dave just learned to love the MOAB!!!

Nice one, Steve ! !

3352. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:58:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422205818.18935.00000743@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65488

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030421151548.18769.00000104@mb-m24.aol.com>

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Fourth use of plagiarized comments today.

Steve, K4YZ

3353. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 00:58:46 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422205846.25464.00000001@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 65489

>I've done it before, don't have anything to prove, and don't have a
>lot of free time.
>

Just checked QRZ again Brian, nope your still not an EXTRA.

3354. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 01:00:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422210022.18935.00000744@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65490

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030421151547.18769.00000103@mb-m24.aol.com>

>No matter what job, educational level....(SNIP)

Fifth use of plagiarized comments today...

Pretty lame...

Steve, K4YZ

3355. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 01:01:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422210146.18935.00000745@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65491

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030421151549.18769.00000106@mb-m24.aol.com>

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Sixth use of plagiarized comments today.

Are we seeing a pattern of abuse and strained ethics here...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

3356. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 01:03:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422210315.18935.00000746@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65492

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030421151551.18769.00000107@mb-m24.aol.com>

>>> No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>>
>> A plagiarizing putz, at that.
>>
>>Sheeesh.
>
> No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Still at it for seventh time today.

Liar, cheat AND plagiarist.

Some "professional"...Yeah..I can see how Brain and Vippy look up to this guy...

Steve, K4YZ

3357. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 01:04:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422210436.18935.00000747@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65493

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030421151552.18769.00000108@mb-m24.aol.com>

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Eighth use of plagiarized comments.

Borrrrrrrinnnnnng, Your Putziness.

Steve

3358. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 01:08:05 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <VHlpa.572562$L1.167101@sccrnsc02>
Source record: 65494

Hello Stewart .. It is a shame guys get their shorts tight by a little fun ....no sense of humor. OTOH It is a shame to see that class of ticket go south. I have many fond memories of my days on 40 on the 3 crystals I had. The class allowed me to develop a skill that continues to bring me enjoyment and a release of my day's stress.

God Bless 73 KI3R Port Vue Pa nr Pittsburgh
"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0304221300.3996b651@posting.google.com...
> As the number of Novice Class license-holders dwindles down to a
> handful, and the elimination of this class of Amateurs seems
> inevitbable; it seems a good time to reflect on what this means to the
> US Amateur Radio Service...
>
> Let's look at the term "Novice" itself... the word Novice is derived
> from the Middle English word "novis" - which means, literally "No
> Vice"... so, what this means in terms of the rest of the Amateur
> classes, is that these Novices are the only Operators having "No
> Vice"... the rest of us have this "vice" of ham radio... some to more
> degree than others... but, in all cases, we "have the vice"... or, in
> other words, are "of the vicious"... this can clearly be seen here on
> this Usenet group, where all of these Non-Novices, fight their vicious
> battles everyday... yes, the Novices will be missed - as all we will
> be is "pure vice".

3359. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 01:31:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422213133.18935.00000758@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65495

>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/21/2003 3:32 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030421163241.19006.00000448@mb-m05.aol.com>

>Morse code IS irrelevant. Amateur radio licensed Comm Theory Prof apparently
>agrees. The other rf Profs do not even have amateur radio license, not even
>the
>antenna Prof!

Morse Code is not irrelevent. It is irrelevent to YOU, since you elect to
remain a No Code tech, and that's alright.

I doubt your "profs" have a clue about anything beyond the theoretical, if
you are the end result of thier endeavors.

>To many people use Morse to block the real talent in the hobby.

Huh...?!?!

>They use an easily (but time consuming) learnable skill as some kind of proof
>of achievement.

It IS an achievement, Vippy. ALL learning is an achievement. Even for
you.

>Even real emergency comm skills would be more useful than Morse
>code.

What "emergency comm skills" SUFFER because of one's proficiency with
Morse Code, Vipul? Real-time examples, please, not some vague comments of
vaporous "profs"...

>The skill has no use outside amateur radio or anywhere.

TIS IS AN AMATEUR RADIO FORUM, Vipul...!!! Who CARES where else it may be
useful...?!?!

>Its "usefulness" is
>only to those that made a social agreement that "Morse code will be useful".

Whew...Solid bovine by-product there, Vippy.

It is USEFUL to anyone who makes a contact with another Amateur Radio
station. No "agreements" need be made.

>Juggling(Morse code) is a skill - Outside of the circus(Ham radio), it has
>little use.

Is this more of how you "support" Amateur Radio, Vippy? To compare it to
a "circus"...?!?!

> >It certainly IS much easier to generate excuses for not doing something
>>than it is to just buckle down and do something.
>
>From a small sample, I know have the ability to learn real-time encoding.
>Therefore, one cannot say that I cannot do Morse code.

Sure "one" can...Hre...I'll do it:

"Vipul Shah cannot learn Morse Code".

See...I said it. Can you prove me wrong?

>I did not make an excuse
>that I cannot learn it. I made a decision that the limited benefit was not
>worth the time to learn it.

Since you ahev decided that it's not useful for YOU, and yuo have made
this personal choice, why do you find it necessary to be abuseive and insulting
to those who DO choose to do it...?!?!

>>I bet you
>>might have something to offer the hobby if you tried, but you just want
>>to resent things.
>
>Hams only are interested in their aspects. The aspects I would offer, Hams
>would not be interested in.

Obviously not, Vipul. You can't seem to get the satisfaction of "winning
converts" at the local Amateur Radio clubs.

>Hams like contesting, chasing DX, antennas. Hams have little in common with
>electronic hobbyists.

More solid bovine by-product.

>>Take the total time you have spent posting to rrap. You almost
>>certainly have spent more time on that than you would learning Morse Code.
>
>Just getting the coded license shows you wasted time learning code.

Not if you achieved a goal...If getting an Amateur General or Amateur
Extra class license was the goal, it was time well spent. Otherwise your goals
could not be achieved.

>Outside of Ham radio, Morse is not useful. Hospitals, firefighters, etc do
>not
>use Morse code. Chasing DX is not valued outside Ham radio.

So? This is a forum about Amateur Radio. Youa re free to discuss whatever
you want since it's unmoderated, but in the context of AMATEUR Radio, Morse
Code IS completely relevent AND useful.

>Morse code is used because of a social agreement in the Ham culture that it
>is
>desirable to learn Morse code.

Morse Code is used because it represents a minimum of required technology
to employ and permits operators with different languages to communicate at a
basic level and be mutually understood.

>No, if I learned the code, I would not "decry" it.

SURE you WOULD! Absolutely NO differently than you "decry" Amateur Radio
in non-Amateur Radio forums now!

>I would do everything to
>defend it, since I made the effort to learn it.

SURE you WOULD! Absolutely no differently than you "support" Amateur Radio
in non-Amateur Radio forums now!

>Much like how I know I won't
>enjoy a Hamfest, but I try to convince that there will be something useful
>there.

Oh...I see...You have unabashedly denigrated just about every aspect of
Hamfests in this forum and rec.radio.CB despite insisting that you "support"
Amateur Radio.

NOW you say you'd "support" Morse Code if you learned it even though you
don't like it.

To say you'll "support" something when in reality you don't like it or
even disdain it is to LIE, Vipul.

>And relative has discouraged me from going to Hamfests and told me that Hams
>are old, often non EE people.

Some of my relatives have ried to discourage me from going to 7-11's since
many clerks there are old and from central Asian countries, often non-USA
people.

(Are you getting the drift on just how bigoted that comment of YOURS
sounded, Vippy?)

>Its not code so much as Hams focus on contesting, antennas, chasing
>wallpaper,
>and other boring activities.

If ALL you want to do is tinker or "homebrew", Vippy, I can almost
absolutely assure you that no contester, certificate chaser or antenna fanatic
will enter your home and drag you away and FORCE you to do any of that.

Steve, K4YZ

3360. Re: Echolink - Remove your Radio Award

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 01:33:20 UTC
From: sandman <sandman@luvs.spiro>
Message-ID: <3ea5ed5f@news.comindico.com.au>
Source record: 65496
Cross-posted to: aus.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Kjay wrote:

>
> I too suspect this "sandy" guy was nothing more
> than an elaborate troll. Probably one of these
> clowns who runs low-power during DX contests
> and bootlegs rare-dx callsigns?

Hmm, as soon as someone started cross posting messages to other groups, out come the hillbillies. Geeze Spiro, at least you have one friend in life .....ehehehehehh

>
> I too use Echolink and I have
> yet to find a SINGLE INSTANCE of a
> non-Amateur licenced bootlegger using the same.

They are under your bed Kjay, be VERY carefull

Sandman

3361. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 01:34:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422213416.18935.00000759@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65497

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/21/2003 4:20 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030421172042.18755.00000192@mb-m05.aol.com>

>Are you and K4YZ really brother and sister?

Were your mother and father really parents?

Steve

3362. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 01:38:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422213813.18935.00000760@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65498

>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030421151539.18769.00000099@mb-m24.aol.com>

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

That's eight times he's repeated the same plagairized comments.

And I have deleted a lot w/o reading....

How many times in one day can a guy be so lame...???

Steve

3363. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 01:42:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EA5EF96.6974CD7E@att.net>
Source record: 65499

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Mon, 21 Apr 2003 15:35:12 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > Since a ham radio license (excluding Tech of course) authorizes
> > operation on radiotelegraphy, as a large part of ham radio
> > today, why wouldn't a test of radiotelegraphy ability be in
> > order?
>
> Even a tech licensee can operate (manual Morse) radiotelegraphy
> - just not on the HF bands.
>

Yes, Phil, I know....but I'd wager that darn few techs do!

3364. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 01:46:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422214607.18769.00000140@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 65500

In article <3EA21361.D7CEBB84@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20030419124555.18821.00000073@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >I do "talk shop" - but not in an amateur radio policy newsgroup. Since I
>do
>> not
>> >work for the FCC, ARRL, an amateur radio equipment manufacturer, or as a
>> >communications attorney, such "shop talk" is simply not relevant.
>>
>> You do NOT work for the US government or in any possible
>> capacity for US foreign policy, yet you prattle endlessly
>> about those subjects which do NOT involve amateur radio.
>>
>> You do NOT work for any railroad or have any stated work
>> experience in railroading, yet you have stated IN HERE that
>> you are an expert in knowledge of railroads. Railroads and
>> railroading are NOT amateur radio subjects nor is there any
>> reference to railroads and railroading in US amateur radio
>> regulations.
>>
>> You have NEVER been a member of the United States
>> armed forces or any other military, yet you've implied that
>> you have expert knowledge of military policy, plans,
>> technology, and life as a military person.
>>
>> You spout endlessly in a number of fields of work and
>> policy that have nothing at all to do with amateur radio.
>
>I seem to remember you doing those things, Len. Of course, you may feel
>free to correct me if I'm mistaken.

I'm not sure which things you mean, Dave. Here's a list:

1) work for the US government
2) in any possible capacity for US foreign policy
3) prattle endlessly about those subjects which do NOT involve amateur radio.
4) work for any railroad or have any stated work experience in railroading
5) been a member of the United States armed forces
6) implied expert knowledge of military policy, plans, technology, and life as

a military person.
7) spout endlessly in a number of fields of work and policy that have nothing at all to do with amateur radio.
8) irrelevant, misleading, misdirectioning, and, in general, just a self-promoting bullshit artist.

Which ones has Len done? Obviously, he's done 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8. But there's no evidence he's ever done 2 or 4
>
>Gee, Leonard, you aren't involved in amateur radio in the tiniest way
>and you haven't let that slow you down a bit. I guess that'd make you a
>self-promoting...well, you know the rest.

QED!
>
>I've saved you the embarrassment of seeing the rest of your wild ravings
>again by snipping the balance.
>
Thanks, Dave.

btw, Len states categorically (about me):

"you have stated IN HERE that you are an expert in knowledge of railroads"

I went looking for such a post, and came up with not a single post where I claimed to be an expert in knowledge of railroads. I do know a bit about the steel-wheel stuff, but I leave the pronouncement of "expert" to others.

So we are left with a puzzle: Did Len LIE when he made that claim, or did ne just make an ERROR? Will he admit to it, and apologize for saying untrue things about another, ow will he attack the messenger?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3365. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 01:47:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3EA5F0C9.E0D6D82D@att.net>
Source record: 65551

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> "Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
> news:3EA42F79.3CCFED6E@crosslink.net...
> > But skating ability is essential to hockey, Morse is not essential to
> > radio communications, it isn't even very useful. Fun maybe, useful - no.
> >
> > 73, K3DWW
>
> Useful? Definitely yes. I've seen several occasions when the HF bands were
> in too poor a condition to support understandable voice communications but
> the people on CW/Morse were having plenty of good, readable QSOs.

THAT is the very level of experience that causes those who haven't had it
to doubt the usefulness of Morse radiotelegraphy. On landline it wouldn't work
the same at all. Once they've been there, and seen the light, that attitude does
change - For those who bother to make the trip.

> While
> some of the other digital modes would also work, all the other digital modes
> require that you have a computer hooked into your radio.

Indeed, and no on ever said that there exists no more efficient modes than CW.

Of course those who still have no experience will say that idea was the force
behind
retaining CW and a test for it, but it's just plain wrong.

3366. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 01:51:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422215113.18935.00000762@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65552

>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/21/2003 5:12 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030421181251.19006.00000451@mb-m05.aol.com>

>From (WA8ULX)

>> Are you talking about all the knuckle Dragging Cbplussers, that have
>entered
>>Ham Radio?

>Of course not. You have such a limited view, you cannot see anything else but
>"CBplussers".

I'll be the first one to acknowledge that Code tested or not, Brucie is
one of the most vile and bigoted idiots in this NG. However when it comes to
"limited view(s)", you border on myopic, Vipul.

>Even the code loving Hams in my local clubs don't complain about
>CBers interfering like you do. (They do have a cult-like obcession of CBers,
>however).

Wait, Vippy...You claim they don't "complain" about CBers on the one hand,
then you claim they ahve a "cult -like obcession" (sic) with them.

This alone, if it weren't already so clear, makes it CRYSTAL clear to me
that you have no idea of what a cult is or what "cult-like" is.

>Code can also block those that want to experiment on those freqs.

How?

>Morse does
>not keep dummies from entering the hobby. You are a good example of that.

And lack of Morse testing does not KEEP "dummies from entering the hobby"
either. While I'd stop way-short of calling you a dummy, you certainly do not
present yourself as reasonably knowledgeable on a great many aspects of
radiocommunication.

>Relative has objection that Hams are weird, old - not that they are not EEs.

Heaven forbid your RELATIVES would want you to associate with non-EE's. Do
they have the same reservations about Protestants, Hispanics and non-Central
Asian immigrants?

>HAM radio is boring <to me>. The rest of amateur radio can be interesting.

Then allow me to show you the door, Vipul, and I suggest you step lively lest the door hit you on the South 40....

Steve, K4YZ

3367. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 01:52:08 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422215208.19022.00000501@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 65553

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net

>Show Walsh codes or Turbo codes as numbers running across.
>Have
>> a bunch of waveforms, etc.

>These things are meaningless to someone who hasn't studied them. How would
>it then intrigue a prospective ham when they don't know what they are?

Of course they wouldn't know. They would assume these are the advanced methods and be interested to learn more. Also, showing waveforms tends to get people interested.

On the other hand if the keyers are shown, some won't know what they are. Many will recognize them as Morse code keyers
and see that "amateur" radio is not that advanced. Those that did not know they are Morse code keyers will ask and then be disappointed.

>To the non-ham, they wouldn't be able to tell the difference between
>microwave equipment and other radio equipment.

True. A moving title, in the ad, saying "Microwave equipment", "Amplifier tuning", etc. would help those to know whats there.

Also, with the advanced test equipment shown, with waveforms shown, people would be interested to learn more.

>Why do repeaters last longer? Simple. There are many IND
ENDENT repeaters.
>If one goes down, the others are still accessible. With cell phones, if one
>tower goes down, you've lost communications in a wide area.

>Also hams can,
>on fairly short notice, dismantle their repeater and move it to a more
>suitable location as was done for the 9/11 disaster.

>Cell phone systems and regular phone systems are only designed to handle
>normal traffic loads with only small margins for typical peak usage.

>There is a "net control" who directs
>the communications. The other operators can only speak when directed to do
>so by the net control unless an immediate threat to life or limb occurs and
>then there is a procedure to immediately break in and get the critical
>message transmitted.

>Plus amateurs have message relay techniques, if they care to study them,
>that enable them to get messages in and out without a repeater anyway.
>

These are good examples. Where can I learn more about the procedures used?

3368. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 01:52:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422215251.18935.00000763@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65554

>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/22/2003 4:22 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030422172259.18755.00000182@mb-m06.aol.com>

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Nine.

Steve

3369. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 01:55:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422215502.18935.00000764@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65555

>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/22/2003 4:22 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030422172258.18755.00000180@mb-m06.aol.com>

>> Plagiarized response by allegedly published professional who should
>know
>>better noted.
>
> Strike "alleged," you poor thing. See HAM RADIO Magazine
> of the 1980s and late 1970s.

Allow me to ammend that:

"Plagiarized response by allegedly ORIGINAL published professional who
should know better noted"

Better?

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

That's ten today. Pretty lame.

Steve, K4YZ

3370. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 01:58:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422215820.18935.00000766@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65556

>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/22/2003 4:22 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030422172258.18755.00000179@mb-m06.aol.com>

>In article <20030422073326.18912.00000432@mb-m14.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steamy
>Stalker the Carbon Copy) writes:

Hmmmmmm..."Carbon Copy"...?!?!

That's cute...to wit:

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Eleventh use of same plagiarized comments today, yet Lennie calls ME
"carbon copy"...

Sheeesh.

Steve

3371. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 01:59:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422215912.18935.00000767@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65557

>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/22/2003 4:22 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030422172257.18755.00000178@mb-m06.aol.com>

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Twelve....(sigh...)

Steve

3372. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 02:00:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422220010.18935.00000769@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65558

>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/22/2003 6:27 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030422192745.19022.00000494@mb-m11.aol.com>

>> That list could get real long, Vippy..Ya sure ya wanna go there?
>
>No. Sorry for the unrelated comment.

Apology accepted. Thanks

Steve, K4YZ

3373. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 02:06:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422220657.18935.00000770@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65559

>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com
>Date: 4/22/2003 5:34 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <b84fvf$i9f$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>

>> Nah - the FT-817 makes a GREAT 6m rig... and CW on 6m is about as
>> popular as a stinky sock.
>>
>> - Stewart
>
>Oh really ???? The explain all the CW contacts Ive had in the last two
>E-skip seasons on six meters. Try listening before inserting stinky sock in
>your mouth.

Dan...did you notice the "tag" URL on Stew's signature line?

This is the guy who doesn't think MURS is the new CB band or that anyone
is going to "abuse" MURS.

Uh huh...right....

"Six meters" is about as far as Stew can sling a bag of what he's spewing
in here.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3374. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 02:09:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422220953.18935.00000771@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65561

>Subject: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 4/22/2003 4:00 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0304221300.3996b651@posting.google.com>

I knew, even before I opened the thread, who wrote this...

>As the number of Novice Class license-holders dwindles down to a
>handful, and the elimination of this class of Amateurs seems
>inevitbable; it seems a good time to reflect on what this means to the
>US Amateur Radio Service

It means a class of licnese that outgrew it's usefulness a long time ago
is atrophying as expected.

>Let's look at the term "Novice" itself...(SNIP)

Let's not. It's irrelevent.

Steve, K4YZ

3375. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 02:13:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422221353.18935.00000772@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65562

>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 4/22/2003 7:26 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030422202617.18755.00000241@mb-m05.aol.com>

>In article <20030422001726.18767.00000113@mb-m15.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>> (Prissy Parson)...(SNIP)

Thirty-nine reasons (several spelling errors noted) to keep my kids out of
"professional" radio.

>Well, there you have it ;-)

Yep.

Steve, K4YZ

3376. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 02:21:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EA5F8D9.3040007@adelphia.net>
Source record: 65563

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
>
>>>Why would repeaters last any longer than cell phone towers? Plus all
>>
>>repeater
>>
>>>users would share one freq. Not practical in an emergency.
>>
>> Are you serious? hint:
>>the repeaters often have emergency generators
>
>
> Thats not enough. Local repeater went down and there was no storm. Can you cite
> specific examples where amateur repeaters are better than non-amateur
> repeaters?

Part of a news release from ARRL:

NEWINGTON, Conn., February 7, 2003 -- Amateur Radio Emergency Service
(ARES) members, Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service (RACES) members,
and other ham radio volunteers have been assisting federal, state and
local officials and service agencies in the search for debris from the
shuttle Columbia.

"Ham radio has proven to be the only reliable communications option
during the recovery effort," said Tim Lewallen, a North Texas Public
Information Officer for ARRL, the national association for Amateur
Radio. "The area's dense forests and hilly terrain make communication
via many traditional radio systems difficult."

Authorities have requested that every survey team have at least one
Amateur Radio operator with them so the recovery efforts remain
coordinated and organized. Along with volunteering their communications
expertise, ham radio operators were also involved in the debris
cataloging effort early on. <therest snipped for brevity>

diss that.

>>Hmm, I might do such a thing if I were trying to appeal to a broad
>>
>>>>range of interests.
>>>
>
> Showing Morse code keyers would make those that were interested in the

> <lastest> communications techniques less interested in amateur radio.
>
>
>>How you going to illustrate the latest techniques?
>
>
> There are ways. Show Walsh codes or Turbo codes as numbers running across. Have
> a bunch of waveforms, etc.

I've been looking at waveforms forever. They don't strike me as latest
and greatest.

> There actually was something at a Hamfest/Convention. A setup was there where
> someone used a network analyzer and some patch antennas. This kind of stuff is
> <rarely> there. (It is usually the exception, not the rule at Hamfests). This
> is the stuff that should be mentioned in ad, not Morse code keyers.

What will communicate microwave to an interested onlooker?
What will communicate a network analyzer to an interested onlooker?
You probably haven't been involved in much advertizing work. What is
needed are icons, which serve to communicate whole concepts to people.
Yes, it is a sort of stereotyping. A telegraph key says "Ameteur radio"
to people instantly. Other icons are also used, such as antennas, some
times with goofy lightning bolts emanating from them, microphones and
headsets coming out of boxes, etc. It must be simple, iconic and direct.

It's kind of like how you stereotype hams as obese, nerdy and socially
awkward, except it's used in a positive fashion.

> Or show people using microwave equipment. Show radio amateurs using them.

See above.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3377. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 02:24:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422222434.18935.00000774@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65564

>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/22/2003 6:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030422194515.19022.00000496@mb-m11.aol.com>

>Also note, there is a need for sign language. It is used to communicate for
>handicapped people. Morse code has not such use. Also, hardware can encode
>and
>decode Morse code symbols so people don't have to.

When I first joined Amateur Radio, I stuck up a regualar lunch time QSO on 40 meter CW with a fellow in Akron, OH. Had a great time, learned a lot, and he was very patient with my fledgling skills.

When a local hamfest was approaching I asked if he'd be attending and could we meet. He said he intended to and that I should look for his call on his ballcap.

We met.

I first saw him in a wheelchair being pushed by an "older" woman (30-ish.??) woman. He was wearing black glasses. I was shocked at first, and was even MORE shocked when I approached and addressed him by name. The girl pushing him told me I'd either have to do sign language in his hand or tap Morse Code in his palm!

He had been a US Marine in the Solomons when a Japanese mortar round landed only inches away from his position. He lost his sight immediately, the hearing followed within a year.

You would have never known it on CW. On CW, he was at-liberty to "chat" as anyone else. He "copied" code by resting his fingers on the cone of a large speaker set on the desk.

Yes, Vipul, Morse Code DOES have the ability to provide "freedom" for many "disabled" persons.

I suggest you refer to "Handi-Hams" for far more examples than my one, Vipul...A LOT more...

Steve, K4YZ

3378. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 02:27:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422222717.18935.00000775@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65565

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 4/22/2003 7:51 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304221651.799558b2@posting.google.com>

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3EA214A5.999E7538@earthlink.net>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> > In article <f45722ac.0304190500.7cfb962@posting.google.com>,
>> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> > >He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.
>> >
>> > I'd heard he might have been a snow-removal supervisor for
>> > the runways at Tan Son Hut...but that's probably just a rumor.
>>
>> Just for the record, Len, where is Tan Son Hut?
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>Most people would say its in Vietnam (Ho Chi Minh City/Tan Son Nhat).
>
>Where do you and Wonder Boy put it?

The point, BRAIN, is that there is NO "Tan Son Hut".

Sheesh.

Steve, K4YZ

3379. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 02:32:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422223239.18935.00000777@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65566

>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030421151541.18769.00000100@mb-m24.aol.com>

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Thirteen. No originality...No truth...No kidding...

Steve

3380. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 03:11:48 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Uvnpa.8786$Vu4.7701@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 65567

This is beautiful. All amateurs share one frequency. Please check out
http://www.geocities.com/d_fravel/rlist.html
You will see a *ton* of frequencies/repeaters in the Rochester, NY, area covering from 29 MHz to 1.2 GHz. There is digital information, fast-scan television, and a whole slew of FM repeaters - many of them linked. You can be on 1.2 GHz and be using the 29 MHz repeater and talking to Australia (I've done it from one of the 440 ports). I wouldn't suggest that amateur repeaters are bigger and better than the cell phone towers - but there are some that are solar/wind powered, many have generators, and really bad storms tend to take the large stuff down pretty quickly. Do check the link and explain how all we have is one frequency. Of course, if the phone lines are up, it doesn't matter (then again, a lot of these repeaters are on IRLP).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030422001129.19072.00000278@mb-m10.aol.com...
> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>
> >> A cell phone is not an AMATEUR radio, like the ad supposedly said.
> > >
> > >
> > > DId you see the ad? I posted the original and nowhere did anything I
> > >posted or read for that matter say that!
> >
> > You say just that in the next quote below. You say that radio will come in
> > handy when cell phone does not.
> >
> > >I did not hear them say "I wish I had a radio".
> > >
> > > If a person was trapped, it might come in handy. If they were trying
> > >to get help with telephones and cellulars out of commision, they might
> > >think otherwise
> >
> > How do you know that? Do you work for FEMA?
> >
> > Why would repeaters last any longer than cell phone towers? Plus all
repeater
> > users would share one freq. Not practical in an emergency.
> >
> > >> And it went unnoticed by anyone that was not already a Ham.
> > >
> > > How did you know that?

>
> Awareness of the existance of Hams is low.
>
> >> The ad for Rochester Hamfest SAYS "latest communications techniques",
but
> >then
> >> SHOWS Morse code keys. Morse code is not one of the latest
communication
> >> techniques.
> >
> > Hmm, I might do such a thing if I were trying to appeal to a broad
> >range of interests.
>
> The latest Comm techniques is NOT shown in the ad. Morse code is. The ad
says
> "for amateur radio, MORSE CODE is the latest communications technique".
>
> >Nice fixation on hamfests, Vipul!
>
> How else will non-Hams learn about Ham radio?
>
> >>>Seems to me
> >>>that one of the amateur repeaters was set up for the police since they
lost
> >>>their repeater.
> > I'll bet the police found it handy that they could
> >communicate with each other during the crisis
>
> >Otherwise I can't figure why you post
> >that sort of comment.
>
> One repeater is just is useful as another. I fail to see how the amateur
> repeater had a benefit in a way that praises the benefits of amateur
radio.
>
> --
> Amateur radio is not good for:
> Emergency communications
>
> Amateur radio is good for:
> International goodwill
> --
> Too much "Ham" can be harmful to your health.
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.474 / Virus Database: 272 - Release Date: 4/18/03

3381. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 03:18:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030422231821.18935.00000513@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 65568

> I'll be the first one to acknowledge that Code tested or not, Brucie is
>one of the most vile and bigoted idiots in this NG.

Thank you BED Pan BOY

3382. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 03:20:27 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <%Dnpa.781$Mq6.686@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 65569

Emergency power is necessary .... here is another link ..
http://www.frontiernet.net/~mje/n2hjd.htm
You might possibly gather that some of the repeaters are a bit more complex
and likely a bit sturdier than you think amateur repeaters are.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.474 / Virus Database: 272 - Release Date: 4/18/03

3383. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 03:41:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA60B86.34CE557F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65570

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > stewart wrote:
> > >
> > > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030414221120.15625.00000245@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <f45722ac.0304130444.43023c10@posting.google.com>,
> > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > >
> > > > Well, who said that Morse Code was a growth industry? Granted, there
> > > > seem to be more products for helping people learn the Morse Code now
> > > > than at any other time in history. As another poster observed, the
> > > > interest in QRP caused by new, off-the-shelf QRP rigs like the Yaesu
> > > > FT-817 is making CW more popular than ever. And now that we're on
> > > > the downside of the current solar cycle, using these rigs will be more
> > > > dependant on CW than ever.
> > >
> > > Nah - the FT-817 makes a GREAT 6m rig... and CW on 6m is about as
> > > popular as a stinky sock.
> >
> > You must not be active on 6m, Stew. There is plenty of CW activity on
> > six.
>
> Dave, are you *really* surprised that he doesn't know that?

Not much--especially after seeing his "no vice" effort.

Dave K8MN

3384. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 03:51:32 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304221951.2f1503e0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65571

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030422172306.18755.00000184@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0304220535.3f45a546@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:

(Snipped mother of all mothers of all irrational & irrelevant rants,
almost 400 lines! And 95% of it a copy-paste repeat from the same rant
posted less than 48 hours ago. OYeah, you've popped yer cork Putz. Big
time.)

> There, maybe Kellie can start concentrating on the SUBJECT
> instead of his usual personal insults. He can return the white
> sheet to his solitary bed...hopefully after laundering it...

I'm sorry Putz but after I got two seconds into your repetitive rant
and realized how off-topic it was I skimmed the rest in another two
seconds flat. I still am on topic Putz, To be repetitive myself Morse
is still heavily used in the ham bands 24 hours per day 365 days per
year across the spectrum from 1.8 to at least 145Mhz. And beyond that
yes, of course Morse is a language. Where on earth did you get the
silly notion that it isn't?

w3rv

3385. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 03:54:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA60E66.1BFB0B07@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65573

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA354D2.28616C52@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA181CE.D5602581@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.
> > > >
> > > > He could have operated and just stated that his commander gave him
> > > > verbal permission...but he didn't.
> > >
> > > But you said that you asked for permission and it was denied.
> >
> > ...and?

>
> If your permission was denied then you couldn't operate.

Incorrect. I could have operated at any time. If caught operating,
especially after having asked for permission and being denied, I'd have
had to suffer the consequences. If not caught, I could have just
claimed that my commander gave me verbal permission.

Dave K8MN

3386. Re: internet voice gateways - taking your handheld overseas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 03:54:32 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Y7opa.8790$LM4.3764@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 65572

Speaking of fish without a bicycle, when the World Trade Center got hit, I couldn't connect with my ISP for a week. Seems AT&T had a lot of "stuff" running through New York. Rochester was severely impacted as far as AT&T internet. Let a minor quake (nothing of consequence, just enough to rattle the china) hit and 911 lights right up with really intelligent information such as "we just got hit by an earthquake (no kidding)" or "did we just have an earthquake?". You'd be surprised how quickly a system with a heavy infrastructure can be brought down in a hurry.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030422191724.19022.00000493@mb-m11.aol.com...
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
> >>>Ham radio without internet linking is like a fish without a banjo.
> >>
> >> The phrase is "fish without a bicycle".
> >>
> > So the fish really does need a banjo? 8^)
> >
>
> No, thats the known phrase.
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.474 / Virus Database: 272 - Release Date: 4/18/03

3387. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 03:59:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA60FCD.C76D3BBF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65574

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA214A5.999E7538@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <f45722ac.0304190500.7cfb962@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.
> > >
> > > I'd heard he might have been a snow-removal supervisor for
> > > the runways at Tan Son Hut...but that's probably just a rumor.
> >
> > Just for the record, Len, where is Tan Son Hut?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Most people would say its in Vietnam (Ho Chi Minh City/Tan Son Nhat).

No, I don't believe they would.

> Where do you and Wonder Boy put it?

I wouldn't put it anywhere. There is no Tan Son Hut and there is no Tan
Son Nhat.

Dave K8MN

3388. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 04:23:06 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b864au$6li2u$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 65606

> > If a person was trapped, it might come in handy. If they were trying
> >to get help with telephones and cellulars out of commision, they might
> >think otherwise
>
> How do you know that? Do you work for FEMA?
>
> Why would repeaters last any longer than cell phone towers? Plus all
repeater
> users would share one freq. Not practical in an emergency.
>

In a real emergency and I will use my own area as an example, there is a good chance that the same thing that took out emergency services communication towers as well as possibly cell phone towers. A high wind/severe thunderstorm/tornadic activity is the MOST possible impending danger to our community in which I live.

Other than that the only other major threat identified is Dow Chemical/Dow Corning which are both based out of this county. From inside sources there is enough of the right *2* or *3* chemicals in those plants, and if accidentally or intentionally mixed could level Midland County, as well as at least 1-2 counties in each direction as well.

Granted we have at least a dozen repeaters in our area that can be reached with a 5 watt HT, but even those would be overloaded I am sure, if we ever have a catastrophic level event.....

The hopes would be, to have plenty of operators with "base" station setups with healthy antenna systems that would allow good use of the simplex frequencies. There are some guys around here that have those 75-100 foot towers with the 2meter antenna (as well as others) up that high and they regularly communicate on simplex frequencies with others anywhere from 50-100+ miles away with 5-15 watts. Definitely an improvement over handhelds or mobiles!!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3389. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 04:25:27 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b864av$6li2u$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 65607

Hey.... those AOL cd's make for nice drink coasters!! Or even
mini-frisbies!

Ryan

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:3EA49BC1.6090606@mailcity.moc...
>
>
> WA8ULX wrote:
> >>Difference is the spectrum I want to use is public property
> > >
> > >
> > > Yea I know, all you want is a FREE HANDOUT.
>
> The only thing you get for free nowadays are AOL cd's.
>
>

3390. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 04:45:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423004541.18769.00000126@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65577

In article <20030422210146.18935.00000745@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030421151549.18769.00000106@mb-m24.aol.com>
>
>>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>
> Sixth use of plagiarized comments today.
>
> Are we seeing a pattern of abuse and strained ethics here...?!?!

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has, if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3391. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 04:45:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423004541.18769.00000125@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65578

In article <20030422210315.18935.00000746@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030421151551.18769.00000107@mb-m24.aol.com>
>
>>>> No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>>>
>>> A plagiarizing putz, at that.
>>>
>>>Sheeesh.
>>
>> No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>
> Still at it for seventh time today.
>
> Liar, cheat AND plagiarist.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has, if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3392. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 04:45:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423004543.18769.00000127@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65576

In article <20030422210022.18935.00000744@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030421151547.18769.00000103@mb-m24.aol.com>
>
>>No matter what job, educational level....(SNIP)
>
> Fifth use of plagiarized comments today...
>
> Pretty lame...

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has, if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3393. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 04:45:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423004544.18769.00000129@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65575

In article <20030422202617.18755.00000241@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>> Large load of [explitive] Bandini.
>
>Well, there you have it ;-)

Poor prissy parson, couldn't answer a thing, could you?

3394. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 04:45:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423004544.18769.00000128@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65579

In article <20030422205818.18935.00000743@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030421151548.18769.00000104@mb-m24.aol.com>
>
>>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>
> Fourth use of plagiarized comments today.

Incorrect.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3395. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 04:45:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423004545.18769.00000130@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65580

In article <krlpa.12$X32.14100@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030422194019.19022.00000495@mb-m11.aol.com...
>> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>
>> Thats not enough. Local repeater went down and there was no storm. Can you
>cite
>> specific examples where amateur repeaters are better than non-amateur
>> repeaters?
>
>The World Trade Center disaster.

Incorrect. Putting an emergency coordinating agency IN one
of the WTC buildings was just poor planning.

>The ice storms in some parts of this country this past winter

Sorry, isolated incidents of small communities, not indicative
of non-amateur communications equipment or installations.

>Almost every major hurricane over the last several decades.

Incorrect again.

Try the Northridge Earthquake of 1994 affecting a population
area of 10 million. How was amateur radio directly aiding
anything then?

>Plus amateurs have message relay techniques, if they care to study them,
>that enable them to get messages in and out without a repeater anyway.

Amateur repeaters are coordinated only in frequency for a
specific geographic region.

What amateurs COULD do is not what they DO.

>> Showing Morse code keyers would make those that were interested in the
>> <lastest> communications techniques less interested in amateur radio.
>>
>> >How you going to illustrate the latest techniques?
>>
>> There are ways. Show Walsh codes or Turbo codes as numbers running across.
>Have
>> a bunch of waveforms, etc.
>
>These things are meaningless to someone who hasn't studied them. How would

>it then intrigue a prospective ham when they don't know what they are?

Let ARRL spoon-feed hams "what they ought to know." :-)

>> Or show people using microwave equipment. Show radio amateurs using them.
>
>To the non-ham, they wouldn't be able to tell the difference between
>microwave equipment and other radio equipment.

To nearly ALL hams, all microwave equipment except a parabolic
antenna is meaningless machinery. :-)

Real hams work DX on HF with CW.

3396. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 04:45:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423004549.18769.00000131@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65582

In article <Nflpa.11$X32.10662@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030422001129.19072.00000278@mb-m10.aol.com...
>>
>> How do you know that? Do you work for FEMA?
>>
>> Why would repeaters last any longer than cell phone towers? Plus all
repeater
>> users would share one freq. Not practical in an emergency.
>
>You show your ignorance about emergency communications. There was an
>excellent article in QST about the major contribution in communications
>support made by the ham radio operators at the World Trade Center disaster
>site.

That's hardly unbiased reporting, isn't it?

"Support" is an ambiguous term there. Compare that to the actual
support given by several of the major communications equipment
suppliers.

>There are emergencies on a regular basis where amateur radio has been
>the only way to get enough communications into and out of an area.

But only in small isolated incidents.

>Why do repeaters last longer? Simple. There are many INDENDENT repeaters.
>If one goes down, the others are still accessible.

How are they coordinated for use? Will and idea?

Amateur repeaters aren't tied into the telecommunications
infrastructure.

You forget the large number of INDEPENDENT non-amateur radio
groupings in communities.

>With cell phones, if one
>tower goes down, you've lost communications in a wide area.

Non-amateur telecommunications is not dependent on
cellular telephone sites. Try educating yourself on the
various non-amateur radio services in your community.

>Also hams can,
>on fairly short notice, dismantle their repeater and move it to a more

>suitable location as was done for the 9/11 disaster.

No faster nor better than commercial telecommunications
providers.

>Even if the repeaters
>are unavailable, many amateur radio operators (you do have to study the
>techniques) also know how to effectively and accurately relay messages from
>one operator to another to get to it's final destination.

That IS the prevailing myth.

Where are the DETAILS of such rapid relay of communications and
how long does it take to get between destinations?

Be factual, not the ambiguous generalities provided by ARRL in
newsletters.

>Cell phone systems and regular phone systems are only designed to handle
>normal traffic loads with only small margins for typical peak usage.

The ENTIRE telephone infrastructure is designed that way, including
the cellular part. This has been known for years.

>They are very short of capacity when major disasters occur.

This is often stated but it overlooks the non-switched telephone
circuits that exist for public safety agencies.

Again, you are overlooking the OTHER radios and radio groupings
in communities all over the USA and its possessions. Before
jumping onto ARRL syncophancy bandwagon and playing those
patriotic tunes, try educating yourself on what other community
agencies have and use during Real Emergencies.

>Phone calls, both
>cellular and regular, were taking over 1/2 hour or more to get through for
>days after the World Trade Centers fell.

Somewhat of an untruth. Telephone calls, either wired or cellular,
either get through on the first dial try or they don't.

The tragic and spectacular WTC attack is NOT typical of "Real
Emergencies." Using that is a fine message-point ploy due to all
the emotionalism.

>When an emergency is declared, the FCC can and does allocate certain
>frequencies for usage during the emergency. Those not involved in those
>communications are required to stay off those frequencies. This was done
>for the 9/11 disaster and is frequently done for hurricanes and has been
>done just this past winter for a major ice storm.

For AMATEUR communications, Dee. There's a lot more radio out
there that is not amateur. Definitely a lot more. Try some personal
education on what exists outside of the sphere of ARRL propaganda.

Begin with SHARES as one example. Do a web search for that
acronym.

>The group handling the communications has procedures to move "traffic" as
>it is called smoothly and effectively. There is a "net control" who directs
>the communications. The other operators can only speak when directed to do
>so by the net control unless an immediate threat to life or limb occurs and
>then there is a procedure to immediately break in and get the critical
>message transmitted.

That is the general procedure done on radio command and control
nets since WW2 days. It wasn't invented by radio amateurs.

>> Amateur radio is not good for:
>> Emergency communications
>
>Amateur radio has proven its worth many times over for emergency
>communications. Time and again they have provided vital emergency
>communications. ARRL, a major organization for amateur radio, makes
>available extensive training courses on emergency preparedness and radio
>procedures.

...and ARRL has a wonderful syncophant as all can see.

>Emergency preparedness groups for the nation, cities, states, and counties
>factor the availability of amateur radio into their emergency plans.

Face the facts, it is a small factor.

In Real Emergencies ANYONE can be drafted into the task.

>They
>know, even if you do not, that neither commercial communications (phones and
>cell phones) nor standard emergency communications (police, fire, etc) have
>the capacity to handle even a medium sized disaster let alone a large scale
>emergency.

Dee, please, no more fairy stories. Amateurs are an aid, a small
band-aid, not a full body cast suitable for traction.

I will cite the week beginning 17 January 1994 in the northern half
of Los Angeles where the entire electric power system was
suddenly cut off to a population area of about 10 million. Did the
radio amateurs suddenly spring into action and Save The Day?

No. The FDs and PDs, public safety folks, the utilities, were all
integrated into emergency planning, organization, and training for
the larger area. FDs and PDs had leased landlines that didn't go
through any central office switching. Radios for all agencies that
worked just fine, as expected, as drilled, as trained...mobile or
from emergency generators.

Major earthquake happening. Did the cell sites fail? No, they have
standby power and the sites still stood. Did the telephone system
fail? No. Those calling IN from outside the area code got through.

Where WERE all those mighty amateur radio minutemen during
the first day of the Northridge Earthquake? Busy reading QST by
candlelight?

>> Amateur radio is good for:
>> International goodwill
>
>And it's also good for international goodwill.

Echo?

97.1 (e) has that. Now go to any Almanac and list all the wars that
have happened all around the world since the end of WW2 in 1945.
All of those wars involved nations that have amateur radio inside their
borders.

Tell us again how amateur radio spread all the "goodwill" that stopped
all that warfare "internationally." Didn't prevent Gulf War 2. Didn't
prevent Gulf War 1. Didn't prevent Iran-Iraq war of 1980-1988. Didn't
stop Haiti, Grenada, or Panama.

Three weeks ago France, Germany, and Russia didn't think much of
the USA and weren't hesitant about saying so. News flash: All of
those countries have amateur radio...as does the USA and UK.

Stay with ARRL propaganda. It is a comfort. It is denial of reality.

3397. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 04:45:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423004551.18769.00000132@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65581

In article <sFkpa.1537$Bk5.1301656@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030421163241.19006.00000448@mb-m05.aol.com...
>> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>
>> >If I see a test, I take it. It appears that if you see a test, you
>> >passively avoid it if you think it is too hard or irrevelent.
>> >
>>
>> I have taken tests. I don't avoid tests. My good grades in <hard> rf
>courses
>> show I can pass tests.
>>
>> Morse code IS irrelevant. Amateur radio licensed Comm Theory Prof
>apparently
>> agrees. The other rf Profs do not even have amateur radio license, not
>even the
>> antenna Prof!
>
>That is one person's opinion. There are other people with equal credentials
>that believe just the opposite. Besides until you've been on HF (i.e.
>shortwave) and had the band deteriorate to the point where voice signals
>were unintelligible, you don't have the background to evaluate the relevancy
>of Morse code. And don't rant about the other digital modes. All the other
>digital modes require that a computer be hooked into the radio.
>
>>
>> >Too many people think that way, and all they end up
>> >with is a litany of excuses for not getting anywhere.
>>
>> To many people use Morse to block the real talent in the hobby.
>
>Nobody is using Morse to block the real talent. It only keeps out the
>uninterested.
>
>>
>> They use an easily (but time consuming) learnable skill as some kind of
>proof
>> of achievement. Even real emergency comm skills would be more useful than
>Morse
>> code.
>>

>> The skill has no use outside amateur radio or anywhere. Its "usefulness"
>is
>> only to those that made a social agreement that "Morse code will be
>useful".
>> Juggling(Morse code) is a skill - Outside of the circus(Ham radio), it has
>> little use.
>
>But one can use that argument in reverse. Inside the circus (Ham radio),
>juggling (Morse code) is very useful.
>
>>
>> >It certainly IS much easier to generate excuses for not doing something
>> >than it is to just buckle down and do something.
>>
>> From a small sample, I know have the ability to learn real-time encoding.
>> Therefore, one cannot say that I cannot do Morse code. I did not make an
>excuse
>> that I cannot learn it. I made a decision that the limited benefit was not
>> worth the time to learn it.
>>
>
>You are not qualified to judge its benefit so how can you possibly judge
>whether it is worthwhile.
>
>> >I bet you
>> >might have something to offer the hobby if you tried, but you just want
>> >to resent things.
>>
>> Hams only are interested in their aspects. The aspects I would offer, Hams
>> would not be interested in.
>>
>> Hams like contesting, chasing DX, antennas. Hams have little in common
>with
>> electronic hobbyists.
>>
>
>Then why do you keep blathering on about amateur radio as if you had an
>interest in it. It has become quite apparent that you are only interested
>in electronics. Therefore amateur radio probably isn't for you.
>
>> And relative has discouraged me from going to Hamfests and told me that
>Hams
>> are old, often non EE people.
>
>Why should ham radio be limited to EE people? Why should they even be in
>the majority? Several developments in ham radio were made by people who
>had no EE background whatsoever. Ham radio is intended for anyone who has
>sufficient interest in learning the basic knowledge required for operating,
>maintaining a legal functioning set up, and many other aspects of ham radio.
>I know doctors, lawyers, truck drivers, engineers, and people in just about

>every career you can name who are amateur radio operators and that's the way
>it was intended to be and should be.

I also know people who are doctors, dentists, truck drivers, clerks,
cooks, bakers, plumbers, heavy machine operators, large and
small ship operators and maintainers, vehicle mechanics, pilots,
aircraft maintenance mechanics...all who've been trained to operate
radios as part of their work. Those are also quite capable of destroying
an enemy as part of that work. They are members of the US Army,
USN, USAF, USMC. Men and women, no bar to color or gender or
religious preference. They are all professionals.

Some in here have a hatred and contempt for professionals. Are you
one of those?

3398. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 05:07:04 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b864b0$6li2u$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 65608

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EA59D8E.3F67AAA6@crosslink.net...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Vito if you believe that Morse is useless and tap code is useful that
> > really illustrates the depth of your lack of knoweldge on the subject.
>
> Well then, please educate me. I didn't say Morse was useless - it
> obviously has great recreational value, as witness all the people who
> enjoy it. Perhaps I will too someday. But whatever practical value it
> has escapes me, as it has for more than 40 years. There are many things
> I don't yet know so if you can give me any logical reason(s) why people
> should have to pass a Morse test to use SSB, et cetera, I'll be glad to
> have that information and perhaps change my mind.

Morse has it's place as well as other modes too. Simply a matter of
personal choice of use. Some people want to communicate with their voices
which does not necessarily equate to citizens band, (how a person operates
does however, regardless of mode) and some do not. Some may like the
limited anonymity that non-voice modes offer. Look at morse code or the
computer/digital modes..... no way to know for sure if the person is old or
young. etc with those modes, but voice communications may. Hell, it's not
amateur radio, but look at these newsgroups for example, no way to truly
know much about a person here unless they tell you.

>
> If I were stuck in a mine or submarine, or ???, I could bang out tap
> code on a pipe or a wall or whatever but I couldn't send Morse because
> I'd have no way to make "dahs" vs "dits". OTOH one can send tap code
> with a Morse key. So, tap code is more versatile. It is also easier to
> learn/use.

I believe there is a way of sending morse via that type of method described.
As to how to differentiate the dits and dah's in the form of a "tap" I am
not sure, but I know it has been done before. (Something to do with the
speed or "force" of the "tap???") The problem in real life outside the ham
community, is if someone had the idea to send morse code would a non-ham be
able to decode it?? Probably the tapping alone may catch attention. Who
knows.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.

.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3399. Re: internet voice gateways - taking your handheld overseas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 05:10:08 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b864b2$6li2u$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 65609

Now I know where tune-a-fish comes from! How do ya tuna fish?? :)

Ryan

> > The phrase is "fish without a bicycle".
>
> So the fish really does need a banjo? 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

3400. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 05:14:02 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b864b3$6li2u$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 65610

Ditto... look at 50.001 thru 50.100Mhz for example. Depending on band openings and time of day, there seems to be quite a few ditter-dah'ers there.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

>
> > Nah - the FT-817 makes a GREAT 6m rig... and CW on 6m is about as
> > popular as a stinky sock.
>
> You must not be active on 6m, Stew. There is plenty of CW activity on
> six.
>
> Dave K8MN

3401. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 05:23:34 UTC
From: "Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b864b4$6li2u$7@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 65611

Let the Novice class go, if they are not going to bother testing for it. Find a way to urge the current novice ticket holders to take the test that will make the licensed level at least as a tech or tech +. Same way for the Advanced ticket as well. If there is not going to be a test for that one either, the same would apply too.

As far as semantics of naming of the license class, why not make the following apply in the meantime?

Extra Class=1st Class Amateur Radio license
Advanced Class=2nd Class " "
General Class=3rd Class " "
Tech with Code=4th Class
Tech w/o Code=5th Class
Novice Class=6th Class

If there was ever an motivating factor to get that "all-fired" important upgrade, wouldn't this structure kind of allow for motivation for that??

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0304221300.3996b651@posting.google.com...
> As the number of Novice Class license-holders dwindles down to a
> handful, and the elimination of this class of Amateurs seems
> inevitbable; it seems a good time to reflect on what this means to the
> US Amateur Radio Service...
>
> Let's look at the term "Novice" itself... the word Novice is derived
> from the Middle English word "novis" - which means, literally "No
> Vice"... so, what this means in terms of the rest of the Amateur
> classes, is that these Novices are the only Operators having "No
> Vice"... the rest of us have this "vice" of ham radio... some to more
> degree than others... but, in all cases, we "have the vice"... or, in
> other words, are "of the vicious"... this can clearly be seen here on
> this Usenet group, where all of these Non-Novices, fight their vicious
> battles everyday... yes, the Novices will be missed - as all we will
> be is "pure vice".

3402. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 07:11:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423031118.18985.00000150@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 65583

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/22/2003 11:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423004544.18769.00000128@mb-m21.aol.com>

>> Fourth use of plagiarized comments today.
>
> Incorrect.

All too true.

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Ya got this one in under the wire, Lennie...that made at LEAST fourteen
times you repeated the same plagiarized "profile" that Jim Miccolis initiated
IRT you.

On top of that, you simply quoted in your OWN enitre rants, quoted in
their entirety, only to be followed by your stolen "profile".

Sure impressed me, Lennie.

Yeeeee-ah. Riiiiight.

Steve, K4YZ

3403. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 07:12:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423031206.18985.00000151@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 65584

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/22/2003 11:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423004543.18769.00000127@mb-m21.aol.com>

>> Fifth use of plagiarized comments today...
>>
>> Pretty lame...
>
> No matter what job, educational level

Fifteen.

Steve, K4YZ

3404. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 07:12:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423031245.18985.00000152@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 65585

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/22/2003 11:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423004541.18769.00000126@mb-m21.aol.com>

>>>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>>
>> Sixth use of plagiarized comments today.
>>
>> Are we seeing a pattern of abuse and strained ethics here...?!?!
>
> No matter what job, educational level

Sixteen.

Steve

3405. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 07:13:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423031338.18985.00000153@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 65586

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/22/2003 11:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423004541.18769.00000125@mb-m21.aol.com>

>> Still at it for seventh time today.
>>
>> Liar, cheat AND plagiarist.
>
> No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

(yaaaaaaaaaaaaaawwwwwn)

Seventeenth.

Steve

3406. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 07:15:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423031504.18985.00000154@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 65587

>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/22/2003 11:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423004551.18769.00000132@mb-m21.aol.com>

>Some in here have a hatred and contempt for professionals. Are you
> one of those?

Why not, Lennie??? You certainly seem to be.

Steve

3407. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 07:25:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423032508.18985.00000155@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 65588

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/22/2003 11:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423004545.18769.00000130@mb-m21.aol.com>

>>The World Trade Center disaster.
>
> Incorrect. Putting an emergency coordinating agency IN one
> of the WTC buildings was just poor planning.

Why?

WHICH "disaster scenario" ever envisioned suicidal maniacs hijacking
innocent civilians in a gassed-up airliner then using it as a modern-day Baka
bomb?

>>The ice storms in some parts of this country this past winter
>
> Sorry, isolated incidents of small communities, not indicative
> of non-amateur communications equipment or installations.

Ice storms are only "isolated incidents" in southern California and most
of the "Gulf Coast" states, Your Nearsightedness.

The REST of the United States still has to deal with ANNUAL ice-storms,
blizzards, tornados and others hazzards of nature.

>>Almost every major hurricane over the last several decades.
>
> Incorrect again.
>
> Try the Northridge Earthquake of 1994 affecting a population
> area of 10 million. How was amateur radio directly aiding
> anything then?

She cites "every major hurricaine" and you immediately jump back to your
"Northridge Earthquake of 1994"...Do YOU have a problem differentiating between
hurricaines and earthquakes, Your Scumminess? If so I can provide some pretty
nice links to weather and geological sites that can help you learn...

>>Plus amateurs have message relay techniques, if they care to study them,
>>that enable them to get messages in and out without a repeater anyway.
>
> Amateur repeaters are coordinated only in frequency for a
> specific geographic region.

Hey Your Putziness...Not every "relay technique" involves a repeater.
Amateurs DO utilize bands other than 2M FM.

Not that YOU'D know...

>What amateurs COULD do is not what they DO.

Again, not that YOU'D know.

>To nearly ALL hams, all microwave equipment except a parabolic
> antenna is meaningless machinery.

So says Lennie the Licenseless. The Lame...The Liar...

Steve

3408. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 08:00:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423040038.18985.00000156@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 65589

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/22/2003 11:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423004549.18769.00000131@mb-m21.aol.com>

>In article <Nflpa.11$X32.10662@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
><deehays@qix.net> writes:

>>You show your ignorance about emergency communications. There was an
>>excellent article in QST about the major contribution in communications
>>support made by the ham radio operators at the World Trade Center disaster
>>site.
>
> That's hardly unbiased reporting, isn't it?

Can you, Lennie H, prove that ONE WORD of it was not true?

>"Support" is an ambiguous term there. Compare that to the actual
> support given by several of the major communications equipment
> suppliers.

The "major communications equipment suppliers" did just that...supplied
equipment. ARES supplied people to USE the equiment. People TRAINED in proper
net discipline, "relay techniques" and other techniques in radio communications
as needed.

Unless you can DISPROVE that too?

>>There are emergencies on a regular basis where amateur radio has been
>>the only way to get enough communications into and out of an area.
>
> But only in small isolated incidents.

Uh huh...I remember that little incident involving the flooding of the
interior of the United States not too long ago that displaced tens-of-thousands
of people (who stayed in Red Cross shelters supported by ARES), helped move
hundreds of disaster workers to where they needed to be and provided law
enforcement and fire services in dozens of communities with dispatch/control
capabilities.

>>Why do repeaters last longer? Simple. There are many INDENDENT repeaters.
>>If one goes down, the others are still accessible.
>
> How are they coordinated for use? Will and idea?

Planning and practice. Two skills you are lacking in launching these
tirades, Your Putziness.

>Amateur repeaters aren't tied into the telecommunications
> infrastructure.

That's part of their strength.

If part of the state's 800mHz system craps out mid-state, they're out of
luck.

If the local 2M repeater craps out, I switch repeaters or I go to HF.

>You forget the large number of INDEPENDENT non-amateur radio
> groupings in communities.

REACT...?!?!?

>>With cell phones, if one
>>tower goes down, you've lost communications in a wide area.
>
> Non-amateur telecommunications is not dependent on
> cellular telephone sites. Try educating yourself on the
> various non-amateur radio services in your community.

I have. Other "non-amateur" communications systems are not any where near
as prolific and functional.

>>Also hams can,
>>on fairly short notice, dismantle their repeater and move it to a more
>>suitable location as was done for the 9/11 disaster.
>
> No faster nor better than commercial telecommunications
> providers

And you know this...HOW...?!?!? Practical experience in WHAT Amateur
Radio organization...?!?!?

>>Even if the repeaters
>>are unavailable, many amateur radio operators (you do have to study the
>>techniques) also know how to effectively and accurately relay messages from
>>one operator to another to get to it's final destination.
>
> That IS the prevailing myth.

Then it's 80+ years of myth, substantiated by accolades in the Federal
Register and reams of "general media" press over thsoe 80 years.

>Where are the DETAILS of such rapid relay of communications and
> how long does it take to get between destinations?

In those same 80+ years you keep trying to ignore, Your Lameness.

>>They are very short of capacity when major disasters occur.
>
> This is often stated but it overlooks the non-switched telephone
> circuits that exist for public safety agencies

And when situations like the WTC or midwest floods occur, taking out ALL wireline or fixed-infrastructure assets in that area?

>Before
> jumping onto ARRL syncophancy bandwagon and playing those
> patriotic tunes, try educating yourself on what other community
> agencies have and use during Real Emergencies.

Lennie, before acting like a complete and utter idiot in a forum where archives are only a mouse-click away, you REALLY ought to ask yourself, "How stupid is this going to make me look?"

>For AMATEUR communications, Dee. There's a lot more radio out
> there that is not amateur. Definitely a lot more. Try some personal
> education on what exists outside of the sphere of ARRL propaganda.

Do some yourself, Lennie.

>Begin with SHARES as one example. Do a web search for that
> acronym.

And while you're at it, Dee, please note that a CONSIDERABLE number of "SHARES" users and supporters are the MARS programs (which require Amateur licensure for it's members), Civil Air Patrol (Amateur licensure not required, but most CAP comm folks are also licensed) and the Coast Guard Auxiliary (same deal as Civil Air Patrol), just to name a few.

Ain't it amazin'...?!?! Them danged "Hams" keep showing up EVERYWHERE!

>That is the general procedure done on radio command and control
> nets since WW2 days. It wasn't invented by radio amateurs.

Just perfected by them.

>ARRL, a major organization for amateur radio, makes
>>available extensive training courses on emergency preparedness and radio
>>procedures.
>
> ...and ARRL has a wonderful syncophant as all can see.

Dee, this is where Jim Miccolis' "profile" (recently plagiarized by Lennie hisself) comes into play.

>>Emergency preparedness groups for the nation, cities, states, and counties
>>factor the availability of amateur radio into their emergency plans.
>
> Face the facts, it is a small factor.

On Lanark Street, perhaps.

>In Real Emergencies ANYONE can be drafted into the task.

Lennie's been sitting by the door, anxiously awaiting the day when the local EMA director says "ALL RETIRED EE'S, TO THE BATCAVE!"

>Dee, please, no more fairy stories.

Dang, Lennie, we were about to ask you the SAME thing.

>Amateurs are an aid, a small
> band-aid, not a full body cast suitable for traction.

And if that small bandaid prevents a major infection from occuring, then what's it's worth, Your Putziness?

>I will cite the week beginning 17 January 1994...(SNIP)

Speaking of myopic...Sheesh, Lennie, ONE event where you CLAIM Amateurs were of no help, and you try to undermine both the HISTORICAL FACTS of Amatuer Radio's contributions, and the ONGOING PROGRAMS the incorporate Amatuer Radio into both local and regional disaster plans.

It DOESN'T WORK!

Contrary to YOUR wishes that it weren't so, most of the people in this forum are smart enough to know the truth.

And the TRUTH is not comimg from you...

>Tell us again how amateur radio spread all the "goodwill" that stopped
> all that warfare "internationally." Didn't prevent Gulf War 2. Didn't
> prevent Gulf War 1. Didn't prevent Iran-Iraq war of 1980-1988. Didn't
> stop Haiti, Grenada, or Panama.

Hmmmmm.....Been the recipient of that "good will" and had a chance ot dish a bit of it out...As an Amateur on Okinawa and in the Phillipines, I got to meet people that I ahd talked with onthe radio.

I sat in their homes...I ahd dinner with them...I shook thier ahnds.

Seemed like "good will" to me.

>Stay with ARRL propaganda. It is a comfort. It is denial of reality.

The "denial of reality" belongs to you, you lying, misleading and deceitful old creep.

Steve, K4YZ

3409. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 10:24:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304230224.2d547f09@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65590

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030422205846.25464.00000001@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >I've done it before, don't have anything to prove, and don't have a
> >lot of free time.
> >
>
> Just checked QRZ again Brian, nope your still not an EXTRA.

Know what, Bruce? I just checked rrap again, and you're still a moron.

3410. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 10:25:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423062551.18769.00000133@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65593

In article <20030423004544.18769.00000129@mb-m21.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

> Poor prissy parson, couldn't answer a thing, could you?

Anyone could answer your questions, Len. But why should I, given the fact that you won;t answer mine?

For example, you wrote in a recent post:

"You do NOT work for any railroad or have any stated work experience in railroading, yet you have stated IN HERE that you are an expert in knowledge of railroads."

Where did I state that I am "an expert in knowledge of railroads."? Please produce the posting where I made such a claim.

It's obvious that you won't. So why should I answer your questions?

3411. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 10:25:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423062552.18769.00000134@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65591

In article <20030422172306.18755.00000184@mb-m06.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In the basics of this so-called
> "morse code" it can be stated that it is:
>
> 1. One of the simplest of communications methods possible in
> the primitive electrical technology of the 1840s.

That's a good thing
>
> 2. It is organized as an encoding of the letters, numbers, and
> punctuation of the English language.

Not just English.
>
> 3. The first "morse code" was just an encoding of numbers and
> a few symbols. Number combinations had to be used to
> represent common English words and phrases. Samuel
> Morse's sponsor and financial backer, Alfred Vail, is the
> one who suggested the dot-dash encoding to encompass
> all letters of the English language. In either form, "morse
> code" is still an encoding scheme to represent written
> English letters, numbers, and punctuation marks.

Not just English. Encodings exist for other alphabets.
>
> 4. It is the first widely-used "all-weather, instant" communications
> scheme as compared to much earlier semaphore and fire
> systems previously used in Europe. It was not affected by
> day or night, clouds or rain.

Another good thing.
>
> 5. It was worked out on landlines, evolving close to the present
> form in 52 years of commercial service before the first
> demonstration of radio waves for communication in 1896.

Landlines used sounders and a different code.
>
> 6. It is solely an ON-OFF coding, easily adapted by primitive
> radio technology of the previous turning of the century.

Yet another good thing.
>
> Critique of Kelly's statements now follows:

>
>>There are huge differences between the purposes and usefulness of
>>Morse as it is still used in ham radio and how it has been used by a
>>myriad of commercial, government and military entities over the years.
>>The professional users of the mode had entirely different priorities
>>and missions to accomplish than hams had and still have except under
>>very unusual circumstances.
>
> That is mostly untrue.

How? Are there not huge differences between what hams do and what other services do, and in resources?

> In the beginning of radio, on-off codings were
> the only possible means of communication for ALL users.

Reginald Fessenden demonstrated amplitude modulated voice and music transmission in 1906.

> The
> first use of radio was as a COMMUNICATIONS MEDIUM that was
> quicker and more weather-proof than all previous communicatons
> methods.

Incorrect. Radio was neither quicker nor more weather proof than landline telegraph or telephone. It is more subject to the vagaries of transmission than "wire" communications. Radio is also inherently lacking in security compared to "wire" communications because anyone with suitable equipment can often listen to others' radio communications without being detected, while doing so with "wire" communications requires close proximity to the "wire",

The main advantages of early radio were:

- the freedom from the expense and difficulty of installing the wire infrastructure,

- the ability to communicate with mobile and portable installations, particularly ships at sea.

> ALL users of radio used it for communications.

Yeah, radar took a bit longer.
>
> The information being communicated is not related to the method,
> medium, or mode of "morse code."

Incorrect. Often, "the medium is the message". Otherwise all books would use the same fonts in printing, photography would have totally replaced drawing and painting, etc.

Rest of rant snipped. If you can't even get the basic history right, there's no point in wasting time on the rest.

Most of all, Len, you missed the fact that W3RV wrote:

"By the way none of the above has anything to do with code tests."

so all your ranting is anti-code, not anti-test.

3412. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 10:25:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423062553.18769.00000135@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 65592

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hdr6hkb.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 21 Apr 2003 10:09:15 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>
>>Seems to me that one of the biggest headaches FCC has in the area of
>>noncommercial radio is the issue of freebanders and those who abuse
>>cb.
>>
>>FCC enforcement of these problems is hampered by the need to locate
>>and identify the violators, as well as to develop evidence to warrant
>>a search. IOW the FCC can't just knock on anyone's door and demand to
>>check for an illegal radio installation.
>
> FCC enforcement agents could - and did - knock on the door and
> -request- to make an inspection but do not have the authority to
> enter by force if refused. It takes a court order (warrant) for
> that to happpen. If there is evidence of operation in violation
> of law or rules, the FCC has the authority to issue a monetary
> penalty (administrative version of a fine) against the operator.

Thank you for stating it clearer than I did, Phil.

The point I'm trying to make is that in the case of an unlicensed person, FCC
has to go through the trouble of getting a search warrant just to get a look
inside the premises. They also have the job of finding the alleged violator in
the first place.
>
>>OTOH, when someone applies for an amateur license, they give FCC all
>>sorts of info about themselves and also agree to allow FCC folks to
>>inspect their stations at any reasonable time AND whenever the station
>>is in operation. FCC CAN knock on a ham's door and demand to inspect
>>the ham's station.
>
> Again, the FCC cannot enter by force if refused, but the "hook"
> that the FCC has is much easier - it can suspend/revoke the
> amateur license as well as issue a monetary penalty.

Exactly. FCC also knows (in theory) where all the hams are.

Of course modern DF equipment makes finding a transmitter easier than ever.
>
>>Much less work for FCC to check out a ham's QTH
>>than that of an unlicensed freebander.
>
>>So maybe, just maybe, FCC wants to make amateur radio licenses easier

>>to get so as to fight the freeband problem. If FCC could get all of the
>>freebanders licensed as hams, enforcement would be much easier.
>
> Another way of looking at it is that the courts and The
> Congress take the easy way out and try to define what they
> consider the "root problem" (whether that is the problem or
> not). In the case of a freebander, the issue is that the
> operator did not have a license. How to solve that - change
> the rules so that s/he gets licensed or can legally operate
> without one. Problem solved (??) and case closed.
>
Certainly reasonable. Of course it doesn't address the problem of those
freebanders who don;t want to operate legally, no matter how easy the license
requirements.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3413. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 10:36:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304230236.44d7b103@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65594

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA60E66.1BFB0B07@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > If your permission was denied then you couldn't operate.
>
> Incorrect. I could have operated at any time.

But you were ordered not to. Doesn't that mean you could not operate
amateur radio?

That's what it means to me, at least.

If caught operating,
> especially after having asked for permission and being denied, I'd have
> had to suffer the consequences. If not caught, I could have just
> claimed that my commander gave me verbal permission.

Didn't your commander deny your request in writing?

> Dave K8MN

That must be the difference between Vietnam Era vets and the rest.

3414. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 10:40:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304230240.3ded3b0e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65595

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA60FCD.C76D3BBF@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA214A5.999E7538@earthlink.net>...
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > >
> > > > In article <f45722ac.0304190500.7cfb962@posting.google.com>,
> > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> > > > >He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.
> > > >
> > > > I'd heard he might have been a snow-removal supervisor for
> > > > the runways at Tan Son Hut...but that's probably just a rumor.
> > >
> > > Just for the record, Len, where is Tan Son Hut?
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Most people would say its in Vietnam (Ho Chi Minh City/Tan Son Nhat).
>
> No, I don't believe they would.
>
> > Where do you and Wonder Boy put it?
>
> I wouldn't put it anywhere. There is no Tan Son Hut and there is no Tan
> Son Nhat.

There isn't? Must be a big conspiracy.

Then why did the International Civil Aviation Authority issue it VVTS?

3415. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 10:43:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304230243.5a3deb7e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65596

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030422222717.18935.00000775@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 4/22/2003 7:51 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0304221651.799558b2@posting.google.com>
>
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3EA214A5.999E7538@earthlink.net>...
> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >
> >> > In article <f45722ac.0304190500.7cfb962@posting.google.com>,
> >> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> > >He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.
> >> >
> >> > I'd heard he might have been a snow-removal supervisor for
> >> > the runways at Tan Son Hut...but that's probably just a rumor.
> >>
> >> Just for the record, Len, where is Tan Son Hut?
> >>
> >> Dave K8MN
> >
> >Most people would say its in Vietnam (Ho Chi Minh City/Tan Son Nhat).
> >
> >Where do you and Wonder Boy put it?
>
> The point, BRAIN, is that there is NO "Tan Son Hut".
>
> Sheesh.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

The POINT, Steve, is that you tripped and skinned your knee over a
mispelled word just like your silly master.

3416. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 10:46:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304230246.334b2548@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65597

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030421130929.19078.00000393@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 4/21/2003 5:28 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0304210228.144b9aaf@posting.google.com>
>
> >So you'll engage in radio activity that you believe our troops
> >shouldn't be engaged in?
>
> Brain, it's a shame you try to engage in a conversation for the purpose of
> being argumentative rather than discussing a concept...But then you ARE "Son of
> Lennie", so what could I expect...?!?!
>
> Steve

Its just interesting to me that you'll come in here, whooping and
hollering, then turn your core beliefs on a dime to make a contact on
HF. That is all.

3417. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 10:59:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304230259.3597adbf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65598

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030419163657.18769.00000051@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0304190416.1cb47371@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030419021218.18769.00000065@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> >> In article <3EA0CAE1.F2542A95@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >N2EY wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <20030418151058.18783.00000044@mb-m27.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com
> >> >> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >> >> > Irrelevant and gratuitous snowjobbing by a morseman.
> >> >>
> >> >> What is a "morseman"?
> >> >
> >> >I think they were the Mordic types who used their great kmowledge of
> >> >mavigation to visit Morth America in the Mimth or Temth cemtury.
> >>
> >> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >> government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
> >> if said opponent fails to honor and revere Heil's views, they will
> >> be the target of Heil's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-
> >> downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Heil's self-
> >> importance...and failure to be original...not to mention doing a
> >> very bad imitation of Otto Preminger.
> >
> >C'mon Len, that was actually the most profound thing that Dave has ever
> >posted.
>
> I apologize to you, Brian.
>
> I stand corrected. Heil's impersonation of Otto Preminger playing a
> Luftwaffe commandant is quite good. He needs to lose some
> weight to better fit the polished jackboots.
>
> He is tho thor he can't hurl thunderbolts now...

Len no apology necessary. Its just that Dave is more interesting and likable when he's not being himself.

3418. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 11:05:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304230305.5b5127a8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65599

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304221951.2f1503e0@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030422172306.18755.00000184@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > In article <d22b54c3.0304220535.3f45a546@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> > (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> (Snipped mother of all mothers of all irrational & irrelevant rants,
> almost 400 lines! And 95% of it a copy-paste repeat from the same rant
> posted less than 48 hours ago. OYeah, you've popped yer cork Putz. Big
> time.)
>
> > There, maybe Kellie can start concentrating on the SUBJECT
> > instead of his usual personal insults. He can return the white
> > sheet to his solitary bed...hopefully after laundering it...
>
> I'm sorry Putz but after I got two seconds into your repetitive rant
> and realized how off-topic it was I skimmed the rest in another two
> seconds flat. I still am on topic Putz, To be repetitive myself Morse
> is still heavily used in the ham bands 24 hours per day 365 days per
> year across the spectrum from 1.8 to at least 145Mhz. And beyond that
> yes, of course Morse is a language. Where on earth did you get the
> silly notion that it isn't?
>
> w3rv

Brian, if morse is a language in its own right, why does it always
come with a conversion chart to english?

3419. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 12:06:16 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304230406.7afb887e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65600

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030422194515.19022.00000496@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> From N2EY
>
> > At a basic
> >level, fingerspelling could be considered an "encoding scheme" for the
> >alphabet and numbers, while the word signs could be considered an
> >"encoding scheme" for common words.
>
> There's anohter example of symbol encoding.
>
> >But ASL and other sign languages
> >are much more than encoding schemes.
>
> Like how?
>
> ---
> Also note, there is a need for sign language. It is used to communicate for
> handicapped people. Morse code has not such use. Also, hardware can encode and
> decode Morse code symbols so people don't have to.

Boy you have the rank newbie syndrome written all over your posts.

My youngest daughter is an occupational therapist who worked in the
field of adaptive engineering before she moved into her current
consulting practice. On two occasions when she was in her former mode
she outfitted two extremely disabled patients with the ability to
communicate with their outside worlds with Morse with both the
equipment she cobbled together with the help of an MSEE biomedical
engineer and her training of the patients and their caregivers in the
use of Morse. These were not breakthroughs in OT, it had been done
many times previously.

Don't think for one minute that any of these so-called "Morse
decoders" actually work worth a hoot out on the real-world ham bands.
They don't. They're nothing more than giggles and a way to snipe coin
from those who think they can beat the learning curve with a device.
If you don't believe it try one.

w3rv

3420. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 12:25:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423082533.18755.00000252@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 65601

In article <d22b54c3.0304221127.67a7ba0c@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>> >
>> > Motion: I hereby nominate Sweet Lenny to the office of "Exhalted Grand
>> > Wizard of RRAP"
>> >
>> > Do we have a second?

Seems like a shoo-in for "The Great Bandini".

He's had lots of practice calling people he's never met "boy". Do you think he would try that in person? Probably not - too much FEAR.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3421. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 12:45:29 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423084529.18877.00000513@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 65602

>Know what, Bruce? I just checked rrap again, and you're still a moron.
>

Well Brian does that mean you still havent passed the EXTRA, and maybe you were just lying again?

3422. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 13:40:57 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EA697E9.4070206@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 65621

Vito wrote:
> WA8ULX wrote:
>
>>>getting
>>>accepted into Boozefighters MC by Wino Willy hisself,
>>
>>How impressive.
>
>
> Did I mention my two doctorates?

Doctorates in what? What did you do you dissertations on?

3423. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 13:48:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA6996F.9924B62E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65613

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA60E66.1BFB0B07@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > If your permission was denied then you couldn't operate.
> >
> > Incorrect. I could have operated at any time.
>
> But you were ordered not to. Doesn't that mean you could not operate
> amateur radio?
>
> That's what it means to me, at least.

I wasn't ordered not to do anything, Brian. I was notified that my
request was denied.

> If caught operating,
> > especially after having asked for permission and being denied, I'd have
> > had to suffer the consequences. If not caught, I could have just
> > claimed that my commander gave me verbal permission.
>
> Didn't your commander deny your request in writing?

He certainly did. If I operated and was not caught at it, I could
simply toss the written denial of my request and claim that I had verbal
permission. If I'd been nabbed, I would have suffered the consequences.

> That must be the difference between Vietnam Era vets and the rest.

What is the difference? Service members then requested and received or
were denied written permission to put an amateur radio station on the
air.

Service members now request and receive or are denied written permission
to put an amateur radio station on the air.

The only anomaly seems to be you in Somalia.

Dave K8MN

3424. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 13:56:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA69B4D.7049664@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65614

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA60FCD.C76D3BBF@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA214A5.999E7538@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > In article <f45722ac.0304190500.7cfb962@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > > > >He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.
> > > > >
> > > > > I'd heard he might have been a snow-removal supervisor for
> > > > > the runways at Tan Son Hut...but that's probably just a rumor.
> > > >
> > > > Just for the record, Len, where is Tan Son Hut?

> > > Most people would say its in Vietnam (Ho Chi Minh City/Tan Son Nhat).
> >
> > No, I don't believe they would.
> >
> > > Where do you and Wonder Boy put it?
> >
> > I wouldn't put it anywhere. There is no Tan Son Hut and there is no Tan
> > Son Nhat.
>
> There isn't? Must be a big conspiracy.
>
> Then why did the International Civil Aviation Authority issue it VVTS?

To be specific, the Saigon civil airport was named Ton Son Nhat.
The U.S. air base was Ton Son Nhut. Tan Son Hut must be a Nuoc Mam
scented snack bar outside the air field. U.S. military personnel had
nothing to do with Tan Son Nhat.

I was never assigned to a place called "Tan Son Nhat" or a place called
"Tan Son Hut".

Dave K8MN

3425. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 14:06:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA69DA3.9B278F1A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65615

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <d22b54c3.0304221127.67a7ba0c@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >>
> >> >
> >> > Motion: I hereby nominate Sweet Lenny to the office of "Exhalted Grand
> >> > Wizard of RRAP"
> >> >
> >> > Do we have a second?
>
> Seems like a shoo-in for "The Great Bandini".
>
> He's had lots of practice calling people he's never met "boy". Do you think he
> would try that in person? Probably not - too much FEAR.

Len is the Rodney Dangerfield of r.r.a.p., even if his humor is
unintentional. He gets no respect.

Dave K8MN

3426. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 14:29:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423102942.18950.00000316@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 65616

>Did I mention my two doctorates?

Damn, he should be just Grandfather to Extra.

3427. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 14:46:24 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EA6A740.8040608@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 65625

WA8ULX wrote:
>>What did you do you dissertations on?
>
>
> Agitating CBplusers, and New CB Ham Whinners

LOL, I beleive it.

3428. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 15:28:28 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0304230728.2de34c14@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65617

"garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message news:<VHlpa.572562$L1.167101@sccrnsc02>...
> Hello Stewart .. It is a shame guys get their shorts tight by a little fun
> ....no sense of humor.

It is a sad situation when one loses the ability to laugh at
oneself... or even to laugh period.

> OTOH It is a shame to see that class of ticket go
> south. I have many fond memories of my days on 40 on the 3 crystals I had.
> The class allowed me to develop a skill that continues to bring me enjoyment
> and a release of my day's stress.

I agree.

- Stewart

3429. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 15:29:39 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0304230729.71e5a57d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65618

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:<Pine.LNX.4.55.0304222132400.108@kd6lvw.ampr.org>...
> On Tue, 22 Apr 2003, stewart wrote:
> > As the number of Novice Class license-holders dwindles down to a
> > handful, and the elimination of this class of Amateurs seems
> > inevitbable; it seems a good time to reflect on what this means to the
> > US Amateur Radio Service...
> >
> > Let's look at the term "Novice" itself... the word Novice is derived
> > from the Middle English word "novis" - which means, literally "No
> > Vice"... so, what this means in terms of the rest of the Amateur
> > classes, is that these Novices are the only Operators having "No
> > Vice"... the rest of us have this "vice" of ham radio... some to more
> > degree than others... but, in all cases, we "have the vice"... or, in
> > other words, are "of the vicious"... this can clearly be seen here on
> > this Usenet group, where all of these Non-Novices, fight their vicious
> > battles everyday... yes, the Novices will be missed - as all we will
> > be is "pure vice".
>
> I can't believe how stupid you are.
>
> Novice is actually derrived from the latin adjective NOVUS which means new,
> plus the noun suffix -ICE, meaning "possessing a state or quality." Therefore,
> the combined defintion is "[a person] possessing the quality of being new."

HA!

Gotcha!

- Stewart

3430. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 15:34:13 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304230734.4b2302a2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65619

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030423062552.18769.00000134@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> In article <20030422172306.18755.00000184@mb-m06.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:

. . . . .

> Rest of rant snipped. If you can't even get the basic history right, there's no
> point in wasting time on the rest.
>
> Most of all, Len, you missed the fact that W3RV wrote:
>
> "By the way none of the above has anything to do with code tests."
>
> so all your ranting is anti-code, not anti-test.

BOINK.

If I was anti-test I'd consider the Grand Lizard an embarrassment to the cause . .

w3rv

3431. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 15:37:58 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0304230737.761ee425@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65620

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030422174141.18769.00000107@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <5f4fe4c2.0304221300.3996b651@posting.google.com>,
> horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:
>
> Vinny, vice, video... (film at 11...)
>
> Dwight, someone will make you an "offer" you can't refuse!
>
> :-)

Yes, if I do say so myself, this one was a "classic" ;^)

The study of languages happens to be side hobby of mine... here is a
good reference text:

Baugh, A.C. & T. Cable * A History of the English Language

- Stewart

3432. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 15:51:17 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA6B675.207474C3@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65603

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> Especially from a vanity call K3....

Originally KA3DWW in 1977. When XYL used it for field day some years back 'Delta Whiskey Whiskey' (-.. .-- .--) got thru pileups better than her 'KA6GWP'. So having upgraded to extra she vanitied to K6DWW. I had her drop my "a" at the same time because the ID'r on my new-old repeater only did 7 characters and I wanted to use "/R". Now you too know how I lost my "A". Big ego trip isn't it?
>
> Have you ever wondered why so many folks with call signs actually seem to
> dislike ham radio? Why are they still here then?
>
Good question Dan. It's not ham radio we dislike, it's the jerks it attracts. You know, the geeks who spent months studying to get licensed and live and breathe ham cuz it's the only thing they're successful at; never mind half the Oakland Hells Angels got tech licenses just by reading Dick Bash's book back when that meant drawing complex circuits. If you don't know who I'm talking about there just might well be a picture of him over your bathroom sink.

Well balanced people enjoy ham radio but it isn't the only thing in our lives; nor is our self esteem based on having passed a test.

K3DWW

3433. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 15:52:06 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA6B6A6.10A4D78F@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65604

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >getting
> >accepted into Boozefighters MC by Wino Willy hisself,
>
> How impressive.

Did I mention my two doctorates?

3434. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 16:18:09 UTC
From: Kjay <jayb100001@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ea6bcdc@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 65622

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3EA4026D.9050608@psu.edu...
> An amateur I know caught an ad for the ARS on a Pittsburgh television
> station over the weekend. I didn't see it, and am relaying what he told
me.
>
> The ad was about a young lady who is shaken out of sleep in the middle
> of the night by the rumbling of an earthquake. She immediately grabs her
> HT, which is located on the nightstand beside her bed, and starts
> calling. He didn't get all the details, as just like the Spanish
> inquisition, he wasn't expecting an ad for the ARS.
>
> According to the gentleman, the commercial was well done and a very
> decent advertisement for the ARS.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Sorry Mike.....
It was an advertisment for local pre-paid cellular dealership.
She reached over and grabbed a Nokia cell phone to call for help.
It was not an HT.

3435. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 16:21:19 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA6BD7F.E7DFF1D7@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65605

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Useful? Definitely yes. I've seen several occasions when the HF bands were
> in too poor a condition to support understandable voice communications but
> the people on CW/Morse were having plenty of good, readable QSOs.

And a lot of fun too I'll wager. I got too focused on emcomms and some
band is always open for ground plane/NVIS within my state (VA) to
remember radio has other useful purposes. Thanks for reminding me.

> While some of the other digital modes would also work, all the other digital
> modes require that you have a computer hooked into your radio.
>
Yes, but doesn't everybody nowdays? I bought a used P1 laptop for $35
and software is mostly free. I hope to get Elmered on PSK31 this coming
field day.

73, K3DWW

3436. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 16:25:12 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304230825.44540a84@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65623

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030422194515.19022.00000496@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> From N2EY
>
> > At a basic
> >level, fingerspelling could be considered an "encoding scheme" for the
> >alphabet and numbers, while the word signs could be considered an
> >"encoding scheme" for common words.
>
> There's anohter example of symbol encoding.

At a basic level, yes. But there's much more to it than that.
>
> >But ASL and other sign languages
> >are much more than encoding schemes.
>
> Like how?

The way a person makes a sign can say as much as the sign itself.
Fast, slow, formal, informal, exaggerated, minimized. Various facial
expressions can be added. Choice of sign is another element.

I'm no expert at ASL by any stretch of the imagination, but I learned
enough to gain a basic appreciation of its characteristics. While some
signs are based on English words, and of course fingerspelling is the
Roman alphabet, English knowledge is not absolutely necessary to have
an understanding of ASL.

> ----------
> Also note, there is a need for sign language. It is used to communicate for
> handicapped people.

It was developed by/for deaf people, yes. But it can enhance the life
of anyone who learns to use it. There have been situations where I
have used ASL to communicate where all parties to the communication
have 'normal' hearing. I know elementary school teachers who have
enhanced the education of their students by including ASL, even though
no one in the class was deaf.

One of my longterm goals in life is to improve my ASL skills.

>Morse code has not such use.

INCORRECT.

K4YZ has given one case. There have been other medical situations
where Morse-knowing people have been able to communicate using the

mode when other methods were impractical. Ever been intubated, Vipul?

> Also, hardware can encode and
> decode Morse code symbols so people don't have to.

In some cases, yes. By that same line of thought, deaf people could just write everything down or use little keyboard/display devices. But it's not the same thing.

As W3RV wrote, none of this is about any test. It's about having another tool in the toolbox.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3437. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 16:43:23 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423124323.18792.00000488@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 65624

>What did you do you dissertations on?

Agitating CBplusers, and New CB Ham Whinners

3438. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 16:45:58 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA6C346.AE3D6E60@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65612

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Vshah101 wrote:
> > Why would repeaters last any longer than cell phone towers? Plus all repeater
> > users would share one freq. Not practical in an emergency.
>
> Are you serious? hint:
> the repeaters often have emergency generators
>
> The amateurs often have mobile rigs and/or battery powered ht's or home
> staions that can go off the power grid. You specifically *want* everyone
> on one frequency in an emergency. Not practical? Eminently practical!
>

There's even more to it, guys.

The number of circuits telephone companies provide is based on average usage. In an emergency these are quickly overloaded by people checking on friends and family; so massively overloaded that the system crashes. Normally, the cell system is so good that many police, fire and rescue units have leased private "lines" on it and sold off their old repeaters (I bought one). These private cell lines also quit working when the system crashes. I was told that's what happened in the 9/11 disasters, not the loss of towers. Other nearby towers would "take over" were it not for the overload.

The "old fashioned" repeaters amateurs, and some emergency services, still use are uneffected by this phenomena. Their capability may seem puny compared to the cell system but they have proven capable of handling emergency traffic when their big brother has a stroke.

Cell phone or ARS? Be safe, have both!

73, K3DWW

3439. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 17:16:31 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423131631.19022.00000341@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65626

>LOL, I beleive it.
>

No luck needed its easy to do.

3440. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 17:32:17 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304230932.6459bc99@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65627

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030422172300.18755.00000183@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0304221127.67a7ba0c@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message

> >> And of ALL radio in general. His skills are far more obsolete than
> >> anything he can lay onto Morse code.
> >
> >Of course, that's why he's down to hanging out in RRAP as his last
> >gasp at having any relevance and getting any recognition in radio
> >circles. Imagine how far he'd get with his same old same old
> >troglodyte BS if he hung out in any of the professional radio groups
> >instead of here.
>
> Go on into homebrew and "critique" the results in there. :-)

Just for the hell of it ya Putz I called your bluff and did just that.
A few dozen posts going back to 1996. The vast majority haven't drawn
a response yet. Many were your usual long-winded diatribes which
wandered all over like you do here when you're trying to be
"impressive". Ya oughta slap a patent on the technique and sell it as
a cure for insomnia. Several posts were characteristically
antagonistic. One guy brushed you off as a lurker. Looked to me like
those guys are much more interested in Avery labels than they are in
Avery Fineman. Yeah, you're a real dot hombrew "hero" all righty. No
surprise either, you is what we all know you is.

> >Being the radio "engineering professional" he'd like
> >the snooker the world into thinking he is.
>
> I accept money for services performed. That's the primary
> definition of "professional."

You'll be a "professional" when garbage collectors are considered
professionals.

> Kellie is welcome to question any of the references I've
> provided in here. He doesn't dare for he will be proven wrong
> in his loud-mouth name-calling.

You play the same game in dot hombrew, you try to pass yourself off as
an engineer. Which you are not. We all know that anybody who does not
have an accredited engineering degree is not an engineer except in
extraordinary cases. While you certainly qualify as an extraordinary

case your problem has nothing to do with your status as an electronics bench tech attempting to misrepresent yourself as an engineer. I noticed that Dick dumped a post into dot homebrew which pointedly clarified your status as a non-ham, ya tried, fuhgeddit again, everybody has your number.

> >> At least *it* is still useful *somewhere*
> >> to *somebody*.
> >
> >Morse? All over the planet 24/365, galls him no end.
>
> Kellie is hearing things again. Poor thing. Must be a side effect
> of his other age-related ailments.

You're just plain fulla shit. You've dropped all the way back into your child mode again. Unless there is some freak solar disturbance underway there is no time 24/365 that two-way Morse communications are not audible given any half-baked HF receiver with a BFO and a wire tossed out a window.

> >Maybe he is actually useful to somebody somewhere, maybe he hauls the
> >trash out to the curb. We don't know.
>
> I took out the Kellie yesterday. Monday is our trash pickup day
> over here. I'll take out the Kellie next Monday, too. :-)
>
> I won't have to worry about taking out any Kellie from any
> professional groups or any amateur radio newsgroups which
> talk about radio physics. No Kellie there to take out.

Surf the mech eng groups & reflectors and dot antennas Putz.

> Leonard H. Anderson
> Life Member IEEE

w3rv
Life Member, Order of the Arrow, BSA
Life Member Frankford Radio Club
http://www.gofrc.org/
(both by invitation and election only)
Zzzzzzzzzzz . . . !

3441. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 17:44:01 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304230944.2ccce899@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65628

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304230305.5b5127a8@posting.google.com>...
kelly@dvol.com
> > > (Brian Kelly) writes:

> > year across the spectrum from 1.8 to at least 145Mhz. And beyond that
> > yes, of course Morse is a language. Where on earth did you get the
> > silly notion that it isn't?
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Brian, if morse is a language in its own right, why does it always
> come with a conversion chart to english?

To help those of you who have communications disabilities get past your problems.

3442. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 17:50:37 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304230950.63d80c46@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65629

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030423082533.18755.00000252@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0304221127.67a7ba0c@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >>
> >> >
> >> > Motion: I hereby nominate Sweet Lenny to the office of "Exhalted Grand
> >> > Wizard of RRAP"
> >> >
> >> > Do we have a second?
>
> Seems like a shoo-in for "The Great Bandini".
>
> He's had lots of practice calling people he's never met "boy". Do you think he
> would try that in person? Probably not - too much FEAR.

I'd love to be there when he pulled it on n3mep . . or on any of the
bad boys in philly who hang out in 146.500 simplex Brotherhod Net.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3443. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141021.18770.00000156@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65638

In article <f45722ac.0304230246.334b2548@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Brain, it's a shame you try to engage in a conversation for the purpose
>of
>> being argumentative rather than discussing a concept...But then you ARE
>"Son of
>> Lennie", so what could I expect...?!?!
>>
>> Steve
>
>Its just interesting to me that you'll come in here, whooping and
>hollering, then turn your core beliefs on a dime to make a contact on
>HF. That is all.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3444. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141022.18770.00000158@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65631

In article <f45722ac.0304230240.3ded3b0e@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> I wouldn't put it anywhere. There is no Tan Son Hut and there is no Tan
>> Son Nhat.
>
>There isn't? Must be a big conspiracy.
>
>Then why did the International Civil Aviation Authority issue it VVTS?

The ICAO doesn't exist. Vietnam doesn't exist.

Denial is a river running through Egypt... :-)

3445. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141022.18770.00000157@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65634

In article <f45722ac.0304230243.5a3deb7e@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> The point, BRAIN, is that there is NO "Tan Son Hut".
>>
>> Sheesh.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>The POINT, Steve, is that you tripped and skinned your knee over a
>mispelled word just like your silly master.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3446. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141023.18770.00000159@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65639

In article <20030423031338.18985.00000153@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/22/2003 11:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030423004541.18769.00000125@mb-m21.aol.com>
>
>>> Still at it for seventh time today.
>>>
>>> Liar, cheat AND plagiarist.
>>
>> No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>
> (yaaaaaaaaaaaaaawwwwwn)
>
> Seventeenth.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has, if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3447. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141023.18770.00000160@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65640

In article <20030423031245.18985.00000152@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/22/2003 11:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030423004541.18769.00000126@mb-m21.aol.com>
>
>>>>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>>>
>>> Sixth use of plagiarized comments today.
>>>
>>> Are we seeing a pattern of abuse and strained ethics here...?!?!
>>
>> No matter what job, educational level
>
> Sixteen.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3448. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141024.18770.00000161@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65630

In article <20030423031206.18985.00000151@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/22/2003 11:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030423004543.18769.00000127@mb-m21.aol.com>
>
>>> Fifth use of plagiarized comments today...
>>>
>>> Pretty lame...
>>
>> No matter what job, educational level
>
> Fifteen.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has, if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3449. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141025.18770.00000163@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65643

In article <20030422222717.18935.00000775@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>Date: 4/22/2003 7:51 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304221651.799558b2@posting.google.com>
>
>>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>news:<3EA214A5.999E7538@earthlink.net>...
>>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>> >
>>> > In article <f45722ac.0304190500.7cfb962@posting.google.com>,
>>> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>>> > >He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.
>>> >
>>> > I'd heard he might have been a snow-removal supervisor for
>>> > the runways at Tan Son Hut...but that's probably just a rumor.
>>>
>>> Just for the record, Len, where is Tan Son Hut?
>>>
>>> Dave K8MN
>>
>>Most people would say its in Vietnam (Ho Chi Minh City/Tan Son Nhat).
>>
>>Where do you and Wonder Boy put it?
>
> The point, BRAIN, is that there is NO "Tan Son Hut".
>
> Sheesh.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3450. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141025.18770.00000162@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65645

In article <20030423031118.18985.00000150@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/22/2003 11:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030423004544.18769.00000128@mb-m21.aol.com>
>
>>> Fourth use of plagiarized comments today.
>>
>> Incorrect.
>
> All too true.
>
>>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>
> Ya got this one in under the wire, Lennie...that made at LEAST fourteen
>times you repeated the same plagiarized "profile" that Jim Miccolis initiated
>IRT you.
>
> On top of that, you simply quoted in your OWN enitre rants, quoted in
>their entirety, only to be followed by your stolen "profile".

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3451. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141026.18770.00000164@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65632

In article <20030422210436.18935.00000747@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030421151552.18769.00000108@mb-m24.aol.com>
>
>>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>
> Eighth use of plagiarized comments.
>
> Borrrrrrrinnnnnng, Your Putziness.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has, if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3452. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141026.18770.00000165@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65633

In article <f45722ac.0304230259.3597adbf@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Len no apology necessary. Its just that Dave is more interesting and
>likable when he's not being himself.

You may be right. I've seen other schizophrenics do their thing.

3453. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141027.18770.00000166@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65637

In article <20030423062551.18769.00000133@mb-m21.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030423004544.18769.00000129@mb-m21.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>> Poor prissy parson, couldn't answer a thing, could you?
>
>Anyone could answer your questions, Len. But why should I, given the fact
>that
>you won;t answer mine?
>
>For example, you wrote in a recent post:
>
>"You do NOT work for any railroad or have any stated work experience in
>railroading, yet you have stated IN HERE that you are an expert in knowledge
>of railroads."
>
>Where did I state that I am "an expert in knowledge of railroads."? Please
>produce the posting where I made such a claim.
>
>It's obvious that you won't. So why should I answer your questions?

"Ve haf vays uf making you talk!" - old B-picture movie line.

Heh heh heh. I've made the prissy parson write and write and
write and write in here. :-)

ARRL syncophants can do no wrong. They are the al-queda
of the amateur radio world.

3454. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141028.18770.00000167@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65635

In article <20030422223239.18935.00000777@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030421151541.18769.00000100@mb-m24.aol.com>
>
>>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>
> Thirteen. No originality...No truth...No kidding...

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has, if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3455. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141028.18770.00000168@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65642

In article <20030422221353.18935.00000772@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>Date: 4/22/2003 7:26 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030422202617.18755.00000241@mb-m05.aol.com>
>
>>In article <20030422001726.18767.00000113@mb-m15.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>> (Prissy Parson)...(SNIP)
>
> Thirty-nine reasons (several spelling errors noted) to keep my kids out
>of
>"professional" radio.
>
>>Well, there you have it ;-)
>
> Yep.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has, if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3456. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141030.18770.00000170@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65636

In article <20030422213813.18935.00000760@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/21/2003 2:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030421151539.18769.00000099@mb-m24.aol.com>
>
>>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>
> That's eight times he's repeated the same plagairized comments.
>
> And I have deleted a lot w/o reading....
>
> How many times in one day can a guy be so lame...???

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has, if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3457. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141030.18770.00000169@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65646

In article <20030422214607.18769.00000140@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <3EA21361.D7CEBB84@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>writes:
>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>
>>> In article <20030419124555.18821.00000073@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>> writes:
>>>
>>> >I do "talk shop" - but not in an amateur radio policy newsgroup. Since I
>>do
>>> not
>>> >work for the FCC, ARRL, an amateur radio equipment manufacturer, or as a
>>> >communications attorney, such "shop talk" is simply not relevant.
>>>
>>> You do NOT work for the US government or in any possible
>>> capacity for US foreign policy, yet you prattle endlessly
>>> about those subjects which do NOT involve amateur radio.
>>>
>>> You do NOT work for any railroad or have any stated work
>>> experience in railroading, yet you have stated IN HERE that
>>> you are an expert in knowledge of railroads. Railroads and
>>> railroading are NOT amateur radio subjects nor is there any
>>> reference to railroads and railroading in US amateur radio
>>> regulations.
>>>
>>> You have NEVER been a member of the United States
>>> armed forces or any other military, yet you've implied that
>>> you have expert knowledge of military policy, plans,
>>> technology, and life as a military person.
>>>
>>> You spout endlessly in a number of fields of work and
>>> policy that have nothing at all to do with amateur radio.
>>
>>I seem to remember you doing those things, Len. Of course, you may feel
>>free to correct me if I'm mistaken.
>
>I'm not sure which things you mean, Dave. Here's a list:
>
>1) work for the US government
>2) in any possible capacity for US foreign policy

>3) prattle endlessly about those subjects which do NOT involve amateur radio.
>4) work for any railroad or have any stated work experience in railroading
>5) been a member of the United States armed forces
>6) implied expert knowledge of military policy, plans, technology, and life
>as
>a military person.
>7) spout endlessly in a number of fields of work and policy that have nothing
>at all to do with amateur radio.
>8) irrelevant, misleading, misdirectioning, and, in general, just a
>self-promoting bullshit artist.
>
>Which ones has Len done? Obviously, he's done 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8. But
>there's
>no evidence he's ever done 2 or 4
>>
>>Gee, Leonard, you aren't involved in amateur radio in the tiniest way
>>and you haven't let that slow you down a bit. I guess that'd make you a
>>self-promoting...well, you know the rest.
>
>QED!
>>
>>I've saved you the embarrassment of seeing the rest of your wild ravings
>>again by snipping the balance.
>>
>Thanks, Dave.
>
>btw, Len states categorically (about me):
>
>"you have stated IN HERE that you are an expert in knowledge of railroads"
>
>I went looking for such a post, and came up with not a single post where I
>claimed to be an expert in knowledge of railroads. I do know a bit about the
>steel-wheel stuff, but I leave the pronouncement of "expert" to others.
>
>So we are left with a puzzle: Did Len LIE when he made that claim, or did ne
>just make an ERROR? Will he admit to it, and apologize for saying untrue
>things about another, ow will he attack the messenger?

Hmmm...I thought this thread was about "Max Morse Speed" as
indicated in the Subject line of the header.

No, it all about the ego and personality of a long message writer
who makes many statements about US foreign policy, US military
warfare doctrine and tactics, and how he is always right no matter
what. :-)

3458. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141035.18770.00000171@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65644

In article <20030423040038.18985.00000156@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/22/2003 11:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030423004549.18769.00000131@mb-m21.aol.com>
>
>>In article <Nflpa.11$X32.10662@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
>><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>>>You show your ignorance about emergency communications. There was an
>>>excellent article in QST about the major contribution in communications
>>>support made by the ham radio operators at the World Trade Center disaster
>>>site.
>>
>> That's hardly unbiased reporting, isn't it?
>
> Can you, Lennie H, prove that ONE WORD of it was not true?
>
>>"Support" is an ambiguous term there. Compare that to the actual
>> support given by several of the major communications equipment
>> suppliers.
>
> The "major communications equipment suppliers" did just that...supplied
>equipment. ARES supplied people to USE the equiment. People TRAINED in
>proper
>net discipline, "relay techniques" and other techniques in radio
>communications
>as needed.
>
> Unless you can DISPROVE that too?
>
>>>There are emergencies on a regular basis where amateur radio has been
>>>the only way to get enough communications into and out of an area.
>>
>> But only in small isolated incidents.
>
> Uh huh...I remember that little incident involving the flooding of the
>interior of the United States not too long ago that displaced
>tens-of-thousands
>of people (who stayed in Red Cross shelters supported by ARES), helped move
>hundreds of disaster workers to where they needed to be and provided law
>enforcement and fire services in dozens of communities with dispatch/control

>capabilities.
>
>>>Why do repeaters last longer? Simple. There are many INDENDENT repeaters.
>>>If one goes down, the others are still accessible.
>>
>> How are they coordinated for use? Will and idea?
>
> Planning and practice. Two skills you are lacking in launching these
>tirades, Your Putziness.
>
>>Amateur repeaters aren't tied into the telecommunications
>> infrastructure.
>
> That's part of their strength.
>
> If part of the state's 800mHz system craps out mid-state, they're out of
>luck.
>
> If the local 2M repeater craps out, I switch repeaters or I go to HF.
>
>>You forget the large number of INDEPENDENT non-amateur radio
>> groupings in communities.
>
> REACT...?!?!?
>
>>>With cell phones, if one
>>>tower goes down, you've lost communications in a wide area.
>>
>> Non-amateur telecommunications is not dependent on
>> cellular telephone sites. Try educating yourself on the
>> various non-amateur radio services in your community.
>
> I have. Other "non-amateur" communications systems are not any where
>near
>as prolific and functional.
>
>>>Also hams can,
>>>on fairly short notice, dismantle their repeater and move it to a more
>>>suitable location as was done for the 9/11 disaster.
>>
>> No faster nor better than commercial telecommunications
>> providers
>
> And you know this...HOW...?!?!? Practical experience in WHAT Amateur
>Radio organization...?!?!?
>
>>>Even if the repeaters
>>>are unavailable, many amateur radio operators (you do have to study the
>>>techniques) also know how to effectively and accurately relay messages from
>>>one operator to another to get to it's final destination.

>>
>> That IS the prevailing myth.
>
> Then it's 80+ years of myth, substantiated by accolades in the Federal
>Register and reams of "general media" press over thsoe 80 years.
>
>>Where are the DETAILS of such rapid relay of communications and
>> how long does it take to get between destinations?
>
> In those same 80+ years you keep trying to ignore, Your Lameness.
>
>>>They are very short of capacity when major disasters occur.
>>
>> This is often stated but it overlooks the non-switched telephone
>> circuits that exist for public safety agencies
>
> And when situations like the WTC or midwest floods occur, taking out ALL
>wireline or fixed-infrastructure assets in that area?
>
>>Before
>> jumping onto ARRL syncophancy bandwagon and playing those
>> patriotic tunes, try educating yourself on what other community
>> agencies have and use during Real Emergencies.
>
> Lennie, before acting like a complete and utter idiot in a forum where
>archives are only a mouse-click away, you REALLY ought to ask yourself, "How
>stupid is this going to make me look?"
>
>>For AMATEUR communications, Dee. There's a lot more radio out
>> there that is not amateur. Definitely a lot more. Try some personal
>> education on what exists outside of the sphere of ARRL propaganda.
>
> Do some yourself, Lennie.
>
>>Begin with SHARES as one example. Do a web search for that
>> acronym.
>
> And while you're at it, Dee, please note that a CONSIDERABLE number of
>"SHARES" users and supporters are the MARS programs (which require Amateur
>licensure for it's members), Civil Air Patrol (Amateur licensure not
>required,
>but most CAP comm folks are also licensed) and the Coast Guard Auxiliary
>(same
>deal as Civil Air Patrol), just to name a few.
>
> Ain't it amazin'...?!?! Them danged "Hams" keep showing up EVERYWHERE!
>
>>That is the general procedure done on radio command and control
>> nets since WW2 days. It wasn't invented by radio amateurs.
>

> Just perfected by them.
>
>>ARRL, a major organization for amateur radio, makes
>>>available extensive training courses on emergency preparedness and radio
>>>procedures.
>>
>> ...and ARRL has a wonderful syncophant as all can see.
>
> Dee, this is where Jim Miccolis' "profile" (recently plagiarized by
>Lennie
>hisself) comes into play.
>
>>>Emergency preparedness groups for the nation, cities, states, and counties
>>>factor the availability of amateur radio into their emergency plans.
>>
>> Face the facts, it is a small factor.
>
> On Lanark Street, perhaps.
>
>>In Real Emergencies ANYONE can be drafted into the task.
>
> Lennie's been sitting by the door, anxiously awaiting the day when the
>local EMA director says "ALL RETIRED EE'S, TO THE BATCAVE!"
>
>>Dee, please, no more fairy stories.
>
> Dang, Lennie, we were about to ask you the SAME thing.
>
>>Amateurs are an aid, a small
>> band-aid, not a full body cast suitable for traction.
>
> And if that small bandaid prevents a major infection from occuring, then
>what's it's worth, Your Putziness?
>
>>I will cite the week beginning 17 January 1994...(SNIP)
>
> Speaking of myopic...Sheesh, Lennie, ONE event where you CLAIM Amateurs
>were of no help, and you try to undermine both the HISTORICAL FACTS of
>Amatuer
>Radio's contributions, and the ONGOING PROGRAMS the incorporate Amatuer Radio
>into both local and regional disaster plans.
>
> It DOESN'T WORK!
>
> Contrary to YOUR wishes that it weren't so, most of the people in this
>forum are smart enough to know the truth.
>
> And the TRUTH is not comimg from you...
>
>>Tell us again how amateur radio spread all the "goodwill" that stopped

>> all that warfare "internationally." Didn't prevent Gulf War 2. Didn't
>> prevent Gulf War 1. Didn't prevent Iran-Iraq war of 1980-1988. Didn't
>> stop Haiti, Grenada, or Panama.
>
> Hmmmmm.....Been the recipient of that "good will" and had a chance ot
>dish
>a bit of it out...As an Amateur on Okinawa and in the Phillipines, I got to
>meet people that I ahd talked with onthe radio.
>
> I sat in their homes...I ahd dinner with them...I shook thier ahnds.
>
> Seemed like "good will" to me.
>
>>Stay with ARRL propaganda. It is a comfort. It is denial of reality.
>
> The "denial of reality" belongs to you, you lying, misleading and
>deceitful old creep.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3459. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141036.18770.00000172@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65641

In article <20030423032508.18985.00000155@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/22/2003 11:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030423004545.18769.00000130@mb-m21.aol.com>
>
>>>The World Trade Center disaster.
>>
>> Incorrect. Putting an emergency coordinating agency IN one
>> of the WTC buildings was just poor planning.
>
> Why?
>
> WHICH "disaster scenario" ever envisioned suicidal maniacs hijacking
>innocent civilians in a gassed-up airliner then using it as a modern-day Baka
>bomb?
>
>>>The ice storms in some parts of this country this past winter
>>
>> Sorry, isolated incidents of small communities, not indicative
>> of non-amateur communications equipment or installations.
>
> Ice storms are only "isolated incidents" in southern California and most
>of the "Gulf Coast" states, Your Nearsightedness.
>
> The REST of the United States still has to deal with ANNUAL ice-storms,
>blizzards, tornados and others hazzards of nature.
>
>>>Almost every major hurricane over the last several decades.
>>
>> Incorrect again.
>>
>> Try the Northridge Earthquake of 1994 affecting a population
>> area of 10 million. How was amateur radio directly aiding
>> anything then?
>
> She cites "every major hurricaine" and you immediately jump back to your
>"Northridge Earthquake of 1994"...Do YOU have a problem differentiating
>between
>hurricaines and earthquakes, Your Scumminess? If so I can provide some
>pretty
>nice links to weather and geological sites that can help you learn...

>
>>>Plus amateurs have message relay techniques, if they care to study them,
>>>that enable them to get messages in and out without a repeater anyway.
>>
>> Amateur repeaters are coordinated only in frequency for a
>> specific geographic region.
>
> Hey Your Putziness...Not every "relay technique" involves a repeater.
>Amateurs DO utilize bands other than 2M FM.
>
> Not that YOU'D know...
>
>>What amateurs COULD do is not what they DO.
>
> Again, not that YOU'D know.
>
>>To nearly ALL hams, all microwave equipment except a parabolic
>> antenna is meaningless machinery.
>
> So says Lennie the Licenseless. The Lame...The Liar...

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3460. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141037.18770.00000173@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65657

In article <3EA5F8D9.3040007@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:
>> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>
>>
>>>>Why would repeaters last any longer than cell phone towers? Plus all
>>>
>>>repeater
>>>
>>>>users would share one freq. Not practical in an emergency.
>>>
>>> Are you serious? hint:
>>>the repeaters often have emergency generators
>>
>>
>> Thats not enough. Local repeater went down and there was no storm. Can you
>cite
>> specific examples where amateur repeaters are better than non-amateur
>> repeaters?
>
>Part of a news release from ARRL:
>
>NEWINGTON, Conn., February 7, 2003 -- Amateur Radio Emergency Service
>(ARES) members, Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service (RACES) members,
>and other ham radio volunteers have been assisting federal, state and
>local officials and service agencies in the search for debris from the
>shuttle Columbia.
>
>"Ham radio has proven to be the only reliable communications option
>during the recovery effort," said Tim Lewallen, a North Texas Public
>Information Officer for ARRL, the national association for Amateur
>Radio. "The area's dense forests and hilly terrain make communication
>via many traditional radio systems difficult."
>
>Authorities have requested that every survey team have at least one
>Amateur Radio operator with them so the recovery efforts remain
>coordinated and organized. Along with volunteering their communications
>expertise, ham radio operators were also involved in the debris
>cataloging effort early on. <therest snipped for brevity>
>
>diss that.

Impossible...statements by ARRL are sacrosanct.

Anything said against ARRL is heresy and irreligious.

:-)

3461. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141038.18770.00000174@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65649

In article <20030423031504.18985.00000154@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/22/2003 11:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030423004551.18769.00000132@mb-m21.aol.com>
>
>>Some in here have a hatred and contempt for professionals. Are you
>> one of those?
>
> Why not, Lennie??? You certainly seem to be.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3462. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141039.18770.00000175@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65659

In article <20030422215113.18935.00000762@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/21/2003 5:12 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030421181251.19006.00000451@mb-m05.aol.com>
>
>>From (WA8ULX)
>
>>> Are you talking about all the knuckle Dragging Cbplussers, that have
>>entered
>>>Ham Radio?
>
>>Of course not. You have such a limited view, you cannot see anything else
>but
>>"CBplussers".
>
> I'll be the first one to acknowledge that Code tested or not, Brucie is
>one of the most vile and bigoted idiots in this NG. However when it comes to
>"limited view(s)", you border on myopic, Vipul.
>
>>Even the code loving Hams in my local clubs don't complain about
>>CBers interfering like you do. (They do have a cult-like obcession of CBers,
>>however).
>
> Wait, Vippy...You claim they don't "complain" about CBers on the one
>hand,
>then you claim they ahve a "cult -like obcession" (sic) with them.
>
> This alone, if it weren't already so clear, makes it CRYSTAL clear to me
>that you have no idea of what a cult is or what "cult-like" is.
>
>>Code can also block those that want to experiment on those freqs.
>
> How?
>
>>Morse does
>>not keep dummies from entering the hobby. You are a good example of that.
>
> And lack of Morse testing does not KEEP "dummies from entering the
>hobby"
>either. While I'd stop way-short of calling you a dummy, you certainly do
>not

>present yourself as reasonably knowledgeable on a great many aspects of
>radiocommunication.
>
>>Relative has objection that Hams are weird, old - not that they are not EEs.
>
>
> Heaven forbid your RELATIVES would want you to associate with non-EE's.
>Do
>they have the same reservations about Protestants, Hispanics and non-Central
>Asian immigrants?
>
>>HAM radio is boring <to me>. The rest of amateur radio can be interesting.
>
> Then allow me to show you the door, Vipul, and I suggest you step lively
>lest the door hit you on the South 40....

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3463. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141041.18770.00000177@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65647

In article <20030423082533.18755.00000252@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <d22b54c3.0304221127.67a7ba0c@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
>(Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>>> Brian Kelly wrote:
>>>
>>> >
>>> > Motion: I hereby nominate Sweet Lenny to the office of "Exhalted Grand
>>> > Wizard of RRAP"
>>> >
>>> > Do we have a second?
>
>Seems like a shoo-in for "The Great Bandini".

Poor prissy parson. Still can't stand anyone using term "bullshit?"

"Bandini is the word for fertilizer!" - Radio advertising jingle.

>He's had lots of practice calling people he's never met "boy". Do you think
>he would try that in person? Probably not - too much FEAR.

Not a problem, you REMF non-veteran. I'll call you anything
in-person, face-to-face, that I care to call you. No "fear" at
all.

You don't know what "REMF" stands for, do you?

:-)

3464. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141041.18770.00000176@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65658

In article <20030422213133.18935.00000758@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 4/21/2003 3:32 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030421163241.19006.00000448@mb-m05.aol.com>
>
>>Morse code IS irrelevant. Amateur radio licensed Comm Theory Prof apparently
>>agrees. The other rf Profs do not even have amateur radio license, not even
>>the
>>antenna Prof!
>
> Morse Code is not irrelevent. It is irrelevent to YOU, since you elect
>to
>remain a No Code tech, and that's alright.
>
> I doubt your "profs" have a clue about anything beyond the theoretical,
>if
>you are the end result of thier endeavors.
>
>>To many people use Morse to block the real talent in the hobby.
>
> Huh...?!?!
>
>>They use an easily (but time consuming) learnable skill as some kind of
>proof
>>of achievement.
>
> It IS an achievement, Vippy. ALL learning is an achievement. Even for
>you.
>
>>Even real emergency comm skills would be more useful than Morse
>>code.
>
> What "emergency comm skills" SUFFER because of one's proficiency with
>Morse Code, Vipul? Real-time examples, please, not some vague comments of
>vaporous "profs"...
>
>>The skill has no use outside amateur radio or anywhere.
>
> TIS IS AN AMATEUR RADIO FORUM, Vipul...!!! Who CARES where else it may
>be
>useful...?!?!

>
>>Its "usefulness" is
>>only to those that made a social agreement that "Morse code will be useful".
>
> Whew...Solid bovine by-product there, Vippy.
>
> It is USEFUL to anyone who makes a contact with another Amateur Radio
>station. No "agreements" need be made.
>
>>Juggling(Morse code) is a skill - Outside of the circus(Ham radio), it has
>>little use.
>
> Is this more of how you "support" Amateur Radio, Vippy? To compare it
>to
>a "circus"...?!?!
>
>> >It certainly IS much easier to generate excuses for not doing something
>>>than it is to just buckle down and do something.
>>
>>From a small sample, I know have the ability to learn real-time encoding.
>>Therefore, one cannot say that I cannot do Morse code.
>
> Sure "one" can...Hre...I'll do it:
>
> "Vipul Shah cannot learn Morse Code".
>
> See...I said it. Can you prove me wrong?
>
>>I did not make an excuse
>>that I cannot learn it. I made a decision that the limited benefit was not
>>worth the time to learn it.
>
> Since you ahev decided that it's not useful for YOU, and yuo have made
>this personal choice, why do you find it necessary to be abuseive and
>insulting
>to those who DO choose to do it...?!?!
>
>>>I bet you
>>>might have something to offer the hobby if you tried, but you just want
>>>to resent things.
>>
>>Hams only are interested in their aspects. The aspects I would offer, Hams
>>would not be interested in.
>
> Obviously not, Vipul. You can't seem to get the satisfaction of "winning
>converts" at the local Amateur Radio clubs.
>
>>Hams like contesting, chasing DX, antennas. Hams have little in common with
>>electronic hobbyists.
>

> More solid bovine by-product.
>
>>>Take the total time you have spent posting to rrap. You almost
>>>certainly have spent more time on that than you would learning Morse Code.
>>
>>Just getting the coded license shows you wasted time learning code.
>
> Not if you achieved a goal...If getting an Amateur General or Amateur
>Extra class license was the goal, it was time well spent. Otherwise your
>goals
>could not be achieved.
>
>>Outside of Ham radio, Morse is not useful. Hospitals, firefighters, etc do
>>not
>>use Morse code. Chasing DX is not valued outside Ham radio.
>
> So? This is a forum about Amateur Radio. Youa re free to discuss
>whatever
>you want since it's unmoderated, but in the context of AMATEUR Radio, Morse
>Code IS completely relevent AND useful.
>
>>Morse code is used because of a social agreement in the Ham culture that it
>>is
>>desirable to learn Morse code.
>
> Morse Code is used because it represents a minimum of required
>technology
>to employ and permits operators with different languages to communicate at a
>basic level and be mutually understood.
>
>>No, if I learned the code, I would not "decry" it.
>
> SURE you WOULD! Absolutely NO differently than you "decry" Amateur Radio
>in non-Amateur Radio forums now!
>
>>I would do everything to
>>defend it, since I made the effort to learn it.
>
> SURE you WOULD! Absolutely no differently than you "support" Amateur
>Radio
>in non-Amateur Radio forums now!
>
>>Much like how I know I won't
>>enjoy a Hamfest, but I try to convince that there will be something useful
>>there.
>
> Oh...I see...You have unabashedly denigrated just about every aspect of
>Hamfests in this forum and rec.radio.CB despite insisting that you "support"
>Amateur Radio.
>

> NOW you say you'd "support" Morse Code if you learned it even though you
>don't like it.
>
> To say you'll "support" something when in reality you don't like it or
>even disdain it is to LIE, Vipul.
>
>>And relative has discouraged me from going to Hamfests and told me that Hams
>>are old, often non EE people.
>
> Some of my relatives have ried to discourage me from going to 7-11's
>since
>many clerks there are old and from central Asian countries, often non-USA
>people.
>
> (Are you getting the drift on just how bigoted that comment of YOURS
>sounded, Vippy?)
>
>>Its not code so much as Hams focus on contesting, antennas, chasing
>>wallpaper,
>>and other boring activities.
>
> If ALL you want to do is tinker or "homebrew", Vippy, I can almost
>absolutely assure you that no contester, certificate chaser or antenna
>fanatic
>will enter your home and drag you away and FORCE you to do any of that.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3465. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141042.18770.00000178@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65655

In article <d22b54c3.0304230406.7afb887e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> Also note, there is a need for sign language. It is used to communicate for
>> handicapped people. Morse code has not such use. Also, hardware can encode
>and
>> decode Morse code symbols so people don't have to.
>
>Boy you have the rank newbie syndrome written all over your posts.

Ooopsie, one of the Gang of Four took both vitamins and caffeine in large doses in order to reply.

>My youngest daughter is an occupational therapist who worked in the
>field of adaptive engineering before she moved into her current
>consulting practice.

Good message-point slam-dunk, Kellie!

Anything anyone says from this point on is taken as a "personal insult" to your daughter!

>On two occasions when she was in her former mode
>she outfitted two extremely disabled patients with the ability to
>communicate with their outside worlds with Morse with both the
>equipment she cobbled together with the help of an MSEE biomedical
>engineer and her training of the patients and their caregivers in the
>use of Morse. These were not breakthroughs in OT, it had been done
>many times previously.

How many "times?" "Lots?"

Is that any kind of quantification like all those "26 patents" that boiled down to just ONE?

>Don't think for one minute that any of these so-called "Morse
>decoders" actually work worth a hoot out on the real-world ham bands.
>They don't. They're nothing more than giggles and a way to snipe coin
>from those who think they can beat the learning curve with a device.
>If you don't believe it try one.

I once did that...written by a programmer friend who wrote a program as an intellectual exercise, a hobby project. Worked fine.

But...Real Hams work DX on HF with CW.

3466. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141043.18770.00000179@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65652

In article <f45722ac.0304230305.5b5127a8@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> I'm sorry Putz but after I got two seconds into your repetitive rant
>> and realized how off-topic it was I skimmed the rest in another two
>> seconds flat. I still am on topic Putz, To be repetitive myself Morse
>> is still heavily used in the ham bands 24 hours per day 365 days per
>> year across the spectrum from 1.8 to at least 145Mhz. And beyond that
>> yes, of course Morse is a language. Where on earth did you get the
>> silly notion that it isn't?
>>
>> w3rv
>
>Brian, if morse is a language in its own right, why does it always
>come with a conversion chart to english?

That's a service for all the United Nations translators so that they
can continue to spread the unique ability of international amateur
morse goodwill.

3467. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141043.18770.00000180@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65656

In article <20030422220657.18935.00000770@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com
>>Date: 4/22/2003 5:34 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <b84fvf$i9f$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
>
>>> Nah - the FT-817 makes a GREAT 6m rig... and CW on 6m is about as
>>> popular as a stinky sock.
>>>
>>> - Stewart
>>
>>Oh really ???? The explain all the CW contacts Ive had in the last two
>>E-skip seasons on six meters. Try listening before inserting stinky sock in
>>your mouth.
>
> Dan...did you notice the "tag" URL on Stew's signature line?
>
> This is the guy who doesn't think MURS is the new CB band or that anyone
>is going to "abuse" MURS.
>
> Uh huh...right....
>
> "Six meters" is about as far as Stew can sling a bag of what he's
>spewing in here.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3468. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141044.18770.00000181@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65653

In article <20030422215912.18935.00000767@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/22/2003 4:22 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030422172257.18755.00000178@mb-m06.aol.com>
>
>>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>
> Twelve....(sigh...)

Poor baby, 48 and can't do grade-school arithmetic.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has, if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3469. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141045.18770.00000183@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65650

In article <20030422215502.18935.00000764@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/22/2003 4:22 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030422172258.18755.00000180@mb-m06.aol.com>
>
>>> Plagiarized response by allegedly published professional who should
>>know
>>>better noted.
>>
>> Strike "alleged," you poor thing. See HAM RADIO Magazine
>> of the 1980s and late 1970s.
>
> Allow me to ammend that:
>
> "Plagiarized response by allegedly ORIGINAL published professional who
>should know better noted"
>
> Better?
>
>>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>
> That's ten today. Pretty lame.

Incorrect. Days change...

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3470. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141045.18770.00000182@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65651

In article <20030422215820.18935.00000766@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/22/2003 4:22 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030422172258.18755.00000179@mb-m06.aol.com>
>
>>In article <20030422073326.18912.00000432@mb-m14.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steamy
>>Stalker the Carbon Copy) writes:
>
> Hmmmmmm..."Carbon Copy"...?!?!
>
> That's cute...to wit:
>
>>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>
> Eleventh use of same plagiarized comments today, yet Lennie calls ME
>"carbon copy"...
>
> Sheeesh.

Still incorrect for today.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3471. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141046.18770.00000184@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65648

In article <20030422215251.18935.00000763@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/22/2003 4:22 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030422172259.18755.00000182@mb-m06.aol.com>
>
>>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>
> Nine.
>
>Steve

Incorrect.

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that any newsgroup opponent has,
if said opponent fails to honor and revere Robeson's views, they
will be the target of Robeson's arrogant insults, ridicule, name-
calling, put-downs, denigrations, and gross exaggerations of
Robeson's self-importance and experience...plus the typos
done in anger in emotion-laden "replies"...not to mention puerile
bigotry and sexual-connotation comments.

3472. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:10:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423141048.18770.00000185@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65654

In article <5f4fe4c2.0304230728.2de34c14@posting.google.com>,
horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:

>"garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message
>news:<VHlpa.572562$L1.167101@sccrnsc02>...
>> Hello Stewart .. It is a shame guys get their shorts tight by a little fun
>> ....no sense of humor.
>
>It is a sad situation when one loses the ability to laugh at
>oneself... or even to laugh period.

I'd say that garique has a clue on what is wrong with some of
today's radio amateurs...bad or ill-fitting underwear! :-)

3473. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 18:24:13 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <864r4pkr76.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 65660

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Steve" == Steve Robeson <k4yz@aol.com> writes:

Len> Incorrect. Putting an emergency coordinating agency IN one of
Len> the WTC buildings was just poor planning.

Steve> Why?

Steve> WHICH "disaster scenario" ever envisioned suicidal maniacs
Steve> hijacking innocent civilians in a gassed-up airliner then using
Steve> it as a modern-day Baka bomb?

On September 10th, 2001, I had lunch with a coworker in the company cafeteria. I was talking to the coworker about my concerns with respect to disaster recovery -- my latest project. The office is directly under the final approach for two of SFO's runways, and a passenger jet went overhead. We pondered what would happen if the jet were a bit too low on its approach and determined that our company would probably have ended up closing its doors for good within the year. The ending of one of Tom Clancy's novels came up during that part of the conversation as well.

If I could think of it, and if Tom Clancy could think of it, then disaster planners could think of it. But most people (hams and others) tend to follow the path of least resistance and hope for the best. I don't feel bad for companies in one tower who stored their off-site backups in the other tower -- that is bad planning and shows a lack of foresight. People who work on disaster-related issues like disaster recovery and emergency services need to plan for the worst and then revisit their plans regularly to see if their worst case is sufficiently bad.

My amateur radio skills are insufficiently developed -- regardless of my license -- for me to serve effective as part of an emergency team. I am working on developing my skills to where I can provide valuable assistance to a local organization. My schedule's a little crazy right now, but I plan on taking the ARRL EMCOM courses over the next six months and talking to some of the local folks at Field Day to see if I can find an elmer to help me improve.

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.1 (FreeBSD)

iD4DBQE+ptpYGPFSfAB/ezgRAuz9AKDFFg/91BMcTLJg3RL9eZx9mYdTcwCVH/gs
BKj5oqYUb0xwEHfVHgyxIQ==
=9oFK
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3474. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 20:40:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423164032.19025.00000495@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65661

>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/23/2003 1:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423141028.18770.00000167@mb-m22.aol.com>

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Another day...another opportunity to lie and steal otehrs works.

No doubt the culmination of a decades-long "career" of doing the same
thing in electronics.

I knew he wasn't capable of original thought.

Steve

3475. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 20:41:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423164110.19025.00000496@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65663

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Another day...another opportunity to lie and steal others works.

No doubt the culmination of a decades-long "career" of doing the same thing in electronics.

I knew he wasn't capable of original thought.

Steve

3476. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 20:41:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423164130.19025.00000497@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65662

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Another day...another opportunity to lie and steal others works.

No doubt the culmination of a decades-long "career" of doing the same thing in electronics.

I knew he wasn't capable of original thought.

Steve

3477. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 20:41:42 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3EA6FA86.1030704@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 65696

WA8ULX wrote:
>>LOL, I beleive it.
>>
>
>
> No luck needed its easy to do.

?

3478. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 20:44:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423164437.19025.00000498@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65664

```
>Subject: Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/23/2003 1:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423141030.18770.00000169@mb-m22.aol.com>
>
>In article <20030422214607.18769.00000140@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>In article <3EA21361.D7CEBB84@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>writes:
>>
>>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>>
>>>> In article <20030419124555.18821.00000073@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>>(N2EY)
>>>> writes:
>>>>
>>>> >I do "talk shop" - but not in an amateur radio policy newsgroup. Since I
>>>do
>>>> not
>>>> >work for the FCC, ARRL, an amateur radio equipment manufacturer, or as a
>>>> >communications attorney, such "shop talk" is simply not relevant.
>>>>
>>>> You do NOT work for the US government or in any possible
>>>> capacity for US foreign policy, yet you prattle endlessly
>>>> about those subjects which do NOT involve amateur radio.
>>>>
>>>> You do NOT work for any railroad or have any stated work
>>>> experience in railroading, yet you have stated IN HERE that
>>>> you are an expert in knowledge of railroads. Railroads and
>>>> railroading are NOT amateur radio subjects nor is there any
>>>> reference to railroads and railroading in US amateur radio
>>>> regulations.
>>>>
>>>> You have NEVER been a member of the United States
>>>> armed forces or any other military, yet you've implied that
>>>> you have expert knowledge of military policy, plans,
>>>> technology, and life as a military person.
>>>>
>>>> You spout endlessly in a number of fields of work and
>>>> policy that have nothing at all to do with amateur radio.
>>>
>>>I seem to remember you doing those things, Len. Of course, you may feel
```

>>>free to correct me if I'm mistaken.
>>
>>I'm not sure which things you mean, Dave. Here's a list:
>>
>>1) work for the US government
>>2) in any possible capacity for US foreign policy
>>3) prattle endlessly about those subjects which do NOT involve amateur
>radio.
>>4) work for any railroad or have any stated work experience in railroading
>>5) been a member of the United States armed forces
>>6) implied expert knowledge of military policy, plans, technology, and life
>>as
>>a military person.
>>7) spout endlessly in a number of fields of work and policy that have
>nothing
>>at all to do with amateur radio.
>>8) irrelevant, misleading, misdirectioning, and, in general, just a
>>self-promoting bullshit artist.
>>
>>Which ones has Len done? Obviously, he's done 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8. But
>>there's
>>no evidence he's ever done 2 or 4
>>>
>>>Gee, Leonard, you aren't involved in amateur radio in the tiniest way
>>>and you haven't let that slow you down a bit. I guess that'd make you a
>>>self-promoting...well, you know the rest.
>>
>>QED!
>>>
>>>I've saved you the embarrassment of seeing the rest of your wild ravings
>>>again by snipping the balance.
>>>
>>Thanks, Dave.
>>
>>btw, Len states categorically (about me):
>>
>>"you have stated IN HERE that you are an expert in knowledge of railroads"
>>
>>I went looking for such a post, and came up with not a single post where I
>>claimed to be an expert in knowledge of railroads. I do know a bit about the
>>steel-wheel stuff, but I leave the pronouncement of "expert" to others.
>>
>>So we are left with a puzzle: Did Len LIE when he made that claim, or did ne
>>just make an ERROR? Will he admit to it, and apologize for saying untrue
>>things about another, ow will he attack the messenger?
>
> Hmmm...I thought this thread was about "Max Morse Speed" as
> indicated in the Subject line of the header.
>
> No, it all about the ego and personality of a long message writer

> who makes many statements about US foreign policy, US military
> warfare doctrine and tactics, and how he is always right no matter
> what.

No, it's ALL about LEONARD H. ANDERSON being a pathological liar,
incapable of original thought, stealing the work of others and maing UNTRUE
assertions about others in a vain attempt to hide all of his own failings.

Didn't work this time. Hasn't worked for years. Won't EVER work.

L-O-S-E-R.

Steve

3479. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 20:46:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423164627.19025.00000500@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65665

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

This is six times today, lennie. Where's the originality? Where's the truth?

Another day...another opportunity to lie and steal others works.

No doubt the culmination of a decades-long "career" of doing the same thing in electronics.

I knew he wasn't capable of original thought.

Steve

3480. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 20:46:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423164652.19025.00000501@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65666

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Seven.

Another day...another opportunity to lie and steal others works.

No doubt the culmination of a decades-long "career" of doing the same thing in electronics.

I knew he wasn't capable of original thought.

Steve

3481. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 20:50:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423165042.19025.00000502@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65667

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 4/23/2003 5:43 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304230243.5a3deb7e@posting.google.com>

>The POINT, Steve, is that you tripped and skinned your knee over a
>mispelled word just like your silly master.

I have no Master but God Almighty.

No one in here, as much as I may agree or disagree with them, is He.

Sorry.

Steve

3482. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 20:51:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423165158.19025.00000503@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65668

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/23/2003 1:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423141022.18770.00000157@mb-m22.aol.com>

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

That's eight today...this time in a post to which Lennie wasn't even a direct party.

Sheesh.

Another day...another opportunity to lie and steal others works.

No doubt the culmination of a decades-long "career" of doing the same thing in electronics.

I knew he wasn't capable of original thought.

Steve

3483. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 20:53:10 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304231253.1f414019@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65669

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030423141041.18770.00000177@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <20030423082533.18755.00000252@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <d22b54c3.0304221127.67a7ba0c@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> >(Brian Kelly) writes:
> >
> >>> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >>>
> >>> >
> >>> > Motion: I hereby nominate Sweet Lenny to the office of "Exhalted Grand
> >>> > Wizard of RRAP"
> >>> >
> >>> > Do we have a second?
> >
> >Seems like a shoo-in for "The Great Bandini".
>
> Poor prissy parson. Still can't stand anyone using term "bullshit?"
>
> "Bandini is the word for fertilizer!" - Radio advertising jingle.
>
> >He's had lots of practice calling people he's never met "boy". Do you think
> >he would try that in person? Probably not - too much FEAR.
>
> Not a problem, you REMF non-veteran. I'll call you anything
> in-person, face-to-face, that I care to call you. No "fear" at
> all.
>
> You don't know what "REMF" stands for, do you?
>
> :-)

I do Putz and that's all you were, a RE rack babysitter.

:-) :-)

3484. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 20:54:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423165405.19025.00000505@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65670

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 4/23/2003 5:46 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304230246.334b2548@posting.google.com>

>Its just interesting to me that you'll come in here, whooping and
>hollering, then turn your core beliefs on a dime to make a contact on
>HF. That is all.

My "core beliefs", Brain?

I hardly think so.

>> Brain, it's a shame you try to engage in a conversation for the purpose
>of
>> being argumentative rather than discussing a concept...But then you ARE
>"Son of
>> Lennie", so what could I expect...?!?!

"Second verse, same as the first..."

Steve

3485. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 20:54:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423165436.19025.00000506@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65672

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/23/2003 1:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423141021.18770.00000156@mb-m22.aol.com>

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Nine. Lamer by the minute.

Another day...another opportunity to lie and steal others works.

No doubt the culmination of a decades-long "career" of doing the same
thing in electronics.

I knew he wasn't capable of original thought.

Steve

3486. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 20:55:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423165503.19025.00000507@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65671

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/23/2003 1:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423141026.18770.00000164@mb-m22.aol.com>

Ten.

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Another day...another opportunity to lie and steal others works.

No doubt the culmination of a decades-long "career" of doing the same
thing in electronics.

I knew he wasn't capable of original thought.

Steve

3487. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 20:57:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423165725.19025.00000508@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65673

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/23/2003 1:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423141024.18770.00000161@mb-m22.aol.com>

Eleven. Between yesterday and today, I think that makes twenty eight uses
of the same plagiarized work.

Yet another professional low.

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Another day...another opportunity to lie and steal others works.

No doubt the culmination of a decades-long "career" of doing the same
thing in electronics.

I knew he wasn't capable of original thought.

Steve

3488. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 20:59:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423165928.19025.00000509@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65674

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/23/2003 1:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423141023.18770.00000159@mb-m22.aol.com>

Twelve. Makes 29 in 2 days.

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Another day...another opportunity to lie and steal others works.

No doubt the culmination of a decades-long "career" of doing the same
thing in electronics.

I knew he wasn't capable of original thought.

Steve

3489. Sufficient Evidence

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 21:06:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423170629.19025.00000510@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65675

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/23/2003 1:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423141023.18770.00000160@mb-m22.aol.com>

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

That's thirteen today. Makes it an even 30 for two days "work".
Plagiarism cuts down on the overhead, I guess...

I think Lennie has sufficiently demonstrated the kinda stuff his "career"
was made of, and the kinda stuff we could expect him to "contribute" if he were
in the Amateur Radio service.

Thank God for small favors, eh?

Another day...another opportunity to lie and steal others works.

No doubt the culmination of a decades-long "career" of doing the same
thing in electronics.

I wonder whose work he probably plagiarized for his columns in "Ham
Radio"...?!?!

Steve

3490. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 21:12:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423171223.19025.00000511@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65676

>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/23/2003 1:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423141041.18770.00000177@mb-m22.aol.com>

>>Seems like a shoo-in for "The Great Bandini".
>
> Poor prissy parson. Still can't stand anyone using term "bullshit?"

It's just funny watching an allegedly educated "communications
professional" who can't express himself effectively without profanity.

>"Bandini is the word for fertilizer!" - Radio advertising jingle.

More plagiarism.

>Not a problem, you REMF non-veteran.

WHOA! There's a pot calling the kettle black!

>I'll call you anything
> in-person, face-to-face, that I care to call you. No "fear" at
> all.

That's stupid! You obviously enjoy pain. It's a certainty that you enjoy
humiliation.

>You don't know what "REMF" stands for, do you?

I do. Yet more profanity, albiet a bit more obscure in the alphabet soup
of military jargon.

Putz.

Steve

3491. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 21:18:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423171822.19025.00000512@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65677

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/23/2003 1:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423141036.18770.00000172@mb-m22.aol.com>

>> So says Lennie the Licenseless. The Lame...The Liar...
>
> No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Other than the fourteenth use of the same plagiarized "profile" snippet, I see you had nothing to offer in rebuttal to the post or my assertions.

Nothing original. Nothing we haven't heard over and over and over and....

Steve

3492. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 21:22:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423172258.19025.00000513@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65678

>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 4/23/2003 12:32 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0304230932.6459bc99@posting.google.com>

>Ya oughta slap a patent on the technique and sell it as
>a cure for insomnia.

Slaaaaaaaaaaam-DUNK!

Steve

3493. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 21:26:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423172658.19025.00000514@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65679

>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/23/2003 1:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423141046.18770.00000184@mb-m22.aol.com>
>
>In article <20030422215251.18935.00000763@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 4/22/2003 4:22 PM Central Daylight Time
>>>Message-id: <20030422172259.18755.00000182@mb-m06.aol.com>
>>
>>>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>>
>> Nine.
>>
>>Steve
>
> Incorrect.

That was nine YESTERDAY, and it was correct then.

Today it's fifteenth.

> No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Sheeeeeesh.

Steve

3494. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 21:29:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423172932.19025.00000515@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65680

>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/23/2003 1:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423141044.18770.00000181@mb-m22.aol.com>
>
>In article <20030422215912.18935.00000767@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 4/22/2003 4:22 PM Central Daylight Time
>>>Message-id: <20030422172257.18755.00000178@mb-m06.aol.com>
>>
>>>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>>
>> Twelve....(sigh...)
>
> Poor baby, 48 and can't do grade-school arithmetic.

Sixteenth today, and it seems Lennie is the one with grade-school
arithmetic. Check my birthday on the QRZ site, Lennie, then come back and tell
me who's deficient in basic math skills, "Mr. Engineer".

> No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

As I was saying...

Steve, K4YZ

3495. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 21:30:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423173032.19025.00000516@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65681

>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/23/2003 1:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423141045.18770.00000182@mb-m22.aol.com>
>
>In article <20030422215820.18935.00000766@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 4/22/2003 4:22 PM Central Daylight Time
>>>Message-id: <20030422172258.18755.00000179@mb-m06.aol.com>
>>
>>>In article <20030422073326.18912.00000432@mb-m14.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>(Steamy
>>>Stalker the Carbon Copy) writes:
>>
>> Hmmmmmm..."Carbon Copy"...?!?!
>>
>> That's cute...to wit:
>>
>>>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>>
>> Eleventh use of same plagiarized comments today, yet Lennie calls ME
>>"carbon copy"...
>>
>> Sheeesh.
>
> Still incorrect for today.

Not today, it's not.

> No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Uh huh...

Steve

3496. Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 21:32:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423173233.19025.00000517@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65682

>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/23/2003 1:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423141045.18770.00000183@mb-m22.aol.com>
>
>In article <20030422215502.18935.00000764@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: Add To The "Unique" Suffix Calls
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 4/22/2003 4:22 PM Central Daylight Time
>>>Message-id: <20030422172258.18755.00000180@mb-m06.aol.com>
>>
>>>> Plagiarized response by allegedly published professional who should
>>>know
>>>>better noted.
>>>
>>> Strike "alleged," you poor thing. See HAM RADIO Magazine
>>> of the 1980s and late 1970s.
>>
>> Allow me to ammend that:
>>
>> "Plagiarized response by allegedly ORIGINAL published professional who
>>should know better noted"
>>
>> Better?
>>
>>>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>>
>> That's ten today. Pretty lame.
>
> Incorrect. Days change...

Nope...not going by the date/time/group stamp AOL places on your posts it
wasn't, Lennie.

It would be had the DTG been after midnight of the 23rd.

> No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

As I was saying...

Steve

3497. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 21:36:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423173638.19025.00000518@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65683

>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/23/2003 1:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423141043.18770.00000180@mb-m22.aol.com>

>> "Six meters" is about as far as Stew can sling a bag of what he's
>>spewing in here.
>
> No matter what job, educational...(SNIP)

No rebuttal. Same plagiarism. Nothing to offer. Typical Lennie.

Steve

3498. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 21:41:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423174130.19025.00000519@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65684

>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/23/2003 1:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423141041.18770.00000176@mb-m22.aol.com>

Complete re-posting of post I made in order to re-use his plagiarized
snippet noted.

Very professional for a "communications professional"

I am sooooooooooo unimpressed.

>In article <20030422213133.18935.00000758@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4YZ) writes:

Snipped.

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

Snipped again.

Steve

3499. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 21:45:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423174527.19025.00000521@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 65685

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/23/2003 1:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423141035.18770.00000171@mb-m22.aol.com>

Lennie was so impressed with what I said the first time, he repeatd it for
all to see...

>In article <20030423040038.18985.00000156@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 4/22/2003 11:45 PM Central Daylight Time
>>>Message-id: <20030423004549.18769.00000131@mb-m21.aol.com>
>>
>>>In article <Nflpa.11$X32.10662@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
>>><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>>>>You show your ignorance about emergency communications. There was an
>>>>excellent article in QST about the major contribution in communications
>>>>support made by the ham radio operators at the World Trade Center disaster
>>>>site.
>>>
>>> That's hardly unbiased reporting, isn't it?
>>
>> Can you, Lennie H, prove that ONE WORD of it was not true?

Rest snipped. Lack of rebuttal noted.

>No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)

I lost track. I guess that was about fifteen or sixteen times today
alone?

Some people think alcohol and smoking are hard habits to break...They
should see Lennie's rehashing of plagiarized works...

Steve, K4YZ

3500. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 21:50:42 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304231350.4158095d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65686

lenover21@aol.com (The Great Bandini) wrote in message
news:<20030423141041.18770.00000177@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <20030423082533.18755.00000252@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <d22b54c3.0304221127.67a7ba0c@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> >(Brian Kelly) writes:
> >
> >>> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >>>
> >>> > Motion: I hereby nominate Sweet Lenny to the office of "Exhalted Grand
> >>> > Wizard of RRAP"
> >>> >
> >>> > Do we have a second?
> >
> >Seems like a shoo-in for "The Great Bandini".
>
>Still can't stand anyone using term

[expletive deleted]

>?"
>
Doesn't bother me a bit, Len. I've worked in places where cussing was
an art form. Your skill at it would not even qualify as entry-level.

However, I don't think such language is appropriate in an amateur
radio newsgroup, so I edit it out when encountered. Unlike you, I do
not measure someone's maturity or masculinity by how many profane
words they produce.

> >He's had lots of practice calling people he's never met "boy". Do you think
> >he would try that in person? Probably not - too much FEAR.
>
> Not a problem, you REMF non-veteran.

Contradiction in terms, Len.

> I'll call you anything in-person, face-to-face, that I care to call you.
> No "fear" at all.

Big brave words from a continent away. Your very lame attempt to
incite another to anger is noted.
>
> You don't know what "REMF" stands for, do you?

Sure.

Note that I have not called anyone an "REMF". Not even you, Len.

3501. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 21:52:52 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304231352.22c9fe6b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65687

lenover21@aol.com (The Great Bandini) wrote in message
news:<20030423141030.18770.00000169@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <20030422214607.18769.00000140@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >
> >btw, Len states categorically (about me):
> >
> >"you have stated IN HERE that you are an expert in knowledge of railroads"
> >
> >I went looking for such a post, and came up with not a single post where I
> >claimed to be an expert in knowledge of railroads. I do know a bit about the
> >steel-wheel stuff, but I leave the pronouncement of "expert" to others.
> >
> >So we are left with a puzzle: Did Len LIE when he made that claim, or did ne
> >just make an ERROR? Will he admit to it, and apologize for saying untrue
> >things about another, or will he attack the messenger?
>
> Hmmm...I thought this thread was about "Max Morse Speed" as
> indicated in the Subject line of the header.

Non-response noted.
>
> No, it all about the ego and personality of a long message writer
> who makes many statements about US foreign policy, US military
> warfare doctrine and tactics, and how he is always right no matter
> what. :-)

Exactly, Len. It's all about you.

3502. Re: internet voice gateways - taking your handheld overseas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 21:57:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EA70C78.3080307@adelphia.net>
Source record: 65688

Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX wrote:
> Now I know where tune-a-fish comes from! How do ya tuna fish?? :)

I give up, how do you tuna fish (I just know I'm going to regret this! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3503. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 22:19:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304231419.5a557239@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65689

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030423084529.18877.00000513@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> >Know what, Bruce? I just checked rrap again, and you're still a moron.
> >
>
> Well Brian does that mean you still havent passed the EXTRA, and maybe you were
> just lying again?

What was I lying about the first time?

3504. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 22:21:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304231421.54a5cafa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65690

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304230944.2ccce899@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304230305.5b5127a8@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com
> > > > (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> > > year across the spectrum from 1.8 to at least 145Mhz. And beyond that
> > > yes, of course Morse is a language. Where on earth did you get the
> > > silly notion that it isn't?
> > >
> > > w3rv
> >
> > Brian, if morse is a language in its own right, why does it always
> > come with a conversion chart to english?
>
> To help those of you who have communications disabilities get past your problems.

And when you copy Morse Code, do you do so in French?

3505. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 22:22:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304231422.66150fd1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65691

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030423141043.18770.00000179@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0304230305.5b5127a8@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> I'm sorry Putz but after I got two seconds into your repetitive rant
> >> and realized how off-topic it was I skimmed the rest in another two
> >> seconds flat. I still am on topic Putz, To be repetitive myself Morse
> >> is still heavily used in the ham bands 24 hours per day 365 days per
> >> year across the spectrum from 1.8 to at least 145Mhz. And beyond that
> >> yes, of course Morse is a language. Where on earth did you get the
> >> silly notion that it isn't?
> >>
> >> w3rv
> >
> >Brian, if morse is a language in its own right, why does it always
> >come with a conversion chart to english?
>
> That's a service for all the United Nations translators so that they
> can continue to spread the unique ability of international amateur
> morse goodwill.

As much as I'd like to believe that, I'll just accept that Kelly is wrong.

3506. D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 22:24:00 UTC
From: 75mwidessb <babooom@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ea71281$1@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 65692
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Everything you ever wanted to ever know about
High Fidelity SSB - but were either afraid to
ask, or your too much of a wuss because
RH has "spooked you" concerning the topic of late...

http://www.nu9n.com/

G-d bless this guy!
He's a genuine audio/radio Engineer.
An asset we seem to have little of in ham radio these days....

3507. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 22:27:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304231427.14de0ec9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65693

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA69B4D.7049664@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA60FCD.C76D3BBF@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA214A5.999E7538@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > In article <f45722ac.0304190500.7cfb962@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> > > > > > >He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I'd heard he might have been a snow-removal supervisor for
> > > > > > the runways at Tan Son Hut...but that's probably just a rumor.
> > > > >
> > > > > Just for the record, Len, where is Tan Son Hut?
>
> > > > Most people would say its in Vietnam (Ho Chi Minh City/Tan Son Nhat).
> > > >
> > > No, I don't believe they would.
> > >
> > > Where do you and Wonder Boy put it?
> > >
> > I wouldn't put it anywhere. There is no Tan Son Hut and there is no Tan
> > Son Nhat.
> >
> There isn't? Must be a big conspiracy.
> >
> Then why did the International Civil Aviation Authority issue it VVTS?
>
> To be specific, the Saigon civil airport was named Ton Son Nhat.
> The U.S. air base was Ton Son Nhut. Tan Son Hut must be a Nuoc Mam
> scented snack bar outside the air field. U.S. military personnel had
> nothing to do with Tan Son Nhat.
>
> I was never assigned to a place called "Tan Son Nhat" or a place called
> "Tan Son Hut".
>
> Dave K8MN

Neither was I, but I can find it on a map. And its in Vietnam.

3508. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 22:28:39 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304231428.45a87a17@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65694

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030423141042.18770.00000178@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0304230406.7afb887e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> Also note, there is a need for sign language. It is used to communicate for
> >> handicapped people. Morse code has not such use. Also, hardware can encode
> and
> >> decode Morse code symbols so people don't have to.
> >
> >Boy you have the rank newbie syndrome written all over your posts.
>
> Ooopsie, one of the Gang of Four took both vitamins and
> caffeine in large doses in order to reply.
>
> >My youngest daughter is an occupational therapist who worked in the
> >field of adaptive engineering before she moved into her current
> >consulting practice.
>
> Good message-point slam-dunk, Kellie!
>
> Anything anyone says from this point on is taken as a "personal
> insult" to your daughter!

And there's another typical Putz The Low Life comment.

> >On two occasions when she was in her former mode
> >she outfitted two extremely disabled patients with the ability to
> >communicate with their outside worlds with Morse with both the
> >equipment she cobbled together with the help of an MSEE biomedical
> >engineer and her training of the patients and their caregivers in the
> >use of Morse. These were not breakthroughs in OT, it had been done
> >many times previously.
>
> How many "times?" "Lots?"

Maybe bunches, maybe a flock, take yer pick . . why?

> Is that any kind of quantification like all those "26 patents" that
> boiled down to just ONE?

Putzie 'Ole Bean, if you're gonna continue in your role as the RRAP
bufoon you really do need to come up with new material at least once
in awhile. Ya wore that one out years ago. It was two related patents
Putz, you missed one.

> >Don't think for one minute that any of these so-called "Morse
> >decoders" actually work worth a hoot out on the real-world ham bands.
> >They don't. They're nothing more than giggles and a way to snipe coin
> >from those who think they can beat the learning curve with a device.
> >If you don't believe it try one.
>
> I once did that...written by a programmer friend who wrote a
> program as an intellectual exercise, a hobby project. Worked
> fine.

Bullshit. Try using it to copy a Morse station 300Hz away from another Morse station which is 20dB stronger in a band with any noise content. Piece of cake by ear, dismal failure with a "decoder". Been there Putz so cut yer shit.

>
> But...Real Hams work DX on HF with CW.

Welp then I guess I'm just not a real ham since I have an SSB DXCC.

3509. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 22:41:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304231441.662963c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65695

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA6996F.9924B62E@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA60E66.1BFB0B07@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > If your permission was denied then you couldn't operate.
> > >
> > > Incorrect. I could have operated at any time.
> >
> > But you were ordered not to. Doesn't that mean you could not operate
> > amateur radio?
> >
> > That's what it means to me, at least.
>
> I wasn't ordered not to do anything, Brian. I was notified that my
> request was denied.

Then, obviously, you couldn't operate. Why do you say that you could?

> > If caught operating,
> > > especially after having asked for permission and being denied, I'd have
> > > had to suffer the consequences. If not caught, I could have just
> > > claimed that my commander gave me verbal permission.
> >
> > Didn't your commander deny your request in writing?
>
> He certainly did. If I operated and was not caught at it, I could
> simply toss the written denial of my request and claim that I had verbal
> permission. If I'd been nabbed, I would have suffered the consequences.

But that would be illegal operation and unethical action on your part.
Why would you even think it?

> > That must be the difference between Vietnam Era vets and the rest.
>
> What is the difference? Service members then requested and received or
> were denied written permission to put an amateur radio station on the
> air.

Exactly. Your operation was denied. Mine was permitted. But you say
you would have operated anyway and disposed of your written order not
to operate, then lie about it. I think that's the difference between
you and me.

> Service members now request and receive or are denied written permission
> to put an amateur radio station on the air.
>
> The only anomaly seems to be you in Somalia.

Permission was granted.

No anomaly. No destroyed paperwork. No lies.

You must have belonged to a different ethical era.

3510. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 22:46:26 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423184626.19022.00000371@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65697

From K4YZ:
>>> Incorrect. Putting an emergency coordinating agency IN one
>>> of the WTC buildings was just poor planning.
>>
>> Why?
>>
>> WHICH "disaster scenario" ever envisioned suicidal maniacs hijacking
>>innocent civilians in a gassed-up airliner then using it as a modern-day
>Baka
>>bomb?

Noone could see that scenario ahead of time. But, they did know terrorists were trying to blow up the building using car bombs, so they knew the building could be unsafe.

3511. Re: Gain block

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 22:51:04 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <wvCcnX8G_NdFhTqjXTWcpQ@crocker.com>
Source record: 65698
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030422211406.938$5H_-_@newsreader.com...
> > > > ||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
> > > > Brian Griffey
> > > > See the SkyWave Linear Amplifier at
> > > > http://home.att.net/~briangriffey/Index.html
> > > > $130 through April03!
> > > > ||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
> > >

here is the official way to report stuff like this:

FCC CONSUMER ALERT

Federal Communications Commission

Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau

445 12th Street, SW Washington, DC 20554

1-888-CALL-FCC (voice)

1-888-835-5322 (TTY)

www.fcc.gov/cgb

UNAUTHORIZED EQUIPMENT SOLD ON INTERNET AND IN PUBLICATIONS

The Federal Communications Commission receives hundreds of complaints about
alleged illegal (non-FCC certified) equipment being offered for sale on the
Internet or in publications. The Commission is monitoring this situation
carefully and requests your assistance. If you have any information about
illegal or uncertified equipment being offered for sale, please forward it
to the FCC. Useful information for the FCC includes:

* An original advertisement or Web address where the illegal equipment is

being advertised or offered for sale with the types of equipment about which

the allegations are being made, highlighted.

* If it is a Web-auction we will need the name of the auction site, the
exact

item number, and auction opening and closing dates.

* Name and address of the individual or business offering the item(s) for
sale.

* Complainant's name and telephone number in the event follow-up is necessary.

This information can remain confidential, if requested.

* Specifically, why you think the equipment is not in compliance with FCC rules.

* Number of pieces or types of equipment about which the allegations are being

made (one piece, five pieces, how many models, etc.).

Information can be mailed to the FCC at the address below or e-mailed to fccinfo@fcc.gov.

###

To receive information on this and other FCC consumer topics through the

Commission's electronic subscriber service, click on

www.fcc.gov/cgb/emailservice.html

3512. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 22:51:34 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423185134.19022.00000372@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65699

From: "Kjay" jayb100001@yahoo.com

>Sorry Mike.....
>It was an advertisment for local pre-paid cellular dealership.
>She reached over and grabbed a Nokia cell phone to call for help.
>It was not an HT.

Thats what I was saying. It could have been part of an ad for something else.
The person said he did not see the whole ad.
Don't assume the ad is for amateur radio. I've never seen an amateur radio ad
on tv, so I would not assume the ad was for amateur radio.

3513. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 22:55:02 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304231455.2d0c1c92@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65700

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030422194515.19022.00000496@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> From N2EY
>
> > At a basic
> >level, fingerspelling could be considered an "encoding scheme" for the
> >alphabet and numbers, while the word signs could be considered an
> >"encoding scheme" for common words.
>
> There's anohter example of symbol encoding.
>
> >But ASL and other sign languages
> >are much more than encoding schemes.
>
> Like how?
>
> ---
> Also note, there is a need for sign language. It is used to communicate for
> handicapped people. Morse code has not such use. Also, hardware can encode and
> decode Morse code symbols so people don't have to.

Here's some more light on the subject(s)at hand:

"The term CW, short for Continuous Wave is a little misleading. A
continuous wave is normally a 'carrier on' situation, with no
modulation present on the carrier. Voice is for instance a carrier
modulated signal. The continuous wave signal is keyed in an 'on and
off' in the rhythm of the morse code. Some use the term CW meaning
sending the Morse code. Others call it just Morse. CW or Morse is
considered to be - don't be shocked - a fuzzy mode <fuzzy_modes.htm>.
It is not coded, rather it is a natural language. The signal is read
from the receiver without any change to time of arrival of data or
content of data. Computer reception of Morse, which requires
electronic decisions, must always perform worse than a human expert.
If you can handle Morse and have tried out one or more of the
available Morse decoders you know that this is true. Another reason
that the human 'interface' is quite superior to the different Morse
decoders is that the brain, when receiving Morse, can also filter out
the required signal amidst a number of other Morse transmissions,
often having a different pitch."

From http://home.zonnet.nl/fvaneeuwen/cw.htm

w3rv

3514. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 23:01:31 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423190131.19022.00000375@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65701

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net

>From Vshah101's many previous postings it can be deduced that his divisions
>goes like this:
> Everything Vshah101 likes (which is only electronics) is amateur radio
> Everything Vshah101 dislikes (which is all other aspects) is ham radio.

No, there are others, some who are not EEs, who share my opinion.

Ham radio is the unrequired conventions, unneeded codewords, etc.

Hams focus on antennas, working all states, collecting wallpaper, DX, CW.

They tend to view radio as a culture, such as the shortwave, CB, etc. They
define "true" Hams.

There are many more examples.

3515. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 23:19:31 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423191931.19022.00000378@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65702

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net

>That is one person's opinion. There are other people with equal credentials
>that believe just the opposite.

I did not cite the Prof. I only assume because of class topic coverage.

>you don't have the background to evaluate the relevancy of Morse code.

Others do have the background. The studies have been done. Others have methodically evaluated modulation schemes. Your biased view cannot see that.

>But one can use that argument in reverse. Inside the circus (Ham radio),
>juggling (Morse code) is very useful.

Morse code is not useful. It is only used because Hams agree to use it.

>It has become quite apparent that you are only interested
>in electronics. Therefore amateur radio probably isn't for you.

No, I like the practical aspects also.

Thats how a typical HAM would denfine amateur radio - as something not involving electronics.

>I know doctors, lawyers, truck drivers, engineers, and people in just about
>every career you can name who are amateur radio operators and that's the way
>it was intended to be and should be.

Amateur radio has use for emergency communications, worldwide communications, personal communications, etc. Also, many (non-EEs) become skilled with antennas. I have no problem with non EEs joining amateur radio.

3516. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 23:27:31 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423192731.19022.00000379@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65703

From: lenover21@aol.com

> Some in here have a hatred and contempt for professionals. Are you
> one of those?

I don't know about contempt. But, I have seen disinterest at Ham radio meetings and Hamfests.

If an EE asked me about Ham radio, I would say it's not worth it. The exception would be if they were already into antennas as a hobby. For them, I would recommend Ham radio.

3517. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 23:53:07 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b878ve$8or$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65706
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"75mwidessb" <babooom@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3ea71281$1@snipnews.snip.net...
> Everything you ever wanted to ever know about
> High Fidelity SSB - but were either afraid to
> ask, or your too much of a wuss because
> RH has "spooked you" concerning the topic of late...
>
> http://www.nu9n.com/
>
> G-d bless this guy!
> He's a genuine audio/radio Engineer.
> An asset we seem to have little of in ham radio these days....
>
>
>
>
>

I got a better idea...lets all go to Phasing SSB generation. Only suppress
the carrier about 20db. And operate on Double Side Band.

Wouldnt that act similar?

Dan/W4NTI

3518. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-23 23:56:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423195618.16357.00000036@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 65708

>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 4/23/2003 5:22 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304231422.66150fd1@posting.google.com>

>> That's a service for all the United Nations translators so that they
>> can continue to spread the unique ability of international amateur
>> morse goodwill.
>
>As much as I'd like to believe that, I'll just accept that Kelly is wrong.

Why? What was said (or not said) that would cause you to arrive at that
conclusion?

Steve

3519. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 00:00:00 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423200000.19022.00000390@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65710

From K4YZ:

> I doubt your "profs" have a clue about anything beyond the theoretical, if
>you are the end result of thier endeavors.

That could be true of some Profs. Not true of Comm Theory Prof. and Antenna Theory and Design Prof.. Both have worked in industry in their specialty before becoming Prof..

>It IS an achievement, Vippy. ALL learning is an achievement. Even for
>you.

Morse is built up to be some kind of VERY important skill. Its importance is exaggerated.

>>Even real emergency comm skills would be more useful than Morse
>>code.
>
> What "emergency comm skills" SUFFER because of one's proficiency with
>Morse Code,

I'd rather learn several modes than just Morse code. The focus at clubs seem to be out of proportion to just Morse code.

> It is USEFUL to anyone who makes a contact with another Amateur Radio
>station. No "agreements" need be made.

Morse can be useful in some situations, such as low power. The people who claim Morse is good for low power and can be easily assembled often don't homebrew. Most Hams use it for fun.

Hams like to use it for fun, so they agree to use it. Its use is highly due to the "fun" aspect, not the usefulness aspect. Another mode can also be used most of the time.

>"Vipul Shah cannot learn Morse Code".
> See...I said it. Can you prove me wrong?

You will not accept anything other than passing the Morse code test as proof that I can do Morse code. So, it makes no sense to argue that.

>>And relative has discouraged me from going to Hamfests and told me that Hams
>>are old, often non EE people.

> (Are you getting the drift on just how bigoted that comment of YOURS
>sounded, Vippy?)
>

Except, if it was not true, I could argue with them. If I found something useful to me, I could say its useful to me.

3520. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 00:00:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423200058.16357.00000037@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 65711

>Subject: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links
>From: "75mwidessb" babooom@yahoo.com
>Date: 4/23/2003 5:24 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3ea71281$1@snipnews.snip.net>

>Everything you ever wanted to ever know about
>High Fidelity SSB - but were either afraid to
>ask, or your too much of a wuss because
>RH has "spooked you" concerning the topic of late..

On this one I'd have to agree.

Just because we CAN go "narrower", does it mean we HAVE to?

It's supposed to be about experiementing. Isn't that what this is?

On the otherhand, if they are conducting thier "net" on two or more frequencies in order to intentionally take up spectrum, then enforcement is proper.

Otherwise, why no "letters" to the guys who operate AM on 75?

73

Steve, K4YZ

3521. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 00:05:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423200521.16357.00000038@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 65713

>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/23/2003 6:01 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423190131.19022.00000375@mb-m16.aol.com>

>No, there are others, some who are not EEs, who share my opinion.

Such as?

>Ham radio is the unrequired conventions, unneeded codewords, etc.

Such as?

>Hams focus on antennas, working all states, collecting wallpaper, DX, CW.

And the problem with this is...?!?!

>They tend to view radio as a culture, such as the shortwave, CB, etc. They
>define "true" Hams.

And the differecne between this and, say, NASCAR or Fourmula V air racers
is...?!?!

>There are many more examples.

Such as...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

3522. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 00:10:00 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b87au4nng1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65720

"David Lee" <davidlee375@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:2b933e90.0304211235.6eef42e6@posting.google.com...
> Someone wrote:
>
> I received this from a retired Navy buddy who lives in Alabama.
>
> Last week, the Shelby County Alabama Legislative Delegation hosted a
"Stand
> Up for America Rally." More than 1,200 people attended including featured
> speakers Chief Justice Roy Moore, Adjutant General Mark Bowen and Alabama
> State Auditor Beth Chapman.
>
> Attached is a copy of Mrs. Chapman's speech, which resulted in five
standing
> ovations, tremendous applause and an encore. It's a short read and well
worth
> it.
> ----------
>
> Stand Up for America Rally Speech By: Beth Chapman
>
> I'm here tonight because men and women of the United States military have
> given their lives for my freedom. I am not here tonight because Sheryl
Crowe
> , Rosie O'Donnell, Martin Sheen, George Clooney, Jane Fonda or Phil
Donahue,
> sacrificed their lives for me.
>
> ME:
> How profound and moving! As if Sheryl Crowe, George Clooney, Martin Sheen,
> et al., believed they were somehow responsible for her right to speak
> unopposed and before an adoring crowd.
>
> I certainly don't owe my right to speak to the Sean Hannity's and the Ann
> Coulter's of the world as well as the conservative spin-meister's who
> love to demonize a whole group of people (the much maligned and hated
> liberals).

Let's have a pity party for those poor oppressed liberals.

> The conservative version of political correctness would prohibit
> anyone's right to speak out on a war they may seem as immoral, if the
right-
> wingers knew they could get away with it. Right now they know they cannot,
> so they pay lip service to free speech yippie do-dah dah.

Wrongo...conservatives cherish the right to free speech...BUT, just
as we respect that right, we have as much a free speech right to
call the speaker whatever unkind words we want. As to PC, that
exists far more from the liberal left than the right.

> Chapman:
> If my memory serves me correctly, it was not movie stars or musicians, but
> the United States Military who fought on the shores of Iwo Jima, the
jungles
> of Vietnam, and the beaches of Normandy.
>
> Me:
> How a mature adult could make such an asinine statement as above puzzles
> me. Does she really think anyone though otherwise? Is this the kind of
> nutty, self-serving rhetoric we can continue to expect from the lunatic
> fringe of the conservative party? Note that I am not labeling all
conserva-
> tives as lunatic. I am labeling a select group of conservatives as such.

Label any way you want.

> Chapman:
> Tonight, I say we should support the President of the United States and
> the U.S. Military and tell the liberal,tree-hugging, Birkenstock-wearing,
> hippy, tie-dyed liberals...
>
> Me:
> Yes, the inevitable put downs and insults coming from a small mind that
> cannot argue a case intelligently but only resort to extremely popular,
> stock putdowns that occur frequently whenever a few of these nutcases
> are gathered together. She equates liberal with anti everything American
> and poisons the well with her childish name calling.

Just when and where did Clooney, et al make any
arguments to their anti-war stand. Seems they only have the
balls to make their statements and then flea the debate.

> Message:
> ....to go make their movies and music and whine somewhere else.
>
> Me:
> It seems to me the whining is coming from you my dear.

Have you listened to Tim Robbins?

> The whole world
> is against you poor, poor, conservatives, isn't it?

Not at all...just a handful as I see the reports.

> The mean old god-
> hating liberals are just gosh-darned determined to wreck your little
> pathetic world where you gather from time to time to moan about this
> cruel planet and this mean, old, bad bad bad liberal country. If you

> don't like America the way it is, leave it. Uh, why are you still here?
> Oh, I see, you want to "change it" rather than leave it, right? Well,
> please grant those you despise the same right to try to right a preceived
> injustice, rather YOU agree with it or not.

You are free to try anything legal. Blocking traffic to protest,
for example, isn't.

> Jove help us if your ilk ever
> seized full control of this country. YOU and your conservative co-horts
> could oppose anything your black hearts desired but you would make certain
> that those hated liberals would lose their rights to protest anything you
> are for.

Just who has proposed limiting free speech? As to being called
whatever, well...if you speak your mind and
can't take the heat...just get out of the kitchen.

> Chapman:
> After all, if they lived in Iraq, they wouldn't be allowed the freedom of
> speech they're being given here today.
>
> Me:
> Which the conservatives, if they were honest, would rip away from the
> liberals in a New York minute if they had sufficent power to do so.

Absolute bulls--t and you know it.

> After
> all, they already demonize those who protested the war, and used their
god-
> given right to protest, even in a time of war. Demonization is the first
> step toward dehuminization, and the next step after that is to strip the
> dehumanized ones of their rights and then come the stench of the ovens.
> I hope it never gets that far.

What a pathetic exaggeration.

> Chapman:
> Ironically, they would be put to death at the hands of Sadam Husssein
> or Osama Bin Laden.
>
> Me:
> And in the near future perhaps put to death by a majority of radical
> conservative myrmidons in the U.S.A. who would do it with a smile on
> their faces, thinking they were doing God a service?

I ask again...who has made even a hint of such a thought other
than liberal leftists fabricating such bunk.

> Chapman:
> I want to know how the very people who are against war because of the
> loss of life, can possibly be the same people who are for abortion?

>
> Me:
> Another canard that needs to be put to rest. Not all those who protest
> the war are for abortion. Not all who want the woman to decide on the
> issue of abortion are against the war. This kind of statement does get
> the party faithful stirred up however and it makes nice rhetoric. I bet
> the crowd roared on this one.

An argument made by many. Deal with it.

> Chapman:
> They are the same people who are for animal rights but against the rights
> of the unborn.
>
> Me:
> Another generalization that reveals the speaker's stupidity and/or a
> deliberate deception on her part to elicit more applause from her adoring
> fold. Again, not everyone who believes a woman should decide whether to
> terminate her preganancy is against the war. Furthermore, those who raise
> their voices loudly about animal rights are a diverse lot, some with
> families, some chuchgoers,others even who voted for Bush in 2000. It is
> a fallacy to believe that all those who cry out about animal rights agree
> 100% in every other political or religious belief.
>
> You would never know this by reading the biased conservative op-ed pieces
> and the tendentious talking heads on Radio. The speaker loves to issue
> all black-white statements that paint the issue as "we conservatives are
> all good" and "the liberals are all bad." She should try to obtain a good
> book on logic and learn that generalizations such as she makes makes her
> look very uneducated. Really, she is just another conservative wrapping
> herself in the flag, using it to further her own agendas and reveling in
> the adulations of her comrades.

Yawn. Enough of this, time to move
on.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

> Chapman:
> The movie stars say they want to go to Iraq and serve as "human
> shields" for the Iraqis. I say let them buy a one-way ticket and go.
>
> Me:
> Even though I did not oppose the ousting of Sadaam Hussein by force, I
> see this statement as one of pure meanness, a cold hearted statement from
> one who despises those who oppose her views. I really believe this woman
> would be a danger to society should she ever achieve a status of power
> much like that of the president.
>
> Chapman:
> No one likes war. I hate war!

>
> Me:
> How nice of her to say so.
>
> Chapman:
> But the one thing I hate more is the fact that this country has been
> forced into war-innocent people have lost their lives- - and there but
> for the grace of God, it could have been my brother, my
> husband, or even worse my own son.
>
> Me:
> The ubiquitous God word is used, no doubt with great effect on the
> audience. I have no problem with someone mentioning God, but when
> people begin to play games with His name by using it in speeches merely
> to win points or playing political football with it or for pure rhetorical
> it does become tiresome.
>
> Chapman:
> On December 7, 1941, there are no records of movie stars treading the
> blazing waters of Pearl Harbor.
>
> Me:
> Neither is there a record of right-wing talking heads and writers like
> Ann Coulter, Bill O'Reilly, Jack Kinsella, and many others of the same
> ilk treading the waters of Pearl. But I know that the conservative pundits
> of today would have remained safely ensconced behind their microphones and
> computers (typrwriters) railing against the dangerous liberals rather than
> standing tall and enlisting in the armed forces to fight the real enemy.
>
> Chapman:
> On September 11, 2001; there are no photos of movie stars stand
> ing as "human shields" against the debris and falling bodies ascending
from the
> World Trade Center.
>
> Me:
> There are no photos of the Sean Hannity's, Ann Coulter's, Bill O'Relly's,
> Pat Robertson's, Jerry Falwell's, Jack Kinsella's, etc., standing there
> as "human shields" either. Hmmmm.
>
> Chapman:
> There were only policemen and firemen - - underpaid
> civil servants who gave their all with nothing expected in return.
>
> Me:
> Yes, and no thanks to conservative blowhards like this speaker, who talks
> the talk, but I doubt could even walk half the walk in the shoes of those
> brave people who died September 11, 2001.
>
> Chapman:

> When the USS Cole was bombed, there were no movie stars guarding the
ship -
> - where were the human shields then?
>
> Me:
> Probably the same place she and the conservative talk-show hosts were-
> sitting on their buns mouthing off about the mean old liberals and how
> poorly the conservatives are being treated in this society. Why didn't
> one of them go over there and act as a human shield?
>
> Chapman:
> If America's movie stars want to be human shields, let them shield the
gang
> -ridden streets of Los Angeles, or New York City, let them shield the
lives
> of the children of North Birmingham whose mothers lay them down to sleep
on
> the floor each night to shelter them from stray bullets.
>
> Me:
> Well, this is brilliant! Using this profound logic, everytime someone
wanted
> to protest a conservative presidents' war, and they wanted to offer them-
> selves as shields, showing a willingness to die for their beliefs, they
> would have to justify doing so by first going to the places mentioned by
the
> speaker above, thus rendering their goal useless. I tell you what, let the
> conservative talking heads put their buns where their mouth is- let them
> shield those areas above before they use it as a political football and
> rhetorical tool. The statement above is unadulterated stupidity.
>
> Chapman:
> If they want to be human shields, I say let them shield the men and women
> of honesty and integrity that epitomizes courage and embody the spirit of
> freedom by wearing the proud uniforms of the United States Military.
>
> Me:
> And this should include, again, Neil Boortz, Larry Elder,
> Sean Hannity, Ann Coulter, Jack Kinsella, all conservative op-ed writers,
> then maybe, just maybe, I would begin to see some consistency in the
> requests of the conservative writers and speakers.
>
> Chapman:
> Those are the people who have earned and deserve shielding!
>
> Me:
> This is probably the only sensible statement made so far. But, if we
> shielded them, we would be in bad shape, wouldn't we? Our troops are
> the finest in the world. They don't, and will never need, shielding from
> the likes of us.

>
> Chapman:
> Throughout the course of history, this country has remained free, not
> because of movie stars and liberal activists,
>
> Me:
> And definitely not because of talk-show hosts and radical right-wing
> speakers like this one,
>
> Chapman:
> but because of brave men and women who hated war too. However, they
> lay down their lives so that we all may live in freedom. After all -
> "What greater love hath no man, that he lay down his life for his friend,"
> or in this case a country.
>
> Me:
> Yes, a bible quote. This stamps the speaker as "authentic". It's getting
> to the point if you don't at least once quote the bible in a patriotic
> speech some in the audience begin to doubt your sincerity. Keep in mind
the
> man who made this quote. He laid down his life, but took it back about
> 3 days later. The young men who die, providing cover for a comrade, or the
> man who throws himself on a grenade, has offered far more than that. If
they
> only could take back their lives after three days!
>
> Chapman:
> We should give our military honor and acknowledgement and not let their
> lives be in vain. If you want to see true human shields, walk through Ar-
> lington Cemetery. There lie human shields, heroes, and the BRAVE Americans
> who didn't get on television and talk about being a human shield - they
> were human shields.
>
> Me:
> I wonder how many right-wing talk-show hosts and op-ed writers are at
> Arlington? How many bellicose conservative-spouting talk-the-talk but
> cannot-walk-the-walk rhetoricians are there?
>
> Chapman:
> I thank God tonight for freedom - - those who bought and paid for it with
> their lives in the past - - those who will protect it in the present and
> defend it in the future.
>
> Me:
> I thank the proud men of the U.S. Military, whether Army, Navy, Air-Force
> or Marines. They are the ones bleeding and dying, not God. Again, she uses
> God as a rhetorical tool. This no doubt gets the crowd worked up in a
> frenzy, but I prefer to give the credit to who the credit is due.
>
> Chapman:

> America has remained silent too long! God-fearing people have remained
> silent too long!
>
> Me:
> Bulls@#t. For the last 30 years of my life I have heard this trite phrase
> hundreds, if not thousands, of times. Our radio waves are filled with
> christian radio stations, Sunday morning tv is an exercise in homilies
> and liberal bashing. The mail pouches of our mail delivery men and women
> bulge with religious periodicals berating evolutionists, abortionists,
> humanists, and they have been doing this for at least 30 years. Judging
> by copies of religious Journals from the 1950's it was pretty much the
> same. This message of urgency has been roaring since I was a little child.
> Revivals, Christian Rock-concerts, Pizza-Bashes at the local church are
all
> used as evangelizing tools as well as opportunities to malign Humanism and
> Secularism, Evolution and Homosexuality.The above statement is simply
> warmed over rhetoric from an individual who had great difficulty in
> finding anything original to say.
>
>
> Chapman:
> We must lift our voices united in a humble prayer to God for guidance and
> the strength and courage to sustain us throughout whatever the future may
> hold.
>
>
> Me:
> Yes, the stamp of authenticity. Mention God, prayer, and you receive the
> "seal of approval." I wonder what God thinks of Himself being used as a
> political football. I hope to ask him one day.
>
> Chapman:
> After the tragic events of Sept. 11th, my then eleven -year-old son said
> terrorism is a war against them and us and if you're not one of us, then
> you're one of them.
>
> Me:
> Hitler said this same thing to the German people when it came time to
> purge the party of some of its more liberal elements. This either-or
> bifurication is a common tool among right-wing demagogues. Hitler used
> it with great effect, and his references to God and Jesus Christ were
> interesting. He made it a crime to protest a war, namely, any war he
> waged. His evil war on the Jews and on the rest of Europe went virtually
> unopposed because he made it where you couldn't do it, even if your
> conscience was against it. God help this country if the
ultra-conservatives
> ever get their way.
>
> It would be only a matter of time before it was illegal
> to protest a war in process. Then, give it a couple of generations, maybe

> 3 or 4, and a real demagogue rises to power and unleashes an unholy war on
> the inhabitants of this earth. What will those whose consciences rebel at
> the very thought of this war do? They will be helpless to protest, or if
> they do, it will be at their own peril, because of wishes of the modern
day
> right-wing fanatics. Once a war is in progress, any protest will be seen
> as "putting our troops in peril".
>
> This phrase was also used by the Nazis
> in 1943. There was a group of anti-war protestors in Nazi-Germany, who,
> shortly after the fall of Stalingrad in January 1943, began printing anti-
> war leaflets and distributing them at the University in Munich. The group
> was known as the "Weisse Rose" or "White Rose". They saw Hitler as anti-
> Christian and his war as an unholy war. But thanks to some really handy
> german laws against protesting the war when a war was in progress, this
was
> a capital offense. The "White Rose" was caught in February 1943 and its
> members were promptly executed. Two of them were no older than 22. And all
> of this because a law had been passed at one time that considered any
> protests in wartime as "putting troops at risk". I find it remarkable the
> right uses the same expressions today. Incidentally, many Germans today
> consider the "White Rose" members as heroes against an evil regime.
>
> Chapman:
> So in closing tonight, let us be of one accord, let us stand proud, and
> let us be the human shields of prayer,
>
> Me:
> More religious rhetoric. I am not against religion in the public arena,
> but when it is so obviously done to win brownie points with the adoring
> flock I cannnot help wonder if God is offended at his name being used in
> such a vain manner. I don't know what to make of all this ostentatious
> displays of religion. These people should know this doesn't make you
> a better christian or a better human being even. It's not what comes out
> of your mouth but what emanates from your life 24-7. That is what counts
> most, in my opinion. Send the troops a letter of encouragement instead,
> or a box of goodies one can eat and share with his comrades.
> They will appreciate this just as much as your prayers. If you are a good
> christian you don't need to be told to pray. You will do it anyway without
> a word being spoken.
>
> Chapman:
> encouragement and support for the President, our troops and their
> families and our country.
>
> May God bless America, the land of the free, the home of the brave and
> the greatest country on the face of this earth!
>
> Me:
> Yes, this is the greatest country on the face of the earth. I would have

> no other. This country is great because men died for this precious freedom
> and this includes the freedom to dissent. The founding fathers were
> dissenters of the greatest human king and kingdom of that time. Dissent
> is one of the greatest freedoms we have and needs to be protected from
> those who want to make dissent an illegal activity, even if its only
> during wartime. We or our grandchildren will one day need this freedom to
> oppose a tyrant who would oppose his will on the world. While this isn't
the
> case with the present adminsitration, the way to a dark, Nazi-like era in
> American history will be paved by the likes of this speaker in Alabama.

3523. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 00:13:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423201327.16357.00000039@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 65715

>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/23/2003 6:19 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423191931.19022.00000378@mb-m16.aol.com>

>Others do have the background. The studies have been done. Others have
>methodically evaluated modulation schemes. Your biased view cannot see that.

By "biased view", you mean "practical experience"...?!?!

>>But one can use that argument in reverse. Inside the circus (Ham radio),
>>juggling (Morse code) is very useful.
>
>Morse code is not useful. It is only used because Hams agree to use it.

It IS useful. It permits persons who do not share a common language to
communicate. Until a "universal translator" the likes of TV's "Star Trek"
series is invented, it will have to do...

>>It has become quite apparent that you are only interested
>>in electronics. Therefore amateur radio probably isn't for you.
>
>No, I like the practical aspects also.

Obviously not, or you'd like Morse Code too, since it's one of the MOST
practical things in Amateur Radio.

>Thats how a typical HAM would denfine amateur radio - as something not
>involving electronics.

OK, Vippy...You are quickly assimilating Lennies traits...We will ask you
to please cite where Dee said Amateur Radio is something that does NOT involve
electronics.

>Amateur radio has use for emergency communications, worldwide communications,
>personal communications, etc. Also, many (non-EEs) become skilled with
>antennas. I have no problem with non EEs joining amateur radio.

Obviously you do since you've made several posts in the last few days
about NOT associating with "non-EE's".

Steve, K4YZ

3524. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 00:18:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423201832.16357.00000040@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 65716

>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/23/2003 6:27 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423192731.19022.00000379@mb-m16.aol.com>

>If an EE asked me about Ham radio, I would say it's not worth it.

You change your stroy faster than you change underwear, Lennie...oooops, I mean Vipul.

Are you NOW stating that you do NOT support Amateur Radio? You have made several posts in which you very specifically stated that you "support Amatuer Radio in non-Amateur forums".

>The
>exception would be if they were already into antennas as a hobby. For them, I
>would recommend Ham radio.

Why? They can experiment with antennas without any kind of license at all, Vippy...If they absolutely MUST be able to generate RF, they can resort to Part 15, Part 95, or take out an "Experiemental" license without any testing or social affiliations of ANY kind.

Why, even YOU could do THAT, Vippy!

Steve, K4YZ

3525. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 00:24:06 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423202406.19022.00000396@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65717

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net

>> >Show Walsh codes or Turbo codes as numbers running across.
>> >Have
>> >> a bunch of waveforms, etc.

>To non-technical types, they will merely look like op-art having no
>relationship to radios or communications.

Turbo codes probably will have no effect, or bad effect, from an advertising point of view. They might see it as too technical for them. Waveforms might get people interested.

>I seriously doubt that they would be disappointed. Most people expect both
>old and new elements to be maintained in hobbies.

Okay, but the words should match the pictures. Latest methods does not match Morse code.

>A moving title, in the ad, saying "Microwave equipment", "Amplifier
>> tuning", etc. would help those to know whats there.
>
>Again, won't mean much to a non-tech type.
>They will think of ovens.

Moving titles will make it clear whats being shown. This is often done in ads - It gets people interested.

Also, show Hams in communications, group, and fun social activities - to leave the impression of popular hobby.

3526. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 00:24:40 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <c9Gpa.60816$Si4.42955@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 65718

Hello Len ....Well I'll tell you that I think that the "BAD" underwear notation fits some of the guys I've known over the years.

God Bless 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Port Vue Pa nr Pittsburgh ....soon to be in Belle Vernon Pa

>
> I'd say that garique has a clue on what is wrong with some of
> today's radio amateurs...bad or ill-fitting under wear! :-)

3527. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 00:25:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423202521.16357.00000041@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 65721

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>Date: 4/23/2003 7:35 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <EjGpa.381$X32.412895@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>

>> Of course they wouldn't know. They would assume these are the advanced
>methods
>> and be interested to learn more. Also, showing waveforms tends to get
>people
>> interested.
>
>To non-technical types, they will merely look like op-art having no
>relationship to radios or communications

Hey Dee...just give them a toke of pot, a shot of whiskey, sit them down in front of an O-scope and fill out an FCC Form 605 while they are gazing into the waveform!

>> On the other hand if the keyers are shown, some won't know what they are.
>Many
>> will recognize them as Morse code keyers
>> and see that "amateur" radio is not that advanced. Those that did not know
>they
>> are Morse code keyers will ask and then be disappointed.
>>
>
>I seriously doubt that they would be disappointed. Most people expect both
>old and new elements to be maintained in hobbies.

Oh NO! Absolutely NOT! As soon as someone invents something new we must ALL immediately destroy all of our now "antiquated" gear and embrace the new technology.

YOU WILL BE ASSILIMILATED!

RESISTANCE IS FUTILE!

>> True. A moving title, in the ad, saying "Microwave equipment", "Amplifier
>> tuning", etc. would help those to know whats there.
>
>Again, won't mean much to a non-tech type. They will think of ovens.

Or some rock-and-roll type tapping on a mic, saying "Ampliier check...1-2-3...Mic check...1-2-3..."

73

Seve, K4YZ

3528. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 00:25:36 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423202536.18890.00000528@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 65719

>What was I lying about the first time?
>

The comment that you passed the EXTRA.

3529. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 00:26:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423202619.18890.00000529@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 65722

>> No luck needed its easy to do.
>
>?

?????

3530. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 00:35:48 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <EjGpa.381$X32.412895@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65704

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030422215208.19022.00000501@mb-m11.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
>
> >Show Walsh codes or Turbo codes as numbers running across.
> >Have
> >> a bunch of waveforms, etc.
>
> >These things are meaningless to someone who hasn't studied them. How
would
> >it then intrigue a prospective ham when they don't know what they are?
>
> Of course they wouldn't know. They would assume these are the advanced
methods
> and be interested to learn more. Also, showing waveforms tends to get
people
> interested.

To non-technical types, they will merely look like op-art having no
relationship to radios or communications.

>
> On the other hand if the keyers are shown, some won't know what they are.
Many
> will recognize them as Morse code keyers
> and see that "amateur" radio is not that advanced. Those that did not know
they
> are Morse code keyers will ask and then be disappointed.
>

I seriously doubt that they would be disappointed. Most people expect both
old and new elements to be maintained in hobbies.

> >To the non-ham, they wouldn't be able to tell the difference between
> >microwave equipment and other radio equipment.
>
> True. A moving title, in the ad, saying "Microwave equipment", "Amplifier
> tuning", etc. would help those to know whats there.

Again, won't mean much to a non-tech type. They will think of ovens.

>
> Also, with the advanced test equipment shown, with waveforms shown, people
> would be interested to learn more.
>

See comment about op-art.

> [snip of my comments on communications procedures]
>
> These are good examples. Where can I learn more about the procedures used?
>

The ARRL puts out several publications on emergency and service
communications procedures.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

3531. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 00:36:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423203630.16357.00000044@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 65723

>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/23/2003 7:00 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423200000.19022.00000390@mb-m16.aol.com>

>Morse is built up to be some kind of VERY important skill. Its importance is
>exaggerated.

By whom? Where? In what regulation?

>> What "emergency comm skills" SUFFER because of one's proficiency with
>>Morse Code,
>
>I'd rather learn several modes than just Morse code. The focus at clubs seem
>to
>be out of proportion to just Morse code.

Oh? In WHAT clubs, Vipul?

>Morse can be useful in some situations, such as low power. The people who
>claim
>Morse is good for low power and can be easily assembled often don't homebrew.
>Most Hams use it for fun.

There are about a dozen national and international QRP clubs that would
disagree with you, Vippy. "Homebrewing" is very important to them. And I
point out that QRP is NOT "just CW".

>Hams like to use it for fun, so they agree to use it. Its use is highly due
>to
>the "fun" aspect, not the usefulness aspect. Another mode can also be used
>most
>of the time.

Perhaps, but if that other mode doesn't meet the criteria for the
application intended, what good is it?

>>"Vipul Shah cannot learn Morse Code".
>> See...I said it. Can you prove me wrong?
>
>You will not accept anything other than passing the Morse code test as proof
>that I can do Morse code. So, it makes no sense to argue that.

You said no one could say it. I DID say it and proved you wrong. No
arguement. You cannot or will not prove me wrong.

And I CAN accept any other example as proof (other than taking the VE
test)...For example when you feel you have mastered the Code, I will come to MA

and watch you employ Morse Code without the use of any interpretive devices.
No test needed...Just let's see you use it.

>Except, if it was not true, I could argue with them. If I found something
>useful to me, I could say its useful to me.

But WAIT, Vipul! You've spent many months in here saying Morse Code is
NOT useful to Amateur Radio in general.

You have been provided with countless examples of why it IS useful.

NOW you state tHAt something IS useful, but only if it is useful to
YOU...?!?!

BBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !

WHAT A JOKER!

Steve, K4YZ

3532. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 00:48:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <JvGpa.385$X32.417707@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65705

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EA6BD7F.E7DFF1D7@crosslink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > Useful? Definitely yes. I've seen several occasions when the HF bands
were
> > in too poor a condition to support understandable voice communications
but
> > the people on CW/Morse were having plenty of good, readable QSOs.
>
> And a lot of fun too I'll wager. I got too focused on emcomms and some
> band is always open for ground plane/NVIS within my state (VA) to
> remember radio has other useful purposes. Thanks for reminding me.
>
> > While some of the other digital modes would also work, all the other
digital
> > modes require that you have a computer hooked into your radio.
> >
> Yes, but doesn't everybody nowdays? I bought a used P1 laptop for $35
> and software is mostly free. I hope to get Elmered on PSK31 this coming
> field day.

Nope. Tried the other digital modes a few years back, found it boring, and
thus have never bothered to hook it up with the later computers and radios
that I got.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

3533. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 00:50:21 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <hxGpa.387$X32.418387@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65707

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EA6C346.AE3D6E60@crosslink.net...
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> > Vshah101 wrote:
> > > Why would repeaters last any longer than cell phone towers? Plus all
repeater
> > > users would share one freq. Not practical in an emergency.
> >
> > Are you serious? hint:
> > the repeaters often have emergency generators
> >
> > The amateurs often have mobile rigs and/or battery powered ht's or home
> > staions that can go off the power grid. You specifically *want* everyone
> > on one frequency in an emergency. Not practical? Eminently practical!
> >
>
> There's even more to it, guys.
>
> The number of circuits telephone companies provide is based on average
> usage. In an emergency these are quickly overloaded by people checking
> on friends and family; so massively overloaded that the system crashes.
> Normally, the cell system is so good that many police, fire and rescue
> units have leased private "lines" on it and sold off their old repeaters
> (I bought one). These private cell lines also quit working when the
> system crashes. I was told that's what happened in the 9/11 disasters,
> not the loss of towers. Other nearby towers would "take over" were it
> not for the overload.
>
> The "old fashioned" repeaters amateurs, and some emergency services,
> still use are uneffected by this phenomena. Their capability may seem
> puny compared to the cell system but they have proven capable of
> handling emergency traffic when their big brother has a stroke.
>
> Cell phone or ARS? Be safe, have both!
>
> 73, K3DWW

Great write up and your last sentence is an especially good one.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

3534. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 00:51:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EA73521.2090207@adelphia.net>
Source record: 65724

Kjay wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3EA4026D.9050608@psu.edu...
>
>>An amateur I know caught an ad for the ARS on a Pittsburgh television
>>station over the weekend. I didn't see it, and am relaying what he told
>
> me.
>
>>The ad was about a young lady who is shaken out of sleep in the middle
>>of the night by the rumbling of an earthquake. She immediately grabs her
>>HT, which is located on the nightstand beside her bed, and starts
>>calling. He didn't get all the details, as just like the Spanish
>>inquisition, he wasn't expecting an ad for the ARS.
>>
>>According to the gentleman, the commercial was well done and a very
>>decent advertisement for the ARS.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> Sorry Mike.....
> It was an advertisment for local pre-paid cellular dealership.
> She reached over and grabbed a Nokia cell phone to call for help.
> It was not an HT.

Seriously? Haw, if so, I was taken in. Wouldn't be the first time tho'.

I wonder why all disaster services don't use cell phones?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3535. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 00:54:32 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <cBGpa.390$X32.419765@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65709

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0304231421.54a5cafa@posting.google.com...
> And when you copy Morse Code, do you do so in French?

The French do so when communicating with other Frenchmen.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

3536. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 01:00:01 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <IGGpa.395$X32.420618@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65712

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030423190131.19022.00000375@mb-m16.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
> >From Vshah101's many previous postings it can be deduced that his
divisions
> >goes like this:
> > Everything Vshah101 likes (which is only electronics) is amateur
radio
> > Everything Vshah101 dislikes (which is all other aspects) is ham
radio.
>
> No, there are others, some who are not EEs, who share my opinion.
>
> Ham radio is the unrequired conventions, unneeded codewords, etc.

There conventions and words are needed to facilitate communication in this
unique field. EVERY activity has its own unique vocabulary. This is part
of amateur radio

>
> Hams focus on antennas, working all states, collecting wallpaper, DX, CW.
>

These are all elements of amateur radio and do not exclude any of the other
elements. Our club for example, provides public service communications to
half a dozen events (like walk-a-thons) annually.

> They tend to view radio as a culture, such as the shortwave, CB, etc. They
> define "true" Hams.

No the true Hams embrace all members of the amateur service and celebrate
the diversity of the Ham community.

The "many more" examples that you think you could cite won't due as they
would just emphasize the wide ranging diversity of amateur (ham radio) and
show its breadth and depth of activities and capabilities.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

3537. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 01:00:35 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423210035.19022.00000402@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65726

From K4YZ:
>>If an EE asked me about Ham radio, I would say it's not worth it.

>Are you NOW stating that you do NOT support Amateur Radio? You have made
>several posts in which you very specifically stated that you "support Amatuer
>Radio in non-Amateur forums".

I support amatuer radio in that I mentioned a Hamfest to a non-Ham, I loaned someone my ARRL handbook, I mentioned to some people that I am a Ham.

I happened to be in those situations. That is the scope. In those cases I did support amateur radio. I will not go out of my way to support amateur radio.

If an EE asked me about Ham radio, I would say its not worth it, because thats what I believe.

>
>>The
>>exception would be if they were already into antennas as a hobby. For them,
>I
>>would recommend Ham radio.
>
> Why? They can experiment with antennas without any kind of license at
>all,

True, they can do that. But, if a person has this interest, they truly would benefit from Ham radio. In the area of antennas, Hams do share their knowledge, so someone interested in that probably would benefit from that.

By the way, I got "the call" a few minutes ago today. It seems I did not make my deadline that was due at the end of this month. I did not obtain enough experience to continue, and cannot afford more courses. So, I may not be an EE (forget rf specialty, which I was not working in) anymore.

I most likely will be changing into a more stable, higher paying, less "glamorous" (non-EE) field pretty soon. I would still like to learn as much as I can about emergency comm, use of certain modes, etc. Learning about circuit design now would be pointless. I will probably keep my amateur radio hobby membership and build <simple> circuits for fun.

3538. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 01:04:57 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ZKGpa.396$X32.424642@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65714

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030423191931.19022.00000378@mb-m16.aol.com...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
> >That is one person's opinion. There are other people with equal
credentials
> >that believe just the opposite.
>
> I did not cite the Prof. I only assume because of class topic coverage.

Can't operate on an assumption. Assumptions have caused a lot of grief in
the world.

>
> >you don't have the background to evaluate the relevancy of Morse code.
>
> Others do have the background. The studies have been done. Others have
> methodically evaluated modulation schemes. Your biased view cannot see
that.

Ok cite the name and author of the published study and I'll go read it and
report back. Remember that the invention of the typewriter and later the
word processor did not eliminate the need for pencil and paper and teaching
the skill of handwriting.

>
> >But one can use that argument in reverse. Inside the circus (Ham radio),
> >juggling (Morse code) is very useful.
>
> Morse code is not useful. It is only used because Hams agree to use it.

Try to sell that idea at the nadir of the sunspot cycle.

>
> >It has become quite apparent that you are only interested
> >in electronics. Therefore amateur radio probably isn't for you.
>
> No, I like the practical aspects also.
>
> Thats how a typical HAM would denfine amateur radio - as something not
> involving electronics.

Wrong. Hams definition of amateur radio does not exclude electronics but
instead covers all aspects of the hobby. Not every amateur is going to have
the time, money or interest to participate in all aspects of the hobby. As
in ordinary daily life, one must pick and choose what part of the hobby they

are going to focus on.
>

> >I know doctors, lawyers, truck drivers, engineers, and people in just
about
> >every career you can name who are amateur radio operators and that's the
way
> >it was intended to be and should be.
>
> Amateur radio has use for emergency communications, worldwide
communications,
> personal communications, etc. Also, many (non-EEs) become skilled with
> antennas. I have no problem with non EEs joining amateur radio.

But you want everyone to become an electronics expert when that's not the
be-all and end-all of amateur radio.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

3539. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 01:22:10 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423212210.19022.00000404@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65727

From K4YZ:

>Hey Dee...just give them a toke of pot, a shot of whiskey, sit them down in
>front of an O-scope and fill out an FCC Form 605 while they are gazing into
>the
>waveform!

How do can you give them whiskey in a TELEVISION ad. This is what we are
talking about.

> YOU WILL BE ASSILIMILATED!
> RESISTANCE IS FUTILE!

This seems the attitude of those that love Morse code.

>>> True. A moving title, in the ad, saying "Microwave equipment", "Amplifier
>>> tuning", etc. would help those to know whats there.
>>
>>Again, won't mean much to a non-tech type. They will think of ovens.
>
> Or some rock-and-roll type tapping on a mic, saying "Ampliier
>check...1-2-3...Mic check...1-2-3..."
>

Moving titles work as an advertising method. I have seen this in other ads.
They clarify whats being show, so someone wont confuse it for a "Mic check".
They increase interest and thats why they are used.

3540. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 01:40:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA740A5.C44DE5C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65728

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030422172300.18755.00000183@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > In article <d22b54c3.0304221127.67a7ba0c@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com

> > I accept money for services performed. That's the primary
> > definition of "professional."
>
> You'll be a "professional" when garbage collectors are considered
> professionals.

There's a group of ladies who hang out on the streets of Wheeling
Island. Like Len, they accept money for services performed. They are
truly professionals.

Dave K8MN

3541. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 01:43:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA74120.60BE136D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65729

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0304230240.3ded3b0e@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> I wouldn't put it anywhere. There is no Tan Son Hut and there is no Tan
> >> Son Nhat.
> >
> >There isn't? Must be a big conspiracy.
> >
> >Then why did the International Civil Aviation Authority issue it VVTS?
>
> The ICAO doesn't exist. Vietnam doesn't exist.
>
> Denial is a river running through Egypt... :-)

Not so fast, Bub. You only babbled about some snack bar called "Tan Son
Hut"

Dave K8MN

3542. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 01:46:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA741F1.ECCADA1F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65730

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030423062551.18769.00000133@mb-m21.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <20030423004544.18769.00000129@mb-m21.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> >> Poor prissy parson, couldn't answer a thing, could you?
> >
> >Anyone could answer your questions, Len. But why should I, given the fact
> >that
> >you won;t answer mine?
> >
> >For example, you wrote in a recent post:
> >
> >"You do NOT work for any railroad or have any stated work experience in
> >railroading, yet you have stated IN HERE that you are an expert in knowledge
> >of railroads."
> >
> >Where did I state that I am "an expert in knowledge of railroads."? Please
> >produce the posting where I made such a claim.
> >
> >It's obvious that you won't. So why should I answer your questions?
>
> "Ve haf vays uf making you talk!" - old B-picture movie line.
>
> Heh heh heh. I've made the prissy parson write and write and
> write and write in here. :-)

Pretty clever manner in which you've done so--by writing and writing and
writing and writing :-) :-)

> ARRL syncophants can do no wrong. They are the al-queda
> of the amateur radio world.

Run out of Nazi material?

You've lost any credibility here, Leonard H.

Dave K8MN

3543. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 01:49:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA742A8.16A01249@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65731

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030422214607.18769.00000140@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <3EA21361.D7CEBB84@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >writes:
> >
> >>Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>>
> >>> In article <20030419124555.18821.00000073@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >>(N2EY)
> >>> writes:
> >>>
> >>> >I do "talk shop" - but not in an amateur radio policy newsgroup. Since I
> >>do
> >>> not
> >>> >work for the FCC, ARRL, an amateur radio equipment manufacturer, or as a
> >>> >communications attorney, such "shop talk" is simply not relevant.
> >>>
> >>> You do NOT work for the US government or in any possible
> >>> capacity for US foreign policy, yet you prattle endlessly
> >>> about those subjects which do NOT involve amateur radio.
> >>>
> >>> You do NOT work for any railroad or have any stated work
> >>> experience in railroading, yet you have stated IN HERE that
> >>> you are an expert in knowledge of railroads. Railroads and
> >>> railroading are NOT amateur radio subjects nor is there any
> >>> reference to railroads and railroading in US amateur radio
> >>> regulations.
> >>>
> >>> You have NEVER been a member of the United States
> >>> armed forces or any other military, yet you've implied that
> >>> you have expert knowledge of military policy, plans,
> >>> technology, and life as a military person.
> >>>
> >>> You spout endlessly in a number of fields of work and
> >>> policy that have nothing at all to do with amateur radio.
> >>
> >>I seem to remember you doing those things, Len. Of course, you may feel
> >>free to correct me if I'm mistaken.
> >
> >I'm not sure which things you mean, Dave. Here's a list:
> >

> >1) work for the US government
> >2) in any possible capacity for US foreign policy
> >3) prattle endlessly about those subjects which do NOT involve amateur radio.
> >4) work for any railroad or have any stated work experience in railroading
> >5) been a member of the United States armed forces
> >6) implied expert knowledge of military policy, plans, technology, and life
> >as
> >a military person.
> >7) spout endlessly in a number of fields of work and policy that have nothing
> >at all to do with amateur radio.
> >8) irrelevant, misleading, misdirectioning, and, in general, just a
> >self-promoting bullshit artist.
> >
> >Which ones has Len done? Obviously, he's done 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8. But
> >there's
> >no evidence he's ever done 2 or 4
> >>
> >>Gee, Leonard, you aren't involved in amateur radio in the tiniest way
> >>and you haven't let that slow you down a bit. I guess that'd make you a
> >>self-promoting...well, you know the rest.
> >
> >QED!
> >>
> >>I've saved you the embarrassment of seeing the rest of your wild ravings
> >>again by snipping the balance.
> >>
> >Thanks, Dave.
> >
> >btw, Len states categorically (about me):
> >
> >"you have stated IN HERE that you are an expert in knowledge of railroads"
> >
> >I went looking for such a post, and came up with not a single post where I
> >claimed to be an expert in knowledge of railroads. I do know a bit about the
> >steel-wheel stuff, but I leave the pronouncement of "expert" to others.
> >
> >So we are left with a puzzle: Did Len LIE when he made that claim, or did ne
> >just make an ERROR? Will he admit to it, and apologize for saying untrue
> >things about another, ow will he attack the messenger?
>
> Hmmm...I thought this thread was about "Max Morse Speed" as
> indicated in the Subject line of the header.

You've taken this thread on a merry circuitous chase yourself, Leonard
old boy.

> No, it all about the ego and personality of a long message writer
> who makes many statements about US foreign policy, US military
> warfare doctrine and tactics, and how he is always right no matter
> what. :-)

You always have to make it about yourself, don't you?

Dave K8MN

3544. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 01:51:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <vqHpa.404$X32.442879@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65725

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030423192731.19022.00000379@mb-m16.aol.com...
> If an EE asked me about Ham radio, I would say it's not worth it. The
> exception would be if they were already into antennas as a hobby. For
them, I
> would recommend Ham radio.

How can you possibly make such a judgement for another person? The EE may very well have a multitude of interests that would fit very nicely with ham radio. There is everything from homebrew to digital communications to the development of new modes. And that's just a bare sampling of the technical aspect. Then of course there is the community service aspect. How can you assume that a EE would not be interested?

You are continuing to limit other people's interests and activities to those that you think they should care about.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3545. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 01:54:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA743CC.4A55D882@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65732

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030423082533.18755.00000252@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <d22b54c3.0304221127.67a7ba0c@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> >(Brian Kelly) writes:
> >
> >>> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >>>
> >>> >
> >>> > Motion: I hereby nominate Sweet Lenny to the office of "Exhalted Grand
> >>> > Wizard of RRAP"
> >>> >
> >>> > Do we have a second?
> >
> >Seems like a shoo-in for "The Great Bandini".
>
> Poor prissy parson. Still can't stand anyone using term "bullshit?"
>
> "Bandini is the word for fertilizer!" - Radio advertising jingle.
>
> >He's had lots of practice calling people he's never met "boy". Do you think
> >he would try that in person? Probably not - too much FEAR.
>
> Not a problem, you REMF non-veteran. I'll call you anything
> in-person, face-to-face, that I care to call you. No "fear" at
> all.

Sure you would, Casper--in your vivid daydreams.

> You don't know what "REMF" stands for, do you?
>
> :-)

Leonard doesn't play well with others.

Dave K8MN

3546. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 02:02:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA745BC.812CA210@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65733

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA69B4D.7049664@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA60FCD.C76D3BBF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA214A5.999E7538@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > In article <f45722ac.0304190500.7cfb962@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > > > > > >He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I'd heard he might have been a snow-removal supervisor for
> > > > > > > the runways at Tan Son Hut...but that's probably just a rumor.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Just for the record, Len, where is Tan Son Hut?
> > >
> > > > > Most people would say its in Vietnam (Ho Chi Minh City/Tan Son Nhat).
> > > > >
> > > > No, I don't believe they would.
> > > >
> > > > Where do you and Wonder Boy put it?
> > > >
> > > I wouldn't put it anywhere. There is no Tan Son Hut and there is no Tan
> > > Son Nhat.
> > >
> > There isn't? Must be a big conspiracy.
> > >
> > Then why did the International Civil Aviation Authority issue it VVTS?
> >
> To be specific, the Saigon civil airport was named Ton Son Nhat.
> The U.S. air base was Ton Son Nhut. Tan Son Hut must be a Nuoc Mam
> scented snack bar outside the air field. U.S. military personnel had
> nothing to do with Tan Son Nhat.
> >
> I was never assigned to a place called "Tan Son Nhat" or a place called
> "Tan Son Hut".
```

>
> Neither was I, but I can find it on a map. And its in Vietnam.

Your attention is directed to the statement Leomard H. Amdersom wrote
about me.

Dave K8MN

3547. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 02:07:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA74736.9086D28A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65734

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA6996F.9924B62E@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA60E66.1BFB0B07@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > > > If your permission was denied then you couldn't operate.
> > > > >
> > > > > Incorrect. I could have operated at any time.
> > > >
> > > > But you were ordered not to. Doesn't that mean you could not operate
> > > > amateur radio?
> > > >
> > > > That's what it means to me, at least.
> > >
> > I wasn't ordered not to do anything, Brian. I was notified that my
> > request was denied.
>
> Then, obviously, you couldn't operate. Why do you say that you could?

Because I can do anything if I'm willing to accept the consequences.

> > > If caught operating,
> > > > especially after having asked for permission and being denied, I'd have
> > > > had to suffer the consequences. If not caught, I could have just
> > > > claimed that my commander gave me verbal permission.
> > >
> > > Didn't your commander deny your request in writing?
> >
> > He certainly did. If I operated and was not caught at it, I could
> > simply toss the written denial of my request and claim that I had verbal
> > permission. If I'd been nabbed, I would have suffered the consequences.
>
> But that would be illegal operation and unethical action on your part.

Yes it would have been, had I actually operated. I didn't.

> Why would you even think it?

I can think about anything I like. Consequences only result from
actions, not thought.

> > > That must be the difference between Vietnam Era vets and the rest.
> >
> > What is the difference? Service members then requested and received or
> > were denied written permission to put an amateur radio station on the
> > air.
>
> Exactly. Your operation was denied. Mine was permitted.

You have nothing to offer which confirms that claim. I don't believe
you.

> But you say
> you would have operated anyway and disposed of your written order not
> to operate, then lie about it. I think that's the difference between
> you and me.

Get real. I didn't operate and never claimed to.

> > Service members now request and receive or are denied written permission
> > to put an amateur radio station on the air.
> >
> > The only anomaly seems to be you in Somalia.
>
> Permission was granted.

..and you can offer what as proof of your claim?

> No anomaly. No destroyed paperwork. No lies.

We have no way of knowing what took place. You have nothing to back
your statements.

> You must have belonged to a different ethical era.

That what you stated earlier. Then again, you have no way of backing
any of your statements. Tough luck, kid.

Dave K8MN

3548. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 02:09:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA747C3.57A29AA5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65735

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From K4YZ:
> >>> Incorrect. Putting an emergency coordinating agency IN one
> >>> of the WTC buildings was just poor planning.
> >>
> >> Why?
> >>
> >> WHICH "disaster scenario" ever envisioned suicidal maniacs hijacking
> >>innocent civilians in a gassed-up airliner then using it as a modern-day
> >Baka
> >>bomb?
>
> Noone could see that scenario ahead of time. But, they did know terrorists were
> trying to blow up the building using car bombs, so they knew the building could
> be unsafe.

So what is your assessment, Mr. Shah? Should the building have been
abandoned? Do you ever intend to present a tale which has the
possibility of a plausable outcome?

Dave K8MN

3549. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 02:11:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA7483A.5AA03E2E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65736

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
> >From Vshah101's many previous postings it can be deduced that his divisions
> >goes like this:
> > Everything Vshah101 likes (which is only electronics) is amateur radio
> > Everything Vshah101 dislikes (which is all other aspects) is ham radio.
>
> No, there are others, some who are not EEs, who share my opinion.

Sounds like some sort of cult to me.

Dave K8MN

3550. Facts About Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 02:12:20 UTC
From: codeman@codefoever.com
Message-ID: <b87h6404o@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 65738

```
Know code = Know Ham
No code = no ham

The eternal truth, proven every day.

Moan CBers, moan.
```

3551. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 02:14:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA748E3.3D0B2D0F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65737

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net

> Morse code is not useful. It is only used because Hams agree to use it.

Reading your posts is generally not useful.

> Thats how a typical HAM would denfine amateur radio - as something not
> involving electronics.

That is simply a wild and unsubstantiated supposition on your part.

> Amateur radio has use for emergency communications, worldwide communications,
> personal communications, etc. Also, many (non-EEs) become skilled with
> antennas. I have no problem with non EEs joining amateur radio.

That's awfully big of you.

Dave K8MN

3552. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 02:43:54 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <JbIpa.45$yp4.18@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 65739
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Dan, Dan, Dan ...

Question: Is phasing worse? Are you sure? Carrier suppression wouldn't be nearly as important as unwanted sideband suppression. Check out some of the QST articles over the past few years. The reality may well be that with digital processing, that quadrature phasing may well be held more tightly with DSP than with analog components. The RF quadrature (at least for one frequency, or a small frequency spread) would be easy. It may turn out that we could get better suppression with phasing. Then again, the two methods might just be combined. Folks who think they have a broadcasting license and want to pass 10 KHz audio are simply out on a weekend pass. The Friendly Candy Company will reel them back in, in time. Just a thought :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b878ve$8or$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
>
> I got a better idea...lets all go to Phasing SSB generation. Only
suppress
> the carrier about 20db. And operate on Double Side Band.
>
> Wouldnt that act similar?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.474 / Virus Database: 272 - Release Date: 4/18/03

3553. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 02:50:23 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030423225023.18952.00000478@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 65740

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>So what is your assessment, Mr. Shah? Should the building have been
>abandoned? Do you ever intend to present a tale which has the
>possibility of a plausable outcome?

Sadly, I do not have a tale with a plausable outcome. Its easy for me to say this afterward. Not so easy to do. This event emphacizes the need for emergency preparedness.

3554. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 03:11:22 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <b87kkqqdo1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 65741
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Jim Hampton" (aa2qa@frontiernet.net) writes:
> Dan, Dan, Dan ...
>
> Question: Is phasing worse? Are you sure? Carrier suppression wouldn't be
> nearly as important as unwanted sideband suppression. Check out some of the
> QST articles over the past few years. The reality may well be that with
> digital processing, that quadrature phasing may well be held more tightly
> with DSP than with analog components. The RF quadrature (at least for one
> frequency, or a small frequency spread) would be easy. It may turn out that
> we could get better suppression with phasing. Then again, the two methods
> might just be combined. Folks who think they have a broadcasting license
> and want to pass 10 KHz audio are simply out on a weekend pass. The
> Friendly Candy Company will reel them back in, in time. Just a thought :)
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim
>
I didn't quite get that statement, either.

If there was problems with carrier suppresion in old rigs, it was due
to the tubes (and their warm-up time) rather than whether the rig
was phasing or filter. Sure, a filter rig places the carrier
on the slope of the filter, but a balanced modulator should be
able to get rid of enough carrier, given enough care.

Looking at schematics of phasing rigs, most of them had low
pass filters in the audio chain. It was there to limit
bandwidth, and likely to put less requirements on the audio
phase shift network. If the PSN only had to see a limited bandwidth,
it did not have to be as broadband.

Except for in recent years, phasing was pretty much dead forty years
ago, and definitely by thirty years ago. That was a whole different
time ago. Likely harder to get precision components, and few had
the test equipment the average ham has now to match components.
So really simple PSN's were used. They used tubes, and likely
that made some problems with getting good balance, because of
the size of the components.

The phasing rigs of today are more complicated, taking advantage
of recent advances, and likely are better than those simple
phasing rigs of the fifties.

Michael VE2BVW

> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b878ve$8or$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
>>
>>
>> I got a better idea...lets all go to Phasing SSB generation. Only
> suppress
>> the carrier about 20db. And operate on Double Side Band.
>>
>> Wouldnt that act similar?
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>>
>>
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.474 / Virus Database: 272 - Release Date: 4/18/03
>
>

3555. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 04:01:13 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0304240359330.382@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 65742

On Wed, 23 Apr 2003, Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX wrote:
> Let the Novice class go, ...
>
> As far as semantics of naming of the license class, why not make the
> following apply in the meantime?
>
> Extra Class=1st Class Amateur Radio license
> Advanced Class=2nd Class " "
> General Class=3rd Class " "
> Tech with Code=4th Class
> Tech w/o Code=5th Class
> Novice Class=6th Class

Why not this:
Extra = 1st. Advanced OR General = 2nd. Tech (all kinds) = 3rd.
Novice - NO RENEWALS. Eliminate HF for Tech+

Now THAT will get them to upgrade! :-)

3556. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 04:03:32 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0304240402260.382@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 65743

On Wed, 23 Apr 2003, stewart wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:<Pine.LNX.4.55.0304222132400.108@kd6lvw.ampr.org>...
> > On Tue, 22 Apr 2003, stewart wrote:
> > > As the number of Novice Class license-holders dwindles down to a
> > > handful, and the elimination of this class of Amateurs seems
> > > inevitbable; it seems a good time to reflect on what this means to the
> > > US Amateur Radio Service...
> > >
> > > Let's look at the term "Novice" itself... the word Novice is derived
> > > from the Middle English word "novis" - which means, literally "No
> > > Vice"... so, what this means in terms of the rest of the Amateur
> > > classes, is that these Novices are the only Operators having "No
> > > Vice"... the rest of us have this "vice" of ham radio... some to more
> > > degree than others... but, in all cases, we "have the vice"... or, in
> > > other words, are "of the vicious"... this can clearly be seen here on
> > > this Usenet group, where all of these Non-Novices, fight their vicious
> > > battles everyday... yes, the Novices will be missed - as all we will
> > > be is "pure vice".
> >
> > I can't believe how stupid you are.
> >
> > Novice is actually derrived from the latin adjective NOVUS which means new,
> > plus the noun suffix -ICE, meaning "possessing a state or quality." Therefore,
> > the combined defintion is "[a person] possessing the quality of being new."
>
> HA!
>
> Gotcha!

Got me how? You have yet to make any post that makes any kind of intelligent
sense, and the above simply proves that to anyone who simply started reading
here in the past 3 months that such is so.

3557. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 04:10:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b87o42vqb0@208.207.71.129>
Source record: 65744

N2EY wrote:

>
> > I'll call you anything in-person, face-to-face, that I care to call you.
> > No "fear" at all.
>
> Big brave words from a continent away.

Ya mighta noticed how quiet he got awhile back when I mentioned, while dressing him down over another of his
favorite rants where he denys the now-defunct Interstate Police CW net ever even iexisted, that I had been in
his area the previous week......
He's got gonads the size of watermelons when you're a K miles away. Somehow they seem to disappear when he
perceives any possible "threat".

No CW Testicles indeed.

3558. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 04:21:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b87onnvqb1@208.207.71.129>
Source record: 65745

Dave Heil wrote:

>
> You've lost any credibility here, Leonard H.

When did he ever have any?

3559. Re: internet voice gateways - taking your handheld overseas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 06:21:08 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b88ntr$71657$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 65816

Don't know... that's why *I* was asking..... :)

Ryan

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EA70C78.3080307@adelphia.net...
> Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX wrote:
> > Now I know where tune-a-fish comes from! How do ya tuna fish?? :)
>
> I give up, how do you tuna fish (I just know I'm going to regret this!
8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

3560. Re: Facts About Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 07:46:42 UTC
From: Ginger Eakle <virginiaeakle@peoplepc.com>
Message-ID: <vaf5mdritlrf53@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 65746

"The Code Man" <codeman@codefoever.com> wrote in message
news:b87h6404o@enews3.newsguy.com...
> Know code = Know Ham
> No code = no ham
>
> The eternal truth, proven every day.
>
> Moan CBers, moan.
>
I am glad not all Ham's are like you. If so no one would want to become a
ham radio operator.

3561. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 10:04:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304240204.48ee5aab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65747

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<b87o42vqb0@208.207.71.129>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >
> > > I'll call you anything in-person, face-to-face, that I care to call you.
> > > No "fear" at all.
> >
> > Big brave words from a continent away.
>
> Ya mighta noticed how quiet he got awhile back when I mentioned, while dressing him down over another of his
> favorite rants where he denys the now-defunct Interstate Police CW net ever even iexisted, that I had been in
> his area the previous week......
> He's got gonads the size of watermelons when you're a K miles away. Somehow they seem to disappear when he
> perceives any possible "threat".
>
> No CW Testicles indeed.

Are you saying that you want to meet up and fight?

3562. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 10:10:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304240210.514f4781@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65748

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304231253.1f414019@posting.google.com>...

> I do Putz and that's all you were, a RE rack babysitter.
>
> :-) :-)

I got a tour of an aircraft carrier once. Doesn't mean I was in the Navy.

You didn't even make the rear echelon.

3563. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 10:14:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304240214.ca6c2e3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65749

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030423195618.16357.00000036@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 4/23/2003 5:22 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0304231422.66150fd1@posting.google.com>
>
> >> That's a service for all the United Nations translators so that they
> >> can continue to spread the unique ability of international amateur
> >> morse goodwill.
> >
> >As much as I'd like to believe that, I'll just accept that Kelly is wrong.
>
> Why? What was said (or not said) that would cause you to arrive at that
> conclusion?
>
> Steve

What was said.

3564. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 10:19:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304240219.162b027@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65750

"garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:<c9Gpa.60816$Si4.42955@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>...
> Hello Len ....Well I'll tell you that I think that the "BAD" underwear
> notation fits some of the guys I've known over the years.
>
> God Bless 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Port Vue Pa nr Pittsburgh ....soon to be in
> Belle Vernon Pa
>
> >
> > I'd say that garique has a clue on what is wrong with some of
> > today's radio amateurs...bad or ill-fitting under wear! :-)

Say hi to Belle Vernon for me. Heck of on Off-Ramp they've got. Brian

3565. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 10:25:51 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304240225.6fb12177@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65801

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030423165158.19025.00000503@mb-m02.aol.com>...

> I knew he wasn't capable of original thought.
>
> Steve

Now you're stealing my work. I said that about Heil a couple of weeks
ago when he started posting Jim's work.

3566. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 10:28:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304240228.23459402@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65802

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA74120.60BE136D@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <f45722ac.0304230240.3ded3b0e@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >> I wouldn't put it anywhere. There is no Tan Son Hut and there is no Tan
> > >> Son Nhat.
> > >
> > >There isn't? Must be a big conspiracy.
> > >
> > >Then why did the International Civil Aviation Authority issue it VVTS?
> >
> > The ICAO doesn't exist. Vietnam doesn't exist.
> >
> > Denial is a river running through Egypt... :-)
>
> Not so fast, Bub. You only babbled about some snack bar called "Tan Son
> Hut"
>
> Dave K8MN

You were stationed at a snack bar? Makes sense.

3567. Re: Sufficient Evidence

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 10:34:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304240234.62cddc16@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65803

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030423170629.19025.00000510@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 4/23/2003 1:10 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20030423141023.18770.00000160@mb-m22.aol.com>
>
> >No matter what job, educational level...(SNIP)
>
> That's thirteen today. Makes it an even 30 for two days "work".
> Plagiarism cuts down on the overhead, I guess...
>
> I think Lennie has sufficiently demonstrated the kinda stuff his "career"
> was made of, and the kinda stuff we could expect him to "contribute" if he were
> in the Amateur Radio service.
>
> Thank God for small favors, eh?
>
> Another day...another opportunity to lie and steal others works.
>
> No doubt the culmination of a decades-long "career" of doing the same
> thing in electronics.
>
> I wonder whose work he probably plagiarized for his columns in "Ham
> Radio"...?!?!
>
> Steve

You might want to go talk to Dave about the same subject.

3568. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 10:51:51 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424065151.08447.00000002@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 65804

>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>Date: 4/24/03 12:10 AM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <b87o42vqb0@208.207.71.129>

> He's got gonads the size of watermelons when you're a K miles away.
>Somehow they seem to disappear when he
>perceives any possible "threat".
>
> No CW Testicles indeed.

HEY! I resemble that remark! ;-) ;-)
>
Yes, Len, I said I was going to stop using this screen name. But I didn't say
when. ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-)

3569. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 11:09:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424070952.19094.00000002@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65805

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/23/2003 8:22 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423212210.19022.00000404@mb-m16.aol.com>

>How do can you give them whiskey in a TELEVISION ad. This is what we are
>talking about.

English, Vipul...Try to put your sentences together in ENGLISH.

>> YOU WILL BE ASSILIMILATED!
>> RESISTANCE IS FUTILE!
>
>This seems the attitude of those that love Morse code.

Or EE's who think that Amateur Radio is to be the sole dominion of
waveforms, "homebrewing", skinny people and "preety fems"

Steve, K4YZ

3570. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 11:11:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424071120.19094.00000003@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65806

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/23/2003 9:50 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423225023.18952.00000478@mb-m18.aol.com>

>>So what is your assessment, Mr. Shah? Should the building have been
>>abandoned? Do you ever intend to present a tale which has the
>>possibility of a plausable outcome?
>
>Sadly, I do not have a tale with a plausable outcome. Its easy for me to say
>this afterward. Not so easy to do. This event emphacizes the need for
>emergency
>preparedness.

The Perpetual Pessimist.

Steve

3571. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 11:14:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424071445.19094.00000004@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65807

>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/23/2003 8:00 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030423210035.19022.00000402@mb-m16.aol.com>

>I support amatuer radio in that I mentioned a Hamfest to a non-Ham, I loaned
>someone my ARRL handbook, I mentioned to some people that I am a Ham.

Well gee whiz then. Let's gie Vippy the Humanitarian Ham of the Year Award.

>I happened to be in those situations. That is the scope. In those cases I did
>support amateur radio. I will not go out of my way to support amateur radio.

Where I come from we'd call a person like you a "fair weather friend".

>If an EE asked me about Ham radio, I would say its not worth it, because
>thats
>what I believe.

Why? Not enough "preety fems"?

>> Why? They can experiment with antennas without any kind of license at
>>all,
>
>True, they can do that. But, if a person has this interest, they truly would
>benefit from Ham radio. In the area of antennas, Hams do share their
>knowledge,
>so someone interested in that probably would benefit from that.

One track mind.

Steve

3572. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 11:21:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424072119.19094.00000005@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65808

>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>Date: 4/23/2003 8:51 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <vqHpa.404$X32.442879@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>

>> If an EE asked me about Ham radio, I would say it's not worth it. The
>> exception would be if they were already into antennas as a hobby. For
>them, I
>> would recommend Ham radio.
>
>How can you possibly make such a judgement for another person?...(SNIP)

Vippy assumes that since HE is the square peg, every other EE would ALSO be a square peg..

Steve, K4YZ

3573. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 11:22:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424072221.19094.00000006@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65809

>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 4/24/2003 5:14 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304240214.ca6c2e3@posting.google.com>

>> Why? What was said (or not said) that would cause you to arrive at
>that
>> conclusion?
>
>What was said.

Nothing was said that was wrong.

Steve

3574. Re: Facts About Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 11:54:34 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <_fQpa.535$WL3.12@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 65810

I'm a no code tech.

I'm also the County ARES/RACES EC/RO

and the county Skywarn Coordinator.

The code boyz are just too too too busy working contests to bother with
helping their fellow man.

--

>> Remove "zz" from e-mail address to direct reply. <<

"The Code Man" <codeman@codefoever.com> wrote in message
news:b87h6404o@enews3.newsguy.com...
> Know code = Know Ham
> No code = no ham
>
> The eternal truth, proven every day.
>
> Moan CBers, moan.
>

3575. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 12:26:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424082616.18783.00000125@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 65811

In article <3EA741F1.ECCADA1F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 (The Great Bandini) wrote:

>> In article <20030423062551.18769.00000133@mb-m21.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >In article <20030423004544.18769.00000129@mb-m21.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> >(Len Over 21) writes:
>> >
>> >> Poor prissy parson, couldn't answer a thing, could you?
>> >
>> >Anyone could answer your questions, Len. But why should I, given the fact
>> >that you won't answer mine?

No answer from TGB
>> >
>> >For example, you wrote in a recent post:
>> >
>> >"You do NOT work for any railroad or have any stated work experience in
>> >railroading, yet you have stated IN HERE that you are an expert in
>> >knowledge of railroads."
>> >
>> >Where did I state that I am "an expert in knowledge of railroads."? Please
>> >produce the posting where I made such a claim.
>> >
>> >It's obvious that you won't. So why should I answer your questions?

Still no answer from TGB
>>
>> "Ve haf vays uf making you talk!" - old B-picture movie line.

Obvious lame Nazi reference fro Len. Godwin's Rule invoked, Len loses.
>>
>> Heh heh heh. I've made the prissy parson write and write and
>> write and write in here. :-)

Just like Len's strategy of boxing: He'd try to wear out his opponent by
stopping all of the opponents' punches with his face. ;-) ;-)
>
>Pretty clever manner in which you've done so--by writing and writing and
>writing and writing :-) :-)

More like writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and writing...
>
>> ARRL syncophants can do no wrong. They are the al-queda
>> of the amateur radio world.
>
>Run out of Nazi material?

Probably just recycling old stuff. Note his bad spelling. His Klan imagery (something about burning things on people's lawns) should be next.
>
>You've lost any credibility here, Leonard H.
>
Not at all, Dave. One cannot lose what one never had in the first place.

Perhaps we should all go back to ignoring him. Spring is here, antenna work beckons, new rigs to build and check out. Hamfest season, too. Field Day is just two months away.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3576. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 12:33:10 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304240433.e6a1da@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65812

How about this:

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/04/24/1/?nc=1

73 de Jim, N2EY

3577. Re: Facts About Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 12:34:52 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424083452.19059.00000006@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65813

>The code boyz are just too too too busy working contests to bother with
>helping their fellow man.
>

We leave that to the CBplusers

3578. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 12:36:34 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424083634.19059.00000007@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 65814

>Eliminate HF for Tech+
>
>Now THAT will get them to upgrade! :-)

The only thing that will let them upgrade is more FREE HANDOUTS.

3579. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 12:42:50 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304240442.235a2362@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65815

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304230406.7afb887e@posting.google.com>...
> vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030422194515.19022.00000496@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> > From N2EY
> >
> > > At a basic
> > >level, fingerspelling could be considered an "encoding scheme" for the
> > >alphabet and numbers, while the word signs could be considered an
> > >"encoding scheme" for common words.
> >
> > There's anohter example of symbol encoding.
> >
> > >But ASL and other sign languages
> > >are much more than encoding schemes.
> >
> > Like how?
> >
> > ----------
> > Also note, there is a need for sign language. It is used to communicate for
> > handicapped people. Morse code has not such use. Also, hardware can encode and
> > decode Morse code symbols so people don't have to.
>
> Boy you have the rank newbie syndrome written all over your posts.
>
> My youngest daughter is an occupational therapist who worked in the
> field of adaptive engineering before she moved into her current
> consulting practice. On two occasions when she was in her former mode
> she outfitted two extremely disabled patients with the ability to
> communicate with their outside worlds with Morse with both the
> equipment she cobbled together with the help of an MSEE biomedical
> engineer and her training of the patients and their caregivers in the
> use of Morse. These were not breakthroughs in OT, it had been done
> many times previously.
>
There's even a book about it:

http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/0205287514/qid%3D984341658/sr%3D1-3/makoa/002-6993544-9102412

$43 from Amazon.com (!)

73 de Jim, N2EY

3580. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 13:21:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA7E551.C7A2D457@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65817

Brian wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<b87o42vqb0@208.207.71.129>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > > I'll call you anything in-person, face-to-face, that I care to call you.
> > > > No "fear" at all.
> > >
> > > Big brave words from a continent away.
> >
> > Ya mighta noticed how quiet he got awhile back when I mentioned, while dressing him down over another of his
> > favorite rants where he denys the now-defunct Interstate Police CW net ever even iexisted, that I had been in
> > his area the previous week......
> > He's got gonads the size of watermelons when you're a K miles away. Somehow they seem to disappear when he
> > perceives any possible "threat".
> >
> > No CW Testicles indeed.
>
> Are you saying that you want to meet up and fight?

What are you--Don King?

Dave K8MN

3581. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 13:24:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA7E60F.E6A378B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65818

Brian wrote:
>
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030423165158.19025.00000503@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>
> > I knew he wasn't capable of original thought.
> >
> > Steve
>
> Now you're stealing my work. I said that about Heil a couple of weeks
> ago when he started posting Jim's work.

That's because of your well known reading comprehension difficulty.
Each time I used N2EY's work, I used his call and quotations. I did not
attempt a cheesey re-work and attempt to pass it off as my own.

Dave K8MN

3582. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 13:31:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA7E71E.C3FD13F1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65819

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA74120.60BE136D@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <f45722ac.0304230240.3ded3b0e@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >> I wouldn't put it anywhere. There is no Tan Son Hut and there is no Tan
> > > >> Son Nhat.
> > > >
> > > >There isn't? Must be a big conspiracy.
> > > >
> > > >Then why did the International Civil Aviation Authority issue it VVTS?
> > >
> > > The ICAO doesn't exist. Vietnam doesn't exist.
> > >
> > > Denial is a river running through Egypt... :-)
> >
> > Not so fast, Bub. You only babbled about some snack bar called "Tan Son
> > Hut"

>
> You were stationed at a snack bar? Makes sense.

Would you like to make a public comment on my military service? Do you
have some problem with it?

Dave K8MN

3583. Re: Sufficient Evidence

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 13:37:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA7E89D.D0C0705B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65820

Brian wrote:
>
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030423170629.19025.00000510@mb-m02.aol.com>...

> > I wonder whose work he probably plagiarized for his columns in "Ham
> > Radio"...?!?!

> You might want to go talk to Dave about the same subject.

I never wrote for "Ham Radio". My work appeared in "Ham Radio Horizons"
and "CQ". I've quoted others but I've not represented the words of
another as my own.

Are you as flakey in the flesh as you appear in this newsgroup?

Dave K8MN

3584. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 13:52:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA7ECA9.4099D27F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65822

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3EA741F1.ECCADA1F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 (The Great Bandini) wrote:
>
> >> In article <20030423062551.18769.00000133@mb-m21.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >(N2EY)
> >> writes:

> >> "Ve haf vays uf making you talk!" - old B-picture movie line.
>
> Obvious lame Nazi reference fro Len. Godwin's Rule invoked, Len loses.

Len's skill at swaying others toward his view of amateur radio nirvana
is legendary.

> >> Heh heh heh. I've made the prissy parson write and write and
> >> write and write in here. :-)
>
> Just like Len's strategy of boxing: He'd try to wear out his opponent by
> stopping all of the opponents' punches with his face. ;-) ;-)

> >Pretty clever manner in which you've done so--by writing and writing and
> >writing and writing :-) :-)
>
> More like writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and writing
> and writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and
> writing...

He's no doubt thinking, "I've really *pant* worn him down with my clever
ploy *pant*.

> >> ARRL syncophants can do no wrong. They are the al-queda
> >> of the amateur radio world.
> >
> >Run out of Nazi material?
>
> Probably just recycling old stuff. Note his bad spelling. His Klan imagery
> (something about burning things on people's lawns) should be next.

Burning microphones and teletype machines, no doubt.

> >You've lost any credibility here, Leonard H.
> >
> Not at all, Dave. One cannot lose what one never had in the first place.

>
> Perhaps we should all go back to ignoring him. Spring is here, antenna work
> beckons,...

I'll have to wait for the high winds to die down in r.r.a.p. and here on
the hilltop.

> ...new rigs to build and check out. Hamfest season, too.

I enjoy hitting the smaller hamfests in eastern Ohio, West Virginia and
in western PA. I'm going to go to the Breezeshooters hamfest in Butler,
PA in June.

> Field Day is
> just two months away.

The local ARES group wanted N8NN and I to join their effort but I think
Bert wants to do another two op effort from out here on the hilltop.
That puts us only 600 feet away from the kitchen, beds and a shower.
We'll likely use his call this year since we used mine last year. We'll
use his Yaesu "Field" once again as the Orion is staying safely indoors.

Dave K8MN

3585. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 13:57:12 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304240557.3caea423@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65823

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<cBGpa.390$X32.419765@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0304231421.54a5cafa@posting.google.com...
> > And when you copy Morse Code, do you do so in French?

. .

> The French do so when communicating with other Frenchmen.

In this vein and as a dxer I've worked piles of non-English speaking hams over a lotta years Dee. I can stumble thru bits of spoken French & a bit more Spanish but it's no fun at all on phone as far as I'm concerned and I'm completely out of luck when I run into Russians for instance. Working the same stations with Morse is far easier/faster/more accurate because of the worldwide standardized phrases, Q-signals and abbreviations used by Morse ops. The transmission of "UR 589 QSB QRM OM"is 100% decipherable by all Morse ops globally without translation into any native languages. Another good reason to be a "multilingual" U.S. ham, speak English and Morse .
.

> Dee Flint, N8UZE

w3rv

3586. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 14:09:35 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304240609.60113f8d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65824

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA741F1.ECCADA1F@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <20030423062551.18769.00000133@mb-m21.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > writes:
> >
> > >In article <20030423004544.18769.00000129@mb-m21.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> > >(Len Over 21) writes:
> > >
> > >> Poor prissy parson, couldn't answer a thing, could you?
> > >
> > >Anyone could answer your questions, Len. But why should I, given the fact
> > >that
> > >you won;t answer mine?
> > >
> > >For example, you wrote in a recent post:
> > >
> > >"You do NOT work for any railroad or have any stated work experience in
> > >railroading, yet you have stated IN HERE that you are an expert in knowledge
> > >of railroads."
> > >
> > >Where did I state that I am "an expert in knowledge of railroads."? Please
> > >produce the posting where I made such a claim.
> > >
> > >It's obvious that you won't. So why should I answer your questions?
> >
> > "Ve haf vays uf making you talk!" - old B-picture movie line.
> >
> > Heh heh heh. I've made the prissy parson write and write and
> > write and write in here. :-)
>
> Pretty clever manner in which you've done so--by writing and writing and
> writing and writing :-) :-)
>
> > ARRL syncophants can do no wrong. They are the al-queda
> > of the amateur radio world.
>
> Run out of Nazi material?

I forgot to ship his white sheet. I can't find him in QRZ.com for some
reason, does anybody here have his address? Or maybe Dick can drop it
off on him during his pass thru LA. Maybe Dick can also run a gonads
check while he's there.

> You've lost any credibility here, Leonard H.
>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

3587. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 14:57:12 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0304240657.44985b8c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65825

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:<Pine.LNX.4.55.0304240402260.382@kd6lvw.ampr.org>...

> Got me how? You have yet to make any post that makes any kind of intelligent
> sense, and the above simply proves that to anyone who simply started reading
> here in the past 3 months that such is so.

Try a size 42, or simply getting out of LA for awhile... it will do
wonders for your disposition :) Think of all that circulation that's
getting cut off when you are stuck in traffic for hours a day dodging
illegals without insurance on the I-5.

- Stewart

3588. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 15:44:05 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304240744.12c29c3a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65826

Getting back to the subject of Chirac, Iraq and France...

check this out:

http://www.snopes.com/politics/soapbox/rooney.asp

Not an urban legend or false attribution!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3589. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 16:50:39 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA815DF.8C5D12A2@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65821

JJ wrote:
>
> Vito wrote:
> > WA8ULX wrote:
> >
> >>>getting
> >>>accepted into Boozefighters MC by Wino Willy hisself,
> >>
> >>How impressive.
> >
> >
> > Did I mention my two doctorates?
>
> Doctorates in what? What did you do you dissertations on?

Divinity and Metaphysics. Religeon vs reality. Hard sciences are easy by comparison. Everybody knows how many electrons are in a Coulomb but how many angels on the head of a pin? (c;]

K3DWW

3590. New newsgroup name

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 16:59:13 UTC
From: "Kevin Muenzler, WB5RUE" <wb5rue@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3ea817eb$1_2@127.0.0.1>
Source record: 65827

I've been away from this newsgroup for many years and decided to take a peak back in. You know, nothing has changed. There is very little in the way of substantive discussion going on. It's little more than arguing and name calling...and by the same people. I vote that we change the name of this group to rec.radio.amateur.childisharguments

eh?

Kevin, WB5RUE

-----== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Unlimited-Uncensored-Secure Usenet News==----
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World! >100,000 Newsgroups
---= 19 East/West-Coast Specialized Servers - Total Privacy via Encryption =---

3591. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 18:26:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424142611.04525.00000041@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 65828

In article <d22b54c3.0304240609.60113f8d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message >news:<3EA741F1.ECCADA1F@earthlink.net>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> > In article <20030423062551.18769.00000133@mb-m21.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com >(N2EY)
>> > writes:
>> >
>> > >In article <20030423004544.18769.00000129@mb-m21.aol.com>, >lenover21@aol.com
>> > >(Len Over 21) writes:
>> > >
>> > >> Poor prissy parson, couldn't answer a thing, could you?
>> > >
>> > >Anyone could answer your questions, Len. But why should I, given the >fact
>> > >that
>> > >you won;t answer mine?
>> > >
>> > >For example, you wrote in a recent post:
>> > >
>> > >"You do NOT work for any railroad or have any stated work experience in
>> > >railroading, yet you have stated IN HERE that you are an expert in >knowledge
>> > >of railroads."
>> > >
>> > >Where did I state that I am "an expert in knowledge of railroads."? >Please
>> > >produce the posting where I made such a claim.
>> > >
>> > >It's obvious that you won't. So why should I answer your questions?
>> >
>> > "Ve haf vays uf making you talk!" - old B-picture movie line.
>> >
>> > Heh heh heh. I've made the prissy parson write and write and
>> > write and write in here. :-)
>>
>> Pretty clever manner in which you've done so--by writing and writing and
>> writing and writing :-) :-)
>>
>> > ARRL syncophants can do no wrong. They are the al-queda

>> > of the amateur radio world.
>>
>> Run out of Nazi material?
>
>I forgot to ship his white sheet. I can't find him in QRZ.com for some
>reason, does anybody here have his address?

Check out his comments to the FCC on 98-143. ECFS page on FCC website. The mighty professional had to send FCC paper copies and a disk because he couldn't figger out how to send them electronically. Also waited until the very last minute before the January 15 deadline, effectively cutting off reply comments before the deadline.

>Or maybe Dick can drop it
>off on him during his pass thru LA.

Bed Bath and Beyond is right down the road from here.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3592. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 18:26:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424142612.04525.00000042@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 65829

In article <3EA7ECA9.4099D27F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <3EA741F1.ECCADA1F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 (The Great Bandini) wrote:
>>
>> >> In article <20030423062551.18769.00000133@mb-m21.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>> >(N2EY)
>> >> writes:
>
>> >> "Ve haf vays uf making you talk!" - old B-picture movie line.
>>
>> Obvious lame Nazi reference from Len. Godwin's Rule invoked, Len loses.
>
>Len's skill at swaying others toward his view of amateur radio nirvana
>is legendary.

I get the impression he does nothing but damage to the no code test cause.
>
>> >> Heh heh heh. I've made the prissy parson write and write and
>> >> write and write in here. :-)
>>
>> Just like Len's strategy of boxing: He'd try to wear out his opponent by
>> stopping all of the opponents' punches with his face. ;-) ;-)

'Just a few more and his arm will be really sore....'
>
>> >Pretty clever manner in which you've done so--by writing and writing and
>> >writing and writing :-) :-)
>>
>> More like writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and
>>writing
>> and writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and
>> writing...
>
>He's no doubt thinking, "I've really *pant* worn him down with my clever
>ploy *pant*.

Like one of Baldrick's * "fiendishly clever plans"
>

>> >> ARRL syncophants can do no wrong. They are the al-queda
>> >> of the amateur radio world.
>> >
>> >Run out of Nazi material?
>>
>> Probably just recycling old stuff. Note his bad spelling. His Klan imagery
>> (something about burning things on people's lawns) should be next.
>
>Burning microphones and teletype machines, no doubt.

ARRL diamonds, as I recall. The usual ethnic/racist/gender/ageist slur stuff.
>
>> >You've lost any credibility here, Leonard H.
>> >
>> Not at all, Dave. One cannot lose what one never had in the first place.
>>
>> Perhaps we should all go back to ignoring him. Spring is here, antenna work
>> beckons,...
>
>I'll have to wait for the high winds to die down in r.r.a.p. and here on
>the hilltop.

"There's a mighty wind ablowin'....."~

20-1/2 years I lived on RadioTelegraph Hill. This new QTH is pretty good but
cramped for antennas. Someday....
>
>> ...new rigs to build and check out. Hamfest season, too.
>
>I enjoy hitting the smaller hamfests in eastern Ohio, West Virginia and
>in western PA. I'm going to go to the Breezeshooters hamfest in Butler,
>PA in June.

Where's that calendar?
>
>> Field Day is
>> just two months away.
>
>The local ARES group wanted N8NN and I to join their effort but I think
>Bert wants to do another two op effort from out here on the hilltop.
>That puts us only 600 feet away from the kitchen, beds and a shower.
>We'll likely use his call this year since we used mine last year. We'll
>use his Yaesu "Field" once again as the Orion is staying safely indoors.

bwahaahaa!

Lotta options here. QRP is fun but the category is competitive and you do earn
each QSO.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

* - reference to the "Blackadder" comedy series.
~ - reference to "A Mighty Wind", mockumentary from the folks who gave us "This Is Spinal Tap" and "Best In Show"

3593. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 20:13:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b89gh1$1gf$0@208.206.142.107>
Source record: 65830

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<b87o42vqb0@208.207.71.129>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > > I'll call you anything in-person, face-to-face, that I care to call you.
> > > > No "fear" at all.
> > >
> > > Big brave words from a continent away.
> >
> > Ya mighta noticed how quiet he got awhile back when I mentioned, while dressing him down over another of his
> > favorite rants where he denys the now-defunct Interstate Police CW net ever even iexisted, that I had been in
> > his area the previous week......
> > He's got gonads the size of watermelons when you're a K miles away. Somehow they seem to disappear when he
> > perceives any possible "threat".
> >
> > No CW Testicles indeed.
>
> Are you saying that you want to meet up and fight?

Are you saying that I said that? Try reading what was *written*, clown.

3594. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 20:15:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b89gkt$1gf$1@208.206.142.107>
Source record: 65831

Brian wrote:

> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304231253.1f414019@posting.google.com>...
>
> > I do Putz and that's all you were, a RE rack babysitter.
> >
> > :-) :-)
>
> I got a tour of an aircraft carrier once. Doesn't mean I was in the Navy.

And I'm sure millions of former and current swabbies are thanking their lucky stars.

>
>
> You didn't even make the rear echelon.

Sorry PAL, he was a primary force in *building* the darn thing. You were another one of the
weather
guessers.

3595. Re: New newsgroup name

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 21:06:51 UTC
From: Gordon A Langstaff <veryniceguy@clomp.com>
Message-ID: <LIYpa.605532$3D1.330423@sccrnsc01>
Source record: 65832

Tell us something we don't already know. This ng is nothing but a cesspool.

GAL N6RUE

"Kevin Muenzler, WB5RUE" <wb5rue@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:3ea817eb$1_2@127.0.0.1...
: I've been away from this newsgroup for many years and decided to take a peak
: back in. You know, nothing has changed. There is very little in the way of
: substantive discussion going on. It's little more than arguing and name
: calling...and by the same people. I vote that we change the name of this
: group to rec.radio.amateur.childisharguments
:
: eh?
:
: Kevin, WB5RUE
:
:
:
:
: ----== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Unlimited-Uncensored-Secure Usenet News==----
: http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World! >100,000 Newsgroups
: ---= 19 East/West-Coast Specialized Servers - Total Privacy via Encryption =---

3596. Re: New newsgroup name

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 22:10:49 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304241410.1d836082@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65833

"Kevin Muenzler, WB5RUE" <wb5rue@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<3ea817eb$1_2@127.0.0.1>...
> I've been away from this newsgroup for many years and decided to take a peak
> back in. You know, nothing has changed. There is very little in the way of
> substantive discussion going on. It's little more than arguing and name
> calling...and by the same people. I vote that we change the name of this
> group to rec.radio.amateur.childisharguments
>
> eh?
>
> Kevin, WB5RUE

Kevin, welcome back. It's OK with me if you rename it. Brian

3597. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 22:13:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304241413.1e20c93f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65834

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<cBGpa.390$X32.419765@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0304231421.54a5cafa@posting.google.com...
> > And when you copy Morse Code, do you do so in French?
>
> The French do so when communicating with other Frenchmen.
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE

Then they would be communicating in French, not a unique language.

Morse is an encoding scheme, not a language. And its not digital either.

3598. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 22:16:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304241416.26ef63c4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65835

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304240557.3caea423@posting.google.com>...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<cBGpa.390$X32.419765@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0304231421.54a5cafa@posting.google.com...
> > > And when you copy Morse Code, do you do so in French?
>
> . .
>
> > The French do so when communicating with other Frenchmen.
>
> In this vein and as a dxer I've worked piles of non-English speaking
> hams over a lotta years Dee. I can stumble thru bits of spoken French
> & a bit more Spanish but it's no fun at all on phone as far as I'm
> concerned and I'm completely out of luck when I run into Russians for
> instance. Working the same stations with Morse is far
> easier/faster/more accurate because of the worldwide standardized
> phrases, Q-signals and abbreviations used by Morse ops. The
> transmission of "UR 589 QSB QRM OM"is 100% decipherable by all Morse
> ops globally without translation into any native languages. Another
> good reason to be a "multilingual" U.S. ham, speak English and Morse .
> .
>
> > Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
> w3rv

This is one reason I took to posting on rrap - to dismiss all these
Morse Myths. Where is Aaron Jones when you need him?

Perhaps the Q-siganls are universally understood, but Q-signals are
not Morse code. I even hear them spoken on fm repeaters and
side-band.

3599. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 22:17:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304241417.6903aced@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65836

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030424072221.19094.00000006@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 4/24/2003 5:14 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0304240214.ca6c2e3@posting.google.com>
>
> >> Why? What was said (or not said) that would cause you to arrive at
> that
> >> conclusion?
> >
> >What was said.
>
> Nothing was said that was wrong.
>
> Steve

Then you would be wrong.

3600. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 22:18:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304241418.780ea92a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65837

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA7E551.C7A2D457@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<b87o42vqb0@208.207.71.129>...
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > > I'll call you anything in-person, face-to-face, that I care to call you.
> > > > > No "fear" at all.
> > > >
> > > > Big brave words from a continent away.
> > >
> > > Ya mighta noticed how quiet he got awhile back when I mentioned, while dressing him
down over another of his
> > > favorite rants where he denys the now-defunct Interstate Police CW net ever even
iexisted, that I had been in
> > > his area the previous week......
> > > He's got gonads the size of watermelons when you're a K miles away. Somehow they seem
to disappear when he
> > > perceives any possible "threat".
> > >
> > > No CW Testicles indeed.
> >
> > Are you saying that you want to meet up and fight?
>
> What are you--Don King?
>
> Dave K8MN

What are you--DICK Caroll?

3601. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 22:19:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304241419.4a02254a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65838

nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
news:<20030424065151.08447.00000002@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >Date: 4/24/03 12:10 AM Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <b87o42vqb0@208.207.71.129>
>
> > He's got gonads the size of watermelons when you're a K miles away.
> >Somehow they seem to disappear when he
> >perceives any possible "threat".
> >
> > No CW Testicles indeed.
>
> HEY! I resemble that remark! ;-) ;-)
> >
> Yes, Len, I said I was going to stop using this screen name. But I didn't say
> when. ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-)

;^)

I've got a nose. You don't.

3602. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 22:32:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304241432.d9537d3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65839

Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA815DF.8C5D12A2@crosslink.net>...
> JJ wrote:
> >
> > Vito wrote:
> > > WA8ULX wrote:
> > >
> > >>>getting
> > >>>accepted into Boozefighters MC by Wino Willy hisself,
> > >>
> > >>How impressive.
> > >
> > >
> > > Did I mention my two doctorates?
> >
> > Doctorates in what? What did you do you dissertations on?
>
> Divinity and Metaphysics. Religeon vs reality. Hard sciences are easy by
> comparison. Everybody knows how many electrons are in a Coulomb but how
> many angels on the head of a pin? (c;]
>
> K3DWW

Angels on the head of a pin!

Vito, you're just the man I've been hoping to meet. I've always wondered if the head of a pin was large enough to hold a brain. Go check out Bruce and get back to me, please.

3603. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 22:42:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304241442.60fe4e80@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65840

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA7E71E.C3FD13F1@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA74120.60BE136D@earthlink.net>...
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > >
> > > > In article <f45722ac.0304230240.3ded3b0e@posting.google.com>,
> > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > > >
> > > > >> I wouldn't put it anywhere. There is no Tan Son Hut and there is no Tan
> > > > >> Son Nhat.
> > > > >
> > > > >There isn't? Must be a big conspiracy.
> > > > >
> > > > >Then why did the International Civil Aviation Authority issue it VVTS?
> > > > >
> > > > The ICAO doesn't exist. Vietnam doesn't exist.
> > > > >
> > > > Denial is a river running through Egypt... :-)
> > > >
> > > Not so fast, Bub. You only babbled about some snack bar called "Tan Son
> > > Hut"
> >
> > >
> > You were stationed at a snack bar? Makes sense.
>
> Would you like to make a public comment on my military service? Do you
> have some problem with it?
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, all of these comments are public. That's how you got to respond
to a comment I directed at DICK. Had they been private, you would not
have been able to read it, and not comment on it. QSL?

Getting back to the snack bar in Vietnam. Why you keep bringing it
up? It must have been a significant part of your life while
in-country.

What did your orders say? Did they put you in a snack bar or an Air
Base?

3604. Re: Facts About Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 22:44:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304241444.2719ae1a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65841

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030424083452.19059.00000006@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >The code boyz are just too too too busy working contests to bother with
> >helping their fellow man.
> >
>
> We leave that to the CBplusers

Bruce, you don't leave it to anyone. You're simply incapable of doing it.

3605. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 22:47:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304241447.6f502608@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65842

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA745BC.812CA210@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA69B4D.7049664@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA60FCD.C76D3BBF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA214A5.999E7538@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > In article <f45722ac.0304190500.7cfb962@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> > > > > > > > >He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I'd heard he might have been a snow-removal supervisor for
> > > > > > > > the runways at Tan Son Hut...but that's probably just a rumor.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Just for the record, Len, where is Tan Son Hut?
>
> > > > > > > Most people would say its in Vietnam (Ho Chi Minh City/Tan Son Nhat).
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > No, I don't believe they would.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Where do you and Wonder Boy put it?
> > > > > >
> > > > > I wouldn't put it anywhere. There is no Tan Son Hut and there is no Tan
> > > > > Son Nhat.
> > > > >
> > > > There isn't? Must be a big conspiracy.
> > > >
> > > Then why did the International Civil Aviation Authority issue it VVTS?
> > >
> > To be specific, the Saigon civil airport was named Ton Son Nhat.
> > The U.S. air base was Ton Son Nhut. Tan Son Hut must be a Nuoc Mam
> > scented snack bar outside the air field. U.S. military personnel had
> > nothing to do with Tan Son Nhat.
> >
> I was never assigned to a place called "Tan Son Nhat" or a place called

> > > "Tan Son Hut".
>
> >
> > Neither was I, but I can find it on a map. And its in Vietnam.
>
> Your attention is directed to the statement Leomard H. Amdersom wrote
> about me.

Then -why- do you continue to engage me on the topic?

3606. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 23:29:01 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0304242329190.634@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 65843

On Thu, 24 Apr 2003, WA8ULX wrote:
> >Eliminate HF for Tech+
> >
> >Now THAT will get them to upgrade! :-)
>
> The only thing that will let them upgrade is more FREE HANDOUTS.

So, upgrade or LOSE isn't sufficient?

3607. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 23:31:45 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0304242330360.634@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 65844

On Thu, 24 Apr 2003, stewart wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:<Pine.LNX.4.55.0304240402260.382@kd6lvw.ampr.org>...
> > Got me how? You have yet to make any post that makes any kind of intelligent
> > sense, and the above simply proves that to anyone who simply started reading
> > here in the past 3 months that such is so.
>
> Try a size 42, or simply getting out of LA for awhile... it will do
> wonders for your disposition :) Think of all that circulation that's
> getting cut off when you are stuck in traffic for hours a day dodging
> illegals without insurance on the I-5.

Wrong again loser. I telecommute (in fact, I'm self-employed and don't have
much of a commute at all).

Let's see if Mr. Teaze can go for "strike 3" and win the idiot hattrick of 2003!

3608. Re: New newsgroup name

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-24 23:32:45 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0304242333060.634@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 65845

On Thu, 24 Apr 2003, Kevin Muenzler, WB5RUE wrote:
> I've been away from this newsgroup for many years and decided to take a peak
> back in. You know, nothing has changed. There is very little in the way of
> substantive discussion going on. It's little more than arguing and name
> calling...and by the same people. I vote that we change the name of this
> group to rec.radio.amateur.childisharguments

Rec.radio.amateur.spam is more like it.

3609. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 00:01:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424200153.04525.00000056@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 65846

In article <b87kkqqdo1@freenet9.carleton.ca>, et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) writes:

>If there was problems with carrier suppresion in old rigs, it was due
>to the tubes (and their warm-up time) rather than whether the rig
>was phasing or filter. Sure, a filter rig places the carrier
>on the slope of the filter, but a balanced modulator should be
>able to get rid of enough carrier, given enough care.

I disagree, slightly.

The phasing rigs of the '50s could be stabilized with low-drift components. The main problem seems to have been that even with the best adjustment the unwanted sideband suppression would not be any better than 40 dB. 30 dB was a more realistic figure in practice.
>
>Looking at schematics of phasing rigs, most of them had low
>pass filters in the audio chain. It was there to limit
>bandwidth, and likely to put less requirements on the audio
>phase shift network. If the PSN only had to see a limited bandwidth,
>it did not have to be as broadband.

Agreed. But there's also the fact that for communications purposes 3 kHz is plenty. Many serious SSB DX/contest types use less than 2.5 kHz.
>
>Except for in recent years, phasing was pretty much dead forty years
>ago, and definitely by thirty years ago. That was a whole different
>time ago. Likely harder to get precision components, and few had
>the test equipment the average ham has now to match components.
>So really simple PSN's were used. They used tubes, and likely
>that made some problems with getting good balance, because of
>the size of the components.
>
Agreed, but the problem was largely dealt with by use of packaged PSNs like the B&W 2Q4/350.

I think what really wiped out the phasing method for hams was the introduction of heterodyne-type SSB transceivers. The first ones were expensive (Cosmophone, KWM-1/KWM-2), but there soon followed much less expensive models such as the NCX-3. These rigs put an entire station (less power supply, antenna, mike and sometimes speaker) into one box. Cost was reduced by the use of only one set of oscillators and one filter.

In theory the same thing could have been done with the phasing method, but the T/R switching would be complex and the unwanted sideband rejection still only 40 dB at best.

>The phasing rigs of today are more complicated, taking advantage
>of recent advances, and likely are better than those simple
>phasing rigs of the fifties.
>
Agreed.

But regardless of method, the wisdom of wideband SSB is debatable.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3610. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 00:56:49 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <lJ%pa.610193$L1.172822@sccrnsc02>
Source record: 65848

OK Brian .... I lost it coming off of 70 into Lower BV after a light rain ....beautiful fishtale knocked over a bunch of rubber poles that came back up. I am a homecare PT and that is my service area so the Mid Mon Valley got me after 15 years of driving there. 73 Brian ..Tom KI3R
"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0304240219.162b027@posting.google.com...
> "garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:<c9Gpa.60816$Si4.42955@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>...
> > Hello Len ....Well I'll tell you that I think that the "BAD" underwear
> > notation fits some of the guys I've known over the years.
> >
> > God Bless 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Port Vue Pa nr Pittsburgh ....soon to be
in
> > Belle Vernon Pa
> >
> > >
> > > I'd say that garique has a clue on what is wrong with some of
> > > today's radio amateurs...bad or ill-fitting under wear! :-)
>
> Say hi to Belle Vernon for me. Heck of on Off-Ramp they've got. Brian

3611. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 01:00:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304241700.70fc0d15@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65849

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030424142612.04525.00000042@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <3EA7ECA9.4099D27F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3EA741F1.ECCADA1F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 (The Great Bandini) wrote:
> >
> >> >> In article <20030423062551.18769.00000133@mb-m21.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (N2EY)
> >> >> writes:
> >
> >> >> "Ve haf vays uf making you talk!" - old B-picture movie line.
> >>
> >> Obvious lame Nazi reference from Len. Godwin's Rule invoked, Len loses.
> >
> >Len's skill at swaying others toward his view of amateur radio nirvana
> >is legendary.
>
> I get the impression he does nothing but damage to the no code test cause.

Code damages the code test cause. It is enough.

> >> >> Heh heh heh. I've made the prissy parson write and write and
> >> >> write and write in here. :-)
> >>
> >> Just like Len's strategy of boxing: He'd try to wear out his opponent by
> >> stopping all of the opponents' punches with his face. ;-) ;-)
>
> 'Just a few more and his arm will be really sore....'

Wow, you guys are wits.

> >> >Pretty clever manner in which you've done so--by writing and writing and
> >> >writing and writing :-) :-)
> >>
> >> More like writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and
> >>writing
> >> and writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and writing and
> >> writing...

> >
> >He's no doubt thinking, "I've really *pant* worn him down with my clever
> >ploy *pant*.
>
> Like one of Baldrick's * "fiendishly clever plans"

Verifiable wits.

> >> >> ARRL syncophants can do no wrong. They are the al-queda
> >> >> of the amateur radio world.
> >> >
> >> >Run out of Nazi material?
> >>
> >> Probably just recycling old stuff. Note his bad spelling. His Klan imagery
> >> (something about burning things on people's lawns) should be next.
> >
> >Burning microphones and teletype machines, no doubt.
>
> ARRL diamonds, as I recall. The usual ethnic/racist/gender/ageist slur stuff.

As long as it's not true, no one will buy it, right?

> >> >You've lost any credibility here, Leonard H.
> >> >
> >> Not at all, Dave. One cannot lose what one never had in the first place.
> >>
> >> Perhaps we should all go back to ignoring him. Spring is here, antenna work
> >> beckons,...
> >
> >I'll have to wait for the high winds to die down in r.r.a.p. and here on
> >the hilltop.
>
> "There's a mighty wind ablowin'....."~

Some would call it a gale. Some would call it just more pcta foolishness.
>
> 20-1/2 years I lived on RadioTelegraph Hill. This new QTH is pretty good but
> cramped for antennas. Someday....

Wow, "RADIO" Telegraph Hill. Let me check my dictionary of geographic names.

> >> ...new rigs to build and check out. Hamfest season, too.
> >
> >I enjoy hitting the smaller hamfests in eastern Ohio, West Virginia and
> >in western PA. I'm going to go to the Breezeshooters hamfest in Butler,
> >PA in June.

Hmmm. "Breezeshooters." Must be a DX group.

> Where's that calendar?

Where did you leave it?

> >> Field Day is
> >> just two months away.
> >
> >The local ARES group wanted N8NN and I to join their effort but I think
> >Bert wants to do another two op effort from out here on the hilltop.
> >That puts us only 600 feet away from the kitchen, beds and a shower.
> >We'll likely use his call this year since we used mine last year. We'll
> >use his Yaesu "Field" once again as the Orion is staying safely indoors.
>
> bwahaahaa!

Yep, who wants to hire a forklift for field day? Them Ten-Tecs can get big.

> Lotta options here. QRP is fun but the category is competitive and you do earn
> each QSO.

Go non-competitive. And don't go copying messages prior to your start time.

3612. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 01:02:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA88931.F6236743@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65850

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA7E551.C7A2D457@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<b87o42vqb0@208.207.71.129>...
> > > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > I'll call you anything in-person, face-to-face, that I care to call you.
> > > > > > > No "fear" at all.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Big brave words from a continent away.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Ya mighta noticed how quiet he got awhile back when I mentioned, while dressing him
down over another of his
> > > > > favorite rants where he denys the now-defunct Interstate Police CW net ever even
iexisted, that I had been in
> > > > > his area the previous week......
> > > > > He's got gonads the size of watermelons when you're a K miles away. Somehow they
seem to disappear when he
> > > > > perceives any possible "threat".
> > > > >
> > > > > No CW Testicles indeed.
> > > >
> > > Are you saying that you want to meet up and fight?
> > >
> > What are you--Don King?

> What are you--DICK Caroll?

Who is DICK Caroll?

Dave K8MN

3613. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 01:09:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA88AD9.BC4BC6C9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65751

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA7E71E.C3FD13F1@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA74120.60BE136D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > In article <f45722ac.0304230240.3ded3b0e@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > > >
> > > > > >> I wouldn't put it anywhere. There is no Tan Son Hut and there is no Tan
> > > > > >> Son Nhat.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >There isn't? Must be a big conspiracy.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >Then why did the International Civil Aviation Authority issue it VVTS?
> > > > >
> > > > > The ICAO doesn't exist. Vietnam doesn't exist.
> > > > >
> > > > > Denial is a river running through Egypt... :-)
> > > >
> > > > Not so fast, Bub. You only babbled about some snack bar called "Tan Son
> > > > Hut"
> > >
> > >
> > > You were stationed at a snack bar? Makes sense.
> >
> > Would you like to make a public comment on my military service? Do you
> > have some problem with it?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Dave, all of these comments are public. That's how you got to respond
> to a comment I directed at DICK. Had they been private, you would not
> have been able to read it, and not comment on it.

Tell me something I don't know. Of course the posts are public.
Your crack about being stationed at a snack bar making sense to you
doesn't seem to make much sense. I asked you a question, you chose
diversion.

> QSL?

Anyone who says this on the ham bands is a stupendous lid.

>
> Getting back to the snack bar in Vietnam. Why you keep bringing it
> up? It must have been a significant part of your life while
> in-country.

It's your reading comprehension thing again.

> What did your orders say? Did they put you in a snack bar or an Air
> Base?

The answers are there. Go back and attempt reading them.

Dave K8MN

3614. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 01:10:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304241710.331b2919@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65752

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304240609.60113f8d@posting.google.com>...

> I forgot to ship his white sheet. I can't find him in QRZ.com for some
> reason, does anybody here have his address?

Kelly, you keep the white sheet for your own ceremonies.

But if you need Len, try Superpages.com.

If you can spell it, it'll pop up.

If you can't spell it, just clip and paste this:

Len Anderson

Or maybe Dick can drop it
> off on him during his pass thru LA. Maybe Dick can also run a gonads
> check while he's there.

DICK is probably quite adept at running "gonads checks." 10-4, GUD BUDDY?

3615. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 01:13:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304241713.380e87b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65754

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030424142611.04525.00000041@mb-m29.aol.com>...

> Check out his comments to the FCC on 98-143. ECFS page on FCC website. The
> mighty professional had to send FCC paper copies and a disk because he couldn't
> figger out how to send them electronically.

I think that's how the attorneys do it. Real paper, right?

Also waited until the very last
> minute before the January 15 deadline, effectively cutting off reply comments
> before the deadline.

The FCC specifies the window. If you've got a problem with it, take
it up with that Powell kid.

> >Or maybe Dick can drop it
> >off on him during his pass thru LA.
>
> Bed Bath and Beyond is right down the road from here.

Ah, you two guys go ahead and hook up. That's not my style.

3616. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 01:13:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA88BCF.5CE484FB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65753

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA745BC.812CA210@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA69B4D.7049664@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA60FCD.C76D3BBF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA214A5.999E7538@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > In article <f45722ac.0304190500.7cfb962@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > > > > > > > >He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I'd heard he might have been a snow-removal supervisor for
> > > > > > > > > the runways at Tan Son Hut...but that's probably just a rumor.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Just for the record, Len, where is Tan Son Hut?
> > >
> > > > > > > Most people would say its in Vietnam (Ho Chi Minh City/Tan Son Nhat).
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > No, I don't believe they would.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Where do you and Wonder Boy put it?
> > > > > >
> > > > > I wouldn't put it anywhere. There is no Tan Son Hut and there is no Tan
> > > > > Son Nhat.
> > > > >
> > > > There isn't? Must be a big conspiracy.
> > > > >
> > > > Then why did the International Civil Aviation Authority issue it VVTS?
> > > >
> > > To be specific, the Saigon civil airport was named Ton Son Nhat.
> > > The U.S. air base was Ton Son Nhut. Tan Son Hut must be a Nuoc Mam
> > > scented snack bar outside the air field. U.S. military personnel had
```

> > > > nothing to do with Tan Son Nhat.
> > > >
> > > > I was never assigned to a place called "Tan Son Nhat" or a place called
> > > > "Tan Son Hut".
> >
> > >
> > > Neither was I, but I can find it on a map. And its in Vietnam.
> >
> > Your attention is directed to the statement Leomard H. Amdersom wrote
> > about me.
>
> Then -why- do you continue to engage me on the topic?

I believe you have it backward. ?nairB ,cixelsyd ouy erA.

NM8K evaD

3617. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 01:16:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304241716.226f2704@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65755

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030423141026.18770.00000165@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0304230259.3597adbf@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Len no apology necessary. Its just that Dave is more interesting and
> >likable when he's not being himself.
>
> You may be right. I've seen other schizophrenics do their thing.

He won't be the last. Czech out Jim with the "bwahahaha" laugh below.

He's got the Steve disease.

3618. Re: Facts About Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 01:32:34 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Se0qa.872$X32.859349@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 65847

You are overreacting to some idiots. Don't let them bias you against those who like code. Sweeping generalities are usually wrong. I know a lot of people into code AND into community service.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

"Steve Fleckenstein" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> wrote in message news:_fQpa.535$WL3.12@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> I'm a no code tech.
>
> I'm also the County ARES/RACES EC/RO
>
> and the county Skywarn Coordinator.
>
>
> The code boyz are just too too too busy working contests to bother with
> helping their fellow man.
>
> --
>
>
> >> Remove "zz" from e-mail address to direct reply. <<
>
>
>
> "The Code Man" <codeman@codefoever.com> wrote in message
> news:b87h6404o@enews3.newsguy.com...
> > Know code = Know Ham
> > No code = no ham
> >
> > The eternal truth, proven every day.
> >
> > Moan CBers, moan.
> >
>
>

3619. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 01:33:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304241733.25044248@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65756

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA74736.9086D28A@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA6996F.9924B62E@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA60E66.1BFB0B07@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > If your permission was denied then you couldn't operate.
> > > > >
> > > > > Incorrect. I could have operated at any time.
> > > >
> > > > But you were ordered not to. Doesn't that mean you could not operate
> > > > amateur radio?
> > > >
> > > > That's what it means to me, at least.
> > >
> > > I wasn't ordered not to do anything, Brian. I was notified that my
> > > request was denied.
> >
> > Then, obviously, you couldn't operate. Why do you say that you could?
>
> Because I can do anything if I'm willing to accept the consequences.

Superman. Superiorman. Smugman. PCTA will give you a pass.

> > > > If caught operating,
> > > > > especially after having asked for permission and being denied, I'd have
> > > > > had to suffer the consequences. If not caught, I could have just
> > > > > claimed that my commander gave me verbal permission.
> > > >
> > > > Didn't your commander deny your request in writing?
> > >
> > > He certainly did. If I operated and was not caught at it, I could
> > > simply toss the written denial of my request and claim that I had verbal
> > > permission. If I'd been nabbed, I would have suffered the consequences.
> >
> > But that would be illegal operation and unethical action on your part.
>
> Yes it would have been, had I actually operated. I didn't.

Good thing. After that French 6M stuff, you otta try to keep your
nose clean.

> > Why would you even think it?
>
> I can think about anything I like. Consequences only result from
> actions, not thought.

But if you keep dwelling on them...

Oh, hey, go ask Jimmy Carter about his thoughts.

> > > > That must be the difference between Vietnam Era vets and the rest.
> > >
> > > What is the difference? Service members then requested and received or
> > > were denied written permission to put an amateur radio station on the
> > > air.
> >
> > Exactly. Your operation was denied. Mine was permitted.
>
> You have nothing to offer which confirms that claim. I don't believe
> you.

And you've offered -nothing- that proves your Vietnam operation didn't
take place.

> > But you say
> > you would have operated anyway and disposed of your written order not
> > to operate, then lie about it. I think that's the difference between
> > you and me.
>
> Get real. I didn't operate and never claimed to.

Prove it.

Your envy of those who could operate was readily apparent in your
posting of your snack bar days.

> > Service members now request and receive or are denied written permission
> > > to put an amateur radio station on the air.
> > >
> > > The only anomaly seems to be you in Somalia.
> >
> > Permission was granted.
>
> ..and you can offer what as proof of your claim?
>
> > No anomaly. No destroyed paperwork. No lies.
>
> We have no way of knowing what took place. You have nothing to back
> your statements.

Nor do you. And I don't believe you. You're just not credible.

> > You must have belonged to a different ethical era.
>
> That what you stated earlier. Then again, you have no way of backing
> any of your statements. Tough luck, kid.

You're the one who thought up tossing your orders not to operate, then lie about it. That's the work of a devious mind. And it's all here on rrap.

Prove you didn't operate. If anyone will believe you.

3620. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 01:38:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304241738.3a10d3f6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65757

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA7E60F.E6A378B@earthlink.net>...

> That's because of your well known reading comprehension difficulty.
> Each time I used N2EY's work, I used his call and quotations. I did not
> attempt a cheesey re-work and attempt to pass it off as my own.
>
> Dave K8MN

So you admit that you offer no original thought?

3621. Re: Facts About Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 01:49:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030424214941.18769.00000179@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 65758

In article <_fQpa.535$WL3.12@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Steve Fleckenstein" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> writes:

>
>I'm a no code tech.
>
>I'm also the County ARES/RACES EC/RO
>
>and the county Skywarn Coordinator.
>
>
>The code boyz are just too too too busy working contests to bother with
>helping their fellow man.

Steve:

Sooo -- are you saying that code proficiency and public service in the ARS are mutually exclusive?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3622. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 01:49:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030424214941.18769.00000180@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 65759

In article <5f4fe4c2.0304221231.30166900@posting.google.com>,
horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:

>> Well, who said that Morse Code was a growth industry? Granted, there
>> seem to be more products for helping people learn the Morse Code now
>> than at any other time in history. As another poster observed, the
>> interest in QRP caused by new, off-the-shelf QRP rigs like the Yaesu
>> FT-817 is making CW more popular than ever. And now that we're on
>> the downside of the current solar cycle, using these rigs will be more
>> dependant on CW than ever.
>
>Nah - the FT-817 makes a GREAT 6m rig... and CW on 6m is about as
>popular as a stinky sock.

Hmmm -- I was hardly aware of the sudden popularity of stinky socks!

On 6 meters, the ONLY DX contacts I've EVER had have been on CW!

BTW I'm contemplating the purchase of an FT-817 myself. Anyone have
a recommendation for a good portable antenna tuner?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3623. Re: internet voice gateways - taking your handheld overseas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 01:50:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EA89471.20809@adelphia.net>
Source record: 65760

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Don't know... that's why *I* was asking..... :)

I'll go work on somethin'.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3624. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 01:54:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304241754.65b19b4a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65761

"Ray Early" <none@noneearlyanon.com> wrote in message news:<b7uqg0hfk0@pita.alt.net>...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hdnav10.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > On Sun, 20 Apr 2003 08:19:55 -0400, Jack wrote:
> >
> > >> > If the regs have changed to permit a commander to issue ham
> > >> > operating permission, so be it (I think that would be a bad
> > >> > move if it was so).
> > >> >
> > >> > We will see.
> > >>
> > >> . . . keep us posted.
> >
> > And if my source realizes that this "fly on the wall" has
> > caught them with the hand in the cookie jar, we may never get
> > a reply, no matter how "insignificant" the cookie. I do not
> > consider proper "by the book" license issuance procedure as
> > "insignificant" but then again I'm a pro in that business so
> > what do I know, right, "Jack"?
> >
> > > The George W. Bush haters are down to grasping
> > >at straws and looking for gold at the end of rainbows.
> >
> > I cannot talk for others, but although I do not respect an
> > awful lot of things that Our Prezident and his bag-carrier the
> > Attorney General have done and want to do to the American
> > public, there is a vast difference between disrepect and hate.
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
> >
> >
> >
>
> I heard our military guys operating from Iraq on
> 20 meters today. They gave out their operating sked
> and described the unusual conditions they are operating
> out of. They've even had some qsl cards made up.
>
> Ray

Sounds awful. Sheezzz. Getting QSL cards made up???

Maybe Fill can pull some strings and get them courts martialled.

Viva La Iraq!

3625. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 02:09:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304241809.6e5513d6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65762

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA355AE.9FE825E9@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA18089.68A200CB@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA088A4.B011F968@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA00DCE.6709A863@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdi8aza.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > > > > > > > > On 16 Apr 2003 18:56:22 -0700, Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >> I questioned the legality of this in an inquiry to both the
> > > > > > > > >> ARRL and the FCC. We will see what legal justification they
> > > > > > > > >> come up with for a military commander to authorize non-military
> > > > > > > > >> recreational communications on any frequency in contradiction
> > > > > > > > >> to standing procedures binding upon the military.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >It's nice to see an amateur atempting to squash the spirit of amateur
radio.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >Probably an attorney.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > One of the better communications attornies around if I say so
> > > > > > > > myself. Rule compliance is my specialty and I've been on the
> > > > > > > > prosecution side as well as the defense side.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > If I gotta play by the book, ev'one gotta play by the book.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Phil, if you wanna play at all, you've got to get yourself in the game.
> > > > > >
> > > > > On the face of it, your comment was the usual, silly Brian Burke stuff.
> > > > > The more I thought it about it, the more I saw some logic in it. To
> > > > > extend your idea, if Len Anderson wants to play, he has to get in the
> > > > > game.
> > > > >
> > > > That's what you've been saying all along.

> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Why is it bad when I adopt that theology?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I didn't say it was bad. You only thought that because of your poor
> > > > > > reading comprehension. I think it was good and I'm glad that you're the
> > > > > > one who wrote it. I'm afraid though that you've aroused the ire of your
> > > > > > mentor.
> > > > >
> > > > > Then you agree that Phil needs to get into the game before he can have
> > > > > a valid opinion on the subject?
> > > >
> > > > Sure I do. Further, I think he's already in the game.
> > >
> > You think Phil's in the service and you think he's deployed to Iraq?
> > You might want to check with him on that.
>
> I don't think he's in the military or in Iraq.

Yet you think he has a valuable contribution to make concerning the
military operation in Iraq?

Kimd of opems the gates to Lem, doesm't imt?

> > > > And I don't think Phil considers himself my mentor.
> > > >
> > > > I don't consider Phil as your mentor either. Phil is a rational man.
> > > > Your mentor is the non-participant in amateur radio who frequently posts
> > > > here.
> > >
> > Then you need to make yourself clear.
>
> I did. You needed clarification due to your reading comprehension
> difficulty.

You didn't.

> > > > > > > > Go enlist, then volunteer for Iraq.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Why would Phil do that?
>
> > > > > > > So he could properly frame the written permission required by deployed
> > > > > > > amateurs. Sure would be nice for those deployed commanders and
> > > > > > > amateurs to have some professional legal advice, instead of a bunch of
> > > > > > > armchair warriors and codester lawyers.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Seems to me that in past applicable situations, most have figured it out
> > > > > > without the assistance of an attorney. You, for example, seem to be the
> > > > > > only guy in Somalia who had trouble with the concept.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave, don't just blow, blow harder. You'll need to do a bit of
> > > > > research before anyone with at least half a brain would buy into that.
> > > > >

> > > > Name all the "guys" in Somalia.
> > > > Name all the "guys" in Somalia that were amateur radio operators.
> > > > Name all of those "guys" in Somalia that were amateur radio operators
> > > > and obtained permission to operate.
> > > >
> > > > And you've left out all the "gals" that were sent as well.
> > >
> > > I didn't have the impression that everyone in Somalia wanted to operate
> > > an amateur radio station.

Nor did I. But you're the one that drew them all..., correction,
"most" in with your wild accusations.

Those who didn't operate on the ham bands had
> > > no problem. Those who operated legally had written permission. Then
> > > there's you.
> >
> > Dave, I had no trouble. I operated legally.
>
> So you say. No one has stepped up to confirm the tale of your alleged
> operation.

Nor is it likely they will. It was a relatively small operation. Not
many combattants involved, and Willy kept it small. Sort of like a
NEO on a little American Embassy. Happens all the time.

I operated legally. Seems like you're SOL.

3626. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 02:20:31 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424222031.01566.00000038@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 65763

>I've always
>wondered if the head of a pin was large enough to hold a brain. Go
>check out Bruce and get back to me, please.

No question in regards to you Brian, we know your Brain would fit with plenty
of room to spare

3627. Re: Facts About Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 02:22:24 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424222224.01566.00000039@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 65764

>You're simply incapable of doing it.

Not incapable just will not do it. Im really waiting for you to pass the EXTRA, then i will do it.

3628. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 02:30:43 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8a6pi$jj1$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65765

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0304240744.12c29c3a@posting.google.com...
> Getting back to the subject of Chirac, Iraq and France...
>
> check this out:
>
> http://www.snopes.com/politics/soapbox/rooney.asp
>
> Not an urban legend or false attribution!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Great piece,
thanks Jim for posting the link.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3629. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:09:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304241909.151fc249@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65766

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA7ECA9.4099D27F@earthlink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:

Brilliant stroke that last post was . . (?!)

> I enjoy hitting the smaller hamfests in eastern Ohio, West Virginia and
> in western PA. I'm going to go to the Breezeshooters hamfest in Butler,
> PA in June.
>
> > Field Day is
> > just two months away.

Ugggg!

>
> The local ARES group wanted N8NN and I to join their effort but I think
> Bert wants to do another two op effort from out here on the hilltop.

I got leaned on to work with the local group last year, "we really
need cw ops". "Yeah, well here's some code practice tapes, enjoy."
Sheesh . .

> That puts us only 600 feet away from the kitchen, beds and a shower.
> We'll likely use his call this year since we used mine last year. We'll
> use his Yaesu "Field" once again as the Orion is staying safely indoors.

Yeah, use the throwaway gear.

I'm planning on running single op from one of my daughters' back yards
out in the far 'burbs. I tried it last year but the 940 went kaput two
contacts after the start. At least I have the lines already in the
trees. And a new radio.

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

3630. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:10:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424231024.18769.00000181@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 65779

In article <JbIpa.45$yp4.18@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Dan, Dan, Dan ...
>
>Question: Is phasing worse? Are you sure? Carrier suppression wouldn't be
>nearly as important as unwanted sideband suppression. Check out some of the
>QST articles over the past few years. The reality may well be that with
>digital processing, that quadrature phasing may well be held more tightly
>with DSP than with analog components. The RF quadrature (at least for one
>frequency, or a small frequency spread) would be easy. It may turn out that
>we could get better suppression with phasing. Then again, the two methods
>might just be combined.

A breakthrough in broadband single sideband phasing modulation
and demodulation happened with Mike Gingell's PhD thesis in the
UK (1975, University of London Faculty of Engineering), his
"polyphase" network. Gingell is now living the US, has the US
amateur license KN4BS (was N4VQP).

The Gingell network values were refined by Tetsuo Yoshida,
JA1KO, and that can be seen in QEX, June 1995.

RF quadrature generation can be done relatively easy with a
pair of chained flip-flops clocked at four times the local
oscillator frequency. That is done by Dan Tayloe's very low-
insertion-loss mixer (patented) using a CMOS quad switch IC.
The Tayloe Mixer also has very low intermodulation, better
than nearly all conventional diode mixer configurations.

All of those were incorporated into a homebrew HF receiver
designed by Hans Summers, G0UPL, and is described on his
website www.hanssummers.com complete with photos as
well as schematics and other descriptions. Unwanted
sideband suppression is greater than 40 db by measurement
of the receiver...since the method is bilateral, SSB generation
can achieve the same unwanted sideband suppression and
the Tayloe Mixer can suppress the carrier so far that great
care in layout is required to see near the ultimate value of such.

The improved/refined Gingell polyphase network by
can result in four very accurate quadrature audio phases over
an audio bandpass that can reach "high fidelity" bandwidths.
The Yoshida network values can use 2 to 5 percent component
values for this very close quadrature over a wide bandwidth, much
better than previous quadrature methods.

See also Harry Lythall's (SM0VPO) website, for a couple of examples of SSB by polyphase networks. If for nothing else, I recommend his "Frequently Asked Silly Questions" collection from his website's "Start" section. Hilarious! For some other examples in Europe, see SM6LKM's site or that of Aleksandre Stare (S57NAN). Note: There is a great deal of innovation going on in European amateur radio today compared to what is publicized in the US.

Combining known modern-day analog and digital techniques can result in almost any desired bandwidth for the common amateur radio modes. The only limits are the regulations' limits in each administrations' civil radio regulating agency.

3631. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:10:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424231025.18769.00000182@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 65769

In article <f45722ac.0304240225.6fb12177@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> I knew he wasn't capable of original thought.
>>
>> Steve
>
>Now you're stealing my work. I said that about Heil a couple of weeks
>ago when he started posting Jim's work.

There are two standards in here: Morsemen Extras and everyone
else.

Morsemen Extras can do anything they wish without impunity.
They are gods of radio...never do anything wrong. They do not
plagiarize the divine words of other gods of radio.

Everyone else is subject to rule, judgement, berating, denigrating
as the gods of radio wish at the moment. [So, what else is new?]

3632. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:10:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424231026.18769.00000183@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 65771

In article <f45722ac.0304231441.662963c@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> What is the difference? Service members then requested and received or
>> were denied written permission to put an amateur radio station on the
>> air.
>
>Exactly. Your operation was denied. Mine was permitted. But you say
>you would have operated anyway and disposed of your written order not
>to operate, then lie about it. I think that's the difference between
>you and me.
>
>> Service members now request and receive or are denied written permission
>> to put an amateur radio station on the air.
>>
>> The only anomaly seems to be you in Somalia.
>
>Permission was granted.
>
>No anomaly. No destroyed paperwork. No lies.
>
>You must have belonged to a different ethical era.

He was an employee of the Department of State of the USA.

That alone should explain it...

3633. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:10:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424231027.18769.00000184@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 65773

In article <d22b54c3.0304240609.60113f8d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>I forgot to ship his white sheet. I can't find him in QRZ.com for some
>reason, does anybody here have his address?

It's the same as it was on many bylines in HAM RADIO magazine:

Leonard H. Anderson
10048 Lanark Street
Sun Valley, California 91352

>Or maybe Dick can drop it
>off on him during his pass thru LA. Maybe Dick can also run a gonads
>check while he's there.

Kellie and the dickiebird seem to have a perverted sense of
sexuality and biology all tied up with morsemanship.

It must be the hours and hours of sitting still, mesmerized by
all that catatonic concentration in trying to work the "weak ones."
After a while they do the Zen thing and become One with the
QRN and QRM. They lose touch with reality while imagining
themselves to be radio gods. Poor things...

3634. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:10:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424231028.18769.00000185@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 65775

In article <3EA73521.2090207@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

> Seriously? Haw, if so, I was taken in. Wouldn't be the first time tho'.
>
> I wonder why all disaster services don't use cell phones?

They do. Disaster services use a variety of different forms of
radio communications.

Too many amateurs think there are only two kinds of radios,
theirs and cell phones. That's tunnel-vision thinking. There are
many different kinds of radios (other than amateur) used every
day by public service agencies and their workers...and radios
used every day by utility services and their workers...and radios
used every day by businesses and those workers other than
CB and short-range unlicensed fast-food-stand portables.

ALL of those could be coordinated into disaster planning.

3635. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:10:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424231028.18769.00000186@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 65776

In article <20030423185134.19022.00000372@mb-m16.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: "Kjay" jayb100001@yahoo.com
>
>>Sorry Mike.....
>>It was an advertisment for local pre-paid cellular dealership.
>>She reached over and grabbed a Nokia cell phone to call for help.
>>It was not an HT.
>
>Thats what I was saying. It could have been part of an ad for something else.
>The person said he did not see the whole ad.
>Don't assume the ad is for amateur radio. I've never seen an amateur radio ad
>on tv, so I would not assume the ad was for amateur radio.

What Mike was doing was no different than repeating some story told by a friend who had heard something from another...and doing some creative imagination to change the original context.

Doing that in here is an example of desperate straw-grabbing in order to win some kind of imaginged message points.

Unfortunately, a lot of that straw-grabbing goes on in here. :-)

Morsemen need lots of straw to reproduce their kind of strawmen.

There MIGHT have been a public service advertisement on a local TV cable service SOMEPLACE at around 3 AM or so at the lowest ad rate time. If there is such an happening, it would be immediately puffed up, glorified, clad in the best Newington bunting, and paraded around as "publicity on national television for the entire public!"

:-)

3636. Re: internet voice gateways - taking your handheld overseas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:10:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424231029.18769.00000187@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 65770

In article <3EA70C78.3080307@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX wrote:
>> Now I know where tune-a-fish comes from! How do ya tuna fish?? :)
>
> I give up, how do you tuna fish (I just know I'm going to regret this!
8^)

Practice your scales...

3637. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:10:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424231030.18769.00000188@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 65772

In article <vqHpa.404$X32.442879@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>How can you possibly make such a judgement for another person? The EE may
>very well have a multitude of interests that would fit very nicely with ham
>radio.

Morsemen make such judgements almost with every breath.

Love morse code and one is an exemplary human being.

Dislike morse code and one is inferior, filth, not fit to live.

That's the "judgement" style of morsemen.

>There is everything from homebrew to digital communications to the
>development of new modes.

Number one on the morsemen's hit parade of superior amateurism
is morse code ability.

>And that's just a bare sampling of the technical
>aspect. Then of course there is the community service aspect. How can you
>assume that a EE would not be interested?

Tsk, tsk, tsk. I've been working with EEs since 1956 and been one
for not quite that long. MOST of them aren't that interested.

How can you expect electronics professionals working in advanced
electronics and radio to idolize and revere standards and practices
in radio that were frozen in place since before WW2?

>You are continuing to limit other people's interests and activities to those
>that you think they should care about.

No problem. The Morsemen think that everyone SHOULD love
and respect morse code skill in US amateur radio over and above
anything else in that hobby. [see Gang of Four output]

Ordinarily, in any other venue, that would be called hypocrisy.
In amateur radio it seems to be something else... :-)

3638. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:10:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424231031.18769.00000189@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 65768

In article <f45722ac.0304240210.514f4781@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0304231253.1f414019@posting.google.com>...
>
>> I do Putz and that's all you were, a RE rack babysitter.
>>
>> :-) :-)
>
>I got a tour of an aircraft carrier once. Doesn't mean I was in the Navy.
>
>You didn't even make the rear echelon.

Okay, we can strike the "RE" part but the "MF" still applies to
Kellie... :-)

3639. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:10:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424231032.18769.00000191@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 65767

In article <3EA740A5.C44DE5C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030422172300.18755.00000183@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> > In article <d22b54c3.0304221127.67a7ba0c@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>
>> > I accept money for services performed. That's the primary
>> > definition of "professional."
>>
>> You'll be a "professional" when garbage collectors are considered
>> professionals.
>
>There's a group of ladies who hang out on the streets of Wheeling
>Island. Like Len, they accept money for services performed. They are
>truly professionals.

I don't know any "Wheeling Island." You do. Are you a regular
customer there or just visit there once in a while?

3640. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:10:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424231032.18769.00000190@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 65774

In article <f45722ac.0304240204.48ee5aab@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:<b87o42vqb0@208.207.71.129>...
>> N2EY wrote:
>>
>> > > I'll call you anything in-person, face-to-face, that I care to call
you.
>> > > No "fear" at all.
>> >
>> > Big brave words from a continent away.
>>
>> Ya mighta noticed how quiet he got awhile back when I mentioned, while
>dressing him down over another of his
>> favorite rants where he denys the now-defunct Interstate Police CW net
>ever even iexisted, that I had been in
>> his area the previous week......
>> He's got gonads the size of watermelons when you're a K miles away.
>Somehow they seem to disappear when he
>> perceives any possible "threat".
>>
>> No CW Testicles indeed.
>
>Are you saying that you want to meet up and fight?

It would seem that dickiebird overdosed on testosterone
supplements again. :-)

3641. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:10:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424231035.18769.00000192@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 65777

In article <d22b54c3.0304231455.2d0c1c92@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
>news:<20030422194515.19022.00000496@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> From N2EY
>>
>> > At a basic
>> >level, fingerspelling could be considered an "encoding scheme" for the
>> >alphabet and numbers, while the word signs could be considered an
>> >"encoding scheme" for common words.
>>
>> There's anohter example of symbol encoding.
>>
>> >But ASL and other sign languages
>> >are much more than encoding schemes.
>>
>> Like how?
>>
>> ---
>> Also note, there is a need for sign language. It is used to communicate for
>> handicapped people. Morse code has not such use. Also, hardware can encode
>and
>> decode Morse code symbols so people don't have to.
>
>
>Here's some more light on the subject(s)at hand:
>
>"The term CW, short for Continuous Wave is a little misleading. A
>continuous wave is normally a 'carrier on' situation, with no
>modulation present on the carrier. Voice is for instance a carrier
>modulated signal. The continuous wave signal is keyed in an 'on and
>off' in the rhythm of the morse code. Some use the term CW meaning
>sending the Morse code. Others call it just Morse. CW or Morse is
>considered to be - don't be shocked - a fuzzy mode <fuzzy_modes.htm>.
>It is not coded, rather it is a natural language. The signal is read
>from the receiver without any change to time of arrival of data or
>content of data. Computer reception of Morse, which requires
>electronic decisions, must always perform worse than a human expert.
>If you can handle Morse and have tried out one or more of the
>available Morse decoders you know that this is true. Another reason
>that the human 'interface' is quite superior to the different Morse
>decoders is that the brain, when receiving Morse, can also filter out
>the required signal amidst a number of other Morse transmissions,

>often having a different pitch."
>
>From http://home.zonnet.nl/fvaneeuwen/cw.htm

Kellie, you're supposed to be this hotshot engineer with all the experience in court...can't you write a single paragraph of your own without quoting someone else? :-)

3642. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:10:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030424231037.18769.00000193@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 65778

In article <d22b54c3.0304231428.45a87a17@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message >news:<20030423141042.18770.00000178@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0304230406.7afb887e@posting.google.com>, >kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >> Also note, there is a need for sign language. It is used to communicate >for
>> >> handicapped people. Morse code has not such use. Also, hardware can >encode
>> and
>> >> decode Morse code symbols so people don't have to.
>> >
>> >Boy you have the rank newbie syndrome written all over your posts.
>>
>> Ooopsie, one of the Gang of Four took both vitamins and
>> caffeine in large doses in order to reply.
>>
>> >My youngest daughter is an occupational therapist who worked in the
>> >field of adaptive engineering before she moved into her current
>> >consulting practice.
>>
>> Good message-point slam-dunk, Kellie!
>>
>> Anything anyone says from this point on is taken as a "personal
>> insult" to your daughter!
>
>And there's another typical Putz The Low Life comment.

Tsk, tsk, tsk... :-)

>> >On two occasions when she was in her former mode
>> >she outfitted two extremely disabled patients with the ability to
>> >communicate with their outside worlds with Morse with both the
>> >equipment she cobbled together with the help of an MSEE biomedical
>> >engineer and her training of the patients and their caregivers in the
>> >use of Morse. These were not breakthroughs in OT, it had been done
>> >many times previously.
>>
>> How many "times?" "Lots?"
>
>Maybe bunches, maybe a flock, take yer pick . . why?

A frock of wild turkeys? A pride in lyins? :-)

Kellie, that's a real tear-jerker story which is right in there with
the jerker whose son was behind the lines in Iraq in 1991
sending intel out via morse. That gets you a condescending
"uh-huh" while everyone waits for the white-coat guys to come
take you away.

You may be one step away from a geniatrics ward yourself
but I don't seriously believe you or any relative is going to
"teach morse code" to diabled elderly folks, especially
those with Alzheimer's symptoms.

You will protest the heck of that and transmit more names,
but I wouldn't be disappointed if your next post claims you
taught Ted McElroy everything he knew about morse.

>> Is that any kind of quantification like all those "26 patents" that
>> boiled down to just ONE?
>
>Putzie 'Ole Bean, if you're gonna continue in your role as the RRAP
>bufoon you really do need to come up with new material at least once
>in awhile. Ya wore that one out years ago. It was two related patents
>Putz, you missed one.

Delusions again, faulty memory. From the Patent Gazeteer to the
Delphion, Kellie has ONLY ONE patent and that is as co-inventor.
The current ONE repleaced the previous TWO which were superseded
by the current one.

Anyone can go look at www.delphion.com and do the serarch, find
out the same. You keep on denying it but the third-party sites
haven't changed anything.

>Bullshit. Try using it to copy a Morse station 300Hz away from another
>Morse station which is 20dB stronger in a band with any noise content.
>Piece of cake by ear, dismal failure with a "decoder". Been there Putz
>so cut yer shit.

Did your last hoagie give you a tummy ache or did you, too, over-
dose on testosterone supplements?

I described somebody else's program development that was done
just for intellectual kicks by a programmer. I never claimed it would
drag all the imaginary signals out from below the noise floor. It did
manage to work through some adjacent signals received by my
Icom receiver loaned for the final experimental trials. It could handle
a wide variation of rates as well as dot-dash ratios and discriminate
against some, not all, interference bursts. That was demonstrated
in front of two morsemen who confirmed the decoding on the screen
from their real-time aural decoding of the signal.

The Icom IC-R70 had the standard 2.5 KHz BW crystal filter so it
put out all the other noise garbage and adjacent signals within

that bandwidth. During the demo with the morsemen present, only one signal appeared to have a morse code rate of 40 WPM, while all others didn't top 30 WPM. The program could handle 90 WPM equivalent maximum, a dash:dot ratio of 2:1 to 4:1 at any rate. Character and "word" spacings were also flexible but I don't remember the exact ranges...those worked within bounds determined by the rate detection interpretation.

That program was worked out around 1988 to 1989. It had NO good market application then, still doesn't, and was strictly just a programmer's own exercise in trying out some ideas. It worked, was demonstrated to Real Morsemen, and that was that.

The Real Morsemen "didn't like it," but then they got to arguing between themselves on which of them was "better." Typical. :-)

>> But...Real Hams work DX on HF with CW.
>
>Welp then I guess I'm just not a real ham since I have an SSB DXCC.

As an amateur extra I worked with years ago said, "Ham is the butchered meat of swine." :-)

Congratulations on being considered intelligible in speech at 100 locations. Raise small flag. Everyone salute. Pin medal.

3643. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:14:25 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304241914.1752c859@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65780

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030424142612.04525.00000042@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <3EA7ECA9.4099D27F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:

> >I enjoy hitting the smaller hamfests in eastern Ohio, West Virginia and
> >in western PA. I'm going to go to the Breezeshooters hamfest in Butler,
> >PA in June.
>
> Where's that calendar?

Timonium July 27.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3644. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:20:35 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304241920.4a772e45@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65781

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030424142611.04525.00000041@mb-m29.aol.com>...

> >> Run out of Nazi material?
> >
> >I forgot to ship his white sheet. I can't find him in QRZ.com for some
> >reason, does anybody here have his address?
>
> Check out his comments to the FCC on 98-143. ECFS page on FCC website. The
> mighty professional had to send FCC paper copies and a disk because he couldn't
> figger out how to send them electronically. Also waited until the very last
> minute before the January 15 deadline, effectively cutting off reply comments
> before the deadline.

Yeah, but he can't pull that crap here huh?

> >Or maybe Dick can drop it
> >off on him during his pass thru LA.
>
> Bed Bath and Beyond is right down the road from here.

No way, there's a Salvation Army outlet in Collingdale.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3645. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:32:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA8AC4A.48A267C3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65782

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA74736.9086D28A@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA6996F.9924B62E@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA60E66.1BFB0B07@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > > > > If your permission was denied then you couldn't operate.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Incorrect. I could have operated at any time.
> > > > > >
> > > > > But you were ordered not to. Doesn't that mean you could not operate
> > > > > amateur radio?
> > > > > >
> > > > > That's what it means to me, at least.
> > > > >
> > > > I wasn't ordered not to do anything, Brian. I was notified that my
> > > > request was denied.
> > >
> > > Then, obviously, you couldn't operate. Why do you say that you could?
> >
> > Because I can do anything if I'm willing to accept the consequences.
>
> Superman. Superiorman. Smugman. PCTA will give you a pass.

Anyone on the planet can do anything he likes if he is willing to accept
the possbile consequences.

> > > > > If caught operating,
> > > > > > especially after having asked for permission and being denied, I'd have
> > > > > > had to suffer the consequences. If not caught, I could have just
> > > > > > claimed that my commander gave me verbal permission.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Didn't your commander deny your request in writing?
> > > > >
> > > > He certainly did. If I operated and was not caught at it, I could
> > > > simply toss the written denial of my request and claim that I had verbal
> > > > permission. If I'd been nabbed, I would have suffered the consequences.

> > >
> > > But that would be illegal operation and unethical action on your part.
> >
> > Yes it would have been, had I actually operated. I didn't.
>
> Good thing. After that French 6M stuff, you otta try to keep your
> nose clean.

That's moronic. I broke no Tanzanian regs and I'm not responsible for
the actions of French hams.

> > > Why would you even think it?
> >
> > I can think about anything I like. Consequences only result from
> > actions, not thought.
>
> But if you keep dwelling on them...

If I keep dwelling on them, what?

> Oh, hey, go ask Jimmy Carter about his thoughts.

I don't know Jimmy Carter and I don't think much of him.

> > > > > That must be the difference between Vietnam Era vets and the rest.
> > > > >
> > > > > What is the difference? Service members then requested and received or
> > > > > were denied written permission to put an amateur radio station on the
> > > > > air.
> > > >
> > > > Exactly. Your operation was denied. Mine was permitted.
> > >
> > > You have nothing to offer which confirms that claim. I don't believe
> > > you.
> >
> > And you've offered -nothing- that proves your Vietnam operation didn't
> > take place.

No, I don't. Then again, I needn't attempt the proof of a negative.

> > > But you say
> > > you would have operated anyway and disposed of your written order not
> > > to operate, then lie about it. I think that's the difference between
> > > you and me.
> > >
> > > Get real. I didn't operate and never claimed to.
> >
> > Prove it.

I needn't attempt proof of a negative.

> Your envy of those who could operate was readily apparent in your
> posting of your snack bar days.

I posted nothing about me and a snack bar.

> > > Service members now request and receive or are denied written permission
> > > > to put an amateur radio station on the air.
> > > >
> > > > The only anomaly seems to be you in Somalia.
> > >
> > > Permission was granted.
> >
> > ..and you can offer what as proof of your claim?
> >
> > > No anomaly. No destroyed paperwork. No lies.
> >
> > We have no way of knowing what took place. You have nothing to back
> > your statements.
>
> Nor do you. And I don't believe you. You're just not credible.

I needn't attempt proof of a negative. You, on the other hand, are
faced with the opposite situation.

> > > You must have belonged to a different ethical era.
> >
> > That what you stated earlier. Then again, you have no way of backing
> > any of your statements. Tough luck, kid.
>
> You're the one who thought up tossing your orders not to operate, then
> lie about it. That's the work of a devious mind. And it's all here
> on rrap.

What are you babbling about, Brian?

> Prove you didn't operate. If anyone will believe you.

How does one prove a negative, Brian? You're still twisting in the wind
over your alleged T5 permission.

Dave K8MN

3646. Re: New newsgroup name

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:37:26 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <2ebhavo1u897bgg7ktdkr0s46hm88bb70f@4ax.com>
Source record: 65783

On Thu, 24 Apr 2003 11:59:13 -0500, "Kevin Muenzler, WB5RUE"
<wb5rue@yahoo.com> wrote:

>I've been away from this newsgroup for many years and decided to take a peak
>back in. You know, nothing has changed. There is very little in the way of
>substantive discussion going on. It's little more than arguing and name
>calling...and by the same people. I vote that we change the name of this
>group to rec.radio.amateur.childisharguments
>
>eh?
>
>Kevin, WB5RUE

I prefer the name rec.radio.cbwannabes

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

3647. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:40:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA8AEAF.A4B46A46@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65784

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA355AE.9FE825E9@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA18089.68A200CB@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA088A4.B011F968@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA00DCE.6709A863@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdi8aza.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...

> > > > Sure I do. Further, I think he's already in the game.
> > > >
> > > You think Phil's in the service and you think he's deployed to Iraq?
> > > You might want to check with him on that.
> > >
> > I don't think he's in the military or in Iraq.
>
> Yet you think he has a valuable contribution to make concerning the
> military operation in Iraq?

I think he has valueable input on the use of the ham bands by military
personnel in Iraq. I wouldn't argue the regs with Phil.

> Kimd of opems the gates to Lem, doesm't imt?

Len isn't in the military, isn't in Iraq, isn't an attorney, wasn't with
the FCC and isn't a ham. Except for those things, I'm sure he has
tremendous knowledge of the matter under discussion.

> > > > > And I don't think Phil considers himself my mentor.
> > > > >
> > > > I don't consider Phil as your mentor either. Phil is a rational man.
> > > > Your mentor is the non-participant in amateur radio who frequently posts
> > > > here.
> > > >

> > > Then you need to make yourself clear.
> >
> > I did. You needed clarification due to your reading comprehension
> > difficulty.
>
> You didn't.

You're right. I didn't need clarification.

> > So you say. No one has stepped up to confirm the tale of your alleged
> > operation.
>
> Nor is it likely they will. It was a relatively small operation. Not
> many combattants involved, and Willy kept it small. Sort of like a
> NEO on a little American Embassy. Happens all the time.

Then it should be easy for you to find someone who can confirm your
tale.

> I operated legally.

So you tell us. There is nothing or no one to confirm what you say.

Seems like you're SOL.

How so?

Dave K8MN

3648. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:47:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA8B053.D1082642@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65785

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA7ECA9.4099D27F@earthlink.net>...

> >
> > The local ARES group wanted N8NN and I to join their effort but I think
> > Bert wants to do another two op effort from out here on the hilltop.
>
> I got leaned on to work with the local group last year, "we really
> need cw ops". "Yeah, well here's some code practice tapes, enjoy."
> Sheesh . .

Our ARES gang had five stations last year and managed 200 CW QSOs in 24
hours. They could use the help. I was actually leaning toward it but I
think Bert wants to see how much we can better last year's effort out
here.

> > That puts us only 600 feet away from the kitchen, beds and a shower.
> > We'll likely use his call this year since we used mine last year. We'll
> > use his Yaesu "Field" once again as the Orion is staying safely indoors.
>
> Yeah, use the throwaway gear.

I'm not going to bite the hand that brings the rig. Last year I brought
the tuner, furnished the generator, dragged along the Vibroplex Iambic
and operated.
>
> I'm planning on running single op from one of my daughters' back yards
> out in the far 'burbs. I tried it last year but the 940 went kaput two
> contacts after the start. At least I have the lines already in the
> trees. And a new radio.

...and you'll be close to the kitchen, toilet, shower and a bed.

Dave K8MN

3649. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 03:53:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA8B196.DACE9FE5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65786

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0304231441.662963c@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> What is the difference? Service members then requested and received or
> >> were denied written permission to put an amateur radio station on the
> >> air.
> > >
> > >Exactly. Your operation was denied. Mine was permitted. But you say
> > >you would have operated anyway and disposed of your written order not
> > >to operate, then lie about it. I think that's the difference between
> > >you and me.
> > >
> > >> Service members now request and receive or are denied written permission
> > >> to put an amateur radio station on the air.
> > >>
> > >> The only anomaly seems to be you in Somalia.
> > >
> > >Permission was granted.
> > >
> > >No anomaly. No destroyed paperwork. No lies.
> > >
> > >You must have belonged to a different ethical era.
>
> He was an employee of the Department of State of the USA.
>
> That alone should explain it...

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

3650. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 04:01:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA8B372.F20602CD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65787

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EA740A5.C44DE5C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian Kelly wrote:
> >>
> >> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030422172300.18755.00000183@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >> > In article <d22b54c3.0304221127.67a7ba0c@posting.google.com>,
> >kelly@dvol.com
> >>
> >> > I accept money for services performed. That's the primary
> >> > definition of "professional."
> >>
> >> You'll be a "professional" when garbage collectors are considered
> >> professionals.
> >>
> >There's a group of ladies who hang out on the streets of Wheeling
> >Island. Like Len, they accept money for services performed. They are
> >truly professionals.
>
> I don't know any "Wheeling Island." You do.

Yes, I do. Everyone who lives in the area is familiar with Wheeling
Island.

> Are you a regular
> customer there or just visit there once in a while?

I didn't write anything about being a customer. Yes, I have occasion to
be on Wheeling Island and have been known to drive with my eyes open.

When you show up for the lost person drill, after we've arranged your
rescue from Wildcat Hollow, I'll drop you at Wheeling Downs. It is on
the island. I'm sure the girls will have a great time discussing
professionalism.

Dave K8MN

3651. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 04:16:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030425001646.04903.00000077@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 65788

>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 4/24/2003 5:19 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304241419.4a02254a@posting.google.com>

>I've got a nose. You don't.

I've got a nose AND the hose!

You loose!

Steve

3652. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 04:18:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030425001852.04903.00000078@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 65789

>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/24/2003 10:10 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030424231031.18769.00000189@mb-m20.aol.com>

>Okay, we can strike the "RE" part but the "MF" still applies to
> Kellie

Still with the profanity...insinuated if not verbatim.

What a L-O-S-E-R ! ! ! !

3653. Re: Facts About Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 04:34:12 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8bkg5$80rdi$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 65851

And everyone fell for the "trolling" yet once more..... Dontcha all know
that is what he wants, a reaction??

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:Se0qa.872$X32.859349@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> You are overreacting to some idiots. Don't let them bias you against
those
> who like code. Sweeping generalities are usually wrong. I know a lot of
> people into code AND into community service.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> "Steve Fleckenstein" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> wrote in message
> news:_fQpa.535$WL3.12@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net...
> > I'm a no code tech.
> >
> > I'm also the County ARES/RACES EC/RO
> >
> > and the county Skywarn Coordinator.
> >
> >
> > The code boyz are just too too too busy working contests to bother with
> > helping their fellow man.
> >
> > --
> >
> >
> > >> Remove "zz" from e-mail address to direct reply. <<
> >
> >
> >
> > "The Code Man" <codeman@codefoever.com> wrote in message
> > news:b87h6404o@enews3.newsguy.com...
> > > Know code = Know Ham
> > > No code = no ham
> > >
> > > The eternal truth, proven every day.
> > >

> > > Moan CBers, moan.
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

3654. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 04:44:18 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8bkg7$80rdi$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 65852

That would definitely get them to upgrade at least to the General class level, for those that want HF priviliges.
The main point I was sort of getting at was if certain people hold getting upgrades as the only priority one should have, then a structure should be set up to coerce that into happening.

The way I look at it is, if a person wants the privileges they will earn them. If they don't, well, that is up to them. In my case, even if I had shot right up to extra class, the privileges afforded of that level of licensure are not anything I have the ability to enjoy in my life. For about the past 12 months and most likely the next 12-18 months, my useage is skimming close to the "inactive" status due to my schedule. (Not as many people to communicate with during the hours I am up..... damned third shifter here.)

Each person has their own individual reasons for what they want to enjoy out of ham radio, and that should be respected.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0304240359330.382@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Wed, 23 Apr 2003, Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX wrote:
> > Let the Novice class go, ...
> >
> > As far as semantics of naming of the license class, why not make the
> > following apply in the meantime?
> >
> > Extra Class=1st Class Amateur Radio license
> > Advanced Class=2nd Class " "
> > General Class=3rd Class " "
> > Tech with Code=4th Class
> > Tech w/o Code=5th Class
> > Novice Class=6th Class
>
> Why not this:
> Extra = 1st. Advanced OR General = 2nd. Tech (all kinds) = 3rd.
> Novice - NO RENEWALS. Eliminate HF for Tech+
>
> Now THAT will get them to upgrade! :-)

3655. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 04:49:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b8aeplqaj0@208.207.71.171>
Source record: 65790

Dave Heil wrote:

>
> That's moronic.

That would probably be because a moron did it.

3656. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 06:01:58 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304242201.311a83b8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65791

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030424214941.18769.00000180@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> In article <5f4fe4c2.0304221231.30166900@posting.google.com>,
> horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:
>
> >> Well, who said that Morse Code was a growth industry? Granted, there
> >> seem to be more products for helping people learn the Morse Code now
> >> than at any other time in history. As another poster observed, the
> >> interest in QRP caused by new, off-the-shelf QRP rigs like the Yaesu
> >> FT-817 is making CW more popular than ever. And now that we're on
> >> the downside of the current solar cycle, using these rigs will be more
> >> dependant on CW than ever.
> >
> >Nah - the FT-817 makes a GREAT 6m rig... and CW on 6m is about as
> >popular as a stinky sock.
>
> Hmmm -- I was hardly aware of the sudden popularity of stinky socks!
>
> On 6 meters, the ONLY DX contacts I've EVER had have been on CW!
>
> BTW I'm contemplating the purchase of an FT-817 myself. Anyone have
> a recommendation for a good portable antenna tuner?

http://www.ldgelectronics.com/z-11.html

Can't miss.

> 73 de Larry, K3LT

w3rv

3657. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 09:42:50 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030425054250.24185.00000079@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 65792

>Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 4/24/03 6:19 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304241419.4a02254a@posting.google.com>
>
>nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
>news:<20030424065151.08447.00000002@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Morse code proficiency speed
>> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>> >Date: 4/24/03 12:10 AM Eastern Daylight Time
>> >Message-id: <b87o42vqb0@208.207.71.129>
>>
>> > He's got gonads the size of watermelons when you're a K miles away.
>> >Somehow they seem to disappear when he
>> >perceives any possible "threat".
>> >
>> > No CW Testicles indeed.
>>
>> HEY! I resemble that remark! ;-) ;-)
>> >
>> Yes, Len, I said I was going to stop using this screen name. But I didn't
>say
>> when. ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-)
>
>;^)
>
>I've got a nose. You don't.
>
"My dog has no nose"

"How does he smell?"

"Terrible!"

3658. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 10:30:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304250230.147f33da@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65793

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<b89gkt$1gf$1@208.206.142.107>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304231253.1f414019@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > I do Putz and that's all you were, a RE rack babysitter.
> > >
> > > :-) :-)
> >
> > I got a tour of an aircraft carrier once. Doesn't mean I was in the Navy.
>
> And I'm sure millions of former and current swabbies are thanking their lucky stars.

Then they shouldn't have invited me to join their Chief's group.

> > You didn't even make the rear echelon.
>
> Sorry PAL, he was a primary force in *building* the darn thing. You were another one of
the weather
> guessers.

In the age of smart bombs, you need even smarter weathermen. But even
the weatherman of your era did a pretty darned good job at Normandy.

3659. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 10:46:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304250246.2c44401e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65794

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA88BCF.5CE484FB@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA745BC.812CA210@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA69B4D.7049664@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA60FCD.C76D3BBF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA214A5.999E7538@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > In article <f45722ac.0304190500.7cfb962@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> > > > > > > > > > >He could not operate amateur radio in Vietnam.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > I'd heard he might have been a snow-removal supervisor for
> > > > > > > > > > > the runways at Tan Son Hut...but that's probably just a rumor.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Just for the record, Len, where is Tan Son Hut?
>
> > > > > > > > > Most people would say its in Vietnam (Ho Chi Minh City/Tan Son Nhat).
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > No, I don't believe they would.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Where do you and Wonder Boy put it?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I wouldn't put it anywhere. There is no Tan Son Hut and there is no Tan
> > > > > > > > Son Nhat.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > There isn't? Must be a big conspiracy.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Then why did the International Civil Aviation Authority issue it VVTS?
> > > > > >
> > > > > To be specific, the Saigon civil airport was named Ton Son Nhat.
> > > > > The U.S. air base was Ton Son Nhut. Tan Son Hut must be a Nuoc Mam

> > > > > scented snack bar outside the air field. U.S. military personnel had
> > > > > nothing to do with Tan Son Nhat.
> > > > >
> > > > > I was never assigned to a place called "Tan Son Nhat" or a place called
> > > > > "Tan Son Hut".
>
> > > >
> > > > Neither was I, but I can find it on a map. And its in Vietnam.
> > >
> > Your attention is directed to the statement Leomard H. Amdersom wrote
> > about me.
> >
> Then -why- do you continue to engage me on the topic?
>
I believe you have it backward. ?nairB ,cixelsyd ouy erA.
>
NM8K evaD

Now you're forging other people's call signs. Shame!

3660. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 10:56:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304250256.13e59326@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65795

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA8AEAF.A4B46A46@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA355AE.9FE825E9@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA18089.68A200CB@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA088A4.B011F968@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA00DCE.6709A863@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdi8aza.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
>
> > > > > > Sure I do. Further, I think he's already in the game.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You think Phil's in the service and you think he's deployed to Iraq?
> > > > > > You might want to check with him on that.
> > > > >
> > > > > I don't think he's in the military or in Iraq.
> > >
> > > Yet you think he has a valuable contribution to make concerning the
> > > military operation in Iraq?
>
> I think he has valueable input on the use of the ham bands by military
> personnel in Iraq. I wouldn't argue the regs with Phil.

And the PCTA Double Standard pops up yet again.

> > Kimd of opems the gates to Lem, doesm't imt?
>
> Len isn't in the military, isn't in Iraq, isn't an attorney, wasn't with
> the FCC and isn't a ham. Except for those things, I'm sure he has
> tremendous knowledge of the matter under discussion.

And the PCTA Double Standard pops up yet again.

> > > > > > And I don't think Phil considers himself my mentor.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I don't consider Phil as your mentor either. Phil is a rational man.
> > > > > > Your mentor is the non-participant in amateur radio who frequently posts
> > > > > > here.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Then you need to make yourself clear.
> > > >
> > > I did. You needed clarification due to your reading comprehension
> > > difficulty.
> > >
> > You didn't.
>
> You're right. I didn't need clarification.

You must. You referred to Phil as my mentor.

> > > So you say. No one has stepped up to confirm the tale of your alleged
> > > operation.
> > >
> > Nor is it likely they will. It was a relatively small operation. Not
> > many combattants involved, and Willy kept it small. Sort of like a
> > NEO on a little American Embassy. Happens all the time.
>
> Then it should be easy for you to find someone who can confirm your
> tale.

I'll do that at the next reunion.

> > I operated legally.
>
> So you tell us. There is nothing or no one to confirm what you say.

Sure there are. You just don't know them, so they don't exist to you.
>
> Seems like you're SOL.
>
> How so?

Hollow accusations.

3661. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 11:39:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BACE96BE.17AFB%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 65796

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> Too many amateurs think there are only two kinds of
> radios, theirs and cell phones. That's tunnel-vision
> thinking. There are many different kinds of radios
> (other than amateur) used every day by public service
> agencies and their workers...and radios used every
> day by utility services and their workers...and radios
> used every day by businesses and those workers other
> than CB and short-range unlicensed fast-food-stand
> portables.
>
> ALL of those could be coordinated into disaster
> planning.

Not always possible. During and following a serious disaster, the radios used by public service agencies are often overwhelmed, utility services are often using their radios to deal with repairs, the repeaters used by business radios often have no power, and unpredictable noise and interference often makes CB virtually useless.

That leaves only ham radio with a pool of licensed operators with equipment capable of reliable local or even national coverage, the frequencies, and the regulatory mandate, to truly handle supplemental communications following a disaster.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3662. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 14:20:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030425102047.04942.00000128@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 65797

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: Dwight Stewart stewart@say.net
>Date: 4/25/2003 6:39 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <BACE96BE.17AFB%stewart@say.net>

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>> Too many amateurs think there are only two kinds of
>> radios, theirs and cell phones. That's tunnel-vision
>> thinking. There are many different kinds of radios
>> (other than amateur) used every day by public service
>> agencies and their workers...and radios used every
>> day by utility services and their workers...and radios
>> used every day by businesses and those workers other
>> than CB and short-range unlicensed fast-food-stand
>> portables.
>>
>> ALL of those could be coordinated into disaster
>> planning.
>
>
> Not always possible. During and following a serious disaster, the radios
>used by public service agencies are often overwhelmed, utility services are
>often using their radios to deal with repairs, the repeaters used by
>business radios often have no power, and unpredictable noise and
>interference often makes CB virtually useless.
>
> That leaves only ham radio with a pool of licensed operators with
>equipment capable of reliable local or even national coverage, the
>frequencies, and the regulatory mandate, to truly handle supplemental
>communications following a disaster.

Too simple, too much common sense, and a fact repeated over and over...In
other words, you wasted your time with facts on a creep who won't accept the
facts.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3663. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 14:26:48 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304250626.2badc953@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65798

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA8B053.D1082642@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >

> Our ARES gang had five stations last year and managed 200 CW QSOs in 24
> hours. They could use the help.

Obviously . . !

The bunch that leaned on me is a motley pickup crew of mostly
neighborhood club repeater crawlers I don't particulary have much in
common with. When they were all done they'd run up something like a
grand total of 150 contacts made by fifty-some "ops" all bands all
modes. Spare me! There's another group here which is a real ARES
operation and those guys know what they're doing and I've been invited
to jump in with them. They run plenty of cw and contest-style ssb and
do quite well. I think they run in the four-station class, all the
stations are networked together via computer loggers, really slick
bunch of good ops.

> I was actually leaning toward it but I
> think Bert wants to see how much we can better last year's effort out
> here.

You two kicked some serious butt last year despite the FUBARED first
genset, go for it and good luck.

I'm gonna stick with the single-op thing this year "just because".
Lotta work but I gotta do it at least once.

> > > That puts us only 600 feet away from the kitchen, beds and a shower.
> > > We'll likely use his call this year since we used mine last year. We'll
> > > use his Yaesu "Field" once again as the Orion is staying safely indoors.
> >
> > Yeah, use the throwaway gear.
>
> I'm not going to bite the hand that brings the rig. Last year I brought
> the tuner, furnished the generator, dragged along the Vibroplex Iambic
> and operated.

Tally-ho, see ya on the bands!

I'm not bothering with chasing many if any of the bonus points. I'll
be running on the mains for one. It's a very quiet residential
neighborhood and even if I had a genset I couldn't use it because of
the noise. So I'm just gonna chase q's and use FD for a "System Test
Run" and warmup for the CQ WW.

> > I'm planning on running single op from one of my daughters' back yards
> > out in the far 'burbs. I tried it last year but the 940 went kaput two
> > contacts after the start. At least I have the lines already in the
> > trees. And a new radio.
>
> ...and you'll be close to the kitchen, toilet, shower and a bed.

It's a really nice way to do a FD outing. Great location, no noise at all, etc. And all the comforts of home. I had a ball despite the rig crapping out. Got to spend the weekend with my newly-minted granddaughter, ate like a pig, more London Broil and fresh air than I could stand, wunnerful.

Until the ex showed up too. She's fun like neon signs and leaky 13 kV insulators are fun on 80.

Then came the pee bucket caper. This one is the OT daughter who grew up with Dad locked on the paddles and knows very well what an empty plastic bucket alongside a contest operating position is all about. Having been brainwashed on her trip thru medical academia about sanitation and other useless trivia which don't apply on contest weekends she went ballistic when she spotted the bucket. "Mom, he even brought his damned bucket!!" "Father, you are NOT allowed to use that bucket on MY property!"

Then the midddle daughter showed up with her four in the middle of the brawl over Dad's bucket. Somebody, no doubt the fiendish middle daughter clued one of her sons abt the purpose of Pop-pop's ceremonial bucket and the kid asked if he could pee in the bucket too. Zoo. Family reunions are where ya find 'em.

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

3664. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 14:38:20 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304250638.34ced0ca@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65799

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA8B053.D1082642@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:

> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA7ECA9.4099D27F@earthlink.net>...

> > > The local ARES group wanted N8NN and I to join their effort but I think
> > > Bert wants to do another two op effort from out here on the hilltop.
> >
> > I got leaned on to work with the local group last year, "we really
> > need cw ops". "Yeah, well here's some code practice tapes, enjoy."
> > Sheesh . .
>
> Our ARES gang had five stations last year and managed 200 CW QSOs in 24
> hours. They could use the help. I was actually leaning toward it but I
> think Bert wants to see how much we can better last year's effort out
> here.

Last year you two did 897 QSOs and scored 3,542 points. Good for 4th
place out of 30 1B-2 'x2' entries. Not too shabby....!
>
> > > That puts us only 600 feet away from the kitchen, beds and a shower.
> > > We'll likely use his call this year since we used mine last year. We'll
> > > use his Yaesu "Field" once again as the Orion is staying safely indoors.
> >
> > Yeah, use the throwaway gear.

HAW!
>
> I'm not going to bite the hand that brings the rig. Last year I brought
> the tuner, furnished the generator, dragged along the Vibroplex Iambic
> and operated.
> >
> > I'm planning on running single op from one of my daughters' back yards
> > out in the far 'burbs. I tried it last year but the 940 went kaput two
> > contacts after the start. At least I have the lines already in the
> > trees. And a new radio.
>
> ...and you'll be close to the kitchen, toilet, shower and a bed.
>
Gotta get my plan nailed down. It's been too long since I ran
single-handed and even longer since I did single-handed battery ops.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3665. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 14:46:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8bhllhtr1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65800

QUICK EVERYONE LENNIE THE LOSER IS IN NEED OF A ENTRENCHING TOOL TO DIG HIMSELF OUT OF HIS ANTI-MORESMEN RUT.

Dan/W4NTI

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030424231030.18769.00000188@mb-m20.aol.com...
> In article <vqHpa.404$X32.442879@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >How can you possibly make such a judgement for another person? The EE may
> >very well have a multitude of interests that would fit very nicely with ham
> >radio.
>
> Morsemen make such judgements almost with every breath.
>
> Love morse code and one is an exemplary human being.
>
> Dislike morse code and one is inferior, filth, not fit to live.
>
> That's the "judgement" style of morsemen.
>
> >There is everything from homebrew to digital communications to the
> >development of new modes.
>
> Number one on the morsemen's hit parade of superior amateurism
> is morse code ability.
>
> >And that's just a bare sampling of the technical
> >aspect. Then of course there is the community service aspect. How can you
> >assume that a EE would not be interested?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. I've been working with EEs since 1956 and been one
> for not quite that long. MOST of them aren't that interested.
>
> How can you expect electronics professionals working in advanced
> electronics and radio to idolize and revere standards and practices
> in radio that were frozen in place since before WW2?
>
> >You are continuing to limit other people's interests and activities to those

> >that you think they should care about.
>
> No problem. The Morsemen think that everyone SHOULD love
> and respect morse code skill in US amateur radio over and above
> anything else in that hobby. [see Gang of Four output]
>
> Ordinarily, in any other venue, that would be called hypocrisy.
> In amateur radio it seems to be something else... :-)

3666. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 15:56:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030425115650.26656.00000057@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65853

>The way I look at it is, if a person wants the privileges they will earn
>them. If they don't, well, that is up to them.

That is the Main problem, most of the Whinners dont wont to earn them, they just want them handed to them.

3667. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 17:32:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA97193.EEEA3452@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65854

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA8AEAF.A4B46A46@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA355AE.9FE825E9@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA18089.68A200CB@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA088A4.B011F968@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA00DCE.6709A863@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:

> > > > > > You think Phil's in the service and you think he's deployed to Iraq?
> > > > > > You might want to check with him on that.
> > > > > >
> > > > > I don't think he's in the military or in Iraq.
> > > > >
> > > > Yet you think he has a valuable contribution to make concerning the
> > > > military operation in Iraq?
> > >
> > I think he has valueable input on the use of the ham bands by military
> > personnel in Iraq. I wouldn't argue the regs with Phil.
>
> And the PCTA Double Standard pops up yet again.

Howzat, Brian? Phil is an expert in communications law.

> > > Kimd of opems the gates to Lem, doesm't imt?
> > >
> > Len isn't in the military, isn't in Iraq, isn't an attorney, wasn't with
> > the FCC and isn't a ham. Except for those things, I'm sure he has
> > tremendous knowledge of the matter under discussion.
>
> And the PCTA Double Standard pops up yet again.

Howzat, Brian? Len isn't an expert in communications law.

> > > > > > > And I don't think Phil considers himself my mentor.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I don't consider Phil as your mentor either. Phil is a rational man.
> > > > > > Your mentor is the non-participant in amateur radio who frequently posts
> > > > > > here.
> > > > >
> > > > > Then you need to make yourself clear.
> > > >
> > > > I did. You needed clarification due to your reading comprehension
> > > > difficulty.
> > >
> > > You didn't.
> >
> > You're right. I didn't need clarification.
>
> You must. You referred to Phil as my mentor.

That isn't what I wrote. It is only what you understood.

> > > > So you say. No one has stepped up to confirm the tale of your alleged
> > > > operation.
> > >
> > > Nor is it likely they will. It was a relatively small operation. Not
> > > many combattants involved, and Willy kept it small. Sort of like a
> > > NEO on a little American Embassy. Happens all the time.
> >
> > Then it should be easy for you to find someone who can confirm your
> > tale.
>
> I'll do that at the next reunion.

I don't think you're likely to do that. It is more likely that you'll
continue to lean on vapor rather than fact.

> > > I operated legally.
> >
> > So you tell us. There is nothing or no one to confirm what you say.
>
> Sure there are. You just don't know them, so they don't exist to you.

None of 'em have stepped forward to confirm that you received permission
for your alleged T5 operation.

> > Seems like you're SOL.
> >
> > How so?
>
> Hollow accusations.

Your tale of alleged verbal permission to operate from Somalia is what
rings hollow, Brian.

Dave K8MN

3668. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 17:45:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA974AA.B37C3C58@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65855

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA8B053.D1082642@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > >
>
> > > Our ARES gang had five stations last year and managed 200 CW QSOs in 24
> > > hours. They could use the help.
>
> Obviously . . !
>
> The bunch that leaned on me is a motley pickup crew of mostly
> neighborhood club repeater crawlers I don't particulary have much in
> common with. When they were all done they'd run up something like a
> grand total of 150 contacts made by fifty-some "ops" all bands all
> modes. Spare me! There's another group here which is a real ARES
> operation and those guys know what they're doing and I've been invited
> to jump in with them. They run plenty of cw and contest-style ssb and
> do quite well. I think they run in the four-station class, all the
> stations are networked together via computer loggers, really slick
> bunch of good ops.

That second bunch sounds as if it has some real potential.

> > I was actually leaning toward it but I
> > think Bert wants to see how much we can better last year's effort out
> > here.
>
> You two kicked some serious butt last year despite the FUBARED first
> genset, go for it and good luck.

Bert hated that so much that he went out and bought a new Honda
generator so I don't think we'll lose several hours like last year's
near fiasco.

> I'm gonna stick with the single-op thing this year "just because".
> Lotta work but I gotta do it at least once.

I've never done solo Field Day unless you count all those years in
Africa where Field Day is everyday. We never had commercial power in
Freetown during my entire two year tour.

>
> > > That puts us only 600 feet away from the kitchen, beds and a shower.

> > > > We'll likely use his call this year since we used mine last year. We'll
> > > > use his Yaesu "Field" once again as the Orion is staying safely indoors.
> > >
> > > Yeah, use the throwaway gear.
> >
> > I'm not going to bite the hand that brings the rig. Last year I brought
> > the tuner, furnished the generator, dragged along the Vibroplex Iambic
> > and operated.
>
> Tally-ho, see ya on the bands!
>
> I'm not bothering with chasing many if any of the bonus points. I'll
> be running on the mains for one. It's a very quiet residential
> neighborhood and even if I had a genset I couldn't use it because of
> the noise. So I'm just gonna chase q's and use FD for a "System Test
> Run" and warmup for the CQ WW.

We don't chase many of the bonus points either.

> > > I'm planning on running single op from one of my daughters' back yards
> > > out in the far 'burbs. I tried it last year but the 940 went kaput two
> > > contacts after the start. At least I have the lines already in the
> > > trees. And a new radio.
> >
> > ...and you'll be close to the kitchen, toilet, shower and a bed.
>
> It's a really nice way to do a FD outing. Great location, no noise at
> all, etc. And all the comforts of home. I had a ball despite the rig
> crapping out. Got to spend the weekend with my newly-minted
> granddaughter, ate like a pig, more London Broil and fresh air than I
> could stand, wunnerful.

We did have a grill out by the operating position and have some guests
including K8MWO and his XYL. They now live on Lake Cumberland in
Kentucky.

> Until the ex showed up too. She's fun like neon signs and leaky 13 kV
> insulators are fun on 80.

If I pondered all day, I don't think I could have put together a more
colorful description.

> Then came the pee bucket caper. This one is the OT daughter who grew
> up with Dad locked on the paddles and knows very well what an empty
> plastic bucket alongside a contest operating position is all about.
> Having been brainwashed on her trip thru medical academia about
> sanitation and other useless trivia which don't apply on contest
> weekends she went ballistic when she spotted the bucket. "Mom, he even
> brought his damned bucket!!" "Father, you are NOT allowed to use that
> bucket on MY property!"

I thought the bucket a considerate gesture on your part. It is certainly better than using her lilac bushes.

> Then the midddle daughter showed up with her four in the middle of the
> brawl over Dad's bucket. Somebody, no doubt the fiendish middle
> daughter clued one of her sons abt the purpose of Pop-pop's ceremonial
> bucket and the kid asked if he could pee in the bucket too. Zoo.
> Family reunions are where ya find 'em.

It is easy to think of your own family as dysfunctional until you encounter a gathering of someone else's. My pop used to say that if you shunned every family member who had done something embarrassing or shameful, family reunions would consist of very small groups.

Dave K8MN

3669. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 17:54:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EA976DD.B1FE97F4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65856

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA8B053.D1082642@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA7ECA9.4099D27F@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > The local ARES group wanted N8NN and I to join their effort but I think
> > > > Bert wants to do another two op effort from out here on the hilltop.
> > >
> > > I got leaned on to work with the local group last year, "we really
> > > need cw ops". "Yeah, well here's some code practice tapes, enjoy."
> > > Sheesh . .
> >
> > Our ARES gang had five stations last year and managed 200 CW QSOs in 24
> > hours. They could use the help. I was actually leaning toward it but I
> > think Bert wants to see how much we can better last year's effort out
> > here.
>
> Last year you two did 897 QSOs and scored 3,542 points. Good for 4th
> place out of 30 1B-2 'x2' entries. Not too shabby....!

Bert ponders about how much better we'd have done if we'd not lost all
the time over the generator issue. We used only one antenna, a flattop
with open wire feeder. We're considering additions for this year.

> > > > That puts us only 600 feet away from the kitchen, beds and a shower.
> > > > We'll likely use his call this year since we used mine last year. We'll
> > > > use his Yaesu "Field" once again as the Orion is staying safely indoors.
> > >
> > > Yeah, use the throwaway gear.
>
> HAW!

'RV has a way with words.

> > I'm not going to bite the hand that brings the rig. Last year I brought
> > the tuner, furnished the generator, dragged along the Vibroplex Iambic
> > and operated.
> >
> > > I'm planning on running single op from one of my daughters' back yards
> > > out in the far 'burbs. I tried it last year but the 940 went kaput two
> > > contacts after the start. At least I have the lines already in the

> > > trees. And a new radio.
> >
> > ...and you'll be close to the kitchen, toilet, shower and a bed.
> >
> Gotta get my plan nailed down. It's been too long since I ran
> single-handed and even longer since I did single-handed battery ops.

I've never done FD battery operations but have instead been with groups using various sizes of generators, ranging from little jobs with several hundred watt ratings to big 10 KVA surplus generators mounted on trailers.

Dave K8MN

3670. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 19:11:20 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304251111.2f81f2f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65857

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030424231024.18769.00000181@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> In article <JbIpa.45$yp4.18@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
> >Dan, Dan, Dan ...
> >
> >Question: Is phasing worse? Are you sure? Carrier suppression wouldn't be
> >nearly as important as unwanted sideband suppression. Check out some of the
> >QST articles over the past few years. The reality may well be that with
> >digital processing, that quadrature phasing may well be held more tightly
> >with DSP than with analog components. The RF quadrature (at least for one
> >frequency, or a small frequency spread) would be easy. It may turn out that
> >we could get better suppression with phasing. Then again, the two methods
> >might just be combined.

The phasing idea was kept alive by a few hams even before the
developments of the past few decades. For example:

QST Sep 1969 p 11 "A Direct-Conversion SSB Receiver" by Richard S.
Taylor, W1DAX, uses the venerable 2Q4 network in a solid-state 20
meter receiver.
>
> A breakthrough in broadband single sideband phasing modulation
> and demodulation happened with Mike Gingell's PhD thesis in the
> UK (1975, University of London Faculty of Engineering), his
> "polyphase" network. Gingell is now living the US, has the US
> amateur license KN4BS (was N4VQP).

A version of this network appears in my 1988 ARRL Handbook.
>
> The Gingell network values were refined by Tetsuo Yoshida,
> JA1KO, and that can be seen in QEX, June 1995.

Sadly, it appears that Mr. Yoshida is a silent key. No one with his
name shows up in qrz.com, and the call JA1KO is unassigned.

QEX is published by the ARRL, out of Newington, CT.

Rick Campbell, KK7B, did some interesting work in the 1990s on
phasing-type receivers and transmitters suitable for use up to 500 MHz
directly. Some are available from the ARRL website:

QST Aug 1992 p 19: "High-Performance Direct-Conversion Receivers"

http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/9208019.pdf (7,720,892 bytes)

QST Jan 1993 p 32 "High-Performance, Single-Signal Direct-Conversion Receivers"

http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/t9301032.pdf (2,785,185 bytes)

QST Apr 1993 p 27 "A Multimode Phasing Exciter For 1 to 500 MHz"

http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/9304027.pdf (1,205,616 bytes)

The above projects are known as the R1, R2 and T2, respectively. Kits and PC boards are/were available.

In case anyone thinks KK7B is only interested in HF, see also some of his other articles:

QST Oct 1990 p 27 "A Single-Board Bilateral 5760-MHz Transverter"

QST Jul 1991 p 25 "A Single-Board, No-Tune 902-MHz Transverter"

QST Feb 1992 p 35 "Getting Started on the Microwave Bands"

QST May 1993 p 29 "Single-Conversion Microwave SSB/CW Transceivers"

QST is published by the ARRL, out of Newington, CT.

> RF quadrature generation can be done relatively easy with a
> pair of chained flip-flops clocked at four times the local
> oscillator frequency. That is done by Dan Tayloe's very low-
> insertion-loss mixer (patented) using a CMOS quad switch IC.
> The Tayloe Mixer also has very low intermodulation, better
> than nearly all conventional diode mixer configurations.

Dan Tayloe is N7VE. His mixer is included in a high performance 30 meter CW transceiver developed by him. His 2002 Pacificon presentation on this CW transceiver is available for free download at:

http://www.redhotradio.com/NC30QRPacificon2002.pdf

(This is a 1 MB file)

The N7VE CW transceiver is detailed in the presentation, and can be duplicated. A kit is reportedly in the works, to be available from Red Hot Radio.

> All of those were incorporated into a homebrew HF receiver
> designed by Hans Summers, G0UPL, and is described on his
> website www.hanssummers.com complete with photos as
> well as schematics and other descriptions. Unwanted
> sideband suppression is greater than 40 db by measurement
> of the receiver

This is an 80 meter CW-SSB receiver of interesting homebrew construction. Many other projects on G0UPL's website.

One of the reasons the phasing method has not caught on more with amateurs is that much better unwanted-sideband rejection can be had with crystal filters for the same or less cost and complexity.

An interesting application of the phasing principle could be to use it as the "rear end" of a superhet transceiver, enhancing the performance of a simple crystal filter and improving gain and filtering distribution.

In SSB transmitter applications, the unwanted-sideband rejection needs only to be on a par with the IM distortion products put in the unwanted sideband by later transmitter stages.

> ...since the method is bilateral, SSB generation
> can achieve the same unwanted sideband suppression and
> the Tayloe Mixer can suppress the carrier so far that great
> care in layout is required to see near the ultimate value of such

When will you publish a complete design for such a transceiver, Len?
>
> The improved/refined Gingell polyphase network by
> can result in four very accurate quadrature audio phases over
> an audio bandpass that can reach "high fidelity" bandwidths.
> The Yoshida network values can use 2 to 5 percent component
> values for this very close quadrature over a wide bandwidth, much
> better than previous quadrature methods.

Better in theory. Practice is another issue. None of the receiver designs I have seen has reached 50 dB unwanted-sideband rejection in practice. Has abyone actually developed a homebrew phasing-type receiver with unwanted-sideband rejection equalling that of modern or even vintage superhet designs?
>
> See also Harry Lythall's (SM0VPO) website, for a couple of
> examples of SSB by polyphase networks. If for nothing else,
> I recommend his "Frequently Asked Silly Questions"
> collection from his website's "Start" section. Hilarious! For
> some other examples in Europe, see SM6LKM's site or that
> of Aleksandre Stare (S57NAN).

> Note: There is a great deal
> of innovation going on in European amateur radio today
> compared to what is publicized in the US.

There is a great deal of innovation going on in amateur radio today, compared to what is realized by some. (attention, "Vshah101"!)

> Combining known modern-day analog and digital techniques
> can result in almost any desired bandwidth for the common
> amateur radio modes. The only limits are the regulations'
> limits in each administrations' civil radio regulating agency.

The important question wrt "wide" SSB is not the technical process but rather whether the transmission of >6 kHz bandwidth SSB voice signals on crowded HF bands is really in the best interest of the ARS.

3671. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 21:45:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030425174533.18770.00000235@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65859

In article <BACE96BE.17AFB%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>> Too many amateurs think there are only two kinds of
>> radios, theirs and cell phones. That's tunnel-vision
>> thinking. There are many different kinds of radios
>> (other than amateur) used every day by public service
>> agencies and their workers...and radios used every
>> day by utility services and their workers...and radios
>> used every day by businesses and those workers other
>> than CB and short-range unlicensed fast-food-stand
>> portables.
>>
>> ALL of those could be coordinated into disaster
>> planning.
>
>
> Not always possible. During and following a serious disaster, the radios
>used by public service agencies are often overwhelmed, utility services are
>often using their radios to deal with repairs, the repeaters used by
>business radios often have no power, and unpredictable noise and
>interference often makes CB virtually useless.

Not even close to any general statement...except perhaps in some
backwater areas to the east of the Mississippi.

Telephonic "911" calls are switched by telephone company switching
centers...those do NOT go to normal Public Safety Radio Service
radios. Some public safety radio service centers may temporarily
"patch through" any telephone caller to a mobile radio channel but
that is not routine. The "overwhelm" conditional is inappropriate.

Utility services NORMALLY use their radios to effect repairs to
utilities. That is in no way different from operations during real
emergencies. In properly organized utility areas such as here in
the southland, mobile radios have the capability to communicate
with public safety services.

It is not appropriate to describe business radio users as "often
without (primary) power." That varies with the type of business.
In the southland here, the Metropolitan Transit Authority has
several base stations WITH emergency power generation and
the bus radios can communicate with police departments if
there is a need to do so. MTA here is extensive. Most of the

taxicab services have emergency power at base stations. It would be a more accurate statement to say that MOST business radio users have power to operate without the primary electrical power grid.

FAA controlled airspace communications is required to have emergency power for communications. That includes "ground frequencies" used exclusively for aircraft and airport vehicle ground operations. Since nearly all aircraft communications radios of today can tune to any frequency in the civil aviation bandspace, that is another possible adjunct to extreme real emergency communications.

SHARES is a group of nearly one thousand government radio stations on HF, netted into a national radio organization for emergency and disaster communications independent of other government and civilian radio users. Those HF equipments have multiple voice and data capabilities, use ALE to the current Fed Std and train regularly despite most radios belonging to separate government agencies.

For reliable very-high-throughput multiple radio channel communications, the existing communications satellite infra-structure can allow not only national but international communications. Those would be required on extreme emergencies, far above the WTC attack of 9-11-01.

What is most often neglected in amateur thinking is the US military capability in short, medium, long, and very long communications paths at a moment's notice. Their equipment is designed for the worst possible environmental conditions and is kept in operational order all the time. US military communications, including the National Guard and Air Guard of the various states, can be used and has been used in the past for communications aid in many, many emergencies in the USA. Those do not get the publicity they deserve, a disservice of journalism editors in general.

If that isn't enough, the various TV news services can be a source of communications aid in real emergencies using everything from audio remotes to "videophone" relays of events as they occur. Those worked well in the second Gulf War as well as from the first one.

There are several other sources of short-range communications that could be utilized in a Real Emergency. Mentioning those is only good for ha-ha comments from the ignorant fantasy jerkers.

> That leaves only ham radio with a pool of licensed operators with
>equipment capable of reliable local or even national coverage, the
>frequencies, and the regulatory mandate, to truly handle supplemental

>communications following a disaster.

During REAL EMERGENCIES, the "regulatory mandate" says that
ANYONE can use/operate radios for emergency communications.
It's in the regulations applicable to ALL radio services in the USA.
[see Title 47, Code of Federal Regulations...try Parts 0, 1, 2 to see
that and its "regulatory mandate"]

Yes, amateur radio CAN do "supplemental communications
following a disaster" in the form of health and welfare messages.
FEMA does the same thing but with moving video billboards so
that messages can be seen and identified by relatives in a
disaster area. Health and welfare messages are largely for
emotional aid, are not something that is very directly applicable
to sustaining life of disaster victims. FEMA may or may not have
had its first real trial of its fly-away terminals in the 17 Jan 94
Northridge Earthquake...it was certainly in the first few of such
situations and worked well (as intended).

In reply, you and the Gang of Four will immediately come out with
ARRL newsletter quotes trying to "prove" the value of all that
"emergency disaster planning" and usual propaganda of feel-good
emotionalism toward the wonderfulness of ham radio. Before anyone
does, they ought to stop and THINK for a moment. ARRL is
organized and geared to keeping its membership, hopefully to
expand it from the many-years relative stagnation of membership
numbers. They MUST exaggerate and imply the importance of
amateur radio to the nation and community in order to promote
themselves. Exaggeration and emotional feel-good statements
are necessary for their survival. ARRL is NOT a journalism
endeavor, just another (of thousands) of membership organizations
in the United States.

There IS a cure for tunnel vision, Dwight. In order to effect a cure
you have to get out of the tunnel into reality and learn how the
rest of the world uses radio. Now. Don't rely on myths and
legends of the 1912 sinking of the Titanic. This is 91 years later.

3672. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 21:45:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030425174535.18770.00000236@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65858

In article <f45722ac.0304250256.13e59326@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3EA8AEAF.A4B46A46@earthlink.net>...
>> Brian wrote:
>> >
>> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3EA355AE.9FE825E9@earthlink.net>...
>> > > Brian wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3EA18089.68A200CB@earthlink.net>...
>> > > > > Brian wrote:
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3EA088A4.B011F968@earthlink.net>...
>> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
>> > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3EA00DCE.6709A863@earthlink.net>...
>> > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
>> > > > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > > > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
>message news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hdi8aza.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
>>
>> > > > > Sure I do. Further, I think he's already in the game.
>> > > >
>> > > You think Phil's in the service and you think he's deployed to Iraq?
>> > > You might want to check with him on that.
>> > >
>> > I don't think he's in the military or in Iraq.
>> >
>> Yet you think he has a valuable contribution to make concerning the
>> military operation in Iraq?
>>
>> I think he has valueable input on the use of the ham bands by military
>> personnel in Iraq. I wouldn't argue the regs with Phil.
>
>And the PCTA Double Standard pops up yet again.

A slight correction, Brian. Heil is manufacturing a "discussion"
concerning "my comments on Iraq" that never happened.

I'm not a party to any "'valueable' [sic] input on the use of the ham bands by military personnel in Iraq." I do know the general communications structure of the US military on land for military communications purposes as well as the equipment used in land-air-sea communications by the military. Much of that was established in doctrine and training begun in the 1980s. Much of that has been released for public distribution, is available from several public sources.

US military communications has no need to use any "ham bands" for military communications...not even as "public service messages to the 'boys' at the front." Internet communications have been available to deployed as well as home-stationed military personnel for several years, both for their personal use and for doctrine-training purposes. That has been publicized in the major national news media for years as well as industry trade publications.

US military land forces have IHFR (Improved High Frequency Radio) radio systems that could be used on the "ham bands" (in the nomenclature-jargon of old-timers' reference to "their bands") That is not normally done but is technically possible. IHFR sets are intended for under-500-KM radio paths using NVIS propagation techniques on any frequency between 2 to 30 MHz.

As far as "ARs" (Army Regulations) are concerned for US Army Spectrum Management, those are available publicly at United States Army Publication Agency website at:

http://www.usapa.army.mil

AR 5-12 is the overall document, "Army Management of the Electromagnetic Spectrum." AR 105-70 is a smaller document covering amateur radio operations from US military installations and foreign regions.

There exist similar applicable overall regulations for radio communications in the USAF and USN, but I'm not going to do Dame Heil's referencing homework for her. None in the Gang of Four plus the dickiebird have any authority to judge anything insofar as active US military operations nor dictate any "requirements" that aren't referenced by US military regulations.

>> > Kimd of opems the gates to Lem, doesm't imt?
>>
>> Len isn't in the military, isn't in Iraq, isn't an attorney, wasn't with
>> the FCC and isn't a ham. Except for those things, I'm sure he has
>> tremendous knowledge of the matter under discussion.
>
>And the PCTA Double Standard pops up yet again.

Dame Heil isn't in the military, isn't in Iraq, isn't an attorney, wasn't with the FCC, hasn't participated in US military land-

based military communications since 1973, hasn't kept
current on US military communications equipment, doctrine,
or training in any way for three decades. Other than being
a licensed US radio amateur, Dame Heil can be described
as not knowing squat about US military personnel
equipment, doctrine, techniques, or legalities of any kind
concerning US military personnel within or without US
borders.

Dame Heil seems only bent on childish name-calling to anyone
not agreeing to his arrogant commands and directives of how
all should behave. In short, perfect for the Leider of the Gang
of Four, singing and slinging so much bullshit.

>> > > > > > And I don't think Phil considers himself my mentor.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > I don't consider Phil as your mentor either. Phil is a rational
>man.
>> > > > > Your mentor is the non-participant in amateur radio who frequently
>posts
>> > > > > here.
>> > > > >
>> > > > Then you need to make yourself clear.
>> > >
>> > > I did. You needed clarification due to your reading comprehension
>> > > difficulty.
>> >
>> > You didn't.
>>
>> You're right. I didn't need clarification.
>
>You must. You referred to Phil as my mentor.

Dame Heil is a god of radio. No one can correct her.

>> > > So you say. No one has stepped up to confirm the tale of your alleged
>> > > operation.
>> >
>> > Nor is it likely they will. It was a relatively small operation. Not
>> > many combattants involved, and Willy kept it small. Sort of like a
>> > NEO on a little American Embassy. Happens all the time.
>>
>> Then it should be easy for you to find someone who can confirm your
>> tale.
>
>I'll do that at the next reunion.
>
>> > I operated legally.
>>
>> So you tell us. There is nothing or no one to confirm what you say.
>

>Sure there are. You just don't know them, so they don't exist to you.
>>
>> Seems like you're SOL.
>>
>> How so?
>
>Hollow accusations.

Very hollow. Practically a vacuum.

Dame Heil bluffs a great deal, insinuating much, inplying much,
but never giving any details, references, or anything else to
confirm any bona fides.

Dame Heil is apparently trying to be a role model of what an
amateur extra class ham should be. In that case she succeeds
only in presenting a most negative image to the public. QED.

3673. Repeater Autopatch vs. Telemarketer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 21:48:25 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0304252135030.872@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 65860

Lately, a repeater autopatch has been getting a lot of incoming calls. I suspect that some may be from telemarketers. So far, when the reverse patch answer command has been entered, the caller is gone and what is heard is the "off-hook" signal from telco. However, what is the best course of action should an amateur operator answer a reverse patch and find a telemarketer on the other end?

The options I can think of are:
1) Simply command the patch down without saying a word.
2) Say, "You're in violation of 47 CFR 97.113. Don't call again." Then command the patch down.
3) Something else.

I've already signed up the autopatch's phone number with the appropriate state Attorney General's office "Do not call list," which about July will get automatically added to the federal telemarketer "do not call list" where the law enforcing the list goes into effect in September 2003. What to do in the meantime is the problem.

In the exact situation I am thinking of, the repeater answers the phone by saying (synthesized voice), "This is the <club-callsign> amateur radio club repeater autopatch," then waits for about 30 seconds for a command before the reverse patch ringout on the radio. No audio is gated to or from the radio side until the reverse patch answer command is input. The speech board doesn't have a DVR nor the vocabulary to tell telemarketers to hang up up front.

Comments?

3674. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 22:26:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030425182634.18770.00000220@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 65861

In article <3EA976DD.B1FE97F4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Last year you two did 897 QSOs and scored 3,542 points. Good for 4th
>> place out of 30 1B-2 'x2' entries. Not too shabby....!
>
>Bert ponders about how much better we'd have done if we'd not lost all
>the time over the generator issue.

I betcha you two could bust 1000 Q's easily.

>We used only one antenna, a flattop
>with open wire feeder. We're considering additions for this year.

I learned the hard way that, in small FD ops, complications are often not worth
the trouble. FD's a weenie domestic contest, not CQWW or even SS. No
multipliers, which sucks, but they're not gonna change it. With one tx you go
where the contacts are, rate is everything.

>> > > Yeah, use the throwaway gear.
>>
>> HAW!
>
>'RV has a way with words.

You don't know the half of it.
>
>> > I'm not going to bite the hand that brings the rig. Last year I brought
>> > the tuner, furnished the generator, dragged along the Vibroplex Iambic
>> > and operated.
>> > >
>> > > I'm planning on running single op from one of my daughters' back yards
>> > > out in the far 'burbs. I tried it last year but the 940 went kaput two
>> > > contacts after the start. At least I have the lines already in the
>> > > trees. And a new radio.
>> >
>> > ...and you'll be close to the kitchen, toilet, shower and a bed.
>> >
>> Gotta get my plan nailed down. It's been too long since I ran
>> single-handed and even longer since I did single-handed battery ops.
>
>I've never done FD battery operations but have instead been with groups
>using various sizes of generators, ranging from little jobs with several
>hundred watt ratings to big 10 KVA surplus generators mounted on
>trailers.

BTDT, from just me and a battery and a Ten Tec Argosy to the giant setup at K3BKG years ago. WW2 surplus generator, prolly from SCR-399. 2003 will be FD #36 for me.

The first time I did battery ops was with W3NNL and K3OIO, about 1974. We used 'NNL's homebrew 80/40 CW transceiver.

That xcvr was a neat bit of work. Hybrid unit - solid state except driver and final. Direct conversion with phasing-type rejection of the 'audio image'. This was before Gingell's work was published, btw. 'NNL made the audio PSN. Because it only had to deal with CW bandwidth it did not have to be as complex. Rejection was about 40-45 dB. 12BA6 driver feeding 1625 final. Vibrator supply for 10 W input. Could do up to 75 watts with home power supply, or 50 watts with his dynamotor.

Whole thing was built in the case from a defunct National FB-7. Back then BAs were a dime a dozen. Betcha he wishes he'd left the FB-7 alone!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3675. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 22:41:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304251441.5bcd8e29@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65862

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA97193.EEEA3452@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA8AEAF.A4B46A46@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA355AE.9FE825E9@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA18089.68A200CB@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA088A4.B011F968@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA00DCE.6709A863@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > > > > > You think Phil's in the service and you think he's deployed to Iraq?
> > > > > > > > > > You might want to check with him on that.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I don't think he's in the military or in Iraq.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Yet you think he has a valuable contribution to make concerning the
> > > > > > > > military operation in Iraq?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I think he has valueable input on the use of the ham bands by military
> > > > > > > personnel in Iraq. I wouldn't argue the regs with Phil.
> > > >
> > > > And the PCTA Double Standard pops up yet again.
>
> Howzat, Brian? Phil is an expert in communications law.

Phil isn't in the military, says he never was, and isn't in Iraq.
Phil has no legal authority over amateur operation in Iraq that I'm
aware of.

Do you have information that he does have authority in Iraq? Perhaps
for 12USD he can process their paperwork.

> > > > Kimd of opems the gates to Lem, doesm't imt?
> > >
> > > Len isn't in the military, isn't in Iraq, isn't an attorney, wasn't with
> > > the FCC and isn't a ham. Except for those things, I'm sure he has
> > > tremendous knowledge of the matter under discussion.
> >
> > And the PCTA Double Standard pops up yet again.
>
> Howzat, Brian? Len isn't an expert in communications law.

Who said he was? Len knows about radio, yet isn't allowed to comment
on radio here. If he should, he is unkindly reminded that there is a
difference between military and commercial RF and amateur RF.

> > > > > > > > And I don't think Phil considers himself my mentor.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I don't consider Phil as your mentor either. Phil is a rational man.
> > > > > > > Your mentor is the non-participant in amateur radio who frequently posts
> > > > > > > here.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Then you need to make yourself clear.
> > > > > >
> > > > > I did. You needed clarification due to your reading comprehension
> > > > > difficulty.
> > > >
> > > > You didn't.
> > >
> > > You're right. I didn't need clarification.
> >
> > You must. You referred to Phil as my mentor.
>
> That isn't what I wrote. It is only what you understood.

Then write more clearly, as I said six (6) lines above. Or you can
continue to be vague so as to jump on anyone when they don't read your
mind.

> > > > > So you say. No one has stepped up to confirm the tale of your alleged
> > > > > operation.
> > > >
> > > > Nor is it likely they will. It was a relatively small operation. Not
> > > > many combattants involved, and Willy kept it small. Sort of like a
> > > > NEO on a little American Embassy. Happens all the time.
> > >
> > > Then it should be easy for you to find someone who can confirm your
> > > tale.
> >
> > I'll do that at the next reunion.
>
> I don't think you're likely to do that. It is more likely that you'll
> continue to lean on vapor rather than fact.

Inform us again what your legal role is in all of this. That you
won't accept my answer appears to be a personal problem. Nothing
more, nothing less.

> > > > I operated legally.
> > >
> > > So you tell us. There is nothing or no one to confirm what you say.
> >
> > Sure there are. You just don't know them, so they don't exist to you.
>
> None of 'em have stepped forward to confirm that you received permission
> for your alleged T5 operation.

Hmmm. It's all starting to make sense.

No one has stepped forward from Vietnam to confirm your lost
"no-permission" slip.

Maybe you cheated and now think everyone else is cheating, too.

> > > Seems like you're SOL.
> > >
> > > How so?
> >
> > Hollow accusations.
>
> Your tale of alleged verbal permission to operate from Somalia is what
> rings hollow, Brian.

Where is your lost "no-permission" slip?

3676. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 22:49:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304251449.b25ad48@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65863

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA88AD9.BC4BC6C9@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA7E71E.C3FD13F1@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA74120.60BE136D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > In article <f45722ac.0304230240.3ded3b0e@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > > > >
> > > > > >> I wouldn't put it anywhere. There is no Tan Son Hut and there is no Tan
> > > > > >> Son Nhat.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >There isn't? Must be a big conspiracy.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >Then why did the International Civil Aviation Authority issue it VVTS?
> > > > > >
> > > > > The ICAO doesn't exist. Vietnam doesn't exist.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Denial is a river running through Egypt... :-)
> > > > >
> > > > Not so fast, Bub. You only babbled about some snack bar called "Tan Son
> > > > Hut"
> >
> > > >
> > > You were stationed at a snack bar? Makes sense.
> > >
> > Would you like to make a public comment on my military service? Do you
> > have some problem with it?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
> Dave, all of these comments are public. That's how you got to respond
> to a comment I directed at DICK. Had they been private, you would not
> have been able to read it, and not comment on it.
>
Tell me something I don't know. Of course the posts are public.
Your crack about being stationed at a snack bar making sense to you
doesn't seem to make much sense. I asked you a question, you chose
diversion.

Look, Dave, Len said something about where you were stationed. You started talking about a snack bar. Were you or were you not stationed at a snack bar?

You really need to be more clear and quit straying off the subject, if that's what happened.

> > QSL?
>
> Anyone who says this on the ham bands is a stupendous lid.

Ahem, no license required to operate here.

> > Getting back to the snack bar in Vietnam. Why you keep bringing it
> > up? It must have been a significant part of your life while
> > in-country.
>
> It's your reading comprehension thing again.

So there was no snack bar???

> > What did your orders say? Did they put you in a snack bar or an Air
> > Base?
>
> The answers are there. Go back and attempt reading them.

I'm not clairvoyant.

You really need to learn to be more direct, and quit bringing up things that are off topic and confound the line of discussion.

3677. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 22:58:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304251458.11fd722@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65864

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA8AC4A.48A267C3@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA74736.9086D28A@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA6996F.9924B62E@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA60E66.1BFB0B07@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > > > If your permission was denied then you couldn't operate.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Incorrect. I could have operated at any time.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > But you were ordered not to. Doesn't that mean you could not operate
> > > > > > > > amateur radio?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > That's what it means to me, at least.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I wasn't ordered not to do anything, Brian. I was notified that my
> > > > > > > request was denied.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Then, obviously, you couldn't operate. Why do you say that you could?
> > > > >
> > > > > Because I can do anything if I'm willing to accept the consequences.
> > >
> > > Superman. Superiorman. Smugman. PCTA will give you a pass.
>
> Anyone on the planet can do anything he likes if he is willing to accept
> the possbile consequences.

Anyone except the PCTA. There are no consequences for PCTA, at least
on RRAP.

> > > > > > > > If caught operating,
> > > > > > > > especially after having asked for permission and being denied, I'd have
> > > > > > > > had to suffer the consequences. If not caught, I could have just
> > > > > > > > claimed that my commander gave me verbal permission.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Didn't your commander deny your request in writing?

> > > > >
> > > > > He certainly did. If I operated and was not caught at it, I could
> > > > > simply toss the written denial of my request and claim that I had verbal
> > > > > permission. If I'd been nabbed, I would have suffered the consequences.
> > > > >
> > > > > But that would be illegal operation and unethical action on your part.
> > > >
> > > > Yes it would have been, had I actually operated. I didn't.
> > >
> > Good thing. After that French 6M stuff, you otta try to keep your
> > nose clean.
>
> That's moronic. I broke no Tanzanian regs and I'm not responsible for
> the actions of French hams.

You broke no regs that we know of. We're not required to know the
reqs of other countries, remember?

But it is not good amateur practice to work out of band frenchmen,
especially when you've been informed by a frenchman what their legal
6M bandwidth was.

> > > > Why would you even think it?
> > >
> > > I can think about anything I like. Consequences only result from
> > > actions, not thought.
> >
> > But if you keep dwelling on them...
>
> If I keep dwelling on them, what?

You'll give in to temptation.

> > Oh, hey, go ask Jimmy Carter about his thoughts.
>
> I don't know Jimmy Carter and I don't think much of him.

He probably doesn't think of you often, either.

> > > > > > That must be the difference between Vietnam Era vets and the rest.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > What is the difference? Service members then requested and received or
> > > > > > were denied written permission to put an amateur radio station on the
> > > > > > air.
> > > > >
> > > > > Exactly. Your operation was denied. Mine was permitted.
> > > >
> > > > You have nothing to offer which confirms that claim. I don't believe
> > > > you.
> > >
> > > And you've offered -nothing- that proves your Vietnam operation didn't
> > > take place.

>
> No, I don't. Then again, I needn't attempt the proof of a negative.

But you can't produce your letter of "no-authorization."

> > > > But you say
> > > > you would have operated anyway and disposed of your written order not
> > > > to operate, then lie about it. I think that's the difference between
> > > > you and me.
> > >
> > > Get real. I didn't operate and never claimed to.
> >
> > Prove it.
>
> I needn't attempt proof of a negative.
>
> > Your envy of those who could operate was readily apparent in your
> > posting of your snack bar days.
>
> I posted nothing about me and a snack bar.

Somebody must have. It's in your responses.

> > > > Service members now request and receive or are denied written permission
> > > > > to put an amateur radio station on the air.
> > > > >
> > > > > The only anomaly seems to be you in Somalia.
> > > > >
> > > > Permission was granted.
> > >
> > > ..and you can offer what as proof of your claim?
> > >
> > > > No anomaly. No destroyed paperwork. No lies.
> > >
> > > We have no way of knowing what took place. You have nothing to back
> > > your statements.
> >
> > Nor do you. And I don't believe you. You're just not credible.
>
> I needn't attempt proof of a negative. You, on the other hand, are
> faced with the opposite situation.
>
> > > > You must have belonged to a different ethical era.
> > >
> > > That what you stated earlier. Then again, you have no way of backing
> > > any of your statements. Tough luck, kid.
> >
> > You're the one who thought up tossing your orders not to operate, then
> > lie about it. That's the work of a devious mind. And it's all here
> > on rrap.
>

> What are you babbling about, Brian?
>
> > Prove you didn't operate. If anyone will believe you.
>
> How does one prove a negative, Brian? You're still twisting in the wind
> over your alleged T5 permission.

Show us the letter that you said your Commander gave you, denying you
the privelege to operate amateur radio in Vietnam. Unless you threw
it away as you've alluded to previously.

3678. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 23:02:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304251502.353e953c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65865

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<b8aeplqaj0@208.207.71.171>...
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > That's moronic.
>
> That would probably be because a moron did it.

DICK runs in and squawks every now and then.

3679. Re: Facts About Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 23:13:09 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304251513.3389222b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65866

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030424222224.01566.00000039@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> >You're simply incapable of doing it.
>
> Not incapable just will not do it. Im really waiting for you to pass the EXTRA,
> then i will do it.

You'll never get off your butt to help your fellow man, no matter what
exams I pass.

You're typical of many lazy bubbas that I've met along the way. I
recall sandbagging a flood wall for a town near St. Louis in 93.

The locals came out to watch.

3680. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 23:19:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304251519.be79e18@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65867

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030424222031.01566.00000038@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> >I've always
> >wondered if the head of a pin was large enough to hold a brain. Go
> >check out Bruce and get back to me, please.
>
> No question in regards to you Brian, we know your Brain would fit with plenty
> of room to spare

There's a perfectly rational explanation for that. I have a normal
sized head.

I recall reading that Hoover was reviewing a graduating class of FBI
cadets. As they marched by, Hoover asked, "Who's the pin-head?" Not
knowing who Hoover was referring to, the Commandant reviewed the
uniform requirements of that class, and two cadets had the same small
sized hat. They were both dismissed.

Were you ever dismissed from the FBI academy?

3681. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 23:41:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304251541.11795f2f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65868

Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv) <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message news:<MPG.19065f03e14e815d9896b8@news.mindspring.com>...
> DXCC to accept YI/ operations approved by commanding officers (Apr 15,
> 2003) -- ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, says the
> League will accept for DXCC credit YI/ operations from Iraq by US or
> British military personnel
>
> provided the operator has written permission from his or her commanding
> officer.
>
>
> "There is precedent for this," Mills said, citing an operation during
> the 1991 Gulf War. "These operators will need written authorization to
> operate from their commanding officers
>
>
> until an interim Iraqi government is in place," Mills said. After that
> point, operators would need documented permission from Iraqi
> authorities. The Daily DX has reported that several hams with the US
> military in Iraq have been showing up on the air in recent days. Mark
> Smith, NG5L, of North Carolina, has been active from near Nasiriya as
> YI/NG5L on SSB, usually around 0500 UTC near 14.195 MHz. He's also been
> spotted in Europe and North America on other 20-meter frequencies and at
> other times of the day. Jim Dunkerton, YI/KT4CK, has been active on 15-
> meter SSB between 1430 and 1600 UTC. Bob Furzer, 9K2ZZ/K4CY, has
> apparently crossed into Iraq from Kuwait and has been on the air as
> K4CY/p or K4CY/m.

Here's more. From "The ARRL Letter Vol. 22, No. 17April 25, 2003

==>HAMS ABOUND ON UN WORLD FOOD PROGRAM'S IRAQ "FAST INTERVENTION TEAM"

Several radio amateurs--including some of the world's top operators--are among United Nations World Food Program (WFP) "Fast Intervention Team" (FITTEST) personnel already in Iraq or poised nearby and expected to be inside the war-ravaged country very soon. FITTEST is responsible for building technical infrastructure to ensure WFP can move relief food supplies rapidly and safely. Any ham radio operations would be secondary to the WFP's efforts in Iraq, however.

Peter Casier, ON6TT--who's expected in Baghdad as early as next week--says the WFP will have a critical role in the post-conflict era in Iraq "where 60 percent of the population is dependent on external food aid." In ham radio circles, Casier may be better-known as a top contester and one the

operators of Afghanistan's YA5T after the US-led military action there in 2001.

Other YA5T alumni expected to soon be in Iraq as part of the WFP effort include Robert Kasca, S53R--the last UN international staff person evacuated from Iraq before the conflict--Mark Demeuleneere, ON4WW, and Mats Persson, SM7PKK. Casier and Demeuleneere paired up at World Radiosport Team Championship (WRTC) events in 2000 and 2002. Kasca was director of competition for WRTC 2000. Casier says he, Kasca and Dane Novarlic, S57CQ, were on the air from Iraq until just before the war broke out.

Casier reports that Diya Sayah, YI1DZ--one of the primary operators at the Baghdad Radio Club's YI1BGD and the WFP's Baghdad telecommunications officer--is safe and well in Iraq.

FITTEST also has a mandate to install or build basic technical networks, Casier said, including such systems as VHF repeaters, satellite communications and HF fixed and mobile stations. The team also will set up radio rooms, rework administrative procedures, and assign call signs for all UN humanitarian-aid workers and non-governmental organizations (NGOs)--other international aid organizations.

Others ready to go include Ed Giorgadze, 4L4FN, who's in Turkey. Until last November Giorgadze had operated from North Korea as P5/4L4FN while on a WFP assignment in Pyongyang. Patrick Pointu, F5ORF, and Mark Tell, VK4KMT, among several other FITTEST team members who are radio amateurs.

The Daily DX <http://www.dailydx.com> reported this week that Willie Mohney, YI/KV4EB, has been operating daily on 15 meters at or around 21.270 MHz, moving to 20 meters--perhaps around 14.255."

3682. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-25 23:50:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304251550.79a1029c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65869

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EA974AA.B37C3C58@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA8B053.D1082642@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian Kelly wrote:

> > to jump in with them. They run plenty of cw and contest-style ssb and
> > do quite well. I think they run in the four-station class, all the
> > stations are networked together via computer loggers, really slick
> > bunch of good ops.
>
> That second bunch sounds as if it has some real potential.

I don't know how well they do wrt to FD scores but they're a very
active ARES group in the next county west. They have a big complete
ham station set up permanently in the county dispatch facility
including at least one repeater with it's antenna installed up the
county tower. They have their choice of fire stations they can use for
FD sites. They operated from the grounds of the county hospital last
year. These guys are not HT yahoos, from everything I've seen so far
they're what ARES groups should be like.

> > You two kicked some serious butt last year despite the FUBARED first
> > genset, go for it and good luck.
>
> Bert hated that so much that he went out and bought a new Honda
> generator so I don't think we'll lose several hours like last year's
> near fiasco.

He has the FD bug. Can't beat a Honda either.

> I've never done solo Field Day unless you count all those years in
> Africa where Field Day is everyday. We never had commercial power in
> Freetown during my entire two year tour.

Whatta way to make a buck. Nobody can accuse you of schlepping around
the Court of St. James, Paris & Rome Foggy Bottom cicuits.

How many dx entities have you put on the air?

Looks like one of your old haunts is being infested by Frogs.

- - - -

ARRL DX Bulletin:

GUINEA BISSAU, J5. Sebastian, F8DQZ is QRV as J5UAT and has been
active on 10 meters just before 1500z and 12 meters around 1900z.
QSL to home call.

- - - -

> > . . . ate like a pig, more London Broil and fresh air than I
> > could stand, wunnerful.
>
> We did have a grill out by the operating position and have some guests
> including K8MWO and his XYL. They now live on Lake Cumberland in
> Kentucky.

Grills & a bit of socializing are FD epitomized. Until it becomes the
whole focus of the operation and ya wind up with a radio picnic
instead of a FD operation. Which is the primary reason Jim and I
bailed away from the previously mentioned group.

> > Until the ex showed up too. She's fun like neon signs and leaky 13 kV
> > insulators are fun on 80.
>
> If I pondered all day, I don't think I could have put together a more
> colorful description.

It's easy when ya been there . . ! 80M QRN has historically followed
me everywhere I've ever been on 80. Tried to get on 80 that is.

She's actually a good sport but she puts far too much effort into
taking cheap shots at me.

> > weekends she went ballistic when she spotted the bucket. "Mom, he even
> > brought his damned bucket!!" "Father, you are NOT allowed to use that
> > bucket on MY property!"
>
> I thought the bucket a considerate gesture on your part. It is
> certainly better than using her lilac bushes.

It's all nonsense.

'Way back there was an unofficial local dxer's group which passed out
"Pee Bucket" Awards to those who ran in contests for an entire 48 hour
weekend. Ya got a plastic bucket with your qsl card glued on it. I got
mine and it became a sort of family totem for the weekends Dad spent
in the 'tests. No, I didn't pee in the thing, it was a low-brow family
joke. The problem was that my youngest daughter never caught onto the
fact that it was just a joke and thought that I really did pee in the
bucket. Compounded by me taking for granted that she knew it was a
silly joke.

> It is easy to think of your own family as dysfunctional until you
> encounter a gathering of someone else's. My pop used to say that if you
> shunned every family member who had done something embarrassing or
> shameful, family reunions would consist of very small groups.

Very small boring-as-hell groups.

If my clan ever had an all-out gathering . . never mind . . !

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

3683. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 00:30:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030425203026.04540.00000172@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65870

>Were you ever dismissed from the FBI academy?
>

NO, were you?

3684. Re: Facts About Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 00:35:48 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030425203548.04540.00000173@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65871

>You'll never get off your butt to help your fellow man, no matter what
>exams I pass.

Not true, I help my fellow man everyday, its Knuckle Dragging CBplussers like yourself that I will not help.

>You're typical of many lazy bubbas that I've met along the way.

Im sure you know a Bunch of Bubbas, probably the only people that will have anything to do with you.

>I
>recall sandbagging a flood wall for a town near St. Louis in 93.
>
>The locals came out to watch.

Oh that explains it. I think there were a bunch of prisoners involved in that project, was that you and one of your Bubba boys helping out?

3685. Re: Repeater Autopatch vs. Telemarketer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 01:35:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030425213546.18828.00000439@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65873

In article <Pine.LNX.4.55.0304252135030.872@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>Lately, a repeater autopatch has been getting a lot of incoming calls. I
>suspect that some may be from telemarketers. So far, when the reverse patch
>answer command has been entered, the caller is gone and what is heard is the
>"off-hook" signal from telco. However, what is the best course of action
>should an amateur operator answer a reverse patch and find a telemarketer on
>the other end?
>
>The options I can think of are:
>1) Simply command the patch down without saying a word.
>2) Say, "You're in violation of 47 CFR 97.113. Don't call again." Then
>command the patch down.
>3) Something else.

I say 2). But I would amend it to be: "You're in violation of 47 CFR 97.113.
Do not call this number again. Take this number off your list and inform your
superiors to remove it from all of their lists."

Then hang up.
>
>I've already signed up the autopatch's phone number with the appropriate
>state
>Attorney General's office "Do not call list," which about July will get
>automatically added to the federal telemarketer "do not call list" where the
>law enforcing the list goes into effect in September 2003.

Excellent.

>What to do in the meantime is the problem.
>
>In the exact situation I am thinking of, the repeater answers the phone by
>saying (synthesized voice), "This is the <club-callsign> amateur radio club
>repeater autopatch," then waits for about 30 seconds for a command before the
>reverse patch ringout on the radio. No audio is gated to or from the radio
>side until the reverse patch answer command is input. The speech board
>doesn't
>have a DVR nor the vocabulary to tell telemarketers to hang up up front.
>
>Comments?
>
Is it possible to add some more words to the answer message? Such as "if you
did not intend to access this facility, please hang up and do not call again".
?

73 es GL de Jim, N2EY

3686. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 01:35:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030425213547.18828.00000440@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65872

In article <b8a6pi$jj1$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0304240744.12c29c3a@posting.google.com...
>> Getting back to the subject of Chirac, Iraq and France...
>>
>> check this out:
>>
>> http://www.snopes.com/politics/soapbox/rooney.asp
>>
>> Not an urban legend or false attribution!

There are a number of essays falsely attributed to Kurt Vonnegut, Andy Rooney,
George Carlin and others bouncing around the 'net. This one's for real.

>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Great piece,
>thanks Jim for posting the link.
>
You're welcome, Bill.

An interesting thing about the piece is that nowhere does Andy Rooney actually
say what HIS opinion of the war is.

--

Heard an interesting interview on NPR's "Fresh Air". the other day. Interviewee
was named Tom Freeman (I think) who has written about the Mideast for 20 years
or so. One point he made was that we should expect a certain amount of
animosity from the Iraqis now, because even though the USA spent billions of
dollars and over 100 lives to liberate them, the mere fact that outsiders were
needed to do it was/is humiliating. 'Specially when over 20 years of brutal
sadistic tyranny are ended in less than a month of fighting.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3687. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 01:57:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030425215712.18773.00000174@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 65875

In article <d22b54c3.0304242201.311a83b8@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> BTW I'm contemplating the purchase of an FT-817 myself. Anyone have
>> a recommendation for a good portable antenna tuner?
>
>http://www.ldgelectronics.com/z-11.html
>
>Can't miss.
>

Brian:

Brother, you ain't kiddin! What a neat little tuner! I'd almost be tempted to get the kit version, but my up-close eyesight isn't up to the task of doing that kind of work anymore. My last project was an active attenuator for fox hunting, and I had to build the whole thing under one of those big lighted magnifiers! Like I said, I haven't decided on the 817 yet. I'm still licking my wounds from my annual battle with the IRS.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3688. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 01:57:38 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304251757.7eb47b22@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65874

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0304250230.147f33da@posting.google.com>...
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<b89gkt$1gf$1@208.206.142.107>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0304231253.1f414019@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > > I do Putz and that's all you were, a RE rack babysitter.
> > > >
> > > > :-) :-)
> > >
> > > I got a tour of an aircraft carrier once. Doesn't mean I was in the Navy.
> >
> > And I'm sure millions of former and current swabbies are thanking their lucky stars.
>
> Then they shouldn't have invited me to join their Chief's group.

They musta been looking for deadloads again.

> > > You didn't even make the rear echelon.
> >
> > Sorry PAL, he was a primary force in *building* the darn thing. You were another one of
the weather
> > guessers.
>
> In the age of smart bombs, you need even smarter weathermen. But even
> the weatherman of your era did a pretty darned good job at Normandy.

3689. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 02:16:35 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <F84A26B8F560A6AC.43F1650520DECA2A.70908254ECADC07A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65876

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030425213547.18828.00000440@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <b8a6pi$jj1$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >news:c2356669.0304240744.12c29c3a@posting.google.com...
> >> Getting back to the subject of Chirac, Iraq and France...
> >>
> >> check this out:
> >>
> >> http://www.snopes.com/politics/soapbox/rooney.asp
> >>
> >> Not an urban legend or false attribution!
>
> There are a number of essays falsely attributed to Kurt Vonnegut, Andy
Rooney,
> George Carlin and others bouncing around the 'net. This one's for real.
>
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Great piece,
> >thanks Jim for posting the link.
> >
> You're welcome, Bill.
>
> An interesting thing about the piece is that nowhere does Andy Rooney
actually
> say what HIS opinion of the war is.
>

Hmmmm, interesting that we see this differently, Jim. I think Andy Rooney's
last sentence says what he thinks about *this* war--not necessarily war in
general. However, he does not blatantly say one way or the other and I
think that is the journalistic attitude in him.

> --
>
> Heard an interesting interview on NPR's "Fresh Air". the other day.
Interviewee
> was named Tom Freeman (I think) who has written about the Mideast for 20
years
> or so. One point he made was that we should expect a certain amount of
> animosity from the Iraqis now, because even though the USA spent billions

of
> dollars and over 100 lives to liberate them, the mere fact that outsiders
were
> needed to do it was/is humiliating. 'Specially when over 20 years of
brutal
> sadistic tyranny are ended in less than a month of fighting.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I was listening to that interview also. Really enjoyed the perspective.

Kim W5TIT

3690. Re: Repeater Autopatch vs. Telemarketer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 02:23:26 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0304260210590.954@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 65877

On Sat, 26 Apr 2003, N2EY wrote:
> In article <Pine.LNX.4.55.0304252135030.872@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
> <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:
> >Lately, a repeater autopatch has been getting a lot of incoming calls. I
> >suspect that some may be from telemarketers. So far, when the reverse patch
> >answer command has been entered, the caller is gone and what is heard is the
> >"off-hook" signal from telco. However, what is the best course of action
> >should an amateur operator answer a reverse patch and find a telemarketer on
> >the other end?
> >
> >The options I can think of are:
> >1) Simply command the patch down without saying a word.
> >2) Say, "You're in violation of 47 CFR 97.113. Don't call again." Then
> >command the patch down.
> >3) Something else.
>
> I say 2). But I would amend it to be: "You're in violation of 47 CFR 97.113.
> Do not call this number again. Take this number off your list and inform your
> superiors to remove it from all of their lists."
>
> Then hang up.
> >
> >I've already signed up the autopatch's phone number with the appropriate
> >state
> >Attorney General's office "Do not call list," which about July will get
> >automatically added to the federal telemarketer "do not call list" where the
> >law enforcing the list goes into effect in September 2003.
>
> Excellent.
>
> >What to do in the meantime is the problem.
> >
> >In the exact situation I am thinking of, the repeater answers the phone by
> >saying (synthesized voice), "This is the <club-callsign> amateur radio club
> >repeater autopatch," then waits for about 30 seconds for a command before the
> >reverse patch ringout on the radio. No audio is gated to or from the radio
> >side until the reverse patch answer command is input. The speech board
> >doesn't
> >have a DVR nor the vocabulary to tell telemarketers to hang up up front.
> >
> >Comments?
> >
> Is it possible to add some more words to the answer message? Such as "if you
> did not intend to access this facility, please hang up and do not call again".

No. The speech board is one of those with a limited, pre-programmed vocabulary, and this system does not have DVR capability (as noted above). It's just not possible.

The only suggestion I have received in e-mail was to somehow generate the tone sequence that comes out at the beginning of the "disconnected number message." (I have yet to find out what that sequence of three [multi-]tones is.)

3691. Re: K-YMAN 14.275, er 14.272

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 03:04:07 UTC
From: L L O Y D D A V I E S <firebottle@n0vfp.cm>
Message-ID: <3ea9f312$1_3@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 65878
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

REposted to put into Google.com!

--
Lloyd/N0VFP
"Finest No-Coder to key up a handie talkie"
Ft-817, ATS 909

"Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:634e00e4.0304251355.1c8130e4@posting.google.com...
>
>
>
> Well folks, nearly 4 months have gone by since war was declared on the
> "Belgrade Blow-Hard" aka the "King of Self-Promotion" aka "The MAN
> with the Pecuniary Interest Pecker Breath," our beloved motley fool,
> "Baghdad Baxter."
>
> I guess it's time for an update. The old Bag has been completely
> absent from the airwaves for the past 7 days. This is reminiscent of
> that time in 1999 when Riley was on his ass like white on rice and the
> Bag "left the air to teach high school" or (as he also lied) to
> "prepare his 10 million dollar (FAILED) law suit against the FCC.
>
> Guess what, this time that trick will not play in Gettysburg. The Feds
> are pursuing this pusillanimous pusbag with religious fervor. They
> have more than enough hard evidence to flush his ticket down the
> shitter THREE times... and leading indicators point to this very event
> happening in the very near future. The chase is on and the countdown
> has started!
>
> The Bag can't run... He can't hide! The gig is up and even old Chris
> No-cock is in for a few surprises. My best advice is for both of them
> to buy a couple of FRS handi-talkies and start chatting up the local
> boy scouts, because Ham Radio will soon be a hobby in the past for
> both of them.
>
> -Your Roving Reporter, the All Seeing Eye

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3692. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 03:27:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030425232756.18771.00000181@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 65879

In article <c2356669.0304251111.2f81f2f@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030424231024.18769.00000181@mb-m20.aol.com>...
>> In article <JbIpa.45$yp4.18@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim Hampton"
>> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>>
>> >Dan, Dan, Dan ...
>> >
>> >Question: Is phasing worse? Are you sure? Carrier suppression wouldn't
>be
>> >nearly as important as unwanted sideband suppression. Check out some of
>the
>> >QST articles over the past few years. The reality may well be that with
>> >digital processing, that quadrature phasing may well be held more tightly
>> >with DSP than with analog components. The RF quadrature (at least for one
>> >frequency, or a small frequency spread) would be easy. It may turn out
>that
>> >we could get better suppression with phasing. Then again, the two methods
>> >might just be combined.
>
>The phasing idea was kept alive by a few hams even before the
>developments of the past few decades. For example:
>
>QST Sep 1969 p 11 "A Direct-Conversion SSB Receiver" by Richard S.
>Taylor, W1DAX, uses the venerable 2Q4 network in a solid-state 20
>meter receiver.

Who are writing a reply to?!?

If you want to mention a venerable 34-year-old article, fine, but
the essential component, a metal tube shell enclosed network
that dates back at least 42 years is NOT anything new...or
even close to being "state of the art."

>> A breakthrough in broadband single sideband phasing modulation
>> and demodulation happened with Mike Gingell's PhD thesis in the
>> UK (1975, University of London Faculty of Engineering), his
>> "polyphase" network. Gingell is now living the US, has the US
>> amateur license KN4BS (was N4VQP).
>
>A version of this network appears in my 1988 ARRL Handbook.

Okay, we'll all paste a little gold star beside your name.

The Gingell polyphase network was shown implemented in a 1974
issue of Radio Communication, the magazine of the RSGB. See
Pat Hawker's "Technical Topics" monthly column there. Can you
guess who the author was? Does the call sign G3PLX ring bells?

Imagine that...29 years ago someone in Europe tried something
NEW, a network that didn't need special 1% value components.
Didn't use some "venerable" old part from the USA.

>> The Gingell network values were refined by Tetsuo Yoshida,
>> JA1KO, and that can be seen in QEX, June 1995.
>
>Sadly, it appears that Mr. Yoshida is a silent key. No one with his
>name shows up in qrz.com, and the call JA1KO is unassigned.

So what is the significance of that? Humans get born, grow, and
die. All of us will die...except maybe the immortal morsemen.

How does your statement "invalidate" the article's findings? Does
mathematics die with the mathematician?

Europeans have tried out the Yoshida article values and those
WORK very well.

>QEX is published by the ARRL, out of Newington, CT.

Thank you, Captain Oblivious.

The earth revolves around the sun. Need some more "news?"

>Rick Campbell, KK7B, did some interesting work in the 1990s on
>phasing-type receivers and transmitters suitable for use up to 500 MHz
>directly. Some are available from the ARRL website:
>
>QST Aug 1992 p 19: "High-Performance Direct-Conversion Receivers"

So? Go find a copy of Radio Communication magazine with
that polyphase network in Pat Hawker's column. Guess what
you will find in the same month, same column? Two versions
of European direct-conversion receivers! 29 years ago, not 11
years ago.

>> RF quadrature generation can be done relatively easy with a
>> pair of chained flip-flops clocked at four times the local
>> oscillator frequency. That is done by Dan Tayloe's very low-
>> insertion-loss mixer (patented) using a CMOS quad switch IC.
>> The Tayloe Mixer also has very low intermodulation, better
>> than nearly all conventional diode mixer configurations.
>
>Dan Tayloe is N7VE. His mixer is included in a high performance 30
>meter CW transceiver developed by him. His 2002 Pacificon presentation
>on this CW transceiver is available for free download at:

So? I saw that. Did you see the Tayloe article in RF Design
magazine as I described it? No? You don't read RF Design

magazine? Tsk, tsk, tsk, all that degreed electrical engineering stuff long ago and you don't (or won't) read RF Design?

RF Design magazine is a free (controlled circulation) trade magazine for those involved in (guess what) RF design! :-) Jimmie must not be in the RF design part of "electrical engineering" somewhere...

The Tayloe Mixer is an elegant INNOVATION in heterodyning plus some built-in filtering. The RF Design magazine article shows that. The Tayloe Mixer is unique in that its insertion loss is almost nothing (less than a db, conventional diode mixers have conversion losses of 6 db or more), and has an intermodulation level (IP3 or any other form) so high it is practically at the breakdown level of the CMOS switch at the heart of the mixer.

You can't seem to recognize that, can you? All you do is trot out that Pacificon paper mention again.

>http://www.redhotradio.com/NC30QRPacificon2002.pdf
>
>(This is a 1 MB file)
>
>The N7VE CW transceiver is detailed in the presentation, and can be
>duplicated. A kit is reportedly in the works, to be available from Red
>Hot Radio.

Okay, as a red hot morseman, you've emphasized "CW" several times in this post. Another little gold star beside your name.

>> All of those were incorporated into a homebrew HF receiver
>> designed by Hans Summers, G0UPL, and is described on his
>> website www.hanssummers.com complete with photos as
>> well as schematics and other descriptions. Unwanted
>> sideband suppression is greater than 40 db by measurement
>> of the receiver
>
>This is an 80 meter CW-SSB receiver of interesting homebrew
>construction. Many other projects on G0UPL's website.

Yes, there are. Hans is a relatively young lad (under 30) and ACTIVE in trying out both new and old things. He also likes to work "CW" with a one-tube transmitter and his homebuilt, homedesigned receiver.

>One of the reasons the phasing method has not caught on more with
>amateurs is that much better unwanted-sideband rejection can be had
>with crystal filters for the same or less cost and complexity.

"Less cost?!?" WRONG.

Crystal bandpass filters are found in commercially-built, commercially-sold, ready-to-go amateur radios. That's EASY to apply. Hand over charge card, do electronic money exchange, walk out with ready-built radio box...and instantly one is some kind of "experienced expert" on crystal filters. Yah, yah, yah. Tell me another, Capt. Oblivious.

Compare that to Harry Lythall's (SM0VPO) small PCB for a SSB phasing exciter that uses ordinary 5% parts (less than 30 of them) with the Gingell original value set. No quartz crystal measurement for matching, no need to find motional capacitance or equivalent inductance-capacitance of quartz units.

>An interesting application of the phasing principle could be to use it
>as the "rear end" of a superhet transceiver, enhancing the performance
>of a simple crystal filter and improving gain and filtering
>distribution.

Yes, but without going into the Group Delay variation of different crystal bandpass filters, you can wind up with a heap of odd distortion (unequal amplitudes over bandpass) when coupling the two methods. But, I will give you slack since you've probably never examined group delay on bandpass filters, have you?

>In SSB transmitter applications, the unwanted-sideband rejection needs
>only to be on a par with the IM distortion products put in the
>unwanted sideband by later transmitter stages.

I was NOT talking about "later transmitter stages." That would apply to ALL SSB excitation systems.

Phasing SSB generation requires two major things: Extremely good relative 90 degree phase relationships across the modulation bandwidth done by the phasing network (of whichever kind); extremely good relative 90 degree phase relationships of the heterodyning oscillator source.

If either one of those two major quadrature conditions deviates from 90 degrees (quadrature), both the unwanted sideband suppression and carrier suppression suffer. That has a calculable value as given in the "Collins SSB Book."

A quadrature oscillator source is easiest to obtain over a relatively wide bandwidth by two high-speed digital bistable multivibrators and the oscillator input at four times the desired heterodyning frequency. The only error in quadrature there is from the difference in propagation delay of the flip-flop stages, down in the sub-nanosecond range for 74F series digital devices. For low-power applications, 74HC series can be used, but not over as wide a range as 74F.

Yoshida refinement of the Gingell network values yields quadrature errors of less than 0.2 degrees using worst-case 2% tolerance components; less error with normal tolerance distribution. The quadrature polyphase network of Gingell's has an inherent

wide-band (audio) nature, as wide as anyone wants to extend
the passive R-C network. It could be extended to cover 20 to
20,000 Hz if so desired. Some frequency diversity "carrier"
equipments were tried in the early 1980s using the Gingell
polyphase network which had responses exceeding those values.
[see IEEE Transactions on Communications, several issues in
that time frame]

With quadrature errors so low, the amount of suppression of
unwanted spectral components requires more care in layout to
avoid capacitive cross-coupling. 40 db suppression is quite easy
to do and 50 db suppression is possible with good attention to
PC board layout.

>> ...since the method is bilateral, SSB generation
>> can achieve the same unwanted sideband suppression and
>> the Tayloe Mixer can suppress the carrier so far that great
>> care in layout is required to see near the ultimate value of such
>
>When will you publish a complete design for such a transceiver, Len?

Why should I? You only introduced this NEW item in the thread
to misdirect the subject. You just don't have the background or the
experience in this area of radio to talk about it in engineering and
design terms. Your only recourse is to do a lot of pseudo biblio-
graphy about old QST articles.

>Better in theory. Practice is another issue. None of the receiver
>designs I have seen has reached 50 dB unwanted-sideband rejection in
>practice.

Hot darn! A radio god spoke! "You haven't seen one that reached
such suppression!" That means you have SEEN THEM ALL!
You've examined them all with a spectrum analyzer, have you?

Of course you have...with such bodacious talent at morsemanship
and all those back issues of QST, that makes you an expert on
everydamthing in amateur radio. We all know that. You've implied
it three ways from Sunday for years in here.

>Has abyone actually developed a homebrew phasing-type
>receiver with unwanted-sideband rejection equalling that of modern or
>even vintage superhet designs?

Were you in the grape fields sampling vintage superhets again?
Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Let's put it this way...ALL of the phasing SSB receivers have
suppression better than a Hallicrafters S-40 or an SX-28! :-)
That includes ALL such receivers of the "direct conversion"
type with or without a Tayloe Mixer. Dumas!

Could you (with a straight, honest face) stand there and describe
the test set-up to actually MEASURE the difference in
suppressions? I don't think so. All your theory and "references"
seem restricted to old copies of QST and Electric Radio.

>There is a great deal of innovation going on in amateur radio today,
> compared to what is realized by some. (attention, "Vshah101"!)

More dip-switch remarks from the sorry egoed morseman.

Try to remember whose post you are remarking on, dummy load.

Your exhalted morsemanship doesn't get you credit one in the
technical end of radio. None. Zero. Zip. Nada. Nicht. Nyet.

>> Combining known modern-day analog and digital techniques
>> can result in almost any desired bandwidth for the common
>> amateur radio modes. The only limits are the regulations'
>> limits in each administrations' civil radio regulating agency.
>
>The important question wrt "wide" SSB is not the technical process but
>rather whether the transmission of >6 kHz bandwidth SSB voice signals
>on crowded HF bands is really in the best interest of the ARS.

Oh, my, now you are the Judge, Jury, Arbiter, and Decision-Maker
on Who Should Speak About What?!?

If you would bother to really wear all those ivy-covered degrees and
THINK for a moment, you would find that phasing networks CAN
do SSB generation and demodulation to full human-range audio
frequencies. The bandwidth allowed by LAW for US amateur SSB
transmissions is somewhat ambiguously defined in 97.301 f (1) and
(2). It's all there in black and white, set with real type and printed
on real paper...the LAW for US radio amateurs. YOU have to live
with it, I don't.

You, like Dame Heil, haven't been admitted to any legal bar to make
all those high-sounding legal judgements either in court or out of it.
All you can do is express yourself in a newsgroup and try to build
an image of the Great Ham Technical Guru, an olde-tymer. You do
that but all you have to back you up is some old ARRL publications.

You do "Hi-Fi" fraud, sport...and everyone with any real engineering
background can see it.

Polish.

3693. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 05:26:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030426012609.18244.00000110@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 65880

>Subject: Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/25/2003 10:27 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030425232756.18771.00000181@mb-m18.aol.com>

>>QST Sep 1969 p 11 "A Direct-Conversion SSB Receiver" by Richard S.
>>Taylor, W1DAX, uses the venerable 2Q4 network in a solid-state 20
>>meter receiver.
>
> Who are writing a reply to?!?

Does it matter? You're gonna throw your two cents in anyway.

>If you want to mention a venerable 34-year-old article, fine, but
> the essential component, a metal tube shell enclosed network
> that dates back at least 42 years is NOT anything new...or
> even close to being "state of the art."

You use "state of the art" in quotations. Now the question falls to YOU, Lennie, who are YOU "reply(ing)" to? Jim never said ANY of that was "state of the art.

>>Sadly, it appears that Mr. Yoshida is a silent key. No one with his
>>name shows up in qrz.com, and the call JA1KO is unassigned.
>
> So what is the significance of that? Humans get born, grow, and
> die. All of us will die...except maybe the immortal morsemen.

Irreverence for an engineer, Lennie? Sheesh!

>>QEX is published by the ARRL, out of Newington, CT.
>
> Thank you, Captain Oblivious.

Can't stand seeing ANYTHING of value come out of CT, can ya, Oh Putzy One?

>The earth revolves around the sun. Need some more "news?"

Sure! But we know we won't be seeing it come from you.

>RF Design magazine is a free (controlled circulation) trade
> magazine for those involved in (guess what) RF design! :-)
> Jimmie must not be in the RF design part of "electrical
> engineering" somewhere...

Hmmmmmm. I happen to know several fols who ARE degreed engineers working in (guess what) RF design. Of the seven, only one has "seen" any such magazine, and none are active subscribers?

So how is it that they are allowed to "design" anything without using a LennieRant approved resource????

>You can't seem to recognize that, can you? All you do is trot
> out that Pacificon paper mention again.

Do facts change from day to day, Lennie?

>>The N7VE CW transceiver is detailed in the presentation, and can be
>>duplicated. A kit is reportedly in the works, to be available from Red
>>Hot Radio.
>
> Okay, as a red hot morseman, you've emphasized "CW" several
> times in this post. Another little gold star beside your name.

Does the preference for CW applications invalidate the technical relevence of the work cited?

Or is it simply YOUR disdain for the mode which "invalidates" Jim's references?

>>One of the reasons the phasing method has not caught on more with
>>amateurs is that much better unwanted-sideband rejection can be had
>>with crystal filters for the same or less cost and complexity.
>
> "Less cost?!?" WRONG

Now you are an expert at mass production cost distribution?

>Yes, but without going into the Group Delay variation of different
> crystal bandpass filters, you can wind up with a heap of odd
> distortion (unequal amplitudes over bandpass) when coupling
> the two methods. But, I will give you slack since you've probably
> never examined group delay on bandpass filters, have you?

All this gone to waste.

>I was NOT talking about "later transmitter stages." ...(SNIP)

>Phasing SSB generation requires...(SNIP)

>If either one of those two major quadrature conditions...(SNIP)

>A quadrature oscillator source...(SNIP)

>Yoshida refinement of the Gingell network...(SNIP)

>With quadrature errors so low...(SNIP)

I did not notice a single reference to Amateur Radio POLICY in any of that, Lennie.

Other than to impress yourself with your plagiaristic skills and cut-and-paste technique, what was it for if not to make Lennie look like an RF Hero?

>>When will you publish a complete design for such a transceiver, Len?
>
> Why should I? You only introduced this NEW item in the thread
> to misdirect the subject.

I notice that Lennie only get's on his C&P rants when he thinks he can dazzle us with his technical prowess. Kinda like asking him to do a microwave tutorial.

>You just don't have the background or the
> experience in this area of radio to talk about it in engineering and
> design terms.

Then why the eight paragraph dissertation above?

>Your only recourse is to do a lot of pseudo biblio-
> graphy about old QST articles.

Uh huh.

>Hot darn! A radio god spoke! "You haven't seen one that reached
> such suppression!" That means you have SEEN THEM ALL!
> You've examined them all with a spectrum analyzer, have you?

This is where we can insert Jim's Lennie Profile.

>Of course you have...with such bodacious talent at morsemanship
> and all those back issues of QST, that makes you an expert on
> everydamthing in amateur radio. We all know that. You've implied
> it three ways from Sunday for years in here.

Yep. No "discussing" of the technical points Jim brought up...No "civil debate". Just usual Leonard H. Anderscum Rant and Drivvel.

Hmmmmm....R&D....Research and Development or Rant and Drivvel...?!?! Have to think on that one a bit!

3694. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 08:26:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030426042620.18767.00000204@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 65881

In article <F84A26B8F560A6AC.43F1650520DECA2A.70908254ECADC07A@lp.airnews.net>,
"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030425213547.18828.00000440@mb-m07.aol.com...
>> In article <b8a6pi$jj1$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> >news:c2356669.0304240744.12c29c3a@posting.google.com...
>> >> Getting back to the subject of Chirac, Iraq and France...
>> >>
>> >> check this out:
>> >>
>> >> http://www.snopes.com/politics/soapbox/rooney.asp

>> An interesting thing about the piece is that nowhere does Andy Rooney
>actually
>> say what HIS opinion of the war is.
>>
>
>Hmmmm, interesting that we see this differently, Jim. I think Andy Rooney's
>last sentence says what he thinks about *this* war--not necessarily war in
>general. However, he does not blatantly say one way or the other and I
>think that is the journalistic attitude in him.

I thought that at first, too, Kim.

But when I went back and read it again, it seemed to me that what he was saying
is that the French didn't have the same right he did.

YMMV
> --
>>
>> Heard an interesting interview on NPR's "Fresh Air". the other day.
>>Interviewee
>> was named Tom Freeman (I think) who has written about the Mideast for 20
>>years
>> or so. One point he made was that we should expect a certain amount of
>> animosity from the Iraqis now, because even though the USA spent billions
>>of
>> dollars and over 100 lives to liberate them, the mere fact that outsiders
>>were
>> needed to do it was/is humiliating. 'Specially when over 20 years of
>>brutal
>> sadistic tyranny are ended in less than a month of fighting.

>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>I was listening to that interview also. Really enjoyed the perspective.

He made a lot of good points, didn't he? Hopefully the right people are
listening.

"Fresh Air" originates here in Philadelphia, at WHYY

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>

3695. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 11:46:48 UTC
From: Kenny <R55@slorunxnet.org>
Message-ID: <b8drjfdoa0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 65883

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hdr6hkb.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 21 Apr 2003 10:09:15 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>
> >Seems to me that one of the biggest headaches FCC has in the area of
> >noncommercial radio is the issue of freebanders and those who abuse
> >cb.
> >
> >FCC enforcement of these problems is hampered by the need to locate
> >and identify the violators, as well as to develop evidence to warrant
> >a search. IOW the FCC can't just knock on anyone's door and demand to
> >check for an illegal radio installation.
>
> FCC enforcement agents could - and did - knock on the door and
> -request- to make an inspection but do not have the authority to
> enter by force if refused. It takes a court order (warrant) for
> that to happpen. If there is evidence of operation in violation
> of law or rules, the FCC has the authority to issue a monetary
> penalty (administrative version of a fine) against the operator.
>
> >OTOH, when someone applies for an amateur license, they give FCC all
> >sorts of info about themselves and also agree to allow FCC folks to
> >inspect their stations at any reasonable time AND whenever the station
> >is in operation. FCC CAN knock on a ham's door and demand to inspect
> >the ham's station.
>
> Again, the FCC cannot enter by force if refused, but the "hook"
> that the FCC has is much easier - it can suspend/revoke the
> amateur license as well as issue a monetary penalty.
>
> >Much less work for FCC to check out a ham's QTH
> >than that of an unlicensed freebander.
>
> >So maybe, just maybe, FCC wants to make amateur radio licenses easier
> >to get so as to fight the freeband problem. If FCC could get all of the
> >freebanders licensed as hams, enforcement would be much easier.
>
> Another way of looking at it is that the courts and The
> Congress take the easy way out and try to define what they
> consider the "root problem" (whether that is the problem or
> not). In the case of a freebander, the issue is that the
> operator did not have a license. How to solve that - change
> the rules so that s/he gets licensed or can legally operate
> without one. Problem solved (??) and case closed.

>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
>
GET A LIFE KANE !!!!!!!!!!!

3696. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 12:17:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304260417.5f7cc460@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65884

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<F84A26B8F560A6AC.43F1650520DECA2A.70908254ECADC07A@lp.airnews.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030425213547.18828.00000440@mb-m07.aol.com...
> > In article <b8a6pi$jj1$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"

> > Heard an interesting interview on NPR's "Fresh Air". the other day.
> Interviewee
> > was named Tom Freeman (I think) who has written about the Mideast for 20
> years
> > or so. One point he made was that we should expect a certain amount of
> > animosity from the Iraqis now, because even though the USA spent billions
> of
> > dollars and over 100 lives to liberate them, the mere fact that outsiders
> were
> > needed to do it was/is humiliating. 'Specially when over 20 years of
> brutal
> > sadistic tyranny are ended in less than a month of fighting.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> I was listening to that interview also. Really enjoyed the perspective.
>
> Kim W5TIT

I didn't hear it. But what I find interesting is that they don't have
the courage to die fighting for their own freedoms, but are willing to
fly an airplane into a building or strap on a dynamite vest to hurt
anyone else.

I did hear on NPR of an unintended bombing where -every- villager
interviewed made it a point to say that they were poor. I don't know
if they tell everyone everyday that they are poor or if they were
setting the stage for reparations.

I think Iran just got twice as large.

3697. Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 12:18:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304260418.5ffec758@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65885

Is anyone going? Brian

3698. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 12:26:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030426082619.18821.00000227@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 65886

In article <20030425232756.18771.00000181@mb-m18.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0304251111.2f81f2f@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20030424231024.18769.00000181@mb-m20.aol.com>...
>>> In article <JbIpa.45$yp4.18@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim Hampton"
>>> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>>>
>>> >Dan, Dan, Dan ...
>>> >
>>> >Question: Is phasing worse? Are you sure? Carrier suppression wouldn't
>>be
>>> >nearly as important as unwanted sideband suppression. Check out some of
>>the
>>> >QST articles over the past few years. The reality may well be that with
>>> >digital processing, that quadrature phasing may well be held more tightly
>>> >with DSP than with analog components. The RF quadrature (at least for
>one
>>> >frequency, or a small frequency spread) would be easy. It may turn out
>>that
>>> >we could get better suppression with phasing. Then again, the two
>methods
>>> >might just be combined.
>>
>>The phasing idea was kept alive by a few hams even before the
>>developments of the past few decades. For example:
>>
>>QST Sep 1969 p 11 "A Direct-Conversion SSB Receiver" by Richard S.
>>Taylor, W1DAX, uses the venerable 2Q4 network in a solid-state 20
>>meter receiver.
>
> Who are writing a reply to?!?

What does that mean, Len?
>
> If you want to mention a venerable 34-year-old article, fine,

Then why are you so critical?

> but
> the essential component, a metal tube shell enclosed network
> that dates back at least 42 years is NOT anything new...or

> even close to being "state of the art."

Who said it was? The 2Q4/350 isn't available new any more.

The point of mentioning that article was simply to show that interest in the phasing method never died out among hams, even 34 years ago.
>
>>> A breakthrough in broadband single sideband phasing modulation
>>> and demodulation happened with Mike Gingell's PhD thesis in the
>>> UK (1975, University of London Faculty of Engineering), his
>>> "polyphase" network. Gingell is now living the US, has the US
>>> amateur license KN4BS (was N4VQP).
>>
>>A version of this network appears in my 1988 ARRL Handbook.
>
> Okay, we'll all paste a little gold star beside your name.

Why all the sarcasm, Len? Is it a bad thing that Gingell's work was recognized and published here in the USA?
>
> The Gingell polyphase network was shown implemented in a 1974
> issue of Radio Communication, the magazine of the RSGB. See
> Pat Hawker's "Technical Topics" monthly column there. Can you
> guess who the author was? Does the call sign G3PLX ring bells?

So what's your point? Nobody denies the origin of the network.
>
> Imagine that...29 years ago someone in Europe tried something
> NEW, a network that didn't need special 1% value components.
> Didn't use some "venerable" old part from the USA.

Isn't that obvious?
>
>>> The Gingell network values were refined by Tetsuo Yoshida,
>>> JA1KO, and that can be seen in QEX, June 1995.
>>
>>Sadly, it appears that Mr. Yoshida is a silent key. No one with his
>>name shows up in qrz.com, and the call JA1KO is unassigned.
>
> So what is the significance of that?

I was saddened to learn he was no longer with us, and that no one holds his callsign.

> Humans get born, grow, and
> die. All of us will die...except maybe the immortal morsemen.

What is the significance of your unprovoked snide remarks like that last sentence?
>
> How does your statement "invalidate" the article's findings? Does
> mathematics die with the mathematician?

It doesn't and they don't.

Where do you get these ideas?
>
> Europeans have tried out the Yoshida article values and those
> WORK very well.

Have YOU tried them out? Have YOU built any phasing-type SSB receivers or transceivers, Len? The information has been out there for over a quarter century...
>
>>QEX is published by the ARRL, out of Newington, CT.
>
> Thank you, Captain Oblivious.
>
> The earth revolves around the sun. Need some more "news?"
>
>>Rick Campbell, KK7B, did some interesting work in the 1990s on
>>phasing-type receivers and transmitters suitable for use up to 500 MHz
>>directly. Some are available from the ARRL website:
>>
>>QST Aug 1992 p 19: "High-Performance Direct-Conversion Receivers"
>
> So? Go find a copy of Radio Communication magazine with
> that polyphase network in Pat Hawker's column. Guess what
> you will find in the same month, same column? Two versions
> of European direct-conversion receivers! 29 years ago, not 11
> years ago.

So what? Why are you stuck in the past? Do those old designs have better performance? Are the parts and boards for them still available?

>>> RF quadrature generation can be done relatively easy with a
>>> pair of chained flip-flops clocked at four times the local
>>> oscillator frequency. That is done by Dan Tayloe's very low-
>>> insertion-loss mixer (patented) using a CMOS quad switch IC.
>>> The Tayloe Mixer also has very low intermodulation, better
>>> than nearly all conventional diode mixer configurations.
>>
>>Dan Tayloe is N7VE. His mixer is included in a high performance 30
>>meter CW transceiver developed by him. His 2002 Pacificon presentation
>>on this CW transceiver is available for free download at:
>
> So? I saw that.

Yet for some reason you did not include his callsign in your post. You included the callsign of everyone else mentioned. Perhaps you do not like to admit that the inventor is a 1x2 Extra.

> The Tayloe Mixer is an elegant INNOVATION in heterodyning
> plus some built-in filtering. The RF Design magazine article
> shows that. The Tayloe Mixer is unique in that its insertion
> loss is almost nothing (less than a db, conventional diode

> mixers have conversion losses of 6 db or more), and has an
> intermodulation level (IP3 or any other form) so high it is
> practically at the breakdown level of the CMOS switch at the
> heart of the mixer.

That's ALL obvious from the Pacificon presentation. Available free for the
download.
>
> You can't seem to recognize that, can you?

You couldn't be more wrong, Len.

> All you do is trot
> out that Pacificon paper mention again.
>
"Again"?

>>http://www.redhotradio.com/NC30QRPacificon2002.pdf
>>
>>(This is a 1 MB file)

Lots of good info. Including a duplicatable design.
>>
>>The N7VE CW transceiver is detailed in the presentation, and can be
>>duplicated. A kit is reportedly in the works, to be available from Red
>>Hot Radio.
>
> Okay, as a red hot morseman, you've emphasized "CW" several
> times in this post. Another little gold star beside your name.

So? Is that bad?

Some anti-code types in here have claimed that there is no connection between
Morse code and technical innovation. Not even among hams. Yet the mixer you
describe as an "elegant INNOVATION" came about because one of those 1x2 Extras
you so love to put down was looking for something new. And its first
implementation was in a ham radio CW transceiver.

Does that bother you? It sure seems to. You carefully avoided all mention of
the inventor's callsign, Red Hot Radio and the Pacificon paper.
>
>>> All of those were incorporated into a homebrew HF receiver
>>> designed by Hans Summers, G0UPL, and is described on his
>>> website www.hanssummers.com complete with photos as
>>> well as schematics and other descriptions. Unwanted
>>> sideband suppression is greater than 40 db by measurement
>>> of the receiver
>>
>>This is an 80 meter CW-SSB receiver of interesting homebrew
>>construction. Many other projects on G0UPL's website.
>
> Yes, there are. Hans is a relatively young lad (under 30)

Why do you talk down to him, then?

> and
> ACTIVE in trying out both new and old things. He also likes
> to work "CW" with a one-tube transmitter and his homebuilt,
> homedesigned receiver.

A lot of us are ACTIVE in trying out both new and old things. Some of us also like to work CW with our homebuilt, homedesigned equipment.
>
>>One of the reasons the phasing method has not caught on more with
>>amateurs is that much better unwanted-sideband rejection can be had
>>with crystal filters for the same or less cost and complexity.
>
> "Less cost?!?" WRONG.

No, it's correct. How many superhet receivers with crystal filters have you built at home, Len?
>
> Crystal bandpass filters are found in commercially-built, commercially-
> sold, ready-to-go amateur radios. That's EASY to apply. Hand over
> charge card, do electronic money exchange, walk out with ready-built
> radio box...and instantly one is some kind of "experienced expert"
> on crystal filters. Yah, yah, yah. Tell me another, Capt. Oblivious.

Why all the snide remarks, Len?

In case you hadn't noticed, many homebrew designs use either commercially available filters or homebrew ladder filters.
>
> Compare that to Harry Lythall's (SM0VPO) small PCB for a SSB
> phasing exciter that uses ordinary 5% parts (less than 30 of them)
> with the Gingell original value set. No quartz crystal measurement
> for matching, no need to find motional capacitance or equivalent
> inductance-capacitance of quartz units.

That's nice, Len. But it's not a receiver or a transceiver.
>
>>An interesting application of the phasing principle could be to use it
>>as the "rear end" of a superhet transceiver, enhancing the performance
>>of a simple crystal filter and improving gain and filtering
>>distribution.
>
> Yes, but without going into the Group Delay variation of different
> crystal bandpass filters, you can wind up with a heap of odd
> distortion (unequal amplitudes over bandpass) when coupling
> the two methods. But, I will give you slack since you've probably
> never examined group delay on bandpass filters, have you?

You might be surprised...

Your response to these new ideas is awfully negative, Len.
>
>>In SSB transmitter applications, the unwanted-sideband rejection needs

>>only to be on a par with the IM distortion products put in the
>>unwanted sideband by later transmitter stages.
>
> I was NOT talking about "later transmitter stages." That would
> apply to ALL SSB excitation systems.

Obviously.
>
> Phasing SSB generation requires two major things: Extremely
> good relative 90 degree phase relationships across the modulation
> bandwidth done by the phasing network (of whichever kind);
> extremely good relative 90 degree phase relationships of the
> heterodyning oscillator source.
>
> If either one of those two major quadrature conditions deviates
> from 90 degrees (quadrature), both the unwanted sideband
> suppression and carrier suppression suffer. That has a calculable
> value as given in the "Collins SSB Book."

We KNOW, Len.
>
> A quadrature oscillator source is easiest to obtain over a relatively
> wide bandwidth by two high-speed digital bistable multivibrators
> and the oscillator input at four times the desired heterodyning
> frequency. The only error in quadrature there is from the difference
> in propagation delay of the flip-flop stages, down in the sub-
> nanosecond range for 74F series digital devices. For low-power
> applications, 74HC series can be used, but not over as wide a
> range as 74F.

SO?
>
> Yoshida refinement of the Gingell network values yields quadrature
> errors of less than 0.2 degrees using worst-case 2% tolerance
> components; less error with normal tolerance distribution. The
> quadrature polyphase network of Gingell's has an inherent
> wide-band (audio) nature, as wide as anyone wants to extend
> the passive R-C network. It could be extended to cover 20 to
> 20,000 Hz if so desired. Some frequency diversity "carrier"
> equipments were tried in the early 1980s using the Gingell
> polyphase network which had responses exceeding those values.
> [see IEEE Transactions on Communications, several issues in
> that time frame]

That's nice.
>
> With quadrature errors so low, the amount of suppression of
> unwanted spectral components requires more care in layout to
> avoid capacitive cross-coupling. 40 db suppression is quite easy
> to do and 50 db suppression is possible with good attention to
> PC board layout.

Have you done it? You say it's "easy".
>
>>> ...since the method is bilateral, SSB generation
>>> can achieve the same unwanted sideband suppression and
>>> the Tayloe Mixer can suppress the carrier so far that great
>>> care in layout is required to see near the ultimate value of such
>>
>>When will you publish a complete design for such a transceiver, Len?
>
> Why should I?

Because you lecture endlessly on other's work and theoretical possibilities,
but don't give practical details.

> You only introduced this NEW item in the thread
> to misdirect the subject.

No, I want to actually BUILD something and put it on the air.

> You just don't have the background or the
> experience in this area of radio to talk about it in engineering and
> design terms.

You're quite wrong about that, Len.

But it's clear all you want to do is talk, talk, talk about theory and other
people's articles.

> Your only recourse is to do a lot of pseudo biblio-
> graphy about old QST articles.

Incorrect. Misdirection.
>
>>Better in theory. Practice is another issue. None of the receiver
>>designs I have seen has reached 50 dB unwanted-sideband rejection in
>>practice.
>
> Hot darn! A radio god spoke! "You haven't seen one that reached
> such suppression!" That means you have SEEN THEM ALL!

Nope. There may exist practical designs with better performance

> You've examined them all with a spectrum analyzer, have you?
>
> Of course you have...with such bodacious talent at morsemanship
> and all those back issues of QST, that makes you an expert on
> everydamthing in amateur radio. We all know that. You've implied
> it three ways from Sunday for years in here.

Misdirection and more snide remarks.

You're avoiding the central issue: Are there practical phasing type receiver
implementations that result in better than 50 dB of unwanted sideband
suppression? You obviously don't know of any, either, but don;t want to admit
it. Seems like you are so emotionally attached to the phasing concept that you

can tolerate no rational discussion of its limitations.
>
>>Has anyone actually developed a homebrew phasing-type
>>receiver with unwanted-sideband rejection equalling that of modern or
>>even vintage superhet designs?
>
> Were you in the grape fields sampling vintage superhets again?
> Tsk, tsk, tsk.

In other words, you can't point to any such designs, so you resort to insults.
>
> Let's put it this way...ALL of the phasing SSB receivers have
> suppression better than a Hallicrafters S-40 or an SX-28! :-)
> That includes ALL such receivers of the "direct conversion"
> type with or without a Tayloe Mixer.

In other words, you can't point to any such designs, so you resort to insults.

> Dumas!

Gee, that really convinces me of your professionality, Len.
>
> Could you (with a straight, honest face) stand there and describe
> the test set-up to actually MEASURE the difference in
> suppressions?

Sure. Several methods. One simple way, usable by amateurs without a lot of test equipment, would involve a low distortion signal generator, some calibrated attenuators, and an output meter. Care must be taken not to overload the receiver input when measuring the unwanted sideband.

> I don't think so. All your theory and "references"
> seem restricted to old copies of QST and Electric Radio.

Well, you're wrong. But you'll never admit it.

>>> Combining known modern-day analog and digital techniques
>>> can result in almost any desired bandwidth for the common
>>> amateur radio modes. The only limits are the regulations'
>>> limits in each administrations' civil radio regulating agency.
>>
>>The important question wrt "wide" SSB is not the technical process but
>>rather whether the transmission of >6 kHz bandwidth SSB voice signals
>>on crowded HF bands is really in the best interest of the ARS.
>
> Oh, my, now you are the Judge, Jury, Arbiter, and Decision-Maker
> on Who Should Speak About What?!?

No, that is obviously your role, Len. It's what you do...

All I did was POSE A QUESTION. You seem to think that's wrong.
>
> If you would bother to really wear all those ivy-covered degrees

Where are your degrees from, Len? What institutions? Are they accredited? What date is on the diploma(s)?

> and
> THINK for a moment, you would find that phasing networks CAN
> do SSB generation and demodulation to full human-range audio
> frequencies.

I know that, Len. What's your point, other than to toss out insults?

> The bandwidth allowed by LAW for US amateur SSB
> transmissions is somewhat ambiguously defined in 97.301 f (1) and
> (2). It's all there in black and white, set with real type and printed
> on real paper...the LAW for US radio amateurs. YOU have to live
> with it, I don't.

Everyone has to live with it. Do you think you are above the LAW?

Perhaps the LAW should be changed. This is a policy newsgroup, remember?

All I did was POSE A QUESTION. You seem to think that's wrong.
>
> You, like Dame Heil, haven't been admitted to any legal bar to make
> all those high-sounding legal judgements either in court or out of it.

Neither have you. Hasn't stopped you from commenting on anything in here.

> All you can do is express yourself in a newsgroup and try to build
> an image of the Great Ham Technical Guru, an olde-tymer.

Not me. You. Lots of lectures on theory and other people's work, and recollections of your own "professional" stuff. Plus a very strong bias against certain groups like the ARRL and hams who use CW.

But when it comes to practical designs you've done, that can be duplicated by amateurs with typical basement workshop resources, you have very little to offer.

3699. Re: Facts About Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 12:32:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304260432.3577c29a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65887

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030425203548.04540.00000173@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >You'll never get off your butt to help your fellow man, no matter what
> >exams I pass.
>
> Not true, I help my fellow man everyday, its Knuckle Dragging CBplussers like
> yourself that I will not help.

My knuckles are just fine, and I speak english as if it were my first
language. You might want to try that someday.

> >You're typical of many lazy bubbas that I've met along the way.
>
> Im sure you know a Bunch of Bubbas, probably the only people that will have
> anything to do with you.

And here you are.

> >I
> >recall sandbagging a flood wall for a town near St. Louis in 93.
> >
> >The locals came out to watch.
>
> Oh that explains it. I think there were a bunch of prisoners involved in that
> project, was that you and one of your Bubba boys helping out?

We were wearing uniforms. USAF.

Time for you to quit being a moron and saying outrageous stuff about
your fellow hams. Everyone's all over Vshah, because he'll at least
give a polite answer. No one can stand you.

3700. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 12:35:22 UTC
From: sideband <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net>
Message-ID: <3EAA6FA0.1060105@cac.net>
Source record: 65882
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

http://www.qrz.com/cgi-bin/ikonboard.cgi?act=ST&f=3&t=33730

-SSB

75mwidessb wrote:
> Everything you ever wanted to ever know about
> High Fidelity SSB - but were either afraid to
> ask, or your too much of a wuss because
> RH has "spooked you" concerning the topic of late...
>
> http://www.nu9n.com/
>
> G-d bless this guy!
> He's a genuine audio/radio Engineer.
> An asset we seem to have little of in ham radio these days....
>
>
>
>
>

3701. Re: Article in World Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 12:36:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304260436.1fb6b5c9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65888

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030425203026.04540.00000172@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Were you ever dismissed from the FBI academy?
> >
>
> NO, were you?

But you are a pinhead.

3702. Re: K-YMAN 14.275, er 14.272

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 12:58:26 UTC
From: Maine <Ho@annowheereanon.com>
Message-ID: <b8dvpq$l1v$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 65889

And Baxter will continue to thumb his nose at the
FCC, as he has successfully done for almost two
decades now. The LAST place the commission
wants to deal with k1man is in the federal court system.
Baxter has a well documented case against the FCC,
with a legal team and lots of money to back it up.
If Baxter is ever removed from the air, then the ARRL
will also be removed.
Dream on, Baxter is here to stay. Get used to it!

X457 Monitor

"Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:634e00e4.0304251355.1c8130e4@posting.google.com...
> X-No-archive: yes
>
>
>
> Well folks, nearly 4 months have gone by since war was declared on the
> "Belgrade Blow-Hard" aka the "King of Self-Promotion" aka "The MAN
> with the Pecuniary Interest Pecker Breath," our beloved motley fool,
> "Baghdad Baxter."
>
> I guess it's time for an update. The old Bag has been completely
> absent from the airwaves for the past 7 days. This is reminiscent of
> that time in 1999 when Riley was on his ass like white on rice and the
> Bag "left the air to teach high school" or (as he also lied) to
> "prepare his 10 million dollar (FAILED) law suit against the FCC.
>
> Guess what, this time that trick will not play in Gettysburg. The Feds
> are pursuing this pusillanimous pusbag with religious fervor. They
> have more than enough hard evidence to flush his ticket down the
> shitter THREE times... and leading indicators point to this very event
> happening in the very near future. The chase is on and the countdown
> has started!
>
> The Bag can't run... He can't hide! The gig is up and even old Chris
> No-cock is in for a few surprises. My best advice is for both of them
> to buy a couple of FRS handi-talkies and start chatting up the local
> boy scouts, because Ham Radio will soon be a hobby in the past for
> both of them.
>
> -Your Roving Reporter, the All Seeing Eye

3703. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 13:04:16 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8e09f$90a$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65890

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0304260417.5f7cc460@posting.google.com...
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<F84A26B8F560A6AC.43F1650520DECA2A.70908254ECADC07A@lp.airnews.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030425213547.18828.00000440@mb-m07.aol.com...
> > > In article <b8a6pi$jj1$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>
> > > Heard an interesting interview on NPR's "Fresh Air". the other day.
> > Interviewee
> > > was named Tom Freeman (I think) who has written about the Mideast for
20
> > years
> > > or so. One point he made was that we should expect a certain amount of
> > > animosity from the Iraqis now, because even though the USA spent
billions
> > of
> > > dollars and over 100 lives to liberate them, the mere fact that
outsiders
> > were
> > > needed to do it was/is humiliating. 'Specially when over 20 years of
> > brutal
> > > sadistic tyranny are ended in less than a month of fighting.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> >
> > I was listening to that interview also. Really enjoyed the perspective.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> I didn't hear it. But what I find interesting is that they don't have
> the courage to die fighting for their own freedoms, but are willing to
> fly an airplane into a building or strap on a dynamite vest to hurt
> anyone else.

I see those as a limited set of extremists...not the
general population. From what we have learned, it seems
even Saddam relied more on non-Iraqis for his
extrmists than his own countrymen.
.....

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3704. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 13:45:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030426094526.22022.00000144@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 65891

>Is anyone going? Brian

I am. I will be wearing a Tee Shirt that says "DOWN WITH CBPLUSSERS". I figure it will help ID me. And yes I am going.

3705. Re: Facts About Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 13:47:36 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030426094736.22022.00000145@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 65892

>Time for you to quit being a moron and saying outrageous stuff about
>your fellow hams.

There not my fellow Hams there yours

>No one can stand you.
>

Do you think I care? My life is not Ham Radio.

3706. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 14:23:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304260623.2385b7be@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65893

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030425215712.18773.00000174@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0304242201.311a83b8@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> BTW I'm contemplating the purchase of an FT-817 myself. Anyone have
> >> a recommendation for a good portable antenna tuner?
> > >
> > >http://www.ldgelectronics.com/z-11.html
> > >
> > >Can't miss.
> > >
>
> Brian:
>
> Brother, you ain't kiddin! What a neat little tuner!

I've used an 817 with a Z-11, they definitely *work*, the Z-11 will
handle some pretty nasty SWRs too. The pair together is only a largish
handful.

> I'd almost be tempted
> to get the kit version, but my up-close eyesight isn't up to the task of
> doing that kind of work anymore. My last project was an active
> attenuator for fox hunting, and I had to build the whole thing under one of
> those big lighted magnifiers!

Get the octal socket version . . ?

> Like I said, I haven't decided on the 817
> yet. I'm still licking my wounds from my annual battle with the IRS.

There's always next month.

>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

w3rv

3707. Re: K-YMAN 14.275, er 14.272

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 14:31:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8e58rlvv1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65894
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:634e00e4.0304251355.1c8130e4@posting.google.com...
> X-No-archive: yes
>
>
>
> Well folks, nearly 4 months have gone by since war was declared on the
> "Belgrade Blow-Hard" aka the "King of Self-Promotion" aka "The MAN
> with the Pecuniary Interest Pecker Breath," our beloved motley fool,
> "Baghdad Baxter."
>
> I guess it's time for an update. The old Bag has been completely
> absent from the airwaves for the past 7 days. This is reminiscent of
> that time in 1999 when Riley was on his ass like white on rice and the
> Bag "left the air to teach high school" or (as he also lied) to
> "prepare his 10 million dollar (FAILED) law suit against the FCC.
>
> Guess what, this time that trick will not play in Gettysburg. The Feds
> are pursuing this pusillanimous pusbag with religious fervor. They
> have more than enough hard evidence to flush his ticket down the
> shitter THREE times... and leading indicators point to this very event
> happening in the very near future. The chase is on and the countdown
> has started!
>
> The Bag can't run... He can't hide! The gig is up and even old Chris
> No-cock is in for a few surprises. My best advice is for both of them
> to buy a couple of FRS handi-talkies and start chatting up the local
> boy scouts, because Ham Radio will soon be a hobby in the past for
> both of them.
>
> -Your Roving Reporter, the All Seeing Eye

I heard YI/K1MAN the other evening on 14.272....he was saying he was taking
a teaching job at Baghdad U.

Dan/W4NTI

3708. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 14:41:10 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8e5og$g4$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65895

>
> I was listening to that interview also. Really enjoyed the perspective.
>
> Kim W5TIT

The next move from the Iran backed Shitties...thats right. I spelled it
that way on purpose. Will be to start Viet Cong style attacks.

So much for liberating them.

Dan/W4NTI

3709. Re: K-YMAN 14.275, er 14.272

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 14:45:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8e614$ju9$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65896

"Maine" <Ho@annowheereanon.com> wrote in message
news:b8dvpq$l1v$0@pita.alt.net...
> And Baxter will continue to thumb his nose at the
> FCC, as he has successfully done for almost two
> decades now. The LAST place the commission
> wants to deal with k1man is in the federal court system.
> Baxter has a well documented case against the FCC,
> with a legal team and lots of money to back it up.
> If Baxter is ever removed from the air, then the ARRL
> will also be removed.
> Dream on, Baxter is here to stay. Get used to it!
>
> X457 Monitor

And what 'legal team' is this? The one from OJ's trial? Give us some
names. Or for that matter give us 1 name of 1 lawyer DUMB enough to support
Baxters position.

Dan/W4NTI

3710. Re: Morse code proficiency speed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 14:56:53 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030426105653.26993.00000136@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65897

> Kellie, you're supposed to be this hotshot engineer with all the
> experience in court...can't you write a single paragraph of your
> own without quoting someone else? :-)

You don't seem to be able to...

;-) ;-)

3711. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 16:07:20 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <636F898C60D8A3C5.AEB8600495885770.8FB2E087AA0A0ACC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65898

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0304260417.5f7cc460@posting.google.com...
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<F84A26B8F560A6AC.43F1650520DECA2A.70908254ECADC07A@lp.airnews.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030425213547.18828.00000440@mb-m07.aol.com...
> > > In article <b8a6pi$jj1$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>
> > > Heard an interesting interview on NPR's "Fresh Air". the other day.
> > Interviewee
> > > was named Tom Freeman (I think) who has written about the Mideast for
20
> > years
> > > or so. One point he made was that we should expect a certain amount of
> > > animosity from the Iraqis now, because even though the USA spent
billions
> > of
> > > dollars and over 100 lives to liberate them, the mere fact that
outsiders
> > were
> > > needed to do it was/is humiliating. 'Specially when over 20 years of
> > brutal
> > > sadistic tyranny are ended in less than a month of fighting.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> >
> > I was listening to that interview also. Really enjoyed the perspective.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> I didn't hear it. But what I find interesting is that they don't have
> the courage to die fighting for their own freedoms, but are willing to
> fly an airplane into a building or strap on a dynamite vest to hurt
> anyone else.
>

Well, with all due respect, Brian--that does sound kind of like a Dick
Carrollism: using the word "they" as though you believe everyone is of the
same ilk as those who supported, commanded, and carried out that heinous
act.

>
> I did hear on NPR of an unintended bombing where -every- villager
> interviewed made it a point to say that they were poor. I don't know

> if they tell everyone everyday that they are poor or if they were
> setting the stage for reparations.
>
> I think Iran just got twice as large.
>

I didn't hear or, at least, don't remember the item you mention. But, NPR is my choice of listening!

Kim W5TIT

3712. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 16:08:37 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <E906AA09C73D4087.83E5F1DA01025FA5.D93B8FAC98A06EA1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65899

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b8e5og$g4$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
>
> >
> > I was listening to that interview also. Really enjoyed the perspective.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> The next move from the Iran backed Shitties...thats right. I spelled it
> that way on purpose. Will be to start Viet Cong style attacks.
>
> So much for liberating them.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Oh, good grief, Dan... You need help.

Kim W5TIT

3713. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 16:26:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030426122603.16173.00000054@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 65900

In article <b8e5og$g4$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

> listening to that interview also. Really enjoyed the perspective.
>>
>> Kim
>
>The next move from the Iran backed

[Shiites]

> Will be to start Viet Cong style attacks.
>
>So much for liberating them.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Good point, Dan. While I hope you are mistaken, I would not be at all surprised
if you are correct.

So what should the US-UK coalition forces do then?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3714. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 17:11:12 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8eeji$lh3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65901

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:E906AA09C73D4087.83E5F1DA01025FA5.D93B8FAC98A06EA1@lp.airnews.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b8e5og$g4$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> >
> > >
> > > I was listening to that interview also. Really enjoyed the
perspective.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > The next move from the Iran backed Shitties...thats right. I spelled it
> > that way on purpose. Will be to start Viet Cong style attacks.
> >
> > So much for liberating them.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> Oh, good grief, Dan... You need help.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Why is that Kim? Because I can see what is happening?
Iran is intent on turning Iraq into a Iran too. They want a religious
government there just like theirs. In fact they actually want Iranians
running Iraq.

You don't think they (the Iranians) wont resort to guerilla attacks against
the infidels? US? Open your eyes.

Bush better keep a large armed force in Iraq...with orders to return fire.
Or we will have another Nam. Heck...we still may, no matter what we do.

Dan/W4NTI

3715. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 17:14:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8eepreim1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65902

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030426122603.16173.00000054@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <b8e5og$g4$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> > listening to that interview also. Really enjoyed the perspective.
> >>
> >> Kim
> >
> >The next move from the Iran backed
>
> [Shiites]
>
> > Will be to start Viet Cong style attacks.
> >
> >So much for liberating them.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Good point, Dan. While I hope you are mistaken, I would not be at all
surprised
> if you are correct.
>
> So what should the US-UK coalition forces do then?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I guess that depends on how bad we really want what we say we want. A free Iraq and a non-secular, Iraqi elected government.

It could disintegrate into a US 'selected/appointed' strongman with the US providing the military and financial support. Gee, where is Nuguyn Van Thieu when we need him, eh?

See my point?

Dan/W4NTI

3716. Re: K-YMAN 14.275, er 14.272

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 17:18:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030426131857.06174.00000148@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65903

>Subject: Re: K-YMAN 14.275, er 14.272
>From: "Maine" Ho@annowheereanon.com
>Date: 4/26/2003 7:58 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <b8dvpq$l1v$0@pita.alt.net>

>And Baxter will continue to thumb his nose at the
>FCC, as he has successfully done for almost two
>decades now.

There are a lot of people who thumb thier noses at law enforcement everyday
and get away with it...from inside thier cells, where they belong.

>The LAST place the commission
>wants to deal with k1man is in the federal court system.
>Baxter has a well documented case against the FCC,
>with a legal team and lots of money to back it up.

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! !

>If Baxter is ever removed from the air, then the ARRL
>will also be removed.
>Dream on, Baxter is here to stay. Get used to it!

Ahhhhh...yeah....suuuuuuuuuuuure.

>X457 Monitor

Yet another idiotic anonymous poster.

Steve

3717. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 17:32:57 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <F61953B617CC88D2.3FDDC891D50D99B6.C2709EC20D9FCFCB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65905

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b8eeji$lh3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:E906AA09C73D4087.83E5F1DA01025FA5.D93B8FAC98A06EA1@lp.airnews.net...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:b8e5og$g4$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > >
> > > > I was listening to that interview also. Really enjoyed the
> perspective.
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > > The next move from the Iran backed Shitties...thats right. I spelled
it
> > > that way on purpose. Will be to start Viet Cong style attacks.
> > >
> > > So much for liberating them.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Oh, good grief, Dan... You need help.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> Why is that Kim? Because I can see what is happening?
> Iran is intent on turning Iraq into a Iran too. They want a religious
> government there just like theirs. In fact they actually want Iranians
> running Iraq.
>

Well, the news I've been listening to indicates that the Iraqi folks are
pretty hellbent on just that same thing. The thing many don't seem to
realize is that this is a part of the world where everything *is* all about
religion/religious dogma and it's always been that way. It wouldn't
surprise me at all to see Iraq become what I've heard called, a theocracy.
Why does that surprise anyone? AND, what in the world are "we" (the United
States Gov't.) supposed to do about it? Why? What gives us the right to

make it so that things such as theocracies do not happen? Do unto others as you would have done unto yourself, right? Well, I wouldn't want someone coming "in here" (to the United States) and telling me how it's going to be.

>
> You don't think they (the Iranians) wont resort to guerilla attacks against
> the infidels? US? Open your eyes.
>

That's where you need help, Dan. You think just because of my comments that I have no clue. You're wrong. I have way too much clue and that is why the whole idea of our being "over there" has me concerned--when I bother to think about it and most of the time I try not to. I don't think "we" (the so-called Western world) have a chance in Hell of introducing these people to a new way of thinking. Nor, as indicated by your comments and fervor for one, do most here have a chance in Hell of being able to understand or comprehend what these people are all about.

>
> Bush better keep a large armed force in Iraq...with orders to return fire.
> Or we will have another Nam. Heck...we still may, no matter what we do.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Well, ain't that just peachy? An armed force here, an armed force there, everywhere an armed force, right? Heck, why don't we just plan on making it the United World?

Kim W5TIT

3718. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 17:35:10 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <78896CE67B588331.C4D802526F8F9FA0.AC7095B8261F49F4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65906

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b8eepr$eim$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030426122603.16173.00000054@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > In article <b8e5og$g4$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > > listening to that interview also. Really enjoyed the perspective.
> > >>
> > >> Kim
> > >
> > >The next move from the Iran backed
> >
> > [Shiites]
> >
> > > Will be to start Viet Cong style attacks.
> > >
> > >So much for liberating them.
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > Good point, Dan. While I hope you are mistaken, I would not be at all
> surprised
> > if you are correct.
> >
> > So what should the US-UK coalition forces do then?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> I guess that depends on how bad we really want what we say we want. A
free
> Iraq and a non-secular, Iraqi elected government.
>

Never happen in 2,000+ years. Oh yeah, that's right--it hasn't. And it
won't in the next 2,000 years. And, the idea of an armed presence to
"maintain peace and order" is kind of like thought police, isn't it? Oh,
forgive me for being so real about how I think.

>
> It could disintegrate into a US 'selected/appointed' strongman with the US
> providing the military and financial support. Gee, where is Nuguyn Van
> Thieu when we need him, eh?
>
```

> See my point?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Isn't that the world you foresee by our armed presence?

Kim W5TIT

3719. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 17:35:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030426133534.06174.00000150@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65904

>Subject: Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 4/26/2003 7:26 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030426082619.18821.00000227@mb-m10.aol.com>

>But when it comes to practical designs you've done, that can be duplicated by
>amateurs with typical basement workshop resources, you have very little to
>offer.

There's that word "practical" applied to Lennie, again...As in no
PRACTICAL experience.

Now no practical work to demonstrate. He HAS mentioned his Icom R-70
receiver on several occassions, along with several other spamcan radio
accessories.

You'd think Mr Engineer would be able to put some of that "smarts" to
work.

Guess not. Vipul take note.

Steve, K4YZ

3720. SARS How, Why and the Possible Impact of it.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 18:15:10 UTC
From: kingwesthiway@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030426141510.06283.00000358@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 65907

The new disease SARS is actually a marriage of the common cold and the sexually transmitted disease Chlamydia. The disease was created in a Chinese biological weapons lab in 1999, but escaped when a jealous husband that was a biologist at the Chinese lab unleashed it on the family of the man sleeping with his wife. Because of the close proximity and huge population of China it quickly spread throughout China. The estimated number of cases in China is now 30,000 due to the fact that earlier deaths were ruled as pneumonia and the similar symptoms between the two diseases.
Today China is faced with a horrific problem and is now trying to attempt to stop SARS spreading. As a result foreigners that have already been exposed to the disease are leaving China and returning to their home lands it is estimated that 2 out of 10 will carry the disease to their nation of origin.
SARS is the ultimate biological weapon, because it is from the same disease family as the common cold and is bonded with Chlamydia.ï¿½
SARS attacks the repository system killing 15% of the recipients that are treated, this is a important issue since third world nations do not have the resources to treat the infected. The huge problem is that SARS quickly mutates and a person can be quickly reinfected with disease. It is estimated once the disease takes hold in a third world nation population with in one year the fatality rate will reach 50% or more.
We see this disease as similar to the spread of computer viruses and the model used by the Chinese to create this virus is the same. The military leadership wanted to quickly and silently attack a large population, isolate it and kill it. The problem is that the disease has now struck their own country and it looks like their population will decrease to 500 million within 3 years.
In a best case sceranio within three years SARS will reduce the population of the world by 20%, in a worst case scernario it could reach a 75% reduction with 5 years. The reason is that in third world nations the resources to fight the spread of this disease are nonexistant and the cost to NATO countries will be huge, but the
highly educated and affluent populations of NATO countries will help stop the major outbreaks that will occur.
The positive outcome of SARS could be a huge reduction in the human population of the world. Thus the disease could be a blessing and some environmental and depopulation advocates favor introducing the disease into those areas of the world that in their view are over populated. China has already done this by producing the bioweapon and having it accidentally unleashed. A introduction in India and Indonesia will greatly reduce the strain on natural resources those three nations now have on the world.
Overpopulated cities like Mexico City, New York and Los Angeles could be brought back into balance. The problem is the disease might not stop and it could wipe out the human species within ten years. Thus mankind has invented and spread the means of destruction of his own existance as has been written about in fiction and religion for the last 10,000 years.

http://www.nbr.co.nz/home/column_article.asp?id=5695&cid=17&cname=Asia

3721. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 20:20:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030426162044.16173.00000055@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 65908

In article <20030426082619.18821.00000227@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030425232756.18771.00000181@mb-m18.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <c2356669.0304251111.2f81f2f@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>>(N2EY) writes:
>>
>>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>>news:<20030424231024.18769.00000181@mb-m20.aol.com>...
>>>> In article <JbIpa.45$yp4.18@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>, "Jim Hampton"
>>>> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>>>>
>>>> >Dan, Dan, Dan ...
>>>> >
>>>> >Question: Is phasing worse? Are you sure? Carrier suppression
>wouldn't
>>>be
>>>> >nearly as important as unwanted sideband suppression. Check out some of
>>>the
>>>> >QST articles over the past few years. The reality may well be that with
>>>> >digital processing, that quadrature phasing may well be held more
>tightly
>>>> >with DSP than with analog components. The RF quadrature (at least for
>>one
>>>> >frequency, or a small frequency spread) would be easy. It may turn out
>>>that
>>>> >we could get better suppression with phasing. Then again, the two
>>methods
>>>> >might just be combined.
>>>
>>>The phasing idea was kept alive by a few hams even before the
>>>developments of the past few decades. For example:
>>>
>>>QST Sep 1969 p 11 "A Direct-Conversion SSB Receiver" by Richard S.
>>>Taylor, W1DAX, uses the venerable 2Q4 network in a solid-state 20
>>>meter receiver.
>>
>> Who are writing a reply to?!?
>
>What does that mean, Len?

Tsk, tsk, tsk, you've run out of comprehension skills, have you?

You need to focus on who you are replying to. You seem
confused.

>> If you want to mention a venerable 34-year-old article, fine,
>
>Then why are you so critical?

You live in the past too much. Not only that, your resources
of information are too tightly bound to old ARRL publications.

>> but
>> the essential component, a metal tube shell enclosed network
>> that dates back at least 42 years is NOT anything new...or
>> even close to being "state of the art."
>
>Who said it was? The 2Q4/350 isn't available new any more.

Hasn't been "new" for a long time. That was my point.

There HAVE been "new" networks publicized for a quarter
century. RSGB publications has had them repeatedly.
[you appear to be an Anglophile, should know such things]

>The point of mentioning that article was simply to show that interest in the
>phasing method never died out among hams, even 34 years ago.

You have too much concentration on "dying out." We will all
do that. Think positive, think of future things. Drop all the
glorification of the past.

>Why all the sarcasm, Len? Is it a bad thing that Gingell's work was
>recognized and published here in the USA?

"Recognized and published here" some 13 years after it appeared
in RSGB's Radio Communication magazine. :-)

Rather SLOW in the "recognition" department, I'd say.

>> The Gingell polyphase network was shown implemented in a 1974
>> issue of Radio Communication, the magazine of the RSGB. See
>> Pat Hawker's "Technical Topics" monthly column there. Can you
>> guess who the author was? Does the call sign G3PLX ring bells?
>
>So what's your point? Nobody denies the origin of the network.

Peter Martinez didn't "origin" the network. Try to stay focussed.

Martinez is a clever innovator in the UK. He came up with PSK31,
not the polyphase quadrature audio network. Took a while before
PSK31 was "recognized and published" in the USA after it had
successful trials in European amateur radio.

European amateurs were already trying out and (successfully)
using the Gingell polyphase network in SSB equipment before
it was "recognized and published" in the USA.

>> Imagine that...29 years ago someone in Europe tried something
>> NEW, a network that didn't need special 1% value components.
>> Didn't use some "venerable" old part from the USA.
>
>Isn't that obvious?

Not to you. You keep promoting some old component manufactured
by a Pennsylvania company long ago...as if it were the final word on
state of the art. Can anyone understand geographic bias on your
part? [of course they can]

>>>Sadly, it appears that Mr. Yoshida is a silent key. No one with his
>>>name shows up in qrz.com, and the call JA1KO is unassigned.
>>
>> So what is the significance of that?
>
>I was saddened to learn he was no longer with us, and that no one holds his
>callsign.

Did you want it? :-) :-) :-)

Concentrate on the analysis done by Yoshida in the QEX article.
You ARE the certificated MSEE in here...which you keep mentioning
your degrees every so often...you should KNOW the significance of what
Yoshida's work shows and its possibilities. You haven't come close
to the contents of the Yoshida article of 8 years ago.

You misdirect into some "sadness" emotionalism which doesn't
address anything technical or anything that can point to the wide-
band inherent nature of the Gingell polyphase network.

Note: Wideband performance is part and parcel of possible
"Hi-Fi" SSB, aka wide audio modulation in radio. That happens
to be the origin of this particular subject thread. The thread isn't
about callsigns or mortal departures.

>> Humans get born, grow, and
>> die. All of us will die...except maybe the immortal morsemen.
>
>What is the significance of your unprovoked snide remarks like that last
>sentence?

One of the Gang of Four has already stated in here that he "will
live forever." That's evidentiary in a search of Google, is it not?
[you seem to live in Google a lot of the time, should know those
things]

>> How does your statement "invalidate" the article's findings? Does
>> mathematics die with the mathematician?
>
>It doesn't and they don't.

Then try to discuss the contents of Yoshida's QEX article, not his
apparent lack of QRZ listing.

>Where do you get these ideas?

In this virtual Twilight Zone of olde-tyme hamradio where you live
in the past, referencing others' accomplishments...that's where. :-)

>> Europeans have tried out the Yoshida article values and those
>> WORK very well.
>
>Have YOU tried them out? Have YOU built any phasing-type SSB receivers or
>transceivers, Len? The information has been out there for over a quarter
>century...

Yes, I've built them. I've analyzed them with analysis programs
written by others AND myself.

You want "proof" of that? :-) Go to the RSGB's Radio Communication
issue almost a year after the 1970s mention and look in Pat Hawker's
"Technical Topics" column.

For any other "proof," you don't have the clearance. "You don't have
the need to know!" :-) :-) :-)

>So what? Why are you stuck in the past? Do those old designs have better
>performance? Are the parts and boards for them still available?

Don't try this misdirection route, ancient one, you get lost.

I'm not the one who has running bibliographies of old ARRL
publication sources...YOU are. I'm not the one touting the
glories of a long-out-of-date Barker & Williamson component,
YOU are. [that's in Google too]

[on the Tayloe Mixer...]

>Yet for some reason you did not include his callsign in your post. You
included
>the callsign of everyone else mentioned. Perhaps you do not like to admit that
>the inventor is a 1x2 Extra.

Misdirection on your part again, Jimmie. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Dan Tayloe wasn't born with his amateur radio callsign, was he?
He has an uncommon surname which should be noticeable.

The elegant innovation/invention of the Tayloe Mixer is applicable
to ANY radio-electronics situation involving heterodyning, not just
amateur radio. Dan Tayloe has much to his credit in invention
and innovation and much of that work is not just for ham radio.

Try recognizing the PERSON, not the callsign, Jimmie. It will
make you better rounded as a human being.

>That's ALL obvious from the Pacificon presentation. Available free for the
>download.

So is RF Design magazine for engineers. Free subscription...
if you work in that area. [you might try their website, also free
for access, but be careful, you might learn something new!]

RF Design magazine included Dan Tayloe's amateur callsign in
end notes. RF Design editors aren't tunnel-vision focussed on
amateur radio.

>> You can't seem to recognize that, can you?
>
>You couldn't be more wrong, Len.

I think I'm right in my assessment of you and your "qualifications."

You keep harping on the past, old ARRL articles, anything that
remotely relates to amateur radio, misdirect into other areas
when confronted with technical matters. Snow shoveling.

>>>http://www.redhotradio.com/NC30QRPacificon2002.pdf
>>>
>>>(This is a 1 MB file)
>
>Lots of good info. Including a duplicatable design.

That's also true for the article in RF Design magazine. :-)

I've read both. Have you? I don't think so. :-)

>> Okay, as a red hot morseman, you've emphasized "CW" several
>> times in this post. Another little gold star beside your name.
>
>So? Is that bad?

Not for mighty macho morsemen. Little gold stars are their
"accreditation" as much as the pretty wall hangings and living
in fantasy environments.

>Some anti-code types in here have claimed that there is no connection between
>Morse code and technical innovation. Not even among hams. Yet the mixer you
>describe as an "elegant INNOVATION" came about because one of those 1x2
>Extras you so love to put down was looking for something new. And its first
>implementation was in a ham radio CW transceiver.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...you are getting "redhot" again. :-)

I have no claims of telepathic powers and I doubt that you possess
such. Yet, you make this tenuous "relationship" (for lack of any
word describing a fantasy) that the Tayloe Mixer is directly related
to Tayloe's amateur radio hobby activities. Directly.

You assume powers that are magic, mystical, metaphysical in
divining True Purposes. You don't have them. You have fantasies.

>Does that bother you? It sure seems to. You carefully avoided all mention of
>the inventor's callsign, Red Hot Radio and the Pacificon paper.

"Carefully avoided?" :-)

I identify people, human beings, by their names. That is the convention
in most world societies.

In ARRL's world, that very common societal convention is thrown
aside with the requirement of identification by callsign and ALWAYS
preceding their occupations by "ham."

You are an ARRL syncophant. I can understand your predilection
preferences of over-identification with the amateur radio hobby.
The US Patent and Trademarks Office isn't that narrowly-focussed
(Tayloe Mixer is patented). The FCC isn't that narrowly-focussed
and doesn't require staff or commissioners to be granted amateur
radio licenses in order to regulate amateur radio.

>> Yes, there are. Hans is a relatively young lad (under 30)
>
>Why do you talk down to him, then?

"Talking down?!?" :-) Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Hans is a very active electronics hobbyist, is degreed in physics,
and works professionally as an investment broker for a large
UK investment firm. He has described a number of electronics
and amateur radio projects very well and in detail on his web
site. He and his wife have just become parents for the first time
so all of his hobby activities have been on hiatus. :-)

>A lot of us are ACTIVE in trying out both new and old things. Some of us also
>like to work CW with our homebuilt, homedesigned equipment.

Of course all of you "us" do. We've all been informed of your
"homebuilt, homedesigned" Elecraft K2. :-)

>No, it's correct. How many superhet receivers with crystal filters have you
>built at home, Len?

Only two for HF. :-)

As an electronics design engineer (retired but only from regular hours),
I've had to do cost evaluations for both R&D and production projects.
Such activity instills unbiased evaluation of the task at hand. Hobby
desires don't enter into such work.

As far as a comparison of crystal filter versus R-C phasing methods
of SSB generation or demodulation, anyone can take examples of
already-built projects and cost them out. Crystal filter components
are more expensive than an entire sub-assembly of polyphase
networks and its attendant op-amp circuits and its heterodyne
oscillator phasing sub-circuit. That's the way it is.

>Why all the snide remarks, Len?

You get back what you give, Jimmie. :-)

>In case you hadn't noticed, many homebrew designs use either commercially
>available filters or homebrew ladder filters.

I'm very aware of the "commercially available filters" having procured
several from different vendors while working regular hours. That
includes procurement from Collins Radio's filter division in California
while working at Rocketdyne Division of Rockwell International.
Collins Radio was then another Division of Rockwell International. :-)

As to "homebrew ladder filters" using separate quartz crystal units,
I've only done one of those. I have the literature on design that
appeared in QST and QEX as well as other places. The time and
trouble of matching crystal characteristics, exact resonances, and
accurate measurement of results is inordinately time-consuming.
Anyone doing that needs a stable, accurate frequency counter
AND stable generator; I designed and built my own counter and
have both an HP 606 and HP 608 signal generator to use in my
workshop. Such "homebrew (crystal) ladder filters" are NOT
weekender projects nor are they cheap to make for one-of hobby
applications.

>That's nice, Len. But it's not a receiver or a transceiver.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, the tassel of your MSEE cap and gown must have
worn out long ago. :-)

The subject of this thread was the METHOD of wideband SSB
generation and whether or not it was applicable to amateur radio
use. It was NOT about "a receiver or a transceiver."

Try to stay focussed on the SUBJECT. You are having difficulty
with your ego over-riding objectivity all the time.

>> Yes, but without going into the Group Delay variation of different
>> crystal bandpass filters, you can wind up with a heap of odd
>> distortion (unequal amplitudes over bandpass) when coupling
>> the two methods. But, I will give you slack since you've probably
>> never examined group delay on bandpass filters, have you?
>
>You might be surprised...

That is NOT any sort of answer. It is merely evasion.

Describe "group delay" and relate how it applies to either narrow
or wideband filter subsections of SSB generation or demodulation.

>Your response to these new ideas is awfully negative, Len.

Jimmie has extremely poor reading comprehension. :-)

>> Phasing SSB generation requires two major things: Extremely
>> good relative 90 degree phase relationships across the modulation
>> bandwidth done by the phasing network (of whichever kind);
>> extremely good relative 90 degree phase relationships of the
>> heterodyning oscillator source.

>>
>> If either one of those two major quadrature conditions deviates
>> from 90 degrees (quadrature), both the unwanted sideband
>> suppression and carrier suppression suffer. That has a calculable
>> value as given in the "Collins SSB Book."
>
>We KNOW, Len.

No, you apparently don't know. Since your cap's tassel is so
worn out and frayed from twirling it in everyone's face in here,
you need some refreshing in basics of SSB.

You seem offended by basic information on radio physics. That's
typical behavior of morsemen in here and Gang of Four members
in particular.

>> With quadrature errors so low, the amount of suppression of
>> unwanted spectral components requires more care in layout to
>> avoid capacitive cross-coupling. 40 db suppression is quite easy
>> to do and 50 db suppression is possible with good attention to
>> PC board layout.
>
>Have you done it? You say it's "easy".

Relatively easy to observe with the right test equipment. I have
the test equipment, the experience.

>Because you lecture endlessly on other's work and theoretical possibilities,
>but don't give practical details.

I don't "lecture endlessly." :-) Reiteration of basic information is
necessary in here due to the vacuum of basic radio fundamentals
of others. Amateur radio in the US is not tied up solely with "CW"
and contesting and operating. Some amateurs like to assemble
transceiver kits and say they are "homebuilt, homedesigned."

>> You only introduced this NEW item in the thread
>> to misdirect the subject.
>
>No, I want to actually BUILD something and put it on the air.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Did your Elecraft K2 fail? :-)

YOU are the one with both BSEE and MSEE degrees and
"working as an electrical engineer." You should be able to
do that by yourself without help from others.

Elecraft has some other products in kit form, several other
manufacturers do, too. Those would allow you to "build"
something and get it on the air.

>> You just don't have the background or the
>> experience in this area of radio to talk about it in engineering and
>> design terms.

>
>You're quite wrong about that, Len.

You just deny and evade. No one seems to know what you can
or can't do other than a lot of claims.

>But it's clear all you want to do is talk, talk, talk about theory and other
>people's articles.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. I'm not the one referencing all those old QST
articles! :-)

>> Your only recourse is to do a lot of pseudo biblio-
>> graphy about old QST articles.
>
>Incorrect. Misdirection.

Nope. On target. See YOUR previous posting in this thread. :-)

>Misdirection and more snide remarks.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Your ego is showing grievous wounding. :-)

>You're avoiding the central issue: Are there practical phasing type receiver
>implementations that result in better than 50 dB of unwanted sideband
>suppression?

Is that the "central issue?" I don't think so. See the Subject Title
in the header of this thread.

I don't claim to have seen every phasing type SSB application, so
all I've done is mention SOME of them. Anyone can "do the
numbers" in conceptual design for evaluation. Design engineers
DO that for a living. Hobbyists can do the same if they apply
themselves. I've done both.

"50 db unwanted sideband suppression" limitations or exceedances
apply equally to crystal filter SSB subsystems. Their frequency
responses can be upset in circuit applications by mismatching
from manufacturer's specifications, circuit layout, incorrect driving
and output active stages. In order to accurately measure such
suppression levels, one needs the equipment in an accurate test
equipment setup.

>You obviously don't know of any, either, but don;t want to admit
>it. Seems like you are so emotionally attached to the phasing concept that
>you can tolerate no rational discussion of its limitations.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

Phasing method of SSB modulation or demodulation is inherently
capable of wideband modulation...IF a wideband phasing network
is used. Crystal filter method of SSB modulation or demodulation
has a bandwidth firmly fixed by the filter's bandwidth. Relatively
wide bandwidths of crystal filters - as components - are more

costly than relatively narrow bandwidth units according to many
filter manufacturer's listings.

Crystal filter SSB subsystems have fewer components than the
polyphase quadrature phasing subsystems but both occupy
approximately the same PC board area. Crystal filter components
have greater insertion loss than polyphase audio filters.

The thread subject concerned the relative wideband applicability
of SSB modulation-demodulation. An objective engineering-
style evaluation should cover the many differences and similarities
between systems to achieve a proper comparison. The emotion
of the evaluator has no place in the picture.

>> Dumas!
>
>Gee, that really convinces me of your professionality, Len.

Alexandre Dumas was a noted French writer of popular fiction.
He was a professional writer.

>> I don't think so. All your theory and "references"
>> seem restricted to old copies of QST and Electric Radio.
>
>Well, you're wrong. But you'll never admit it.

I was too hasty to say "all" in place of "nearly all." You DID
quote a Pacificon presentation by Tayloe. :-)

You have NOT acknowledged reading RF Design magazine, an
electronics engineering industry periodical (free to those in
the industry) or the RSGB's Radio Communication magazine.
Neither did you acknowledge the IEEE Transactions of
Communications of the 1980s which had several papers on
polyphase filters.

>> Oh, my, now you are the Judge, Jury, Arbiter, and Decision-Maker
>> on Who Should Speak About What?!?
>
>No, that is obviously your role, Len. It's what you do...

I have both training and experience in objective evaluation of
electronics projects. I bother to research things without acting
as an ARRL syncophant or endlessly mention "CW" when it
doesn't apply to a discussion.

>All I did was POSE A QUESTION. You seem to think that's wrong.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. You've "posed" more than some supermodels. :-)

I've asked questions in here also. You want to escape and
evade technical questions by being vague and general in
answers or you become (apparently) infuriated by non-agreement
to your expertise.

>> If you would bother to really wear all those ivy-covered degrees
>
>Where are your degrees from, Len? What institutions? Are they accredited?
>What date is on the diploma(s)?

Irrelevant to "Hi-Fi" SSB links, the subject title above. :-)

This isn't about academic institutions or degrees or certificates.
Yet, you've reminded everyone of yours from time to time.

>I know that, Len. What's your point, other than to toss out insults?

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Jimmie thinks that any disagreement with his
remarks, however slight, is an "insult." Poor baby. Too much
ego at work there.

>> The bandwidth allowed by LAW for US amateur SSB
>> transmissions is somewhat ambiguously defined in 97.301 f (1) and
>> (2). It's all there in black and white, set with real type and printed
>> on real paper...the LAW for US radio amateurs. YOU have to live
>> with it, I don't.
>
>Everyone has to live with it. Do you think you are above the LAW?

I'm not licensed in US amateur radio service. Regulations on
US amateur radio transmission do not apply directly to me.
They apply to you because you are licensed in US amateur radio.

>Perhaps the LAW should be changed. This is a policy newsgroup, remember?

Why should the LAW be changed?

What is IN this LAW about wideband SSB emission that bothers
you so much?

>All I did was POSE A QUESTION. You seem to think that's wrong.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, there you go "posing" again. Everyone has run
out of film. :-)

Mr. DeMille isn't ready for your closeup yet...

>Not me. You. Lots of lectures on theory and other people's work, and
>recollections of your own "professional" stuff. Plus a very strong bias
>against certain groups like the ARRL and hams who use CW.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. I'm not a synchophant for ARRL. I'm not a Believer
in the emotional enjoyment or efficacy of morse code as a
communications mode. :-)

>But when it comes to practical designs you've done, that can be duplicated by
>amateurs with typical basement workshop resources, you have very little to
>offer.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Just who is the double-degreed BSEE and MSEE
in here who "works as an electrical engineer?" :-)

I should think another who has built 8 ham stations, all home-built and home-designed could do all the "offering." :-)

I'm just an electronics hobbyist who is also a professional in electronics design with years of experience in that. I don't design radio kits so I can't offer those. I've written for Ham Radio magazine, too, and was an Associate Editor there...again, not "offering" anything other than intellectual illumination, information, and advice on real, practical circuits.

So, tell us all about how you "homedesigned" that Elecraft K2? Was it difficult? Did you get all the details from old articles in QST? :-)

3722. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 22:23:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030426182353.21604.00000114@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65909

>Subject: Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/26/2003 3:20 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030426162044.16173.00000055@mb-m28.aol.com>

>>> If you want to mention a venerable 34-year-old article, fine,
>>
>>Then why are you so critical?
>
> You live in the past too much. Not only that, your resources
> of information are too tightly bound to old ARRL publications.

WHOA! That's pretty heavy coming from "Mr. Rear Area Radio Station in the Fifties" ! ! !

>You have too much concentration on "dying out." We will all
> do that. Think positive, think of future things. Drop all the
> glorification of the past.

Only the glory of Heaven exists in the future, Lennie. All of mankind's glories DO exist "in the past", Your Ignorantness.

>Peter Martinez didn't "origin" the network. Try to stay focussed

Still not taking hints, even obvious ones, Lennie?. It's "focused". Please try to remember that next time you are asserting somone is "angry" becasue of typos.

>Not to you. You keep promoting some old component manufactured
> by a Pennsylvania company long ago...as if it were the final word on
> state of the art. Can anyone understand geographic bias on your
> part?

Yet of course you can provide the post wherein he said this?

We won't hold our breath waiting.....

>Concentrate on the analysis done...(SNIP)

Relevence to "policy"...???

>You misdirect into some "sadness" emotionalism...(SNIP)

Relevence to policy...???

>Note: Wideband performance is part and parcel of possible
> "Hi-Fi" SSB, aka wide audio modulation in radio. That happens
> to be the origin of this particular subject thread. The thread isn't
> about callsigns or mortal departures.

Hmmmmm....bandwidth authorizations are relevent to "policy", however why
are you denigrating Jim's expression of regret for the passing of a fine
ENGINEER, Lennie?

Sorry that such expressions of sorrow will never grace this forum for YOU?

>>Where do you get these ideas?
>
> In this virtual Twilight Zone of olde-tyme hamradio where you live
> in the past, referencing others' accomplishments...that's where.

Lennie's lack of citing a verifyable quote/post/Google search noted.

Yet another perfect example of the accuracy of Jim's "profile" for Lennie.

>For any other "proof," you don't have the clearance. "You don't have
> the need to know!"

Ahhhhh...one of YOUR "Seven Hostile Actions", Oh Putzy One?

Just another sample of Lennie's "I got my name in print" boasting without
any EVIDENCE of originality or practical experience.

>I'm not the one who has running bibliographies of old ARRL
> publication sources...YOU are. I'm not the one touting the
> glories of a long-out-of-date Barker & Williamson component,
> YOU are. [that's in Google too]

Jim's "running out" of references? I don't think so. He posts 2
paragraphs, YOU post 20 trying to rebut him.

Someone's running out of something, but I don't think it's Jim.

>>Yet for some reason you did not include his callsign in your post. You
>included
>>the callsign of everyone else mentioned. Perhaps you do not like to admit
>that
>>the inventor is a 1x2 Extra.
>
> Misdirection on your part again, Jimmie. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
> Dan Tayloe wasn't born with his amateur radio callsign, was he?
> He has an uncommon surname which should be noticeable.

Yet you fail to address Jim's comments.

>Try recognizing the PERSON, not the callsign, Jimmie. It will
> make you better rounded as a human being.

So that's why you felt it necessary to make references to a Swedish and
British Amateur by THEIR calls, Lennie...?!?!

>RF Design magazine included Dan Tayloe's amateur callsign in
> end notes. RF Design editors aren't tunnel-vision focussed on
> amateur radio

"Focused". You're getting angry again, Lennie! Temper Fry!

>You keep harping on the past, old ARRL articles, anything that
> remotely relates to amateur radio, misdirect into other areas
> when confronted with technical matters. Snow shoveling.

"Snow shovelling"....Hmmmmmm...I'll remember that one next time we are dumped on with yet another "...there I was at ADA at three in the morning back in 1953..." stories.

>I have no claims of telepathic powers and I doubt that you possess
> such. Yet, you make this tenuous "relationship" (for lack of any
> word describing a fantasy) that the Tayloe Mixer is directly related
> to Tayloe's amateur radio hobby activities. Directly.

So...we are to assume that Mr. Tayloe did all this work, but then DIDN'T apply it to his own Amateur Radio activities?

BBBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! !

>You assume powers that are magic, mystical, metaphysical in
> divining True Purposes. You don't have them. You have fantasies.

Someone here is having fantasies, alright, Lennie...It's not me and it SURE isn't Jim.

>>Does that bother you? It sure seems to. You carefully avoided all mention of
>>the inventor's callsign, Red Hot Radio and the Pacificon paper.
>
> "Carefully avoided?" :-)
>
> I identify people, human beings, by their names. That is the convention
> in most world societies.

This is an Amateur Radio newsgroup. In Amateur Radio it IS "convention" to co-identify licensed persons by their callsigns.

You seem perfectly happy to cite the callsigns of persons whose work you feel "supports" your rants, yet when the possession of an Amateur license might embarrass you, you skip it.

>In ARRL's world, that very common societal convention is thrown
> aside with the requirement of identification by callsign and ALWAYS
> preceding their occupations by "ham."

Nothing is "thrown aside". The callsign is an addendum, not a substitute.

>The US Patent and Trademarks Office isn't that narrowly-focussed
> (Tayloe Mixer is patented).

"focused". You're mad again. Calm down, Oh Putzy One.

>The FCC isn't that narrowly-focussed
> and doesn't require staff or commissioners to be granted amateur
> radio licenses in order to regulate amateur radio.

Here we go back to the FCC and what the commissioners are/are not required
to do to BE commissioners. Not related to any aspect of Amateur Radio policy.

>Hans is a very active electronics hobbyist, is degreed in physics,
> and works professionally as an investment broker for a large
> UK investment firm. He has described a number of electronics
> and amateur radio projects very well and in detail on his web
> site. He and his wife have just become parents for the first time
> so all of his hobby activities have been on hiatus.

Very nice. Now...it's relevence?

>>A lot of us are ACTIVE in trying out both new and old things. Some of us
>also
>>like to work CW with our homebuilt, homedesigned equipment.
>
> Of course all of you "us" do. We've all been informed of your
> "homebuilt, homedesigned" Elecraft K2.

As opposed to what YOU have built lately...?!?!

>As an electronics design engineer (retired but only from regular hours),
> I've had to do cost evaluations for both R&D and production projects.

Your Rants and Drivvel require cost evaluations?

>>Why all the snide remarks, Len?
>
> You get back what you give, Jimmie

The you need to cite Jim's "snide" remarks that are even 1/100th of the
vile, arrogant and downright indecent bile you spew, Your Scumminess ! ! !

>Such "homebrew (crystal) ladder filters" are NOT
> weekender projects nor are they cheap to make for one-of hobby
> applications.

Guess I screwed up. The filters I built (four band superhet based on a
WA0UZO/W1CER design many moons ago) DID go together in a weekend, and I don't
remember it being more than $20. Huh !

Better luck next time, eh, Lennie? Guess some PRACTICAL experience goes a
long way, doesn't it...?!?!

>Try to stay focussed on the SUBJECT. You are having difficulty
> with your ego over-riding objectivity all the time.

Yet another personal insult with an embedded typo. Must be REALLY mad
now...

>>Have you done it? You say it's "easy".
>
> Relatively easy to observe with the right test equipment. I have
> the test equipment, the experience.

Uh huh.

>>Because you lecture endlessly on other's work and theoretical possibilities,
>>but don't give practical details.
>
> I don't "lecture endlessly."

Sure you do. Reams and reams of it! Google refers.

>Reiteration of basic information is
> necessary in here due to the vacuum of basic radio fundamentals
> of others.

But WHY, Lennie?

YOU insist that this forum is ONLY for the discussion of the Morse Code
Testing policy, yet ehre you are, in black and white, insisting that you NEED
to discuss things of a TECHNICAL nature.

Where's the leadership? Where's the example?

You show us neither.

>You just deny and evade. No one seems to know what you can
> or can't do other than a lot of claims.

Sure sounds suspiciously like YOU, Lennie.

>Tsk, tsk, tsk. I'm not the one referencing all those old QST
> articles!

You only make an "issue" of the source of the information, Your Vileness,
not the accuracy of it. Why is that?

>I don't claim to have seen every phasing type SSB application...(SNIP)

>"50 db unwanted sideband suppression" limitations...(SNIP)

>Phasing method of SSB modulation or demodulation...(SNIP)

>Crystal filter SSB subsystems have fewer components...(SNIP)

>The thread subject concerned the relative wideband applicability
> of SSB modulation-demodulation. An objective engineering-
> style evaluation should cover the many differences and similarities
> between systems to achieve a proper comparison. The emotion
> of the evaluator has no place in the picture.

Then why do you BRING emotion to it, Lennie? If you didn't, you wouldn't
find it necessary to wrap your rants in reams of technobabble that, by your OWN
"rules", has no place in a "policy" forum.

>>> Dumas!
>>
>>Gee, that really convinces me of your professionality, Len.
>
> Alexandre Dumas was a noted French writer of popular fiction.
> He was a professional writer.

Yet another frail attempt to obfuscate his lack of literary skill behind childish attempts to hide profanity and namecalling.

>You have NOT acknowledged reading RF Design magazine, an
> electronics engineering industry periodical (free to those in
> the industry) or the RSGB's Radio Communication magazine.

You've not cited where it was required to do so.

>I have both training and experience in objective evaluation of
> electronics projects.

Too bad your training was weak and your skills substandard, Lennie.

>>I know that, Len. What's your point, other than to toss out insults?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Jimmie thinks that any disagreement with his
> remarks, however slight, is an "insult." Poor baby. Too much
> ego at work there.

Hmmmmm.Yet again Jim Miccolis continues to refer to Lennie as "Len", yet "Len" continues to try and belittle and denigrate Jim as "Jimmie".

Am I the only one who see's exactly what kind of two-faced scumbag Lennie really is? Or am I the only one willing to just call him for what he is?

>I'm not licensed in US amateur radio service.

You're not licensed in ANY adio service, save for your GROL, which does not grant you ANY privileges in ANY radio service except for those spelled out in the STATION license of any employer foolish enough to engage you for hire.

>Regulations on
> US amateur radio transmission do not apply directly to me.
> They apply to you because you are licensed in US amateur radio.

Sure they apply to you, Lennie. Go ahead and fire up on 14.195Mhz (with more than 100mW! and a Part 15 antenna!) and start calling "CQ...CQ...This Is Len Anderson calling anyone" and see what happens.

>Tsk, tsk, tsk. I'm not a synchophant for ARRL.

Too bad. At tleast then you'd be SOMETHING.

>I'm just an electronics hobbyist who is also a professional in
> electronics design with years of experience in that. I don't
> design radio kits so I can't offer those. I've written for Ham Radio
> magazine, too, and was an Associate Editor there...again, not
> "offering" anything other than intellectual illumination, information,
> and advice on real, practical circuits.

Which practical circuits are presently in operation in YOUR listening shack, Lennie? A little pre-amp for that Icom R-70? Maybe a converter so you can listen to local ATIS or ATC traffic, thereby making yourself an expert on aeronautical navigation? Or perhaps a VLF converter to listen to "birdies' and "whistlers" everytiime you break wind?

>So, tell us all about how you "homedesigned" that Elecraft K2?
> Was it difficult? Did you get all the details from old articles in
> QST?

Tell us of YOUR Amateur Radio projects, Your Insultingness...!

Steve

3723. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 23:18:20 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8f43tero1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65910

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:78896CE67B588331.C4D802526F8F9FA0.AC7095B8261F49F4@lp.airnews.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b8eepreim1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030426122603.16173.00000054@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > > In article <b8e5og$g4$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
> > >
> > > > listening to that interview also. Really enjoyed the perspective.
> > > >>
> > > >> Kim
> > > >
> > > >The next move from the Iran backed
> > >
> > > [Shiites]
> > >
> > > > Will be to start Viet Cong style attacks.
> > > >
> > > >So much for liberating them.
> > > >
> > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > Good point, Dan. While I hope you are mistaken, I would not be at all
> > surprised
> > > if you are correct.
> > >
> > > So what should the US-UK coalition forces do then?
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > I guess that depends on how bad we really want what we say we want. A
> free
> > Iraq and a non-secular, Iraqi elected government.
> >
>
> Never happen in 2,000+ years. Oh yeah, that's right--it hasn't. And it
> won't in the next 2,000 years. And, the idea of an armed presence to
> "maintain peace and order" is kind of like thought police, isn't it? Oh,
> forgive me for being so real about how I think.
>
> >
> > It could disintegrate into a US 'selected/appointed' strongman with the

US
> > providing the military and financial support. Gee, where is Nuguyn Van
> > Thieu when we need him, eh?
> >
> > See my point?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> Isn't that the world you foresee by our armed presence?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

No, not necessarily. The trick is to get the Iranian backed Shites to see we are serious. Perhaps a little attitude adjusting is in order. Similar to what is happening NOW with Syria.

I see no alternative to a large American army in place in Iraq for many years. Any other solution will invite a major attack by Iran and other not so friendly states in the area.

NONE of the ARAB states really give a rip about the USA. We are simply a very big consumer of their oil. Given their preference we would all go away and NEVER come back.

But now the pandora box is open. Only time will tell.

Dan/W4NTI

3724. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-26 23:26:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8f4k4$35p$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65911

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:F61953B617CC88D2.3FDDC891D50D99B6.C2709EC20D9FCFCB@lp.airnews.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b8eeji$lh3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> >
news:E906AA09C73D4087.83E5F1DA01025FA5.D93B8FAC98A06EA1@lp.airnews.net...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:b8e5og$g4$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > I was listening to that interview also. Really enjoyed the
> > perspective.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > >
> > > > > The next move from the Iran backed Shitties...thats right. I
spelled
> it
> > > > > that way on purpose. Will be to start Viet Cong style attacks.
> > > > >
> > > > > So much for liberating them.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Oh, good grief, Dan... You need help.
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > > Why is that Kim? Because I can see what is happening?
> > > Iran is intent on turning Iraq into a Iran too. They want a religious
> > > government there just like theirs. In fact they actually want Iranians
> > > running Iraq.
> > >
> >
> > Well, the news I've been listening to indicates that the Iraqi folks are
> > pretty hellbent on just that same thing. The thing many don't seem to
> > realize is that this is a part of the world where everything *is* all

about
> religion/religious dogma and it's always been that way. It wouldn't
> surprise me at all to see Iraq become what I've heard called, a theocracy.
> Why does that surprise anyone? AND, what in the world are "we" (the
United
> States Gov't.) supposed to do about it? Why? What gives us the right to
> make it so that things such as theocracies do not happen? Do unto others
as
> you would have done unto yourself, right? Well, I wouldn't want someone
> coming "in here" (to the United States) and telling me how it's going to
be.
>
> >
> > You don't think they (the Iranians) wont resort to guerilla attacks
> against
> > the infidels? US? Open your eyes.
> >
>
> That's where you need help, Dan. You think just because of my comments
that
> I have no clue. You're wrong. I have way too much clue and that is why
the
> whole idea of our being "over there" has me concerned--when I bother to
> think about it and most of the time I try not to. I don't think "we" (the
> so-called Western world) have a chance in Hell of introducing these people
> to a new way of thinking. Nor, as indicated by your comments and fervor
for
> one, do most here have a chance in Hell of being able to understand or
> comprehend what these people are all about.
>
> >
> > Bush better keep a large armed force in Iraq...with orders to return
fire.
> > Or we will have another Nam. Heck...we still may, no matter what we do.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> Well, ain't that just peachy? An armed force here, an armed force there,
> everywhere an armed force, right? Heck, why don't we just plan on making
it
> the United World?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Now there is a idea. Why not take that up with the UN (Useless Nitwits) ?
Im sure they could have a nice chat about it.

Lets do a reality check here Kim. IRAQ has been sponsering and paying for terrorists for decades. They are in cahoots with Syria, and Lebanon (which is occupied by Syria).

Remember how the Palestinians were bragging about being paid 20000 bux US to blow themselves up and kill Isralies?

Ever wonder why they didnt target the US? Well they did. Starting with the cruiseship Acili Lauro (sp??). Who do you thing pays for all this crap? Sure Bin Laden is a player, but not the only one. Dont you see that these groups are all intertwined and interconnected?

Heck I just heard where the GERMANS stopped a ship leaving EGYPT and heading to KOREA with NUCLEAR stuff on board. ITS EVERYWHERE KIM.

WE ARE AT WAR. This is not some sort of Bosnia or Grenada...this is the start of WW3.

Wake up and smell the roses.

Dan/W4NTI

3725. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 02:56:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EAB4758.E164814C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65912

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Dame Heil bluffs a great deal, insinuating much, inplying much,
> but never giving any details, references, or anything else to
> confirm any bona fides.

It's a conspiracy to keep you out of the loop, kindly old gent. Your typical response to anyone whose experience is as great or greater than your own is one of ridicule, disbelief, condescent, or attempted one-upmanship. You, after all, have argued FCC regs with a former FCC attorney, have attempted to belittle one who has a couple of EE degrees which you don't hold, have let on that you know more about U.S. Department of State communications than one who made a career of such work and have done your best to insult anyone working for the ARRL who has dared post here.

Your feeble attempt to mask some of your barbed comments with little smiley faces fails. Your lengthy cuts and pastes of material you've garnered from the web, interspersed with peculiar phrases about "Gods of Radio", "ARRL sycophants" and the like leads readers to believe that you may be posting from the rec room of a mental facility.

> Dame Heil is apparently trying to be a role model of what an
> amateur extra class ham should be.

My name isn't Dame Heil, Leonard. I haven't made any attempt to become a role model for amateur radio any more than I consider you a role model for whatever it is that you think you are. What you aren't is someone involved in amateur radio in any capacity.

> In that case she succeeds
> only in presenting a most negative image to the public. QED.

You aren't the public. My remarks to you are not directed at the general public. They are for you, an unpleasant elderly man with much time on his hands. You present a most negative image here. ZBM-2.

Dave K8MN

3726. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 03:06:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAD0C15D.17B7C%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 65913

I'm going to answer your long-winded message in two parts - this one being the first of the two (yes, I can be long-winded also). The other will address your conclusion, while this will address the key points of your message.

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> Not even close to any general statement...except
> perhaps in some backwater areas to the east of
> the Mississippi.

Certainly larger cities are better equipped to deal with the disruptions following a disaster, but even the largest cities may struggle with this problem during a serious disaster and that is even more so the case for smaller towns.

> Telephonic "911" calls are switched by telephone
> company switching centers...those do NOT go to
> normal Public Safety Radio Service radios. Some
> public safety radio service centers may temporarily
> "patch through" any telephone caller to a mobile
> radio channel but that is not routine. The
> "overwhelm" conditional is inappropriate.

I think we're talking about different types of disasters here. What you say is perhaps true for small, isolated, incidents. But, it is a different story when it comes to the serious disaster. In my next message (the second one in this two-part message), I describe a common disaster that impacted three states. This is not abnormal - an large earthquake along the west coast might impact a similar area.

In these larger situations, the telephone system is one of the first things to fail. This is caused by overuse by civilians trying to call friends and family and damage to parts of that system by the disaster itself.

> Utility services NORMALLY use their radios to effect
> repairs to utilities. That is in no way different
>from operations during real emergencies. (snip)

It most certainly is different. Following a disaster, most utilities have to call in all employees (vacations and time off ends) and for assistance from neighboring utilities to help with the repairs. These extra personnel place a huge load on the existing communications system. Needless to say, this is not the place to look for supplemental communications.

> It is not appropriate to describe business radio users
> as "often without (primary) power." (snip)

You go on to describe several groups with radios that could be used during a disaster. While it all sounds nice, there are a number of pitfalls. For example, it is the towers of base facilities most often damaged during a disaster (the towers of the main communications facilities). Therefore, a guy with a mobile business radio in his vehicle isn't going to do much for you. The ham operator, on the other hand, can at least get you some type of antenna into the air.

Even if you did have a use for people with a business radio in the vehicle, there are other problems. For example, a company is never going to authorize the participation of its employees because of potential liability. And without that authorization, that employee is operating on his own without permission to use his employer's radio equipment.

I could list other pitfalls, but that describes the three largest - proper equipment, coordination, and liability.

> FAA controlled airspace communications is required to
> have emergency power for communications. (snip)

Have you been listening to the news recently? The air traffic control system is already nearly overwhelmed with a lack of personnel and equipment. This is also not the place to go looking for supplemental communication equipment or manpower.

> What is most often neglected in amateur thinking is the US
> military capability in short, medium, long, and very long
> communications paths at a moment's notice. (snip)

Sadly, most National Guard and Air Guard units don't maintain a wealth of communications equipment. Their equipment is limited mostly to what is needed by that unit during peacetime. When called to active duty, members of that unit often join an existing active duty unit with its own radio equipment.

Furthermore, active duty units, and even Guard units, require permission from the chain of command before becoming involved. This takes time, which is not something in abundance following a disaster. These units do often eventually arrive to help, but often days into the disaster recovery (when the most serious demand for supplemental communications is in the hours and days following a disaster).

> Those do not get the publicity they deserve, a disservice
> of journalism editors in general.

National Guard personnel often get recognition for their efforts. But their efforts are often different than what we're discussing here - supplemental communications during and following a disaster.

> If that isn't enough, the various TV news services can be a
> source of communications aid (snip)

And they (TV news services) work well in smaller disasters. However, following a major disaster, these can be disrupted as much as other communications facilities (see example in next message).

> During REAL EMERGENCIES, the "regulatory mandate" says
> that ANYONE can use/operate radios for emergency
> communications. (snip)

However, I'll repeat what I said before - only ham radio offers a pool of licensed operators with equipment capable of reliable local or even national coverage, the frequencies, and the regulatory mandate, to truly handle supplemental communications following a disaster.

It is a package deal - manpower, equipment, available frequencies, and a regulatory mandate to offer assistance. No other radio service offers all four of those. Why would any state or local government agency pass up all that for the patchwork of supplemental communications you describe?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3727. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 03:08:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAD0C173.17B7C%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 65914

I'm going to answer your long-winded message in two parts - this one being the second of the two. The other will address specific parts of your message. This one will address your conclusion.

"Len Over 21" wrote:

> There IS a cure for tunnel vision, Dwight. In order
> to effect a cure you have to get out of the tunnel
> into reality and learn how the rest of the world uses
> radio. Now. Don't rely on myths and legends of the
> 1912 sinking of the Titanic. This is 91 years later.

Okay, lets see that reality by looking at a real disaster - one I was directly involved in. In 1998, Hurricane Hugo hit the North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia coasts. In the hours leading up to this storm's landfall, most residents evacuated this area, including the employees at most television and radio stations.

In the days leading up to landfall, public service communications was filled with traffic dealing with evacuations, accidents, and getting hospital patients to other inland hospitals. During this same period, private utility communications was filled with traffic dealing with storm preparation, shutting down utilities in certain areas, and in re-enforcing certain key utility systems and subsystems.

At this point, it should have been obvious the system would soon be overwhelmed. Employees at dispatch centers were already working overtime and many of those would evacuate as the storm approached.

From this point on, we'll look at just Horry Country in upper South Carolina since that is where I was located. As the storm hit, public service personnel hunkered down to wait out the storm as communications started failing over a wide area. This included the police/fire communications tower in Horry County, most cellular towers in the coastal areas, and many towers belonging to utility companies.

Only one television and one radio station remained on the air during the storm. The television station lost its tower about two in the morning (an hour after first landfall), leaving only the one radio station on the air for the next two days.

As phones failed, shelters and evacuation centers were left with no communications. During the night, several shelters found themselves in serious trouble. One shelter was flooded by the storm's surge, requiring adults to place children on available tables, and another shelter lost a section of its roof.

As the storm moved away from the coast, the coastal towns were left with patchy communications and attempts to piggyback additional traffic onto undamaged communications facilities.

Over the next two days, communications became a major hurdle in dealing with the storm's aftermath. Whole sections of Horry county were left with no public service communications. Surfside Beach and Conway, the only two with undamaged tower facilities, could not reach public service personnel over wide areas of downtown Myrtle Beach.

Three of the four downtown fire stations could not communicate with dispatch. Three of the five hospitals were left with no communications with personnel in the field.

And, since many personnel had evacuated before the storm hit, even finding enough employees to man the few remaining facilities became a problem. The roads leading back into the area were blocked with traffic - many simply parked their cars in the roadway and slept in them until the roads were reopened several days later. This traffic jam prevented many public service personnel, hospital personnel, and utility personnel, from quickly returning to the area.

Prior to this storm, ham operators were not included in the existing disaster planning. Some operators in the surrounding area, those who actually could find their way back into the area, did step in to help. For example, ham operators became the sole communications system for area hospitals for well over a week.

By the second day, National Guard personnel began arriving in the area. They brought two generators with them and five radios, three of which only operated on military frequencies. However, by this time, the communications problem had mostly been resolved, with more restored in the coming days.

In addition to major changes to the existing public service communications system, including better locations for towers and more overall redundancy in the system, ham operators have been well incorporated in future disaster planning. This includes the appointment of a ham coordinator to work directly with the civil defense office, and the involvement of hams in all disaster training exercises. Hurricane Hugo taught one important lesson - no matter how much planning, one cannot foresee every possible outcome. Ham operators will be there to fill in those unforeseen gaps next time.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3728. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 03:12:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EAB4AE7.F27BC86C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65916

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3EA976DD.B1FE97F4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Last year you two did 897 QSOs and scored 3,542 points. Good for 4th
> >> place out of 30 1B-2 'x2' entries. Not too shabby....!
> > >
> > >Bert ponders about how much better we'd have done if we'd not lost all
> > >the time over the generator issue.
> >
> > I betcha you two could bust 1000 Q's easily.

I'd think so, given that we lost five hours last year. I don't think we
can depend on 15m this year so we'll have to hit 80m a bit harder.

> > >We used only one antenna, a flattop
> > >with open wire feeder. We're considering additions for this year.
> >
> > I learned the hard way that, in small FD ops, complications are often not worth
> > the trouble. FD's a weenie domestic contest, not CQWW or even SS. No
> > multipliers, which sucks, but they're not gonna change it. With one tx you go
> > where the contacts are, rate is everything.

I used to love SS but haven't even given it a shot since returning to
the states. CQ WW (both modes) is still my favorite, followed by the CQ
160 'test.

> >> > > Yeah, use the throwaway gear.
> >>
> >> HAW!
> > >
> > >'RV has a way with words.
> >
> > You don't know the half of it.

I'm beginning to understand.

> > >I've never done FD battery operations but have instead been with groups
> > >using various sizes of generators, ranging from little jobs with several
> > >hundred watt ratings to big 10 KVA surplus generators mounted on
> > >trailers.
> >
> > BTDT, from just me and a battery and a Ten Tec Argosy to the giant setup at
> > K3BKG years ago. WW2 surplus generator, prolly from SCR-399. 2003 will be FD
> > #36 for me.

That's quite a run. I missed '71-'75 and '85-'01.

> The first time I did battery ops was with W3NNL and K3OIO, about 1974. We used
> 'NNL's homebrew 80/40 CW transceiver.
>
> That xcvr was a neat bit of work. Hybrid unit - solid state except driver and
> final. Direct conversion with phasing-type rejection of the 'audio image'. This
> was before Gingell's work was published, btw. 'NNL made the audio PSN. Because
> it only had to deal with CW bandwidth it did not have to be as complex.
> Rejection was about 40-45 dB. 12BA6 driver feeding 1625 final. Vibrator supply
> for 10 W input. Could do up to 75 watts with home power supply, or 50 watts
> with his dynamotor.

Pretty nice lash up. I'd like to try a vintage Field Day using a QSL 60
and the FB-7 or mebbe even the pre-war HRO.

> Whole thing was built in the case from a defunct National FB-7. Back then BAs
> were a dime a dozen. Betcha he wishes he'd left the FB-7 alone!

Lord, yes! I love the old National stuff. I still run my SW-3 on a
homebrew supply but an OT sold me an original FB-7 supply a few years
back so I retired its homebrew power supply.

Dave K8MN

3729. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 03:13:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAD0C318.17B7E%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 65915

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" wrote:

> Too simple, too much common sense, and a fact
> repeated over and over...In other words, you wasted
> your time (snip)

Perhaps, Steve. But I remain an optimist.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3730. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 03:13:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030426231335.16156.00000117@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 65917

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/26/2003 9:56 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EAB4758.E164814C@earthlink.net>

>You present a most negative image here. ZBM-2.

Wasn't ZAA more appropriate?

ROTFLMBO ! ! !

Steve, K4YZ

3731. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 03:16:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAD0C3D6.17B80%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 65918

"Brian" wrote:

> Is anyone going? Brian

I was hoping to, but will probably miss it this year.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3732. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 03:25:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EAB4E1B.F3A5E544@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65919

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA97193.EEEA3452@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA8AEAF.A4B46A46@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA355AE.9FE825E9@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA18089.68A200CB@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA088A4.B011F968@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA00DCE.6709A863@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > >

> > > > I think he has valueable input on the use of the ham bands by military
> > > > personnel in Iraq. I wouldn't argue the regs with Phil.
> > > >
> > > And the PCTA Double Standard pops up yet again.
> >
> > Howzat, Brian? Phil is an expert in communications law.
>
> Phil isn't in the military, says he never was, and isn't in Iraq.
> Phil has no legal authority over amateur operation in Iraq that I'm
> aware of.
>
> Do you have information that he does have authority in Iraq? Perhaps
> for 12USD he can process their paperwork.

Maybe you skipped the part where I wrote:

Phil is an expert in communications law.

> > > > > Kimd of opems the gates to Lem, doesm't imt?
> > > >
> > > > Len isn't in the military, isn't in Iraq, isn't an attorney, wasn't with
> > > > the FCC and isn't a ham. Except for those things, I'm sure he has
> > > > tremendous knowledge of the matter under discussion.
> > >
> > > And the PCTA Double Standard pops up yet again.
> >
> > Howzat, Brian? Len isn't an expert in communications law.
>
> Who said he was?

Nobody said he was. Somebody said he wasn't.

> Len knows about radio, yet isn't allowed to comment
> on radio here.

This forum isn't about "radio". It is about "amateur radio" and Len has
posted until his fingers bleed. He just can't get any respect. He's
the r.r.a.p. Rodney Dangerfield.

> If he should, he is unkindly reminded that there is a
> difference between military and commercial RF and amateur RF.

He's reminded that there is a huge difference between
military/commercial operation and amateur radio. He's reminded that
there is a series of exams for becoming a radio amateur and that he
hasn't passed any of 'em. He is a non-participant.

> > > > > > > > > And I don't think Phil considers himself my mentor.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I don't consider Phil as your mentor either. Phil is a rational man.
> > > > > > > > > Your mentor is the non-participant in amateur radio who frequently posts
> > > > > > > > > here.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Then you need to make yourself clear.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I did. You needed clarification due to your reading comprehension
> > > > > > > > difficulty.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > You didn't.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You're right. I didn't need clarification.
> > > >
> > > > You must. You referred to Phil as my mentor.
> >
> > That isn't what I wrote. It is only what you understood.
>
> Then write more clearly, as I said six (6) lines above. Or you can
> continue to be vague so as to jump on anyone when they don't read your
> mind.

The problem isn't on the transmitting end; it is on the receiving end.
You have static between the cans.

> > > > > > So you say. No one has stepped up to confirm the tale of your alleged
> > > > > > operation.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Nor is it likely they will. It was a relatively small operation. Not
> > > > > > many combattants involved, and Willy kept it small. Sort of like a
> > > > > > NEO on a little American Embassy. Happens all the time.
> > > > >
> > > > > Then it should be easy for you to find someone who can confirm your
> > > > > tale.
> > > >
> > > > I'll do that at the next reunion.
> > >
> > I don't think you're likely to do that. It is more likely that you'll
> > continue to lean on vapor rather than fact.
>
> Inform us again what your legal role is in all of this.

It appears to be identical to yours.

> That you won't accept my answer appears to be a personal problem.
> Nothing more, nothing less.

Do you mean your answer, "I don't have any written permission"? If the
answers are those you provided to the questions asked about your
operation, you've not provided them.

> > > > > I operated legally.
> > > > >
> > > > > So you tell us. There is nothing or no one to confirm what you say.
> > > >
> > > > Sure there are. You just don't know them, so they don't exist to you.
> > >
> > None of 'em have stepped forward to confirm that you received permission
> > for your alleged T5 operation.
>
> Hmmm. It's all starting to make sense.
>
> No one has stepped forward from Vietnam to confirm your lost
> "no-permission" slip.

Yeah and no one has stepped up to confirm my story that I was never in
Cambodia or that I never took oboe lessons. That's quite a reach your
attempting there, Brian. Don't reach too far or you'll find yourself
out of your tree.

> Maybe you cheated and now think everyone else is cheating, too.

I did touch an oboe once.

Dave K8MN

3733. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 03:32:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EAB4FB8.1680D664@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65920

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA8AC4A.48A267C3@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA74736.9086D28A@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA6996F.9924B62E@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA60E66.1BFB0B07@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > > > > > > If your permission was denied then you couldn't operate.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Incorrect. I could have operated at any time.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > But you were ordered not to. Doesn't that mean you could not operate
> > > > > > > > > amateur radio?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > That's what it means to me, at least.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I wasn't ordered not to do anything, Brian. I was notified that my
> > > > > > > > > request was denied.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Then, obviously, you couldn't operate. Why do you say that you could?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Because I can do anything if I'm willing to accept the consequences.
> > > > >
> > > > > Superman. Superiorman. Smugman. PCTA will give you a pass.
> > >
> > > Anyone on the planet can do anything he likes if he is willing to accept
> > > the possbile consequences.
>
> Anyone except the PCTA. There are no consequences for PCTA, at least
> on RRAP.
>
> > > > > > > > > If caught operating,
> > > > > > > > > especially after having asked for permission and being denied, I'd have
```

> > > > > > > > had to suffer the consequences. If not caught, I could have just
> > > > > > > > > claimed that my commander gave me verbal permission.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Didn't your commander deny your request in writing?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > He certainly did. If I operated and was not caught at it, I could
> > > > > > > simply toss the written denial of my request and claim that I had verbal
> > > > > > > permission. If I'd been nabbed, I would have suffered the consequences.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > But that would be illegal operation and unethical action on your part.
> > > > >
> > > > > Yes it would have been, had I actually operated. I didn't.
> > >
> > > Good thing. After that French 6M stuff, you otta try to keep your
> > > nose clean.
> >
> > That's moronic. I broke no Tanzanian regs and I'm not responsible for
> > the actions of French hams.
>
> You broke no regs that we know of. We're not required to know the
> reqs of other countries, remember?

Looks like you've got yourself a dilemma, Brian.

> But it is not good amateur practice to work out of band frenchmen,
> especially when you've been informed by a frenchman what their legal
> 6M bandwidth was.

I'm not required to know or care where French stations operate. I
didn't operate from France. I assume that French stations may use the
same bandwidth on 6m that they can use on 10m.

> > > > > Why would you even think it?
> > > >
> > > > I can think about anything I like. Consequences only result from
> > > > actions, not thought.
> > >
> > > But if you keep dwelling on them...
> >
> > If I keep dwelling on them, what?
>
> You'll give in to temptation.

Speak for yourself, Brian.

> > > Oh, hey, go ask Jimmy Carter about his thoughts.
> >
> > I don't know Jimmy Carter and I don't think much of him.
>
> He probably doesn't think of you often, either.

I feel better already.

Dave K8MN

3734. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 03:37:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EAB50D5.8FE12384@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65921

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA88AD9.BC4BC6C9@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA7E71E.C3FD13F1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA74120.60BE136D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Len Over 21 wrote:

> > > Dave, all of these comments are public. That's how you got to respond
> > > to a comment I directed at DICK. Had they been private, you would not
> > > have been able to read it, and not comment on it.
> >
> > Tell me something I don't know. Of course the posts are public.
> > Your crack about being stationed at a snack bar making sense to you
> > doesn't seem to make much sense. I asked you a question, you chose
> > diversion.
>
> Look, Dave, Len said something about where you were stationed.

No, he didn't. I was never stationed at any place called "Tan Son Hut".
I was never in the supply field.

> You
> started talking about a snack bar. Were you or were you not stationed
> at a snack bar?

That's been answered. This is the kind of crap you pulled with Ed Hare.

> > > QSL?
> >
> > Anyone who says this on the ham bands is a stupendous lid.
>
> Ahem, no license required to operate here.

That's how Len got here.

> > > Getting back to the snack bar in Vietnam. Why you keep bringing it
> > > up? It must have been a significant part of your life while
> > > in-country.
> >

> > It's your reading comprehension thing again.
>
> So there was no snack bar???
>
> > > What did your orders say? Did they put you in a snack bar or an Air
> > > Base?
> >
> > The answers are there. Go back and attempt reading them.
>
> I'm not clairvoyant.

Clairvoyant? You're not even coherent.

> You really need to learn to be more direct, and quit bringing up
> things that are off topic and confound the line of discussion.

Go back to picking the flowers off the wallpaper, Brian.

Dave K8MN

3735. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 03:53:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030426235337.04869.00000255@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 65922

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/26/2003 10:25 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EAB4E1B.F3A5E544@earthlink.net>

>Brian wrote:

>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3EA97193.EEEA3452@earthlink.net>...

>> Len knows about radio, yet isn't allowed to comment
>> on radio here.
>
>This forum isn't about "radio". It is about "amateur radio" and Len has
>posted until his fingers bleed. He just can't get any respect. He's
>the r.r.a.p. Rodney Dangerfield.

I think Rodney Dangerfield should SUE for that one, Dave!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3736. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 03:54:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EAB54C9.8DB62882@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65923

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Okay, we'll all paste a little gold star beside your name.

> So what is the significance of that? Humans get born, grow, and
> die. All of us will die...except maybe the immortal morsemen.

> Thank you, Captain Oblivious.
>
> The earth revolves around the sun. Need some more "news?"

> Okay, as a red hot morseman, you've emphasized "CW" several
> times in this post. Another little gold star beside your name.

> Yah, yah, yah. Tell me another, Capt. > Oblivious.

> You just don't have the background or the
> experience in this area of radio to talk about it in engineering
> and design terms. Your only recourse is to do a lot of pseudo
> bibliography about old QST articles.

> Hot darn! A radio god spoke! "You haven't seen one that reached
> such suppression!" That means you have SEEN THEM ALL!
> You've examined them all with a spectrum analyzer, have you?
>
> Of course you have...with such bodacious talent at morsemanship
> and all those back issues of QST, that makes you an expert on
> everydamthing in amateur radio. We all know that. You've implied
> it three ways from Sunday for years in here.

> Were you in the grape fields sampling vintage superhets again?
> Tsk, tsk, tsk.

> That includes ALL such receivers of the "direct conversion"
> type with or without a Tayloe Mixer. Dumas!
>
> All your theory and "references"
> seem restricted to old copies of QST and Electric Radio.

> More dip-switch remarks from the sorry egoed morseman.
>
> Try to remember whose post you are remarking on, dummy load.
>
> Your exhalted morsemanship doesn't get you credit one in the
> technical end of radio. None. Zero. Zip. Nada. Nicht. Nyet.

> Oh, my, now you are the Judge, Jury, Arbiter, and Decision-Maker
> on Who Should Speak About What?!?

>
> If you would bother to really wear all those ivy-covered degrees
> and THINK for a moment,...
>
> You, like Dame Heil, haven't been admitted to any legal bar to make
> all those high-sounding legal judgements either in court or out of > it. All you can do is express yourself in a newsgroup and try to
> build an image of the Great Ham Technical Guru, an olde-tymer. You > do that but all you have to back you up is some old ARRL
> publications.
>
> You do "Hi-Fi" fraud, sport...and everyone with any real
> engineering background can see it.
>
> Polish.

The above is, of course, Len's idea of engaging in civil debate.
The name calling, denigration, insults, ridicule and his desperate need
to invoke one upmanship are all there.

Dave K8MN

3737. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 04:01:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <b8fkltkcg0@208.206.142.77>
Source record: 65924

Dave Heil wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA97193.EEEA3452@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA8AEAF.A4B46A46@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA355AE.9FE825E9@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA18089.68A200CB@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA088A4.B011F968@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA00DCE.6709A863@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > I think he has valueable input on the use of the ham bands by military
> > > > > personnel in Iraq. I wouldn't argue the regs with Phil.
> > > >
> > > > And the PCTA Double Standard pops up yet again.
> > >
> > > Howzat, Brian? Phil is an expert in communications law.
> >
> > Phil isn't in the military, says he never was, and isn't in Iraq.
> > Phil has no legal authority over amateur operation in Iraq that I'm
> > aware of.
> >
> > Do you have information that he does have authority in Iraq? Perhaps
> > for 12USD he can process their paperwork.
>
> Maybe you skipped the part where I wrote:

>
> Phil is an expert in communications law.
>
> > > > > > Kimd of opems the gates to Lem, doesm't imt?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Len isn't in the military, isn't in Iraq, isn't an attorney, wasn't with
> > > > > > the FCC and isn't a ham. Except for those things, I'm sure he has
> > > > > > tremendous knowledge of the matter under discussion.
> > > > >
> > > > > And the PCTA Double Standard pops up yet again.
> > >
> > > Howzat, Brian? Len isn't an expert in communications law.
> >
> > Who said he was?
>
> Nobody said he was. Somebody said he wasn't.
>
> > Len knows about radio, yet isn't allowed to comment
> > on radio here.
>
> This forum isn't about "radio". It is about "amateur radio" and Len has
> posted until his fingers bleed. He just can't get any respect. He's
> the r.r.a.p. Rodney Dangerfield.
>
> > If he should, he is unkindly reminded that there is a
> > difference between military and commercial RF and amateur RF.
>
> He's reminded that there is a huge difference between
> military/commercial operation and amateur radio. He's reminded that
> there is a series of exams for becoming a radio amateur and that he
> hasn't passed any of 'em. He is a non-participant.
>
> > > > > > > > > > And I don't think Phil considers himself my mentor.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > I don't consider Phil as your mentor either. Phil is a rational man.
> > > > > > > > > > Your mentor is the non-participant in amateur radio who frequently posts
> > > > > > > > > > here.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Then you need to make yourself clear.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I did. You needed clarification due to your reading comprehension
> > > > > > > > > difficulty.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > You didn't.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You're right. I didn't need clarification.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You must. You referred to Phil as my mentor.
> > > >
> > > > That isn't what I wrote. It is only what you understood.

> >
> > Then write more clearly, as I said six (6) lines above. Or you can
> > continue to be vague so as to jump on anyone when they don't read your
> > mind.
>
> The problem isn't on the transmitting end; it is on the receiving end.
> You have static between the cans.
>
> > > > > > > So you say. No one has stepped up to confirm the tale of your alleged
> > > > > > > operation.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Nor is it likely they will. It was a relatively small operation. Not
> > > > > > > many combattants involved, and Willy kept it small. Sort of like a
> > > > > > > NEO on a little American Embassy. Happens all the time.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Then it should be easy for you to find someone who can confirm your
> > > > > > > tale.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > I'll do that at the next reunion.
> > > > >
> > > > I don't think you're likely to do that. It is more likely that you'll
> > > > continue to lean on vapor rather than fact.
> > >
> > Inform us again what your legal role is in all of this.
>
> It appears to be identical to yours.
>
> > That you won't accept my answer appears to be a personal problem.
> > Nothing more, nothing less.
>
> Do you mean your answer, "I don't have any written permission"? If the
> answers are those you provided to the questions asked about your
> operation, you've not provided them.
>
> > > > > > I operated legally.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > So you tell us. There is nothing or no one to confirm what you say.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Sure there are. You just don't know them, so they don't exist to you.
> > > >
> > > None of 'em have stepped forward to confirm that you received permission
> > > for your alleged T5 operation.
> > >
> > Hmmm. It's all starting to make sense.
> >
> > No one has stepped forward from Vietnam to confirm your lost
> > "no-permission" slip.
>
> Yeah and no one has stepped up to confirm my story that I was never in
> Cambodia or that I never took oboe lessons. That's quite a reach your

> attempting there, Brian. Don't reach too far or you'll find yourself
> out of your tree.
>
> > Maybe you cheated and now think everyone else is cheating, too.
>
> I did touch an oboe once.
>
> Dave K8MN

Ah, that's it! Brian stayed in a Holiay Inn Express in Mogadishu!

3738. hmmm

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 06:24:21 UTC
From: n7zx@n7zx.com
Message-ID: <8315f733.0304262224.717c3247@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65925

uzdtztcjtp@etasddgmdegukmo.com
fliwuqctbg@kuirdyiyucdribv.com
jepqqqiixw@ywjnsonwdqfhtky.net
mojzjjermy@mkcykepethodkxp.com
bpffddavsw@pxbztmlmhiighqi.org
iqywrswggs@wvtqvsqpzholgtf.com
buchejrrac@ngjinwolgrtqkww.com
hpzfepofma@zopktpqkutmgrcn.net
lpivgsteoh@btdhrmbyyjevhln.org
eztqdgckum@rpaynbtetqqdasc.org
fdiqppayoe@feykehsibbdnmqf.net
dcvfqoyaap@nweytfscbkzcnut.net
dzdesddzqq@adjfzgvpqjgaaju.org
pguqrcsghu@mnhysthfewpenbs.net
rgkgylvatx@jztvpqwfxdjyxni.net
luwpxbqwrw@aokicjjrwkpvixu.org
aduiluwbxy@lubolkqhbtgctqi.org
unwewgyywy@xbyssklajfyfmkq.org
kofiuhofmw@gwohicexnafpbax.com
cojotnyfbu@gyzabvpoglprjeg.net
pdwvwpghjt@risgmlixpoflocn.org
hcgnkwqcgo@pkmvumhcniokeqb.com
numwyqixos@grexkmoyfirvrss.com
zulqqpycol@ivhpqyxnulurntj.com
hkzsqtfsyj@auhvwgutjdhpjeq.net
pdkxawhdfh@kmkopcmubszfypv.net
hqaskktciy@ogpbtmvyvmssmen.org
navhgetanx@jtiimxkgfxzbzqb.net
vjvtwaibic@wnjkxmqsftdvaan.net
hyjdnbqtyw@oqjnfybclxiuqlv.com
fpmivdfqxj@xysibrablfjcunt.com
tklocxiwwl@awcpwubdgujumcp.org
xtatgmnprh@lgjrkesovyjopmr.com
vxyxdzodox@rmsmdihfhzyznwe.com
hoxjvyhkmq@tpxgifuimpypffq.org
jkoedlxldv@ragyrvwhodhasxd.com
lnxilpnwme@qifmgsgiupfbhdm.com
btwnfwrjtf@lwalkssmjpllarb.net
wmawkatayf@fknzzrvfcyhcwvj.com
hesdbalujg@cwstmcmmorrxsmb.com
wpqevsickl@gmepfgpnmgmxqjk.net
hkmqozeqpv@mrtdgiyrcqsgueq.com
tsdhxdymho@udbaqxgcvehzsst.net
xitownbbqa@uvjpkgtdnuoecfy.net

xiwserzhyv@wngsypyxocknmzk.com
yyyxlannou@zmhaaqqcalibqzz.org
ruevoxdsyi@rruccmnjdizngqs.com
gkbtrojjlo@xpalngbqctaspvj.com
rinkqwekre@rftwpqcooyokotp.net
bwczjdmqsx@rkfuadrbkdsgkpw.net
zvuqiniqyn@iipmgjiqsjnwqoe.net
rsplttvbse@ibaxgjuotetbtsj.net
pftjfwrwmx@dndmdjehgjpwfvo.com
rxpmrqolrp@gyaaltjoegnrfkz.net
rqzggfmxtf@ygchpgeelugabai.net
rktbkkasqa@gihrunfcpbtxiac.net
mmbishttao@viyphjpikckebht.com
gcdwulqkbp@dpkcinbbrqdjwew.org
mrjegxntcb@zragykvgvlmdxtz.com
ptonagejsb@qiprmeyvracrqqc.net
eokykoivxk@jqthyghrcgewsiq.net
icypnjxojs@ikleneeigufxoqq.net
hqhoinwmve@ecetmqvjnkcggky.org
jlcifmykpp@ofutldpyicluyrb.org
clxgwpunjb@eqvzmujtqcdskah.net
bpedvspxus@sufpywqauzwcldk.com
bbednoilxn@zuyssrbioenvyji.com
rwpfxalumx@ikemkkxbqfvdbql.net
swpqgmtqux@fxhivcquqbvwuvz.net
ochiqyyutz@xsbrezqsblzhefh.net
losncptlyq@jerpulubmwkgzgf.net
efxegqbkaa@rpsfomnnuxzmuxw.org
lxtlhgqvbw@oqtutmsgofveqdx.org
lzozwikkgc@mayllizqqomprxk.net
vbtybfgxvh@crttmqyytqdghta.com
gjcqnjsnkv@igquptvrxgplokr.org
pewytqudtq@ygmavswuluizdot.com
ndiayghexr@kmbmkyqhklxbstv.com
cjmfwlcqip@nqlfrflhyhvtahh.net
gehezetnar@rfbwgbbglttarpd.com
yiqzunkrhr@yjabdtccblrdjpl.com
goqdkllzko@hhbdmxcthnnwfqb.org
olkoozqytn@azhwjotdwxeidfz.org
xlofbwswzb@idvfzqkchiltibj.org
xjvdcoaugh@bfpodwnubznrzxm.com
zywkotltmk@kngfwchoxezbmxv.net
skiubnnajh@jnuyvocothepysi.org
ehvbiibits@ontwwphygefuuly.com
jbwgpiefiu@nrwknduucfqxjtz.com
prbboyjqbh@gowirejeozenfwy.com
xtmodgzkjp@gqtptqvacxadpoo.org
gexyicmygg@xuzupenfqzrcxdm.org
kkamfeulxz@ephiyqvapwxujow.net
sihlajjpbj@avwwdtbxrlbxasy.com

zmeimipplr@kzzdtxxomeziqan.net
eiaqnvxwem@uymeqftjgkkayym.com
ejoleqaccb@jumbotazzxqvcey.org
gxbexxhuxv@jfabntnowyxoahk.org
zyhavnzvfe@nqxhfxulmwexpwt.net
bxornowmvn@idnfhbpsxjyamaj.org

3739. Re: Repeater Autopatch vs. Telemarketer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 14:05:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030427100532.04525.00000124@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 65926

In article <Pine.LNX.4.55.0304260210590.954@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

(N2EY wrote:)

>> Is it possible to add some more words to the answer message? Such as "if
>> you did not intend to access this facility, please hang up and do not call
>> again".
>
>No.

Dang.

>The speech board is one of those with a limited, pre-programmed
>vocabulary, and this system does not have DVR capability (as noted above).
>It's just not possible.

Understood.

>The only suggestion I have received in e-mail was to somehow generate the
>tone sequence that comes out at the beginning of the "disconnected number
>message."
>(I have yet to find out what that sequence of three [multi-]tones is.)
>
Consider calling a known-disconnected number and recording the tones, then
comparing each with those from a TT phone?

Seems to me that instructing all repeater users to give the message

"You're in violation of 47 CFR 97.113. Do not call this number again. Take
this number off your list and inform your superiors to remove it from all of
their lists."

or something similar, then hanging up, and having them actually do it would
satisfy FCC requirements.

Over the past few weeks I have started answering all telemarketer calls with
"We are not interested. Do not call this number again. Take this number off
your list and inform your superiors to remove it from all of their lists." and
the number of calls has dropped significantly. YMMV

73 de Jim, N2EY

3740. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 14:30:52 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <A237D6910D12A5D4.D5EB760585C5507F.7088600FA1FFABE7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65927

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b8f4k4$35p$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:F61953B617CC88D2.3FDDC891D50D99B6.C2709EC20D9FCFCB@lp.airnews.net...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:b8eeji$lh3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > >
> news:E906AA09C73D4087.83E5F1DA01025FA5.D93B8FAC98A06EA1@lp.airnews.net...
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:b8e5og$g4$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I was listening to that interview also. Really enjoyed the
> > > perspective.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > > >
> > > > > > The next move from the Iran backed Shitties...thats right. I
> spelled
> > > it
> > > > > > that way on purpose. Will be to start Viet Cong style attacks.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > So much for liberating them.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > Oh, good grief, Dan... You need help.
> > > > >
> > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > Why is that Kim? Because I can see what is happening?
> > > Iran is intent on turning Iraq into a Iran too. They want a religious
> > > government there just like theirs. In fact they actually want
Iranians
> > > running Iraq.
> > >
```

> >
> > Well, the news I've been listening to indicates that the Iraqi folks are
> > pretty hellbent on just that same thing. The thing many don't seem to
> > realize is that this is a part of the world where everything *is* all
> about
> > religion/religious dogma and it's always been that way. It wouldn't
> > surprise me at all to see Iraq become what I've heard called, a
theocracy.
> > Why does that surprise anyone? AND, what in the world are "we" (the
> United
> > States Gov't.) supposed to do about it? Why? What gives us the right
to
> > make it so that things such as theocracies do not happen? Do unto
others
> as
> > you would have done unto yourself, right? Well, I wouldn't want someone
> > coming "in here" (to the United States) and telling me how it's going to
> be.
> >
> > >
> > > You don't think they (the Iranians) wont resort to guerilla attacks
> > against
> > > the infidels? US? Open your eyes.
> > >
> >
> > That's where you need help, Dan. You think just because of my comments
> that
> > I have no clue. You're wrong. I have way too much clue and that is why
> the
> > whole idea of our being "over there" has me concerned--when I bother to
> > think about it and most of the time I try not to. I don't think "we"
(the
> > so-called Western world) have a chance in Hell of introducing these
people
> > to a new way of thinking. Nor, as indicated by your comments and fervor
> for
> > one, do most here have a chance in Hell of being able to understand or
> > comprehend what these people are all about.
> >
> > >
> > > Bush better keep a large armed force in Iraq...with orders to return
> fire.
> > > Or we will have another Nam. Heck...we still may, no matter what we
do.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Well, ain't that just peachy? An armed force here, an armed force

there,
> > everywhere an armed force, right? Heck, why don't we just plan on
making
> it
> > the United World?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> Now there is a idea. Why not take that up with the UN (Useless Nitwits)
?
> Im sure they could have a nice chat about it.
>
> Lets do a reality check here Kim. IRAQ has been sponsering and paying for
> terrorists for decades. They are in cahoots with Syria, and Lebanon
(which
> is occupied by Syria).
>
> Remember how the Palestinians were bragging about being paid 20000 bux US
to
> blow themselves up and kill Isralies?
>
> Ever wonder why they didnt target the US? Well they did. Starting with
the
> cruiseship Acili Lauro (sp??). Who do you thing pays for all this crap?
> Sure Bin Laden is a player, but not the only one. Dont you see that these
> groups are all intertwined and interconnected?
>
> Heck I just heard where the GERMANS stopped a ship leaving EGYPT and
> heading to KOREA with NUCLEAR stuff on board. ITS EVERYWHERE KIM.
>
> WE ARE AT WAR. This is not some sort of Bosnia or Grenada...this is the
> start of WW3.
>
> Wake up and smell the roses.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

I don't doubt that one bit, Dan. But, WWWIII or not, the crap in the Middle East is bigger, longer, harder than anything that "we" have ever confronted before. If we are at WWWIII, we'll be at war for the rest of history. And, we don't have any business, wherewithal, or capability of changing anything over there.

Kim W5TIT

3741. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 14:35:25 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <E913AF99A462BE3C.6A3CBBDE8D138255.43D5E57FF4A0430D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65928

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b8f43t$ero$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:78896CE67B588331.C4D802526F8F9FA0.AC7095B8261F49F4@lp.airnews.net...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:b8eepr$eim$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20030426122603.16173.00000054@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > > > In article <b8e5og$g4$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > > > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
> > > >
> > > > > listening to that interview also. Really enjoyed the perspective.
> > > > >>
> > > > >> Kim
> > > > >
> > > > >The next move from the Iran backed
> > > >
> > > > [Shiites]
> > > >
> > > > > Will be to start Viet Cong style attacks.
> > > > >
> > > > >So much for liberating them.
> > > > >
> > > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > > Good point, Dan. While I hope you are mistaken, I would not be at
all
> > > surprised
> > > > if you are correct.
> > > >
> > > > So what should the US-UK coalition forces do then?
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > > I guess that depends on how bad we really want what we say we want. A
> > free
> > > Iraq and a non-secular, Iraqi elected government.
> > >
> >
> > Never happen in 2,000+ years. Oh yeah, that's right--it hasn't. And it
> > won't in the next 2,000 years. And, the idea of an armed presence to
> > "maintain peace and order" is kind of like thought police, isn't it?
```

Oh,
> > forgive me for being so real about how I think.
> >
> > >
> > > It could disintegrate into a US 'selected/appointed' strongman with
the
> US
> > > providing the military and financial support. Gee, where is Nuguyn
Van
> > > Thieu when we need him, eh?
> > >
> > > See my point?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Isn't that the world you foresee by our armed presence?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> No, not necessarily. The trick is to get the Iranian backed Shites to see
> we are serious. Perhaps a little attitude adjusting is in order. Similar
> to what is happening NOW with Syria.
>

Yeah, well, the US government doesn't have a history of being able to pull
that kind of trick. And, the US Govt. doesn't have a history of commanding
the military in such an artful manner.

>
> I see no alternative to a large American army in place in Iraq for many
> years. Any other solution will invite a major attack by Iran and other
not
> so friendly states in the area.
>

I say let them have their war. When the dust settles, we'll see what there
is to deal with. And, by taking that attitude, maybe the rest of the world
would realize that that the United States ain't playing on their streets any
more.

>
> NONE of the ARAB states really give a rip about the USA. We are simply a
> very big consumer of their oil. Given their preference we would all go
away
> and NEVER come back.
>

Well, that's my preference, too. And, the USA isn't such a big consumer of their oil--if we are to believe that Venezuela is our major source of imported oil as has been stated and reported.

> But now the pandora box is open. Only time will tell.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

I don't think we need time to tell us anything.

Kim W5TIT

3742. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 15:54:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8gufo$v8$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65929

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:A237D6910D12A5D4.D5EB760585C5507F.7088600FA1FFABE7@lp.airnews.net...

> > WE ARE AT WAR. This is not some sort of Bosnia or Grenada...this is the
> > start of WW3.
> >
> > Wake up and smell the roses.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> I don't doubt that one bit, Dan. But, WWWIII or not, the crap in the
Middle
> East is bigger, longer, harder than anything that "we" have ever
confronted
> before. If we are at WWWIII, we'll be at war for the rest of history.
And,
> we don't have any business, wherewithal, or capability of changing
anything
> over there.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
I dont agree with that one bit. Part one; We took on both the Empire of Japan and Nazi Germany at the same time. And we came real close to losing that one.

This deal with the middle east is not, AT THIS POINT, that serious. And with our capabilities there is NO COUNTRY in that area that actually is a serious military threat. Which leads us to this.....

If we dont act now and neutralize the threat of those countries CONTINUING to export terrorism against not only the USA but ALL western nations...with the exception of their good buddies the French, or course. Then we will have a MAJOR problem.

I agree with President Bushs plan of prememptive strikes. Its about time we had a administration that knows what its PRIMARY JOB is.

What is that you may ask?

" To preserve and protect the constitution of this country, from all enemies foreign and domestic"

The Presidents primary job is to protect this country...PERIOD. Something Clinton totally ignored.

Don't beleive me? Clinton set up the useless agreement with North Korea....1994. With the primary assistance of another loser, Jimmy Carter. Lets not even discuss the computer and high tech stuff sent to China.

And how about Clinton letting Bin Laden slip away while he was busy getting 'nonsex' from Monica?

The whole bunch of them needs brought up on charges of High treason.

Now this administration has to deal with it all. And deal they are. THANK GOD.

Dan/W4NTI

3743. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 16:26:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030427122609.18772.00000228@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65930

In article <b8eepreim1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>> So what should the US-UK coalition forces do then?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>I guess that depends on how bad we really want what we say we want. A free
>Iraq and a non-secular, Iraqi elected government.

I think you mean a "secular" govt., Dan. Or perhaps I've got the definitions mixed up. The concept I think we're both talking about is a govt. that is not aligned to a particular religious sect.

The problem with that concept is that it has a very bad history in Iraq. SH's govt only paid lip service to Islam. Religious leaders who dared to oppose his govt. were persecuted. End result: When he was under attack, not many religious extremists came to his aid.

>
>It could disintegrate into a US 'selected/appointed' strongman with the US
>providing the military and financial support. Gee, where is Nuguyn Van
>Thieu when we need him, eh?
>
EXACTLY!

>See my point?
>
Sort of.

The big problem I see is that a lot of "Iraqis" don;t see themselves that way. They define themselves first as Sunnis or Kurds or whatever. "Iraqi" is an identity forced on them.

If what the "Iraqi people" really want is to split up their country along religious/ethnic lines, why not? Who has posed the greater threat to the USA - fundamentalist Iran or SH's fascist Iraq?

I say we let them have the kind of country they really want, as long as it doesn't threaten the USA. How many Americans fought, died and were injured to prop up Thieu's govt.? How much of a threat has Vietnam been since that govt. fell a quarter century ago?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3744. ARNewsline 1341 - April 25 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 17:25:24 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030427132524.02864.00000158@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 65931

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1341 April 25, 2003

(Note: This is the first ever Amateur Radio Newsline report anchored from outside of the United States. It was recorded in Auckland, New Zealand by Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF)

**

The following is a Closed Circuit. Newscast 1341 follows immediately. Here is Amateur Radio Newsline Support Fund administrator Andy Jarema, N6TCQ.

--

Amateur Radio Newsline is still on the air. It's still on the air because staff members paid the bills out-of-pocket. This obviously, cannot continue. These people are not Bill Gates, Warren Buffet, or even Michael Jackson. These are your everyday working people who believe so strongly in the mission of Newsline, that they will support it with hard-earned dollars.

We at Newsline need for you, our listening audience, to believe in that mission, too. To believe enough to help keep these newscasts on the air. To show your thanks to the volunteers that keep the latest in Amateur Radio news coming your way.

The address for the Newsline support fund is: Newsline, PO Box 660937, Arcadia, CA 91066.

Again, as always, thank you for your belief, and for your support.

--

Thank you Andy.

**

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1341 with a release date of Friday, April 25 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Bad news for United States hams who like high fidelity single sideband, good news for New Zealand hams worried about restrictive R F exposure laws and the Dayton Hamvention says that it plans to stay where it is. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1341 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

A CLASH OF IDEALS: BE CAREFUL IF YOU RUN WI-FI

A sour note for hams running what some call high fidelity single sideband. It comes in a regulatory advisory letter from the FCC. Amateur Radio Newsline's Paul Courson, WA3VJB, reports from Washington D.C.

--

The letter from FCC enforcement counsel Riley Hollingsworth went out to a list of licensed hams who favor what some call enhanced SSB, which is sometimes nicknamed upper wideband and lower wideband, characterized by extended low end response, a clean mid-range, and expanded treble or high-end crispness.

While their passion is to experiment toward exceptional audio quality with their voice transmission and reception, the experiments have been a flop with some other hams near their frequencies of operation.

Hollingworth said the Commission has received a number of complaints, and that his advisory letter is intended to inform them that the complaints claim the bandwidth of these stations is wider than necessary and contrary to good engineering practice.

The FCC letter did not cite these stations for any violations, and acknowledged that a precise measurement can be somewhat complex. But he encouraged each operator to be aware that it can be "extremely inconsiderate of other operators" to employ what Hollingsworth described as wide-band overly processed audio, especially when, in his words, such audio is combined with high intermodulation distortion generated by certain amplifiers.

Two of the hams who received the letter quickly responded to Hollingsworth. John Anning, NU9N, told the FCC that single sideband does not have to sound like a tin-can anymore, and cited the enhanced audio available from the latest manufactured transceivers from Kenwood and Yaesu, as well as the popularity of external audio augmentation marketed to the amateur community from Heilsound and W2IHY. Anning said his station does not splatter, has low distortion, and is not overly processed. He suggested the problem of splatter and excessive bandwidth from distortion products is far more common on the phone bands during any contest weekend.

The other hi-fi ham sharing his response to the FCC advisory letter is Paul Christensen, W9AC. He told Newsline he is puzzled by the letter since he's been off the air the past six months. Christensen said the letter may have been prompted by a group he characterized as "a half dozen tightly-knit, pandering individuals."

Both men who spoke with Newsline compared the experiments with wideband SSB to the activity of AM, which itself has enjoyed rising popularity and has been getting favorable press in QST, Electric Radio, and Popular Communications. By contrast Hollingsworth has reportedly expressed his belief single side band was developed as a mode with spacesaving advantages, with necessary tradeoffs in audio quality as a presumption with its use in the amateur service.

Again, the advisory letter carries no enforcement sanctions. But Hollingsworth told the stations such complaints can trigger petitions for rulemaking asking for constraints on such activity that the recipients of the letters had better keep in mind.

Reporting for Newsline, this is Paul Courson, WA3VJB, in Washington

--

In preparing his report WA3VJB did contact the FCC’s Riley Hollingsworth. Hollingsworth told Courson that he honestly does not think these letters have any bearing on those hams who operate AM stations altho he admits thart he is getting that question. But he says that in his view, there is no need whatsoever for A-M'ers to be concerned. (ARNewsline™, WA3VJB)

**

RADIO LAW: RF EXPOSURE LIMITS DOWN-UNDER

Some good news for hams down-under. This as the Palmerston North City Council favors Amateur Radio on a proposed plan to change local Radio Frequency exposure limits.

According to Mike Newman, ZL1BNB, the Palmerston North council has declined to accept the recommendation of the New Zealand Department of Health to adopt its testing and reporting proceedures. The Council instead adopted the less stringent emission exposure levels set out in an earlier New Zealand standard as being the maximum levels which can be generated by transmitting equipment within the Palmerston North City boundaries.

In taking this action the Palmerston North city council declined to support the government recommended approach which would have required local radio amateurs to carry out the expensive R F exposure evaluation process. Numerous amateur operators and representatives of the nations national Amateur Radio Society -- the N-Z-A-R-T -- testified in support of the measure that was adopted. (NZART)

**

RADIO LAW: CANADA NEW TOWER LAW REVIEW COMMITTEE

Back in North America, Canada’s Minister of Industry, Alan Rock, has announced the appointment of a National Antenna Tower Review Committee. The Committee will be made up of municipal officials, as well as industry, health and academic experts.

The new committee will be chaired by David A. Townsend. Townsend is a Professor of Law at the University of New Brunswick and has authored a previous study on antenna support structures.

And while the announcement outlines the composition of the new Canadian tower committee it does not give the target dates for the submission of inputs or the method by which information can be provided. Radio Amateurs of Canada, that nations national Amateur Radio society says it plans to participate in any policy review affecting Canadian ham radio operations. (RAC)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America and Auckland New Zealand, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the N9AKN

repeater serving Milwaukee Wisconsin.

(5 sec pause here)

**

ENFORCEMENT: RADIO STATION DINGED FOR $9000

A $9,000 fine against WRKQ - AM in Madisonville, Tennessee, has been affirmed by the Federal Communications Commission. The regulatory agency says that WRKQ allegedly failed at least once to identify itself by call sign. Also that it operated at night with daytime power and failed to adequately attenuate its second harmonic.

The harmonic is a rather interesting issue here. WRKQ operates on 1250 kHz. The FCC says that it's second harmonic falls squarely on WWV's authorized frequency of 2.5 MHz. The FCC says that it measured WRKQ's second harmonic down at only -55 dB per centimeter whereas -70 dB is required by the rules.

You can read more on the web at
http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-03-1033A1.doc (CGC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: YOU CANT SAY THAT ON THE AIR - IN ANY LANGUAGE

The FCC is looking into what a California ham may have said on the air. The agency's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, explains:

--

Duckworth: "Julio Cedeno, N2GRM, of Hollywood California has 20 days to respond to an inquiry concerning both Spanish and English communications from his station operation on 14.322 MHz on March 5th and March 9th of this year. The transmissions contained threats to another amateur as well as language prohibited by the Commissions rules."

--

In its letter the FCC noted directed that N2GRM specifically address the threats in the transmissions as well as the language. The regulatory agency says that threats made against other licensees are viewed very seriously by the Commission. It also told N2GRM that his response will used to determine what enforcement action the FCC may take in this matter.

**

ENFORCEMENT: YOU CANT SAY THAT ON THE AIR

An Eastlake Ohio ham has also heard from the FCC. On March 18th the regulatory agency issued Dave K. Childers, N8QGI, a warning letter regarding transmissions purportedly made by him last December on 27.115 MHz.

For those of you not aware, 27.115 MHz is also known as Class D Citizens Band channel 13 in regions governed by the FCC. In its note, the government agency did explain its position -- upheld by the courts -- regarding its ban on the

type of language Childers is alleged to have used.

The agency also ordered Childers to respond within 20 days from the date of its letter to him. The FCC also told him that his response will be used to determine what enforcement action to take in this matter.

**

HAMVENTION 2003®: WE PLAN TO STAY AT THE HARA

The Dayton Hamvention hopes to stay at the HARA Arena well past 2003. So says the event's General Chairman, Pat Neff, N8IGS. He tells RAIN's Hap Holly, KC9RP that the rumors of a move are simply not true:

--

Neff: "I can't tell you where the rumor is being propagated from but I can tell you that we are in negotiations for future years at HARA Arena and the only difference is that we are really not looking to have a long multi-year contract anymore. We want to be able to have a shorter length contract so that it could be better advantageous to us from a bottom-line aspect."

--

Rumors of a move away from the HARA Arena or that the HARA had been sold seem to pop up every year. Newsline even heard one being circulated at the recent N-A-B show in Las Vegas. And like all before it over the years, this rumor was as phony as the rest.

But the real bottom line is what Pat Neff says -- and we quote: "As much as the city of Dayton is associated with the Hamvention, HARA is associated with Hamvention." And to paraphrase another very famous ham -- thats the way it is! (RAIN)

**

HAMVENTION 2003®: HEAR MORE ON RAIN

By the way. You can hear more about the plans for Hamvention 2003 with Pat Neff, N8IGS, on this weeks RAIN Report. Its on-line right now in streaming audio at www.rainreport.com. Or, if you are Internet deprived, you can dial in on your phone to listen. The number in Chicago is area code 847 827 RAIN. Thats 847 827 7246. (RAIN)

**

HAMVENTION 2003®: DAYTON REMEMBERS THOSE WHO HAVE PASSED ON

Still with Hamvention related news, last week its planners announced the major award winners for 2003. And from time to time the Hamvention also recognizes the contributions of hams who have passed on but left their mark. Roy Neal, K6DUE, reports:

--

Dating back to the days when we hams talked in Morse code and used keys instead of microphones to talk, we hams call our friends who have passed on as Silent Keys'. The term is one of endearment and respect for those radio amateurs who have lead the way. And in keeping with this long tradition, the planners of the 2003 Dayton Hamvention have paused to salute a number of special people whose lives have helped to make ham radio a little bit better.

The first being saluted by Dayton is Joseph Carr, K4IPV, of Falls Church, VA. Carr became a Silent Key on November 25, 2000. During his lifetime K4IPV authored over 85 books and nearly 700 articles covering electronics and technology. He also contributed monthly columns and articles to many popular Amateur Radio magazines.

Al Gross, W8PAL, of Sun City, Arizona became a Silent Key on December 21st, 2000. For those not aware, Gross brought the world such indispensable wireless communications devices as the walkie-talkie, the pager and cordless telephone.

A name that many Amateur Radio Newsline listeners will remember is that of Bill Orr, W6SAI. Bill became left us on January 24, 2001. He was best know for his voluminous publications for radio amateurs, including "The Radio Handbook", "The Beam Antenna Handbook" and many more. He was a good friend to me and to many other hams.

Raymond Ortgiesen, WF1B, was another major contributor to today’s ham radio way of life. He authored “RTTY,” the leading contest software for digital modes.

Ernie Hudson, KI8O, of Dayton, OH became a Silent Key on 8/2/2002. Hudson was a member of the Dayton Red Cross and acted as the Montgomery County Emergency Coordinator and Assistant Coordinator for a number of years. Hudson’s passion was helping people. His efforts focused on public service and disaster relief while also introducing many young people in Amateur Radio.

Finally there are the Columbia Astronauts who perished earlier this year. Three of them were hams. David Brown, KC5ZTC, Kalpana "KC" Chawla, KD5ESI and Laurel Clark, KC5ZSU, who died along with crew-mates Rick Husband, Willie McCool, Michael Anderson and Han Ramon when Columbis disintegrated over Texas during re-entry.

The Dayton Amateur Radio Association says that through the Space Amateur Radio Experiment and the Amateur Radio on the International Space Station programs, ham radio has enjoyed a special relationship with the Astronaut Corps. It is for their dedication, their role in scientific advancement, and their love of their dreams that the Dayton Amateur Radio Association and the Hamvention have made this very special award this award to the crew of the space ship Columbia on its STS-107 last mission.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Roy Neal, K6DUE, reporting

--

The announcement of these special remembrances is on the events website at www.hamvention.org (Hamvention 2003®)

**

HAM HAPPENINGS: T-HUNT TIME

And speaking about things that happen in the spring, its T-Hunt time again. Here’s Joe Moell, K0OV, with the latest:

--

Are you looking for some new outdoor ham fun for the spring and summer months? Join your fellow hams who are tuning up their radio direction finding (RDF) equipment in preparation for the hidden transmitter hunting season.

The CQ Magazine National Foxhunting Weekend will be May 10-11, a time when foxhunters from around the country go on their favorite kind of RDF adventure. It could be a mobile T-hunt. When you set out in your RDF-equipped vehicle, you never know where you'll end up and you don't know what you'll find.

Other hams prefer their foxhunting to be all on foot in a big park. They call it foxtailing, radio-orienteering or ARDF. There's an internationally recognized set of rules for this kind of hunt, which takes place in about 30 countries around the world. Stateside hams will host competitors from some of these countries at the Third USA ARDF Championships in Cincinnati, Ohio beginning July 31.

Of course your club can make up its own transmitter hunting rules. The important thing is to make plans now for transmitter hunting on May 10 and 11, the National Foxhunting Weekend. There are more foxhunting opportunities coming up, and I'll be telling you about them in another report soon. You can read about foxhunting and the National Foxhunting Weekend at my Web site: www.homingin.com. That's one word "homingin" --- homingin.com.

From southern California, where there's some kind of transmitter hunt almost every weekend, this is Joe Moell, Kay-zero-Oscar-Victor, for Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Again Joe’s website is www.homingin.com. And homingin is one word. (ARN ewsline™, K0OV)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the Auckland New Zealand and Los Angeles California, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAMS HELPING HAMS: DISTANCE LEARNING - AMATEUR RADIO STYLE

The Nacogdoches Amateur Radio Club, in Nacogdoches Texas recently solved a big problem using what it calls typical ham radio ingenuity. This, when John

Fullingim, the person who was supposed to talk at their meeting could not get a ride out from Dallas about 180 miles away

Fullingim¹s program was a Power Point Presentation consisting of a series of slides accompanied by live commentary. Rather than cancel the April 2nd meeting, Fullingham e-mailed the Power Point to Army Curtis, AE5P, in Nacogdoches. Curtis loaded it onto his laptop computer for showing at the meeting.

Next, a communications link was then established between Nacogdoches and Dallas using both the Internet and Amateur Radio courtesy of Jeff Clark, K5NAC and Kevin Anderson, KD5CCH. And on the meeting night Curtis ran the slide show in Nacogdoches as Fullingim in Dallas provided commentary using the specially installed system.

The two way link also allowed questions to be asked from the live audience. This remote program lasted almost 90 minutes, and was very well received by everyone present at the meeting. (KD5ING)

**

NEW HAM TECHNOLOGY: RIMIGATE VER 0.2 NOW AVAILABLE

Sean Jewett, KG4NRC, of Antioch, Tennessee has announced the availability of version 0.2 of his RIMiGate application program. This is a freely available Linux based APRS I Gate server.

Version 0.2 is quite a bit different from the earlier release. Users no longer need to have a Linux system to build RIMiGate. RIMiGate is now distributed as a disk image that can be written to disk using freely available tools for Linux, Windows, and Macintosh. In addition, the configuration files now reside on an M-S DOS based file system so users can easily edit configuration files.

The minimum requirements for RIMiGate is a 486 system with a minimum of 12 megs of ram. You can download the program from the http://www.rimboy.com/rimdistro/rimigate/ (KG4NRC)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: AN AO-40 UPDATE

The AMSAT Oscar 40 satellite is continuing to drift downward as was predicted by its controllers. Unfortunately, this makes for bad satellite conditions that are less than favorable for passband use.

Also, the solar angle is worsening and will soon exceed 45 degrees. This will limit satellites available power while warming the spacecraft considerably as the sun swings across it.

Because of these factors, AO-40’s passband transmitters were be turned off on Saturday, April 19th. They will remain off for about 4 weeks or until conditions improve. (ANS)

**

INTERNATIONAL -GERMANY: DEUTSCHE WELLE GOES DIGITAL

Germany's international broadcaster, Deutsche Welle, has announced that as of June it will transmit digitally on shortwave to Europe and the Middle East using the Radio Mondiale broadcast system. This makes Deutsche Welle the first international broadcaster to commit to a start date for regular D-R-M transmissions on the shortwave bands. (ASWLC)

**

OUR HERITAGE: INTERNATIONAL MARCONI DAY

Saturday, the 26th of April, was 'International Marconi Day'. International Marconi Day is a 24-hour on-the-air event held annually to celebrate the birth of Guglielmo Marconi in 1874. Its also an opportunity for amateurs around the world to make contacts with historic Marconi sites to gain an award for working a specific number of participating stations.

At least 35 special event stations were to be on the air for International Marcoini Day 2003. This included the famed W1AA slash MSC Marconi Radio Club representing the Marconi 1901 Siasconset Station on Nantucket Island in the USA. There were also around 15 United Kingdom sites slated to be on such as Poldhu in Cornwall and Alum Bay on the Isle of Wight and Chelmsford in Essex. Other historic stations include VO1IMD from Signal Hill, Newfoundland, and IY4FGM from Marconi's birthplace near Bologna Italy. (MSC ARC, GB2RS)

**

DX

In DX, the RSGB reports that the International Short Wave League's VHF club callsign, MX1SWL, is being used by Tom Read, M1EYP, through the end of April. Tom will be activating several hilltops, particularly in the Pennines, for the Summits On The Air awards program. (GB2RS)

And F0 slash F8CFU planned to be on from the Tuamotu Archipelago in French Polynesia and Tubuai Island in the Austral Islands through the 16th of May. QSL as directed on the air. (GB2RS)

Also, the former 7Q7DC, has now moved to Nairobi and has been given the call 5Z4DE. Don is the first United States citizen in 12 years to obtain a Kenyan license and will be active as soon as he puts his antennas up. (OPDX)

Lastly, word that 4Z4DX, will be active on 160 to 6 meters CW and digital modes as 9N7DX from Nepal through the 12th of May. Again, Q-S-L as directed by the operator. (OPDX)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: HAM RADIO ADVENTURE TO THE SOUTH PACIFIC

And finally this week, how about a ham who has decided not to let age stand in the way of her passion to sail and to operate from rare places. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reports on a truly amazing lady:

--

Susan Meckeley, W7KFI, is 69, loves ham radio and loves to sail. And she recently told the Ohio-Penn DX Newsletter that she is headed to the South Pacific on as three-year DX'pedition odyssey.

Meckeley left Oakland, California, in January and has been slowly working her way south. At that time she spore with OPDX Meckeley was in Mexico and soon to sign W7KFI slash maritime mobile. She has already been to Ensenada, Mexico, for a month, but set sail on April 16th, for San Jose, Punta Cabras.

Heading south, Meckeley told OPDX that she would be operating from the Isle San Martin. She was heard April 17th at 24:41 UTC as XE2/W7KFI on 14.249 MHz from the island. The length of her stay is not known.

Her next stop will be at Bahia de Torguga and from there to Magdelina Bay, Cabo San Lucas, and finally La Paz. Then it is off to the islands in the Sea of Cortez for operating and into Guymas for the hurricane season. Come fall she will go down the mainland coast ending in Costa Rica. In April 2004, Meckeley is off to Galapagos Islands and into the South Pacific.

When she's on the air its with a Yaesu FT-847 and a pair of pop-up masts. She runs all modes except ATV from her 1932 Challanger called the S/V Dharma. She tells OPDX that -- and we quote -- "this size boat I can handle all by myself." And it sounds as if Susan Meckeley, W7KFI, is making her dream come true.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

One last note. Meckeley told OPDX that she has room on board for a crew-member if anyone wants to go. If interested, let OPDX know and the newsletter will forward the message. The e-Mail address is kb8nw@arrl.net (OPDX)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

Before we go, a reminder that the nominating period for the 2003 amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year is now open. No significant changes from last year. Nominees must be 18 or younger. Full rules and an application is on our new special website at www.yhoty.org.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, in Auckland, New Zealand saying 73 and we thank you for listening."
Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

3745. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 17:48:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030427134822.04525.00000126@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 65932

In article <BAD0C173.17B7C%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>> There IS a cure for tunnel vision, Dwight. In order
>> to effect a cure you have to get out of the tunnel
>> into reality and learn how the rest of the world uses
>> radio. Now. Don't rely on myths and legends of the
>> 1912 sinking of the Titanic. This is 91 years later.
>
> Okay, lets see that reality by looking at a real disaster - one I was
>directly involved in. In 1998, Hurricane Hugo hit the North Carolina, South
>Carolina, and Georgia coasts. In the hours leading up to this storm's
>landfall, most residents evacuated this area, including the employees at
>most television and radio stations.

Just the same, us in other parts of the USA could watch TV
journalists' video and sound from INSIDE the hurricane area,
night scenes still lit by street lighting still operational despite
terrible winds. Obviously there wasn't anything close to a
"most evacuated" condition of broadcast personnel...someone
held the TV cameras, others manned the relay truck...and
someone must have been at the power stations keeping the
electric power on for the communities.

> In the days leading up to landfall, public service communications was
>filled with traffic dealing with evacuations, accidents, and getting
>hospital patients to other inland hospitals. During this same period,
>private utility communications was filled with traffic dealing with storm
>preparation, shutting down utilities in certain areas, and in re-enforcing
>certain key utility systems and subsystems.

Thanks to the National Weather Service, affected hurricane areas
get days of warning. Hurricanes seem to be a regular seasonal
event in the east and residents there have, literally, centuries of
experience to plan accordingly.

Other emergencies such as earthquakes, industrial explosions,
wildfires do NOT have any warnings, have NO chance for
preparation of the affected areas.

> At this point, it should have been obvious the system would soon be
>overwhelmed. Employees at dispatch centers were already working overtime and
>many of those would evacuate as the storm approached.

ALL emergency conditions require ALL to work more than regular
hours.

> From this point on, we'll look at just Horry Country in upper South
>Carolina since that is where I was located. As the storm hit, public service
>personnel hunkered down to wait out the storm as communications started
>failing over a wide area. This included the police/fire communications tower
>in Horry County, most cellular towers in the coastal areas, and many towers
>belonging to utility companies.

Compare the relative populations of Horry County in South Carolina
versus Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and Ventura Counties in
California all affected by the Northridge Earthquake.

> Only one television and one radio station remained on the air during the
>storm. The television station lost its tower about two in the morning (an
>hour after first landfall), leaving only the one radio station on the air
>for the next two days.
>
> As phones failed, shelters and evacuation centers were left with no
>communications. During the night, several shelters found themselves in
>serious trouble. One shelter was flooded by the storm's surge, requiring
>adults to place children on available tables, and another shelter lost a
>section of its roof.

Did "most" amateur radio antennas miraculously remain standing
while all those commercial towers fell?

> As the storm moved away from the coast, the coastal towns were left with
>patchy communications and attempts to piggyback additional traffic onto
>undamaged communications facilities.
>
> Over the next two days, communications became a major hurdle in dealing
>with the storm's aftermath. Whole sections of Horry county were left with no
>public service communications. Surfside Beach and Conway, the only two with
>undamaged tower facilities, could not reach public service personnel over
>wide areas of downtown Myrtle Beach.

Those of us in the rest of the USA who watched that hurricane's
progress on live TV were made aware of the problems.

Seems that national TV news networks were there and
communicating live without all the "hurdles."

For how many decades have communities in this region experienced
other hurricanes? How much planning and organization have gone
into emergency preparation?

> Three of the four downtown fire stations could not communicate with
>dispatch. Three of the five hospitals were left with no communications with
>personnel in the field.
>
> And, since many personnel had evacuated before the storm hit, even finding
>enough employees to man the few remaining facilities became a problem. The
>roads leading back into the area were blocked with traffic - many simply
>parked their cars in the roadway and slept in them until the roads were
>reopened several days later. This traffic jam prevented many public service

>personnel, hospital personnel, and utility personnel, from quickly returning
>to the area.

The rest of us in the USA saw the gridlock on live TV.

> Prior to this storm, ham operators were not included in the existing
>disaster planning. Some operators in the surrounding area, those who
>actually could find their way back into the area, did step in to help. For
>example, ham operators became the sole communications system for area
>hospitals for well over a week.

No doubt by "CW" on HF and using the NTS?

We are waiting for the announcement that the HF antennas were
all still up having miraculously survived the winds and rain while all
the commercial towers fell, damaged beyond repair...

> By the second day, National Guard personnel began arriving in the area.
>They brought two generators with them and five radios, three of which only
>operated on military frequencies. However, by this time, the communications
>problem had mostly been resolved, with more restored in the coming days.

Did they get through the gridlock on highways or did they go
cross-country to get there?

"Military frequencies" on HF are interleaved with commercial and
government frequencies. Military HF radios can tune to any
frequency between 2 and 30 MHz. Military VHF radios can tune
over the entire amateur 6m band. Was the South Carolina
National Guard using radios purchased from K-Mart?

> In addition to major changes to the existing public service communications
>system, including better locations for towers and more overall redundancy in
>the system, ham operators have been well incorporated in future disaster
>planning. This includes the appointment of a ham coordinator to work
>directly with the civil defense office, and the involvement of hams in all
>disaster training exercises. Hurricane Hugo taught one important lesson - no
>matter how much planning, one cannot foresee every possible outcome. Ham
>operators will be there to fill in those unforeseen gaps next time.

So, one region of South Carolina "got taught a lesson" in 1998.
How long has that region undergone hurricanes? Never before?
Has Horry County, South Carolina, been cut off from the rest of
the USA for a long time?

California ACS has been organized longer, incorporating MANY
other radio and communications services in its auxilliary
umbrella of organization and planning. The Greater Los Angeles
emergency planning could incorporate amateur radio into its
over-decade-long existance for communications but has managed
well enough without it through a Real Emergency that had NO
warning whatsoever at a bit after 4:30 AM on 17 January 1994.

So far, Dwight, all you've done is a lot of "pep rally rah-rah" about US amateur radio largely to an audience mostly made up of other radio amateurs. That's the wrong audience for addressing REAL emergency planning, organization, preparation, and training.

Real Emergencies aren't games of sport, one "side" against "another." Real Emergencies are survived by ALL working together. Real Emergencies require organization, planning, preparation, integration, and training using ALL available resources.

Real Emergencies aren't survived by high-fiving pep rally fantasies of winning over "the other side" or by a lot of mythical tales and urban legends where amateurs and amateur radio miraculously survives while all commercial and government radios and equipment fails. Real Emergencies aren't planned for by pipe-dreaming heroic acts of aid that haven't happened except in imagination.

Real Emergencies are survived by hard-nosed pragmatism based on past experiences of everyone. Real Emergencies are survived by ignoring the over-inflated egos of certain minority groups who've psyched themselves into an imaginary nirvana of self-importance before anything has happened.

The United States of America has undergone many and varied Real Emergencies besides war and politics over the last half-century. All of it has been recorded, noted, indexed, archived and IS available for reference. It isn't locked up in some guru vault in Newington or archived solely in a collection of amateur radio weekly newsletters. Real Emergency situations aren't a local thing exclusive to one coast or any region.

3746. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 17:48:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030427134826.04525.00000127@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 65933

In article <BAD0C15D.17B7C%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

> Certainly larger cities are better equipped to deal with the disruptions
>following a disaster, but even the largest cities may struggle with this
>problem during a serious disaster and that is even more so the case for
>smaller towns.

No one can forsee true disasters but there ARE ways to plan
for emergencies of a large sort. The greater Los Angeles area
(includes over 70 incorporated cities) has done this and it works
out well. That covers a population of about 10 to 12 million.

> I think we're talking about different types of disasters here. What you
>say is perhaps true for small, isolated, incidents.

A Richter 6.3 earthquake with a total cutoff of all electrical power
is classified as a "small, isolated incident?!?"

17 January 1994. I was here and rode it through. The President
and some of his staff visited here to view the damage. Over 50
residents died as a direct result of that earthquake.

If you think that is a "small, isolated incident," then we don't
have anything to discuss, do we?

>But, it is a different
>story when it comes to the serious disaster. In my next message (the second
>one in this two-part message), I describe a common disaster that impacted
>three states. This is not abnormal - an large earthquake along the west
>coast might impact a similar area.

California is one of the larger states in the union and the most
populous of all of them with about 30 million.

Depending on which "states," their total population may not exceed
that of California's population. California is large enough that driving
north-south from border to border takes at least 10 hours steady
driving at maximum speed allowed on interstates. Big place. Not
as big as Texas or Alaska but bigger than, say, Rhode Island. :-)

The Northridge Earthquake of 1994 didn't reach north enough to
affect mid-California. The Loma Prieta Earthquake in mid-state
didn't affect southern California.

> In these larger situations, the telephone system is one of the first
>things to fail. This is caused by overuse by civilians trying to call
>friends and family and damage to parts of that system by the disaster

>itself.

The telephone SWITCHING SYSTEM is simply overloaded by
callers trying to dial out. That isn't "failure," it is just going beyond
the switching system's traffic capacity as designed. The switching
centers did not fail here in any earthquake...they remained working
with everything intact, standby batteries functioning for the length
of the power outages.

The only TRUE failures of the telephone system here in 1994 was to
some above-ground cable runs on utility poles near the epicenter,
perhaps no more than two dozen poles damaged or downed.

Apparently you are unfamiliar with the leased lines that do NOT go
through the switching system. Those were unaffected here. The
fire departments use them for alarms and warnings at the fire
houses.

Despite the alleged "failure" of the telephone system during the
1994 earthquake, I received a call from my uncle in Florida in the
early afternoon of 17 January. No problems on outside-area
calling IN. By noon of 17 January 1994 I could call out on my
residence phone with no problems.

>> Utility services NORMALLY use their radios to effect
>> repairs to utilities. That is in no way different
>>from operations during real emergencies. (snip)
>
> It most certainly is different. Following a disaster, most utilities have
>to call in all employees (vacations and time off ends) and for assistance
>from neighboring utilities to help with the repairs. These extra personnel
>place a huge load on the existing communications system. Needless to say,
>this is not the place to look for supplemental communications.

"Supplemental communications" were not needed in the 1994
Northridge Earthquake. While there was NO advance warning,
off-duty utility workers could indeed get a "wake-up call" without
any on-duty supervisors calling them by telephone. The utilities
here already have contingency plans for which off-duty personnel
to report without notification. Once reported in they are directed
to sites of damage by supervisors who've been notified by mobile
units.

The police departments and some fire departments have similar
plans. A few large corporations do, too.

"Notification" can be done in many ways. One of the ways you
did not cover was broadcast radio and television. All of the major
radio stations here had emergency power (installed long ago).
Broadcast stations' news departments get their information from
many sources (including the "failed" telephone system which,
miraculously worked...go figure) and can relay that to listeners
with portable receivers.

There wasn't any reported "load" on the telephone system from
notifications of utility workers, off-duty policemen, off-duty firemen,
off-duty anyone in city and county agencies. Certainly not a
"huge load" as alleged.

>> It is not appropriate to describe business radio users
>> as "often without (primary) power." (snip)
>
> You go on to describe several groups with radios that could be used during
>a disaster.

Those were utilized here for the Northridge Earthquake.

>While it all sounds nice, there are a number of pitfalls. For
>example, it is the towers of base facilities most often damaged during a
>disaster (the towers of the main communications facilities).

That wasn't reported as happening in this general area during
the 1994 quake. That quake was strong enough to collapse
a multi-story apartment and the new parking building at CSUN
(California State University at Northridge), both near the
epicenter. A number of tall broadcast and PLMRS towers
remained standing...those dot the area all around th epicenter.

The ONLY "tower" with any trouble was a buckled MHV tower
(part of the Pacific Intertie) that caused the 10-million population
area electrical outage. That was propped up quickly by an
earth-moving vehicle for temporary re-start.

Several very high freeway overpass structures buckled and
collapsed, that due to state civic engineers' omission of stress
components during earthquakes when the ground moves AWAY
(down) from the support columns. That has been rectified.

No radio towers were reported to have buckled due to earth
movement. That repeated "commercial towers always fail"
myth failed to materialize.

>Therefore, a
>guy with a mobile business radio in his vehicle isn't going to do much for
>you. The ham operator, on the other hand, can at least get you some type of
>antenna into the air.

That presupposes that hams' antennas are never damaged or that
enough are clever enough, handy enough, equipped enough to get
"something on the air." Note: Radio amateurs were as frightened
as anyone else in the area in the aftermath of the Northridge quake;
had their own families to take care of FIRST.

> Even if you did have a use for people with a business radio in the
>vehicle, there are other problems. For example, a company is never going to
>authorize the participation of its employees because of potential liability.
>And without that authorization, that employee is operating on his own
>without permission to use his employer's radio equipment.

When mama nature plays rock-and-roll without music, that sort
of nit-picky lawyerese thinking isn't at the forefront of anyone's
mind.

> I could list other pitfalls, but that describes the three largest - proper
>equipment, coordination, and liability.

I'd say that applies to individual radio amateurs as well.

>> FAA controlled airspace communications is required to
>> have emergency power for communications. (snip)
>
> Have you been listening to the news recently? The air traffic control
>system is already nearly overwhelmed with a lack of personnel and equipment.
>This is also not the place to go looking for supplemental communication
>equipment or manpower.

I live less than two miles from Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport
(what had been Lockheed Air Terminal long ago). A neighbor is an
FAA executive there in ATC.

Many years ago, the BUR tower had to be evacuated due to a kitchen
fire in the restaurant on the floor below the tower. Both places were in
the old terminal building. Pacific Aeromotive, a service company at the
airport, lent a large truck and radios for the FAA tower's use...which
they did for about three days. Up and talking in about an hour.
Business helping government. No problems from any air traffic or
anything else (except the fire) on a weekend. That was on a
Saturday in the sixties and I heard the first announcement of BUR
tower shutdown over a little civil airways receiver in my workshop;
I walked out to one corner of the back yard and could see the smoke
from the terminal building's center section.

>> What is most often neglected in amateur thinking is the US
>> military capability in short, medium, long, and very long
>> communications paths at a moment's notice. (snip)
>
> Sadly, most National Guard and Air Guard units don't maintain a wealth of
>communications equipment. Their equipment is limited mostly to what is
>needed by that unit during peacetime. When called to active duty, members
>of that unit often join an existing active duty unit with its own radio
>equipment.

Sorry, that just is NOT the case as demonstrated in Gulf War 1 and
Gulf War 2 a dozen years later. National and Air Guards have to
be ready for war NOW, any time. They are so equipped in this state
from what I've seen up-close and personal. I can't speak for South
Carolina.

The common small-unit land-air radio in the US military is the
SINCGARS. About a quarter million sets have been built in the
14 years of production. Those were fielded to ALL Army units
including National Guard units by 8 years after their introduction.
SINCGARS is directly compatible with amateur 6m frequencies

when set to non-secure modes (frequency range is 30 to 88 MHz).

> Furthermore, active duty units, and even Guard units, require permission
>from the chain of command before becoming involved. This takes time, which
>is not something in abundance following a disaster.

California has plans for this and those plans have been proven in
many state emergencies, small to large. Guard units (the real
ones, not the militias) are normally under the "command" of state
administrations but the President of the US can activate them as
needed. The US military has the capability to communicate and
can quickly deploy by many means. See Gulf War 2, recently
in the news.

>These units do often
>eventually arrive to help, but often days into the disaster recovery (when
>the most serious demand for supplemental communications is in the hours and
>days following a disaster).

As I said before, there was little, if any, sign of "supplemental
communications" done by amateur radio groups here during the
1994 Northridge Earthquake. A couple H&W mentions occured
on the news THREE DAYS afterwards.

>> If that isn't enough, the various TV news services can be a
>> source of communications aid (snip)
>
> And they (TV news services) work well in smaller disasters. However,
>following a major disaster, these can be disrupted as much as other
>communications facilities (see example in next message).

If so, it hasn't been reported by ANY news.

Here's an example: Floodings in the Dakota states on south into
the Mississippi beside Illinois and Missouri. Those bothering to
watch CNN during the floodings in South Dakota could see clear
video, hear clear sound from those remote (not close to studio)
locations. At one location there was a National Guard Humvee
in the background, long whips pulled down to the NVIS position.
One of the CNN correspondents was getting "supplemental
communications" through a cell phone while on the air.

Yes, sir, lots of "failure" of all the commercial radios...

> However, I'll repeat what I said before - only ham radio offers a pool of
>licensed operators with equipment capable of reliable local or even national
>coverage, the frequencies, and the regulatory mandate, to truly handle
>supplemental communications following a disaster.

Problem is, the only "news service" reporting all that wonderfulness
is ARRL. ALL the rest of the news media seems to be blind and
deaf to all that terrific "supplemental communications."

I haven't been to every Real Emergency or Terrible Disaster in the
USA. I've been IN a few, much closer than I cared to be. I CAN
distinguish between radio services in terms of equipment and
most people in them. I've yet to SEE and HEAR them in action in
the "hours and days" following an emergency that I was IN...and
so have hundreds of real journalists not seen or heard amateur
radio "supplemental communications" efforts.

I'll grant you there ARE some cases elsewhere in the country, but
most of that "reporting" by ARRL is exaggeration or error by omission
of all the other radio services and businesses helping out in the "hours
and days" following an emergency. As a case in point, I pointed out
news items from electronic trade press about corporations aiding NYC
after 9-11-01 with radios...which was dismissed and dissed in here
because it was not in ARRL spirit of amateur boosterism. ARRL
gives a false picture because it must tunnel-focus on amateur radio.

> It is a package deal - manpower, equipment, available frequencies, and a
>regulatory mandate to offer assistance. No other radio service offers all
>four of those. Why would any state or local government agency pass up all
>that for the patchwork of supplemental communications you describe?

That "patchwork" you dismiss has worked very well in California. Under
California government web pages you can find details of the ACS
as it exists in this state. Other states have adopted that organization
and implementation plan. The ACS integrates all communications
services without regard for ARRL propaganda or the alleged "package
deal" that amateur radio is supposed to provide.

Yes, amateur radio is a part of that, but it isn't primary and it doesn't
rule nor has it worked out as the fabled stories (by amateurs) have
told. Real emergencies and real disasters aren't helped by fantasy,
mythology, propaganda about "package deal" existances...they are
helped by organization, planning, and training done well before any
emergency or disaster exists. ACS is one way of doing that. It may
not be the ultimate or best auxilliary service but it IS realistic and
takes into account as many of the radio services as exist today and
the thousands of already-trained communications specialists in the
state who are not amateurs.

One great problem of fervent amateur organizational-bent hobbyists
is the failure to see the myriad of OTHER communications services
and methods and technology that ALREADY EXISTS. If the focus
of fervent amateurs is too narrow (all too often the case), then it
can't be effective in integration for real emergency work. Amateurs
tend to become competitive, aggressively so at times, with all those
other communications services and haven't come close to playing
their everyday games nor have they the experience, organization,
or training to be qualified to play in real emergencies.

3747. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 18:08:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304271008.495ece72@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65934

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EAB4E1B.F3A5E544@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA97193.EEEA3452@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA8AEAF.A4B46A46@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA355AE.9FE825E9@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA18089.68A200CB@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA088A4.B011F968@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA00DCE.6709A863@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > I think he has valueable input on the use of the ham bands by military
> > > > > personnel in Iraq. I wouldn't argue the regs with Phil.
> > > >
> > > > And the PCTA Double Standard pops up yet again.
> > >
> > > Howzat, Brian? Phil is an expert in communications law.
> >
> > Phil isn't in the military, says he never was, and isn't in Iraq.
> > Phil has no legal authority over amateur operation in Iraq that I'm
> > aware of.
> >
> > Do you have information that he does have authority in Iraq? Perhaps
> > for 12USD he can process their paperwork.
>
> Maybe you skipped the part where I wrote:
>

> Phil is an expert in communications law.

I would advise against Phil trying to hang a shingle in Iraq.

> > > > > > Kimd of opems the gates to Lem, doesm't imt?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Len isn't in the military, isn't in Iraq, isn't an attorney, wasn't with
> > > > > > the FCC and isn't a ham. Except for those things, I'm sure he has
> > > > > > tremendous knowledge of the matter under discussion.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > And the PCTA Double Standard pops up yet again.
> > > > >
> > > > > Howzat, Brian? Len isn't an expert in communications law.
> > >
> > > Who said he was?
> >
> > Nobody said he was. Somebody said he wasn't.

And there it is.

> > Len knows about radio, yet isn't allowed to comment
> > on radio here.
> >
> > This forum isn't about "radio". It is about "amateur radio" and Len has
> > posted until his fingers bleed. He just can't get any respect. He's
> > the r.r.a.p. Rodney Dangerfield.

We touch on a lot of things in this newsgroup. Only ocassionally do
we actually get to amateur radio.

> > If he should, he is unkindly reminded that there is a
> > difference between military and commercial RF and amateur RF.
> >
> > He's reminded that there is a huge difference between
> > military/commercial operation and amateur radio. He's reminded that
> > there is a series of exams for becoming a radio amateur and that he
> > hasn't passed any of 'em. He is a non-participant.

I think he is free to participate in a newsgroup.

> > > > > > > > > > And I don't think Phil considers himself my mentor.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > I don't consider Phil as your mentor either. Phil is a rational man.
> > > > > > > > > > Your mentor is the non-participant in amateur radio who frequently posts
> > > > > > > > > > here.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Then you need to make yourself clear.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I did. You needed clarification due to your reading comprehension
> > > > > > > > > difficulty.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > You didn't.
> > > > > > > >

> > > > > You're right. I didn't need clarification.
> > > >
> > > > You must. You referred to Phil as my mentor.
> > >
> > > That isn't what I wrote. It is only what you understood.
> >
> > Then write more clearly, as I said six (6) lines above. Or you can
> > continue to be vague so as to jump on anyone when they don't read your
> > mind.
>
> The problem isn't on the transmitting end; it is on the receiving end.
> You have static between the cans.

You have meal in your mouth.

> > > > > > > So you say. No one has stepped up to confirm the tale of your alleged
> > > > > > > operation.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Nor is it likely they will. It was a relatively small operation. Not
> > > > > > > many combattants involved, and Willy kept it small. Sort of like a
> > > > > > > NEO on a little American Embassy. Happens all the time.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Then it should be easy for you to find someone who can confirm your
> > > > > > > tale.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I'll do that at the next reunion.
> > > >
> > > > I don't think you're likely to do that. It is more likely that you'll
> > > > continue to lean on vapor rather than fact.
> > >
> > > Inform us again what your legal role is in all of this.
> >
> > It appears to be identical to yours.

Just the opposite. My operation in Somalia was authorized. Your
operation in Vietnam was denied.

> > That you won't accept my answer appears to be a personal problem.
> > Nothing more, nothing less.
>
> Do you mean your answer, "I don't have any written permission"? If the
> answers are those you provided to the questions asked about your
> operation, you've not provided them.

When you show me your FCC badge, we'll talk. If you don't have one,
you're just another ham with a grudge. Seems like there are more and
more of them every day.

> > > > > > I operated legally.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > So you tell us. There is nothing or no one to confirm what you say.
> > > > >

> > > > Sure there are. You just don't know them, so they don't exist to you.
> > >
> > > None of 'em have stepped forward to confirm that you received permission
> > > for your alleged T5 operation.
> >
> > Hmmm. It's all starting to make sense.
> >
> > No one has stepped forward from Vietnam to confirm your lost
> > "no-permission" slip.
>
> Yeah and no one has stepped up to confirm my story that I was never in
> Cambodia or that I never took oboe lessons. That's quite a reach your
> attempting there, Brian. Don't reach too far or you'll find yourself
> out of your tree.

Dave, isn't this an amateur radio group? Do try to stay on subject.

> > Maybe you cheated and now think everyone else is cheating, too.
>
> I did touch an oboe once.

?

3748. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 18:12:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304271012.7f200c16@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65935

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030426235337.04869.00000255@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >Date: 4/26/2003 10:25 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3EAB4E1B.F3A5E544@earthlink.net>
>
> >Brian wrote:
>
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3EA97193.EEEA3452@earthlink.net>...
>
> >> Len knows about radio, yet isn't allowed to comment
> >> on radio here.
> >
> >This forum isn't about "radio". It is about "amateur radio" and Len has
> >posted until his fingers bleed. He just can't get any respect. He's
> >the r.r.a.p. Rodney Dangerfield.
>
> I think Rodney Dangerfield should SUE for that one, Dave!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

The Steve (Martin) of RRAP speaks. I wonder what his mental history has been?

3749. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 18:20:51 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304271020.39abd85d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65936

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<b8fkltkcg0@208.206.142.77>...

> Ah, that's it! Brian stayed in a Holiay Inn Express in Mogadishu!

DICK only knows how to run in and take pot shots. Get a life. Rent one if you have to. Try to get one bigger than you are, shouldn't cost that much more.

Actually, I slept on top of a stack of pallets the 1st couple of nights, trying to make sure rats didn't get into my sleeping bag. Mosquitos were bad. First night was at the Mog airfield, the next couple at the former embassy. Then I slept on the floor of an expanded van for about a week. When 10th Mountain finally arrived, we got some temper tents and cots.

3750. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 18:30:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304271030.7f85ad18@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65937

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030426094526.22022.00000144@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >Is anyone going? Brian
>
> I am. I will be wearing a Tee Shirt that says "DOWN WITH CBPLUSSERS". I figure
> it will help ID me. And yes I am going.

If I see some dumass wearing such a t-shirt, I'll be sure to say hi.
I'm curious which Far-side character you most closely resemble.

However, my son and I have a Scouting conflict that weekend.

Brian

3751. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 19:05:02 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <yRVqa.1042$DK5.143@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 65938
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Ah yes, AAAAAUUUUUUUUDDDDDIIIIOOOOO!!!

Doncha just luv it :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim
ps - the complaints are likely from contest operators who also believe they 'own' all of the frequencies. Should be even funnier than 3 stooges re-runs :)

"75mwidessb" <babooom@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:3ea71281$1@snipnews.snip.net...
> Everything you ever wanted to ever know about
> High Fidelity SSB - but were either afraid to
> ask, or your too much of a wuss because
> RH has "spooked you" concerning the topic of late...
>
> http://www.nu9n.com/
>
> G-d bless this guy!
> He's a genuine audio/radio Engineer.
> An asset we seem to have little of in ham radio these days....
>
>
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.476 / Virus Database: 273 - Release Date: 4/24/03

3752. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 19:17:56 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030427151756.26508.00000162@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 65939

>If I see some dumass wearing such a t-shirt,

If you look you will see me.

>I'm curious which Far-side character you most closely resemble.

Well most Women refer to me as a GOD or a STUD.

I will also be carrying an HT and listening on 449.85 Simplex. Thats a private Freq used by myself and some closely guarded freinds.

3753. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 19:33:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030427153315.18755.00000313@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65940

In article <20030427122609.18772.00000228@mb-m16.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>I say we let them have the kind of country they really want, as long as it
>doesn't threaten the USA. How many Americans fought, died and were injured to
>prop up Thieu's govt.? How much of a threat has Vietnam been since that govt.
>fell a quarter century ago?

How much of a military man was Miccolis? Where did he fight?

3754. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 19:33:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030427153316.18755.00000314@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 65941

In article <3EAB54C9.8DB62882@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Polish.
>
>The above is, of course, Len's idea of engaging in civil debate.
>The name calling, denigration, insults, ridicule and his desperate need
>to invoke one upmanship are all there.

The word "putz" is also used in the colloquial term for polish, as
in polishing metal, in German and Yiddish.

The Lieder of the Gang of Four polishes his "replies" so that they
are devoid of substance of the subject and contain only personal
attacks on communicators he doesn't like. The Lieder is not a
song of the heart or soul.

The question of "high fidelity" in amateur voice transmissions
has been addressed by the FCC. See the latest Newsline.

The Lieder of the Gang of Four is above all law and tries to
imply that whatever she says IS the law. SOP. QED.

3755. Re: K1MAN is back !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 20:08:21 UTC
From: Idaho Irvin <AllBands@idahoallband20m.net>
Message-ID: <b8hdc0oco0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 65942

And the source of all your "facts" is?

Irv

"Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:634e00e4.0304270557.2662b0e@posting.google.com...
>
> He's also been on 3890 and 3975 QRMING everyone again. This weekend he
> was on from 930 PM to 6 AM... There was a control operator present for
> every minute of that marathon, right? Wink wink. At this point, the
> Feds are committed to taking his license and auctioning his equipment.
>
> Some idiots have said he's a lawyer, or that he has a lot of money, or
> that he has political influence of some kind. None of that shit is
> true. He lives in a little shack by a pond, drives a ten year old car,
> and serves his own stupidly written law suits. It is true that he has
> a big mouth and bigger ego. End of story.
>
> He's monitored constantly now. Notes are being carefully kept for the
> day (soon) they drag his pathetic old ass in front the Administrative
> Law Judge. Enjoy his idiotic 'show' while you can. You might even want
> to buy a T-shirt because they are sure to become collectible. Bye Bye
> Glenn. Listening to you try to make a mockery of our great hobby was
> sickening, but the day of reckoning is coming fast and you can't stop
> it... Hope it was worth it.

3756. N4FZ Official Observer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 20:11:58 UTC
From: Idaho Irvin <AllBands@idahoallband20m.net>
Message-ID: <b8hdiqopt0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 65943

Yes, I actually had to reread it several times!
The BARF/Stumpjumper Preacher is on record
on the K1TP web page as claiming to be an
ARRL Official Observer. Sounds like a replay of
W1BWV (ex-wb1bwv) all over again, for those of
you who remember that scenario?

Irv

3757. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 21:18:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8hhes$l4r$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65944

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030427122609.18772.00000228@mb-m16.aol.com...
> In article <b8eepreim1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> So what should the US-UK coalition forces do then?
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >I guess that depends on how bad we really want what we say we want. A
free
> >Iraq and a non-secular, Iraqi elected government.
>
> I think you mean a "secular" govt., Dan. Or perhaps I've got the
definitions
> mixed up. The concept I think we're both talking about is a govt. that is
not
> aligned to a particular religious sect.
>
> The problem with that concept is that it has a very bad history in Iraq.
SH's
> govt only paid lip service to Islam. Religious leaders who dared to oppose
his
> govt. were persecuted. End result: When he was under attack, not many
religious
> extremists came to his aid.
> >
> >It could disintegrate into a US 'selected/appointed' strongman with the
US
> >providing the military and financial support. Gee, where is Nuguyn Van
> >Thieu when we need him, eh?
> >
> EXACTLY!
>
> >See my point?
> >
> Sort of.
>
> The big problem I see is that a lot of "Iraqis" don;t see themselves that
way.
> They define themselves first as Sunnis or Kurds or whatever. "Iraqi" is an
> identity forced on them.
>
> If what the "Iraqi people" really want is to split up their country along

> religious/ethnic lines, why not? Who has posed the greater threat to the
USA -
> fundamentalist Iran or SH's fascist Iraq?
>
> I say we let them have the kind of country they really want, as long as it
> doesn't threaten the USA. How many Americans fought, died and were injured
to
> prop up Thieu's govt.? How much of a threat has Vietnam been since that
govt.
> fell a quarter century ago?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

58,400 plus a few since added were KIA during the VN War.

The reason VN was not a threat is that we basically destroyed the North with our bombing. They were a economic basket case. And we gave them NOTHING to rebuild. Guess its best to be the loser...that way we pay for it all....what a deal.

There is more at stake here than just Iraq becoming a religious freek zone. This is a real chance to change that mess over in the middle east. Whether we call it a democracy or a dictatorship it matters not. Just as long as they are friendly to us. That way we can stay around and keep the idiots elsewhere in check.

I don't believe Rumsfield when he says we are not staying and not into building empires. We have no choice now. We have been elected to be the 'Policeman of the world'. Like it or not.

Dan/W4NTI

3758. Re: N4FZ Official Observer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 21:20:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8hhj0$7c$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65945

"Idaho Irvin" <AllBands@idahoallband20m.net> wrote in message
news:b8hdiqopt0@pita.alt.net...
> Yes, I actually had to reread it several times!
> The BARF/Stumpjumper Preacher is on record
> on the K1TP web page as claiming to be an
> ARRL Official Observer. Sounds like a replay of
> W1BWV (ex-wb1bwv) all over again, for those of
> you who remember that scenario?
>
> Irv
>
>
>
Dont surprise me a bit. Look how many criminals find the 'Lord' while in
jail.

Dan/W4NTI

3759. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 21:48:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030427174856.20983.00000390@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 65946

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 4/27/2003 1:12 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304271012.7f200c16@posting.google.com>

>The Steve (Martin) of RRAP speaks. I wonder what his mental history has
>been?

I don't know, but let's test yours...

Define the following:

(1) AUTHORIZATION:

(2) ELIGIBILITY:

(3) PERMIT:

(4) LICENSE:

Spelling counts. You should be able to do ths without referal to a
dictionary, however since no one can mentor you anyway, go right ahead.

Steve

3760. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 21:52:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030427175245.20983.00000393@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 65947

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/27/2003 2:33 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030427153315.18755.00000313@mb-m06.aol.com>

>How much of a military man was Miccolis? Where did he fight?

Where did YOU fight? When was your CIB (Combat Infantry Badge) awarded?
Do you rate the basic award or award with wreath?

Or are you yet again trying to present yourself as some kind of "expert"
on yet another field of human endeavor for which you have no practical
experience yourself?

I just think you're a putz.

Steve

3761. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 22:21:00 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <2FFBCF06BC543F01.D938313032860687.E76F9401C689F0CD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65948

Dan, my last post to you on this is that you have been approaching your part in this debate purely from a military/militaristic standpoint. As a military might we can probably maintain anything we want anywhere, and I don't differ from you on that.

My point is that we (the USA) have the convenience of being able to have religion on Sundays. For those folks over there, they *live* their religion. And, for those folks over there, we (the Westerners) are the epitome of their definition of an infidel. For the religious zealots over there, that is all it takes to keep the region in an uproar--and we (the USA military/government) aren't capable of breaking through that to change anything over there.

So, you're premise is probably right--we'll be there from now on and we better be ready to pay the taxes and supplement yet one more--or more--country with food, etc.

Kim W5TIT

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message news:b8gufo$v8$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:A237D6910D12A5D4.D5EB760585C5507F.7088600FA1FFABE7@lp.airnews.net...
>
> > > WE ARE AT WAR. This is not some sort of Bosnia or Grenada...this is
the
> > > start of WW3.
> > >
> > > Wake up and smell the roses.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> > I don't doubt that one bit, Dan. But, WWWIII or not, the crap in the
> Middle
> > East is bigger, longer, harder than anything that "we" have ever
> confronted
> > before. If we are at WWWIII, we'll be at war for the rest of history.
> And,
> > we don't have any business, wherewithal, or capability of changing
> anything
> > over there.
> >

> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> I dont agree with that one bit. Part one; We took on both the Empire of
> Japan and Nazi Germany at the same time. And we came real close to losing
> that one.
>
> This deal with the middle east is not, AT THIS POINT, that serious. And
> with our capabilities there is NO COUNTRY in that area that actually is a
> serious military threat. Which leads us to this.....
>
> If we dont act now and neutralize the threat of those countries CONTINUING
> to export terrorism against not only the USA but ALL western
nations...with
> the exception of their good buddies the French, or course. Then we will
have
> a MAJOR problem.
>
> I agree with President Bushs plan of prememptive strikes. Its about time
we
> had a administration that knows what its PRIMARY JOB is.
>
> What is that you may ask?
>
> " To preserve and protect the constitution of this country, from all
> enemies foreign and domestic"
>
> The Presidents primary job is to protect this country...PERIOD. Something
> Clinton totally ignored.
>
> Don't beleive me? Clinton set up the useless agreement with North
> Korea....1994. With the primary assistance of another loser, Jimmy
Carter.
> Lets not even discuss the computer and high tech stuff sent to China.
>
> And how about Clinton letting Bin Laden slip away while he was busy
getting
> 'nonsex' from Monica?
>
> The whole bunch of them needs brought up on charges of High treason.
>
> Now this administration has to deal with it all. And deal they are.
THANK
> GOD.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

3762. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 22:23:00 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <A3881FC23E4D4B42.C9A796C8D5B8DDFB.2544131ACC8634CE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 65949

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b8hhes$l4r$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030427122609.18772.00000228@mb-m16.aol.com...
> > In article <b8eepreim1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >> So what should the US-UK coalition forces do then?
> > >>
> > >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > >I guess that depends on how bad we really want what we say we want. A
> free
> > >Iraq and a non-secular, Iraqi elected government.
> >
> > I think you mean a "secular" govt., Dan. Or perhaps I've got the
> definitions
> > mixed up. The concept I think we're both talking about is a govt. that
is
> not
> > aligned to a particular religious sect.
> >
> > The problem with that concept is that it has a very bad history in Iraq.
> SH's
> > govt only paid lip service to Islam. Religious leaders who dared to
oppose
> his
> > govt. were persecuted. End result: When he was under attack, not many
> religious
> > extremists came to his aid.
> >
> > >It could disintegrate into a US 'selected/appointed' strongman with the
> US
> > >providing the military and financial support. Gee, where is Nuguyn
Van
> > >Thieu when we need him, eh?
> >
> > EXACTLY!
> >
> > >See my point?
> >
> > Sort of.
> >

> > The big problem I see is that a lot of "Iraqis" don;t see themselves
that
> way.
> > They define themselves first as Sunnis or Kurds or whatever. "Iraqi" is
an
> > identity forced on them.
> >
> > If what the "Iraqi people" really want is to split up their country
along
> > religious/ethnic lines, why not? Who has posed the greater threat to the
> USA -
> > fundamentalist Iran or SH's fascist Iraq?
> >
> > I say we let them have the kind of country they really want, as long as
it
> > doesn't threaten the USA. How many Americans fought, died and were
injured
> to
> > prop up Thieu's govt.? How much of a threat has Vietnam been since that
> govt.
> > fell a quarter century ago?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

EXACTLY, Jim. I am totally on board with that!!!

Kim W5TIT

3763. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 22:34:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030427183414.20983.00000403@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 65950

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/27/2003 12:48 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030427134826.04525.00000127@mb-m29.aol.com>

>No one can forsee true disasters but there ARE ways to plan
> for emergencies of a large sort. The greater Los Angeles area
> (includes over 70 incorporated cities) has done this and it works
> out well. That covers a population of about 10 to 12 million

...and with a tax base and economy the size of some soverign nations, they
have the resources to not HAVE to depend on volunteers.

But they use them anyway...I know. I was one of them.

>> I think we're talking about different types of disasters here. What you
>>say is perhaps true for small, isolated, incidents.
>
> A Richter 6.3 earthquake with a total cutoff of all electrical power
> is classified as a "small, isolated incident?!?"
>
> 17 January 1994. I was here and rode it through. The President
> and some of his staff visited here to view the damage. Over 50
> residents died as a direct result of that earthquake.

His choice of the word "small" was poor, however here you are again trying
to base your entire rant on ONE incident, and even then it's not as convincing
as you'd care to believe.

>If you think that is a "small, isolated incident," then we don't
> have anything to discuss, do we?

Do you ever?

>Depending on which "states," their total population may not exceed
> that of California's population. California is large enough that driving
> north-south from border to border takes at least 10 hours steady
> driving at maximum speed allowed on interstates. Big place. Not
> as big as Texas or Alaska but bigger than, say, Rhode Island.

And a prime example of why your anti-volunteer rants don't hold water. CA
has the financial resources and demographics to support their disaster plan.
Everyone (in SoCal anyway) has the knowledge that they may face such a disaster
and have at least some rudimentary provisions and skills. (Stored water, first
aid kit, battery-powered broadcast radio, etc..)

>The telephone SWITCHING SYSTEM is simply overloaded by
> callers trying to dial out. That isn't "failure," it is just going beyond
> the switching system's traffic capacity as designed. The switching
> centers did not fail here in any earthquake...they remained working
> with everything intact, standby batteries functioning for the length
> of the power outages.

Regardless of the cause, a lack of functionality of a system is a failure
to provide service. You can argue the semantics all day long.

>No problems on outside-area
> calling IN. By noon of 17 January 1994 I could call out on my
> residence phone with no problems.

You would have been able to communicate IMMEDIATELY had you had 2M and a
properly prepared station at home.

And since incomming is unaffected, we'll just engineer the public safety
systems to have repeaters that are outside anticipated disaster areas with
dial-in capability.

That'll be...oh...what? Another $350M or more?

>No radio towers were reported to have buckled due to earth
> movement. That repeated "commercial towers always fail"
> myth failed to materialize.

Who "repeated" that "myth", Lennie?

>That presupposes that hams' antennas are never damaged or that
> enough are clever enough, handy enough, equipped enough to get
> "something on the air." Note: Radio amateurs were as frightened
> as anyone else in the area in the aftermath of the Northridge quake;
> had their own families to take care of FIRST.

Perhaps YOU have to take hour-after-hour to "take care" of them,
Lennie...I guess at your age it's to be expected. I rode out several
earthquakes in SoCal and it never took me more than 10 minutes to make an
assessment and either report back to the base or repsond with ARC, ARES, or the
ER I was working at (PRN) at the time.

>> I could list other pitfalls, but that describes the three largest - proper
>>equipment, coordination, and liability.
>
> I'd say that applies to individual radio amateurs as well.

I'd say that only one out of the three applies, Lennie, that being
liability.

>> Sadly, most National Guard and Air Guard units don't maintain a wealth of
>>communications equipment. Their equipment is limited mostly to what is
>>needed by that unit during peacetime. When called to active duty, members
>>of that unit often join an existing active duty unit with its own radio
>>equipment.
>

> Sorry, that just is NOT the case as demonstrated in Gulf War 1 and
> Gulf War 2 a dozen years later. National and Air Guards have to
> be ready for war NOW, any time. They are so equipped in this state
> from what I've seen up-close and personal. I can't speak for South
> Carolina.

"...up close and personal..."?!?!

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! !

MANY Guard and Reserve units are set up just like Dwight said...they are
JUST augmentation units. They don't have their own assets, or have very
little. Are all G & R units like this? Heck no! But some are.

>The common small-unit land-air radio in the US military is the
> SINCGARS...(SNIP)

I just KNEW Lennie would find a way to work SINCGARS into the rant.

>As I said before, there was little, if any, sign of "supplemental
> communications" done by amateur radio groups here during the
> 1994 Northridge Earthquake. A couple H&W mentions occured
> on the news THREE DAYS afterwards.

WHHHHHOA LENNIE!!!

You have REPEATEDLY stated there was NO Amateur Radio involvment and NO
mention in ANY media of ANY sort in the 94 quake!

Dang, Lennie...CAUGHT IN ANOTHER LIE!

Sheesh, you make this easy!

>> And they (TV news services) work well in smaller disasters. However,
>>following a major disaster, these can be disrupted as much as other
>>communications facilities (see example in next message).
>
> If so, it hasn't been reported by ANY news.

Sure it has.

>Here's an example: Floodings in the Dakota states on south into
> the Mississippi beside Illinois and Missouri. Those bothering to
> watch CNN during the floodings in South Dakota could see clear
> video, hear clear sound from those remote (not close to studio)
> locations. At one location there was a National Guard Humvee
> in the background, long whips pulled down to the NVIS position.
> One of the CNN correspondents was getting "supplemental
> communications" through a cell phone while on the air.
>
> Yes, sir, lots of "failure" of all the commercial radios...

Hmmmm....One video byte from a safe vantage point.

Yeah...I am impressed.

>> However, I'll repeat what I said before - only ham radio offers a pool of
>>licensed operators with equipment capable of reliable local or even national
>>coverage, the frequencies, and the regulatory mandate, to truly handle
>>supplemental communications following a disaster.
>
> Problem is, the only "news service" reporting all that wonderfulness
> is ARRL. ALL the rest of the news media seems to be blind and
> deaf to all that terrific "supplemental communications."

ERROR WILL ROBINSON, ERROR!

You may even refer to the summary of "media hits" in QST...Ooops..can't do
that...ARRL pub! Excuuuuuuuuse me!

>I haven't been to every Real Emergency or Terrible Disaster in the
> USA. I've been IN a few, much closer than I cared to be.

What? The Dunkin' Donuts at Hollywood and Vine ran out of Bavarian Creme
donuts?

Please cite for the general reading viewers what "disasters" you have been
in, in what capacity, and for how long you were active in that effort, Lennie.

A failure to respond will be read as "I lied".

>I'll grant you there ARE some cases elsewhere in the country, but
> most of that "reporting" by ARRL is exaggeration or error by omission
> of all the other radio services and businesses helping out in the "hours
> and days" following an emergency.

Hmmmmmmm....Interesting. I've read numerous items in QST that mentioned
REACT and ALERT, to name a few.

>As a case in point, I pointed out
> news items from electronic trade press about corporations aiding NYC
> after 9-11-01 with radios...which was dismissed and dissed in here
> because it was not in ARRL spirit of amateur boosterism. ARRL
> gives a false picture because it must tunnel-focus on amateur radio.

Hmmmmm again...QST mentioned those activities. So...?!?!

>Yes, amateur radio is a part of that, but it isn't primary and it doesn't
> rule nor has it worked out as the fabled stories (by amateurs) have
> told.

"Primary"? "Rule(s)" ? "Fabled" ?

Again, please quote those assertions and the authors.

Failure to do so will be read as "I lied".

>Real emergencies and real disasters aren't helped by fantasy,
> mythology, propaganda about "package deal" existances...they are
> helped by organization, planning, and training done well before any
> emergency or disaster exists.

There's nothing fanciful about "package deals" that include Amatuer Radio as supplemental communications.

Otherwise, a point we can agree on!

>ACS is one way of doing that. It may
> not be the ultimate or best auxilliary service but it IS realistic and
> takes into account as many of the radio services as exist today and
> the thousands of already-trained communications specialists in the
> state who are not amateurs.

It works well. They ahve the money and the assets to back it up. Podunk USA could do the same thing with the finances and assets to implement it.

>One great problem of fervent amateur organizational-bent hobbyists
> is the failure to see the myriad of OTHER communications services
> and methods and technology that ALREADY EXISTS.

WHO fails? WHO doesn't take into account these services, Lennie?

Steve

3764. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 22:51:55 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.he0o8r2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66001

On 27 Apr 2003 19:17:56 GMT, WA8ULX wrote:

> I will also be carrying an HT and listening on 449.85 Simplex.
> Thats a private Freq

No amateur frequency is "private". Trust me on that... <ggg>

>used by myself and some closely guarded freinds.

Why are they closely guarded? Are they in witness protection,
have death threats been made against them, or does the DA want
them as material witnesses?

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

3765. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-27 23:00:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8hndu$207$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66002

OK I agree with that.

And yes I am looking at it from a military point of view. Sticking to what I know works for me...hi.

Dan/W4NTI

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message news:2FFBCF06BC543F01.D938313032860687.E76F9401C689F0CD@lp.airnews.net...
> Dan, my last post to you on this is that you have been approaching your part
> in this debate purely from a military/militaristic standpoint. As a
> military might we can probably maintain anything we want anywhere, and I
> don't differ from you on that.
>
> My point is that we (the USA) have the convenience of being able to have
> religion on Sundays. For those folks over there, they *live* their
> religion. And, for those folks over there, we (the Westerners) are the
> epitome of their definition of an infidel. For the religious zealots over
> there, that is all it takes to keep the region in an uproar--and we (the USA
> military/government) aren't capable of breaking through that to change
> anything over there.
>
> So, you're premise is probably right--we'll be there from now on and we
> better be ready to pay the taxes and supplement yet one more--or
> more--country with food, etc.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b8gufo$v8$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> >
news:A237D6910D12A5D4.D5EB760585C5507F.7088600FA1FFABE7@lp.airnews.net...
> >
> > > > > WE ARE AT WAR. This is not some sort of Bosnia or Grenada...this is
> the
> > > > > start of WW3.
> > > > >
> > > > > Wake up and smell the roses.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI

> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > > I don't doubt that one bit, Dan. But, WWWIII or not, the crap in the
> > Middle
> > > East is bigger, longer, harder than anything that "we" have ever
> > confronted
> > > before. If we are at WWWIII, we'll be at war for the rest of history.
> > And,
> > > we don't have any business, wherewithal, or capability of changing
> > anything
> > > over there.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > >
> > I dont agree with that one bit. Part one; We took on both the Empire
of
> > Japan and Nazi Germany at the same time. And we came real close to
losing
> > that one.
> >
> > This deal with the middle east is not, AT THIS POINT, that serious. And
> > with our capabilities there is NO COUNTRY in that area that actually is
a
> > serious military threat. Which leads us to this.....
> >
> > If we dont act now and neutralize the threat of those countries
CONTINUING
> > to export terrorism against not only the USA but ALL western
> nations...with
> > the exception of their good buddies the French, or course. Then we will
> have
> > a MAJOR problem.
> >
> > I agree with President Bushs plan of prememptive strikes. Its about
time
> we
> > had a administration that knows what its PRIMARY JOB is.
> >
> > What is that you may ask?
> >
> > " To preserve and protect the constitution of this country, from all
> > enemies foreign and domestic"
> >
> > The Presidents primary job is to protect this country...PERIOD.
Something
> > Clinton totally ignored.
> >
> > Don't beleive me? Clinton set up the useless agreement with North

> > Korea....1994. With the primary assistance of another loser, Jimmy
> Carter.
> > Lets not even discuss the computer and high tech stuff sent to China.
> >
> > And how about Clinton letting Bin Laden slip away while he was busy
> getting
> > 'nonsex' from Monica?
> >
> > The whole bunch of them needs brought up on charges of High treason.
> >
> > Now this administration has to deal with it all. And deal they are.
> THANK
> > GOD.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
>

3766. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 00:43:02 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030427204302.06124.00000427@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 66003

>No amateur frequency is "private". Trust me on that... <ggg>

It is private, trust me on that

>Why are they closely guarded? Are they in witness protection,
> have death threats been made against them, or does the DA want
> them as material witnesses?
>
>--

All of the above.

3767. Re: N4FZ Official Observer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 01:17:29 UTC
From: loose washers <cowboydick3@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3eac8125@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 66004
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Idaho Irvin" <AllBands@idahoallband20m.net> wrote in message
news:b8hdiqopt0@pita.alt.net...
> Yes, I actually had to reread it several times!
> The BARF/Stumpjumper Preacher is on record
> on the K1TP web page as claiming to be an
> ARRL Official Observer. Sounds like a replay of
> W1BWV (ex-wb1bwv) all over again, for those of
> you who remember that scenario?
>
> Irv

With regards to N4FZ, I think that Burroughs said it best.....

" Do not proffer sympathy to the mentally ill; it is a bottomless pit. "
-W. Burroughs

3768. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 02:46:04 UTC
From: Krell1215@NOSPAMyahoo.com
Message-ID: <b8i4lc02rug@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 66005

In article <20030427151756.26508.00000162@mb-m19.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com says...

>Well most Women refer to me as a GOD or a STUD.

...as in, "GOD! Do you need a pair of tweezers to put that STUD away?"

> I will also be carrying an HT and listening on 449.85 Simplex. Thats a private
>Freq used by myself and some closely guarded freinds.

Closely guarded friends? Sounds like they might be riding a short bus to Dayton.

3769. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 03:04:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EAC9A92.1B6D8449@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66006

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3EAB54C9.8DB62882@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Polish.
> > >
> > >The above is, of course, Len's idea of engaging in civil debate.
> > >The name calling, denigration, insults, ridicule and his desperate need
> > >to invoke one upmanship are all there.
>
> The word "putz" is also used in the colloquial term for polish, as
> in polishing metal, in German and Yiddish.
>
> The Lieder of the Gang of Four polishes his "replies" so that they
> are devoid of substance of the subject and contain only personal
> attacks on communicators he doesn't like. The Lieder is not a
> song of the heart or soul.

I published quite a bit of material you wrote in one post. I added two sentences. They didn't require any polish though it is pretty obvious that your responses could use some polish in the civil debate department.

> The question of "high fidelity" in amateur voice transmissions
> has been addressed by the FCC. See the latest Newsline.

Looks like your post in response to Jim missed the mark by a fairly large margin then, Foghorn.

> The Lieder of the Gang of Four is above all law and tries to
> imply that whatever she says IS the law. SOP. QED.

The spear head of the Group of One has a vast fantasy life.
Do you believe you were misquoted? ZBM-2.

Dave K8MN

3770. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 03:08:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EAC9B9C.DFD836A7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66007

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On 27 Apr 2003 19:17:56 GMT, WA8ULX wrote:
>
> > I will also be carrying an HT and listening on 449.85 Simplex.
> > Thats a private Freq
>
> No amateur frequency is "private". Trust me on that... <ggg>
>
> >used by myself and some closely guarded freinds.
>
> Why are they closely guarded? Are they in witness protection,
> have death threats been made against them, or does the DA want
> them as material witnesses?

Maybe they're part of a labor gang.

Dave K8MN

3771. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 03:55:35 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030427235535.22033.00000298@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 66008

I want to go, out of curiosity. As I am pressured not to go to Ham events, I may not be able to.

As of Monday, I am no longer an EE. I missed my deadline, due at end of this month. Soon however, I will be in a more stable, higher paying (but less glamorous, non EE) field.

So, Hamradio will b just hobee. All so, I have no plans 2 learn Morse code.

Some R glad I M no longer EE, Specially some Hams without EE degree. Also, some of my relatives advised me that EE field not wurth it. Some-1 made a 5 year bet. I would like to make some kind of 4 yr bet.

I have another event I have to go to in May. It is a some kind of ceremony and some things must be followed. For example, the ceremony must be done facing the East direction.

Anyway, I would like 2 C what kind of Hams go 2 Dayton Hamfest. 2 C if Hams there R like other typical Hams I have met B-4.

3772. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 04:32:54 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428003254.19604.00000166@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 66009

>...as in, "GOD! Do you need a pair of tweezers to put that STUD away?"

They dont say that to me, is that a problem you have.

>Closely guarded friends? Sounds like they might be riding a short bus to
>Dayton.

No Bus, were Flying on a Private Aircraft.

3773. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 04:34:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428003458.19604.00000167@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 66010

>For example, the ceremony must be done facing the
>East direction.
>----------

Your not a MM, you are not bright enough.

3774. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 04:36:06 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428003606.19604.00000168@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 66011

>
>Maybe they're part of a labor gang.
>
>Dave K8MN

Sorry, no Labor Gang.

3775. Re: Repeater Autopatch vs. Telemarketer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 04:38:34 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EACB04A.B2BA780E@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 66012

"D. Stussy" wrote:

> In the exact situation I am thinking of, the repeater answers the phone by
> saying (synthesized voice), "This is the <club-callsign> amateur radio club
> repeater autopatch," then waits for about 30 seconds for a command before the
> reverse patch ringout on the radio. No audio is gated to or from the radio
> side until the reverse patch answer command is input. The speech board doesn't
> have a DVR nor the vocabulary to tell telemarketers to hang up up front.
>
> Comments?

I had heard that the FCC didn't like it if a caller (possibly a non licensed person) does something that causes a ham transmitter to transmit (even if his voice never reaches the air). I would expect that each member of the repeater club would have a password that he would key in via the touch tone pad on the phone. And when a valid password is entered, that only then is the repeater transmitter keyed up. Thus a telemarketer would never get past. Besides, most telemarketers use automated dialing equipment that screens for answering machines, busy signals and no answers. That equipment will think the repeater is an answering machine and dump the call.

You could install one of those telemarketer zappers you see at radio shack....

3776. Re: Repeater Autopatch vs. Telemarketer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 04:43:11 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EACB15F.A614D7E1@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 66013

"D. Stussy" wrote:

>
>
> The only suggestion I have received in e-mail was to somehow generate the tone
> sequence that comes out at the beginning of the "disconnected number message."
> (I have yet to find out what that sequence of three [multi-]tones is.)

I have a wav file of this at the bottom of my page:
http://www.geocities.com/wa2ise/wav.html

3777. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 05:17:59 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8j8f1$ab847$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66019

Not this year....

Ryan

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0304260418.5ffec758@posting.google.com...
> Is anyone going? Brian

3778. Re: internet voice gateways - taking your handheld overseas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 05:20:16 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8j8f2$ab847$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66020

Damn..... that's even worse.....

Ryan

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030424231029.18769.00000187@mb-m20.aol.com...
> In article <3EA70C78.3080307@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
> >Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX wrote:
> >> Now I know where tune-a-fish comes from! How do ya tuna fish?? :)
> >
> > I give up, how do you tuna fish (I just know I'm going to regret this!
> 8^)
>
> Practice your scales...

3779. Re: Repeater Autopatch vs. Telemarketer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 05:28:52 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8j8f3$ab847$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66021

Bull.... where the hell is the control op for the repeater?? What, a person is expected to carry around a 3x5 card with that message???

> Seems to me that instructing all repeater users to give the message
>
> "You're in violation of 47 CFR 97.113. Do not call this number again. Take
> this number off your list and inform your superiors to remove it from all of
> their lists."
>
> or something similar, then hanging up, and having them actually do it would
]

Seems to me that the repeater should be designed in a manner that incoming calls do not come in to the point of where they are heard over the air and only come across the air if triggered by a set amount of DTMF tones to access that in the first place. Or something along the lines of a pre-recorded "announce-only" message that plays, (not over the air either) and to get past that the control op's would have to type in whatever tone sequence.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3780. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 07:13:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAD24CEE.17CC3%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 66014

"Len Over 21" wrote:

> Just the same, us in other parts of the USA could
> watch TV journalists' video and sound from INSIDE
> the hurricane area, night scenes still lit by
> street lighting still operational despite terrible
> winds.

Yes, we saw those images leading up to the storm's arrival also, just before the power failed. In fact, there were several press trucks here with built-in generators, battery operated remote cameras, and satellite dishes. Sadly, none of that helped the local residents' situation. Most also cleared out several hours before the storm hit, to broadcast pictures from inland areas.

> Did "most" amateur radio antennas miraculously
> remain standing while all those commercial towers
> fell?

Probably very few did. Regardless, that wasn't a concern for disaster response - none of those home based antennas were located where they were needed. Instead, what was needed were temporary antennas set up at communications centers, storm shelters, hospitals, and so on.

> For how many decades have communities in this region
> experienced other hurricanes? How much planning and
> organization have gone into emergency preparation?

Len, you don't seem to have a very realistic view of these situations. Yes, larger towns do fairly well when it comes to emergency preparation. Of course, there are always surprises, but they are usually handled with relative ease. Sadly, such is not the case for smaller towns, isolated communities, isolated residents, and unexpected situations. The drain on disaster resources can be staggering. In some parts of South Carolina following Hurricane Hugo, for example, whole towns and communities were cut off for days with no state or federal assistance. Neighboring communities jumped in to help where they could, placing a further burden on their own resources.

> We are waiting for the announcement that the HF antennas
> were all still up having miraculously survived the winds
> and rain while all the commercial towers fell, damaged
> beyond repair...

Again, you're not being very realistic, Len. Antennas at home (whether they stand or fall) are of little use to disaster personnel. Instead, ham operators volunteer to set up temporary radio facilities where needed, help

to put fallen antennas back up, and help to set up temporary antennas where restoring fallen antenna is not immediately possible.

> Did they get through the gridlock on highways or did
> they go cross-country to get there?

Actually, by the time the national guard arrived, a major roadway was cleared of traffic and patrolled by police to keep it clear. Cars attempting to enter that road were turned around at road stops manned by state police. In the future, that is the plan from the very start.

> So far, Dwight, all you've done is a lot of "pep
> rally rah-rah" about US amateur radio largely to
> an audience mostly made up of other radio amateurs.
> That's the wrong audience for addressing REAL
> emergency planning, organization, preparation,
> and training.

Len, you're placing the burden of emergency planning, organization, preparation, and training, on ham operators. That is neither our job or our emphasis. States, Cities, and regional governments have their own disaster planning, into which ham radio fits. Our involvement goes solely to the proper operation of our equipment and working properly with other civil defense personnel.

> Real Emergencies are survived by hard-nosed
> pragmatism based on past experiences of everyone.
> Real Emergencies are survived by ignoring the
> over-inflated egos of certain minority groups
> who've psyched themselves into an imaginary nirvana
> of self-importance before anything has happened.

I'm sorry, but I've never seen that following any disaster where hams were involved, Len. During Hugo, hams ignored their own situation to volunteer many hours of effort without pay (unlike most other disaster personnel) and without recognition in many cases.

Let me give you an example. One manager and a station employee of a local radio station decided to stay on the air during the storm. Several hours before the storm hit, that station lost all outside communications. A local ham, hearing their situation on the radio, drove through the storm, still hours before landfall, to join them at the station. That ham operator quickly established communications with ham operators outside the area. One of those hams drove to the disaster staging command center and fed communications about the storm (and other info from disaster personnel) back to the ham at the radio station, which was then broadcast to local residents.

As the storm approached, it was clear the station's tower was not going to stand. They responded by spreading a wire antenna throughout the building and operating with reduced power. With that, and several trips to a shed outside to refill the generator, they remained on the air throughout the entire storm. About 2am, the tower did eventually fall. The parking lot was

also flooded with about a foot of water, but the storm surge never made its way into the station.

I went to bed that night listening to this radio station. As the storm raged outside, with the danger still uncertain, their voices were very comforting. You might dismiss this ham operator with nonsense about "over-inflated egos" and "imaginary nirvana of self-importance," but I'll be darn glad to shake his hand any day of the week.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3781. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 08:46:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAD26287.17CC5%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 66015

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> (snip) The greater Los Angeles area (includes
> over 70 incorporated cities) has done this and
> it works out well. That covers a population of
> about 10 to 12 million. (snip)
>
> California is one of the larger states in the
> union and the most populous of all of them with
> about 30 million.

Len, you don't have to lecture me on California. I grew up in Sacramento, later lived in Ontario (near LA), and have family living in Southern California now (the LA area).

> A Richter 6.3 earthquake with a total cutoff of
> all electrical power is classified as a "small,
> isolated incident?!?"

Do remember "small" and "isolated" are relative terms. Compared to the damage done by some hurricanes along the East coast, or compared to some previous earthquakes in California, that earthquake was indeed a "small, isolated incident." Of course, no disaster is small when you're living through it.

> The telephone SWITCHING SYSTEM is simply overloaded
> by callers trying to dial out. That isn't "failure,"

It is a failure of communications, one that directly affects the ability of disaster personnel to reliably use that system (that's what we're talking about here, not telephone calls from your uncle in Florida).

> "Supplemental communications" were not needed in the
> 1994 Northridge Earthquake. While there was NO advance
> warning, off-duty utility workers could indeed get a
> "wake-up call" without any on-duty supervisors calling
> them by telephone. The utilities here already have
> contingency plans for which off-duty personnel to report
> without notification. Once reported in they are directed
> to sites of damage by supervisors who've been notified by
> mobile units.

You're looking at the small picture, Len. Disaster response is not limited to just your immediate area. It's wonderful your town is so well prepared. Can you say the same for smaller towns and communities throughout California?

> That presupposes that hams' antennas are never damaged
> or that enough are clever enough, handy enough, equipped
> enough to get "something on the air." Note: Radio
> amateurs were as frightened as anyone else in the area in
> the aftermath of the Northridge quake; had their own
> families to take care of FIRST.

Len, you've raised this issue several times. However, the condition of an antenna at home is not relevant, because hams don't sit at home when a disaster strikes. Instead, they volunteer at communications centers, shelters, hospitals, Red Cross stations, and so on. And, yes, like all others involved in disaster response, they take care of their families at home first if possible.

> Sorry, that just is NOT the case as demonstrated in Gulf
> War 1 and Gulf War 2 a dozen years later. (snip)

You're confused about how National Guard units work. In general, they rarely go to war as a unit. Instead, personnel within that unit, when called to active duty, are often assigned to existing active duty units. And it is those active duty units which have the equipment you describe, not the National Guard unit. National Guard facilities (bases, stations, etc) most often only maintain the equipment needed for peacetime operations and training. More advanced training is done by joining active duty units or visits to military training centers. There are exceptions to this, I'm sure. But we're talking about this subject in general, not specific units.

> As I said before, there was little, if any, sign of
> "supplemental communications" done by amateur radio
> groups here during the 1994 Northridge Earthquake. A
> couple H&W mentions occurred on the news THREE DAYS
> afterwards.

If that is so, why didn't you step forward to volunteer? Did you even make an effort to see if your services could be useful? Did you check to see if there were hams helping other services, such as the Red Cross?

> Problem is, the only "news service" reporting all that
> wonderfulness is ARRL. ALL the rest of the news media
> seems to be blind and deaf to all that terrific
> "supplemental communications." (snip)

And exactly how much coverage have you seen of any radio communications during a disaster by the media? This stuff is not exactly major news or exciting film footage. Nevertheless, coverage in the mainstream media does occur occasionally.

> Yes, amateur radio is a part of that, but it isn't primary
> and it doesn't rule nor has it worked out as the fabled
> stories (by amateurs) have told. (snip)

Nobody that I know of has ever claimed ham radio is "primary" to disaster planning. Ham radio is a means of supplemental communications, adding addition communications to existing communications systems where needed. As

such, it serves this purpose well.

> One great problem of fervent amateur organizational-bent
> hobbyists is the failure to see the myriad of OTHER
> communications services and methods and technology that
> ALREADY EXISTS. (snip)

I've never seen that. Everything I've read, everyone I've talked to, focuses on ham radio as supplemental communications for existing communications systems. The ham volunteers I've seen seem to understand this concept very well.

> (snip) Amateurs tend to become competitive, aggressively so
> at times, with all those other communications services and
> haven't come close to playing their everyday games nor have
> they the experience, organization, or training to be qualified
> to play in real emergencies.

Again, something I've never seen. Can you provide an example of a real life emergency where this (aggressively competitive behavior by hams) has actually occurred? Can you quote one civil defense person who has complained about a lack of experience, organization, or training, by ham operators? Hams are included in the disaster planning of towns and cities throughout the United States. Can you name one town or city that has excluded hams from that planning because of a lack of experience, organization, or training?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3782. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 10:24:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304280224.779d153e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66016

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EAB50D5.8FE12384@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA88AD9.BC4BC6C9@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA7E71E.C3FD13F1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA74120.60BE136D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > > > > > Dave, all of these comments are public. That's how you got to respond
> > > > > > to a comment I directed at DICK. Had they been private, you would not
> > > > > > have been able to read it, and not comment on it.
> > > >
> > > > Tell me something I don't know. Of course the posts are public.
> > > > Your crack about being stationed at a snack bar making sense to you
> > > > doesn't seem to make much sense. I asked you a question, you chose
> > > > diversion.
> > >
> > > Look, Dave, Len said something about where you were stationed.
>
> No, he didn't. I was never stationed at any place called "Tan Son Hut".

Do you think he might have been one character off, and you chose to
trip and skin your knee?

> I was never in the supply field.

Please stay on topic.

> > You
> > started talking about a snack bar. Were you or were you not stationed
> > at a snack bar?
>
> That's been answered. This is the kind of crap you pulled with Ed Hare.

You didn't bring up the words "snack bar" when Len talked of where you
were stationed? I think you did.

And leave Ed out of this. He's absent by his choice, not anything I
did.

> > > > QSL?
> > >
> > > Anyone who says this on the ham bands is a stupendous lid.
> >
> > Ahem, no license required to operate here.
>
> That's how Len got here.

Then at which point did you confuse usenet with ham bands?

> > > > Getting back to the snack bar in Vietnam. Why you keep bringing it
> > > > up? It must have been a significant part of your life while
> > > > in-country.
> > >
> > > It's your reading comprehension thing again.
> >
> > So there was no snack bar???

Why did you bring up a snack bar?

> > > > What did your orders say? Did they put you in a snack bar or an Air
> > > > Base?
> > >
> > > The answers are there. Go back and attempt reading them.
> >
> > I'm not clairvoyant.
>
> Clairvoyant? You're not even coherent.

Explain your "snack bar" comment.

> > You really need to learn to be more direct, and quit bringing up
> > things that are off topic and confound the line of discussion.
>
> Go back to picking the flowers off the wallpaper, Brian.

Clean up your "snack bar" mess first.

3783. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 11:22:57 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428072257.27996.00000339@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 66017

>> > Look, Dave, Len said something about where you were
>> > stationed.
>>
>> No, he didn't. I was never stationed at any place called
>> "Tan Son Hut".
>
>Do you think he might have been one character off
...
>?
>
Impossible.

Len doesn't make mistakes.

3784. Re: N4FZ Official Observer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 11:56:49 UTC
From: Miami Bob <MiamiBob@medcasternet.org>
Message-ID: <b8j4u4$hv2$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 66018
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

This proves what a farce the ARRL OO program
is! Obviously the ARRL appoints OOs without
doing any background check whatsoever.

Was he ever held responsible for the Stumpjumper
QRM tapes he authored and which were used for
malicious QRM on 3901?

Bob

"loose washers" <cowboydick3@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3eac8125@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> "Idaho Irvin" <AllBands@idahoallband20m.net> wrote in message
> news:b8hdiqopt0@pita.alt.net...
> > Yes, I actually had to reread it several times!
> > The BARF/Stumpjumper Preacher is on record
> > on the K1TP web page as claiming to be an
> > ARRL Official Observer. Sounds like a replay of
> > W1BWV (ex-wb1bwv) all over again, for those of
> > you who remember that scenario?
> >
> > Irv
>
> With regards to N4FZ, I think that Burroughs said it best.....
>
> " Do not proffer sympathy to the mentally ill; it is a bottomless pit. "
> -W. Burroughs
>
>

3785. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 12:51:42 UTC
From: Krell1215@NOSPAMyahoo.com
Message-ID: <b8j84u089h@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 66022

In article <20030428003254.19604.00000166@mb-m20.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com says...
>
>>...as in, "GOD! Do you need a pair of tweezers to put that STUD away?"
>
>They dont say that to me, is that a problem you have.

You're losing your touch, Brucie. You can do better than the "I'm of rubber, you're of glue" comeback.

>>Closely guarded friends? Sounds like they might be riding a short bus to
>>Dayton.
>
> No Bus, were Flying on a Private Aircraft.

So, do you or any of your "closely guarded friends" wear hockey equipment, but don't play on any team?

3786. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 13:56:39 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428095639.25728.00000153@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66023

>So, do you or any of your "closely guarded friends" wear hockey equipment,
>but
>don't play on any team?
>

NO, why do you ask?

>"I'm of rubber,
>you're of glue" comeback.

No you got me on that one

3787. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 14:42:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428104230.21428.00000217@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 66025

> The new bands better serve CBs
>original intentions without all of the inherent problems.

BS, all that would do would be shift the problem to another area. Secondly what makes you think Millions of CBers would leave 11 Meters they are already operate Illegal.

3788. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 15:58:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8jj3pth1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66026

"Krell" <Krell1215@NOSPAMyahoo.com> wrote in message
news:b8i4lc02rug@enews1.newsguy.com...
> In article <20030427151756.26508.00000162@mb-m19.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com
> says...
>
> >Well most Women refer to me as a GOD or a STUD.
>
> ...as in, "GOD! Do you need a pair of tweezers to put that STUD away?"
>
>
> > I will also be carrying an HT and listening on 449.85 Simplex. Thats a
> private
> >Freq used by myself and some closely guarded freinds.
>
> Closely guarded friends? Sounds like they might be riding a short bus to
> Dayton.
>

My GAWD don't you folks know anything? 449.85.....15 KHZ from the top of
the band? Wonder what mode that HT is using?

Dan/W4NTI

3789. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 16:51:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428125127.19094.00000276@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 66027

>Subject: Re: Dayton Hamfest?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/27/2003 10:55 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030427235535.22033.00000298@mb-m12.aol.com>

>I want to go, out of curiosity. As I am pressured not to go to Ham events, I
>may not be able to.

You're being PRESSURED to NOT go to Dayton, Vipul?

Sounds to ME like you're in a cult, alright, but it's NOT Amateur Radio.

>As of Monday, I am no longer an EE. I missed my deadline, due at end of this
>month. Soon however, I will be in a more stable, higher paying (but less
>glamorous, non EE) field.

Then you were not an EE. Once you have earned your degree in the field,
it's yours unless removed for cause or surrendered cor cancellation.

I left nursing for a while after my daughter died. (This is what Lennie
keeps trying to make great hay about but fails miserably). Although NOT
"nursing" on a daily basis, I was STILL a nurse.

>So, Hamradio will b just hobee. All so, I have no plans 2 learn Morse code.

I see the 10 year old is writing for you again. Maybe you should try to
get a refund on your "Hooked On Phonics" package..?!?!

>Some R glad I M no longer EE, Specially some Hams without EE degree.

Thank God it wasn't an ENGLISH degree, Vippy.

And I doubt you ever had an "EE degree".

>Also, some
>of my relatives advised me that EE field not wurth it. Some-1 made a 5 year
>bet. I would like to make some kind of 4 yr bet.

I would have won with a 10 minute bet.

>I have another event I have to go to in May. It is a some kind of ceremony
>and
>some things must be followed. For example, the ceremony must be done facing
>the
>East direction.

Are you embarrased to be Muslim, Vipul? Can't say the words?

>Anyway, I would like 2 C what kind of Hams go 2 Dayton Hamfest. 2 C if Hams
>there R like other typical Hams I have met B-4

Keep this up and we'll open a special "sand box" section just for you,
Vipul. We might even get you a magnetic board with those letters you can move
around and make even sillier looking words. Maybe you and Mark Morgan, KB9RQZ
can share.

Steve, K4YZ

3790. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 17:01:20 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304280901.22d83c3c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66028

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EAB4AE7.F27BC86C@earthlink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > In article <3EA976DD.B1FE97F4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >> Last year you two did 897 QSOs and scored 3,542 points. Good for 4th
> > >> place out of 30 1B-2 'x2' entries. Not too shabby....!
> > >
> > >Bert ponders about how much better we'd have done if we'd not lost all
> > >the time over the generator issue.
> >
> > I betcha you two could bust 1000 Q's easily.
>
> I'd think so, given that we lost five hours last year.

Make that "bust 1200-1300 Q's easily"

> I don't think we
> can depend on 15m this year so we'll have to hit 80m a bit harder.

Agreed.
>
> > >We used only one antenna, a flattop
> > >with open wire feeder. We're considering additions for this year.
> >
> > I learned the hard way that, in small FD ops, complications are often not
> >worth
> > the trouble. FD's a weenie domestic contest, not CQWW or even SS. No
> > multipliers, which sucks, but they're not gonna change it. With one tx you
> >go
> > where the contacts are, rate is everything.
>
> I used to love SS but haven't even given it a shot since returning to
> the states. CQ WW (both modes) is still my favorite, followed by the CQ
> 160 'test.

I leave the big contests to those who know what they are doing. W3RV
would translate that as "yer a wuss..."
>
> > >> > > Yeah, use the throwaway gear.
> > >>
> > >> HAW!
> > >
> > >'RV has a way with words.

> >
> > You don't know the half of it.
>
> I'm beginning to understand.

We gotta do a road trip one of these years...do Dayton and pick you
guys up on the way or somethin...
>
> > >I've never done FD battery operations but have instead been with groups
> > >using various sizes of generators, ranging from little jobs with several
> > >hundred watt ratings to big 10 KVA surplus generators mounted on
> > >trailers.
> >
> > BTDT, from just me and a battery and a Ten Tec Argosy to the giant setup at
> > K3BKG years ago. WW2 surplus generator, prolly from SCR-399. 2003 will be FD
> > #36 for me.
>
> That's quite a run. I missed '71-'75 and '85-'01.

You had good reasons to miss those! And as you said, some of those
years "every day was Field Day"
>
> > The first time I did battery ops was with W3NNL and K3OIO, about 1974.
> > We used
> > 'NNL's homebrew 80/40 CW transceiver.
> >
> > That xcvr was a neat bit of work. Hybrid unit - solid state except driver
> >and
> > final. Direct conversion with phasing-type rejection of the 'audio image'.
> > This
> > was before Gingell's work was published, btw. 'NNL made the audio PSN.
> >Because
> > it only had to deal with CW bandwidth it did not have to be as complex.
> > Rejection was about 40-45 dB. 12BA6 driver feeding 1625 final. Vibrator
> > supply
> > for 10 W input. Could do up to 75 watts with home power supply, or 50 watts
> > with his dynamotor.
>
> Pretty nice lash up. I'd like to try a vintage Field Day using a QSL 60
> and the FB-7 or mebbe even the pre-war HRO.

How many xtals ya got that would tolerate the QSL 60?
>
> > Whole thing was built in the case from a defunct National FB-7. Back then
> >BAs
> > were a dime a dozen. Betcha he wishes he'd left the FB-7 alone!
>
> Lord, yes!

I shudder to think how much stuff was hacked up and/or tossed out in
those days. Of course that was when they were looked upon as old junk

and not worth the shelf space.

Of course if nobody had hacked them up or tossed them out, they'd be
all over the place, and very cheap.

> I love the old National stuff.

You ever been to the AWA museum near Rochester?

> I still run my SW-3 on a
> homebrew supply but an OT sold me an original FB-7 supply a few years
> back so I retired its homebrew power supply.

I had an NC-173 for a number of years, paired up with a Viking 2/122.
Nice AM setup, got it for almost nothing. They "needed work"... Sold
the pair for a bit more than I paid, back in '98 or '99.

It occurs to me that I actually own very few BA sets anymore, but lots
of BA-type parts. Lessee...BC-342-N, BC-453, some test gear. Rest is
homebrew or modern. If I want to do VFD it'll be with homebrew!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3791. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 17:21:17 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EAD630D.27CAFD57@crosslink.net>
Source record: 66024

Somebody wrote
> >
> > >Seems to me that one of the biggest headaches FCC has in the area of
> > >noncommercial radio is the issue of freebanders and those who abuse cb.
> > >

Comes from misunderstanding human nature. People will always "hop-up" their cars, radios, what ever; especially if the Government forbids it. It's as American as apple pie, speeding and mod'ing your ham rig to transmit out of band. The problem is two sided.

First, 1000s of CBrs find themselves crowded into 40 channels. Predictable, the more enterprising among them discovered the almost empty (by comparison) freq's between their band and our 10M band. And who here has never heard the siren call of DX?

Second, CBs are far too easily mod'd to work outside the band. Any 40-chan PLL CB is naturally a 64 (or 128 or ...) channel CB.

IMHO the answer is to reallocate the 11m band back to us, this over a period of say 5 years to be fair. The new bands better serve CBs original intentions without all of the inherent problems. It would also allow FCC to relax RF ampl rules imposed on us.

73, K3DWW

3792. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 17:39:10 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.he21e64.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 66029

On 28 Apr 2003 00:43:02 GMT, WA8ULX wrote:

>>No amateur frequency is "private". Trust me on that... <ggg>

>It is private, trust me on that

>>Why are they closely guarded? Are they in witness protection,
>> have death threats been made against them, or does the DA want
>> them as material witnesses?

> All of the above.

Did you go to school to learn how to be a schmuck or were you
always that way without mentoring?

Another candidate for filtration.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

3793. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 18:42:23 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428144223.16048.00000185@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 66030

>Did you go to school to learn how to be a schmuck or were you
> always that way without mentoring?

Well actually I was normal, and a very easy person to get along with, untill I got me one of them there Ham Radio License's, then everything went down hill.

> Another candidate for filtration.
>

Whats filtration?

3794. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 18:59:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428145928.21264.00000371@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66031

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 4/28/2003 5:24 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304280224.779d153e@posting.google.com>

>Do you think he might have been one character off, and you chose to
>trip and skin your knee?

An error is an error. Especially when the one making it is always on OTHERS cases about doing so.

>> I was never in the supply field.
>
>Please stay on topic.

Please don't hide behind weak obfuscation, Brain.

>> That's been answered. This is the kind of crap you pulled with Ed Hare.
>
>You didn't bring up the words "snack bar" when Len talked of where you
>were stationed? I think you did.
>
>And leave Ed out of this. He's absent by his choice, not anything I
>did.

Are you sure?

>> > Ahem, no license required to operate here.
>>
>> That's how Len got here.
>
>Then at which point did you confuse usenet with ham bands?

Who's confused, Brain? That WAS the point. This is NOT the Amateur Radio service.

>> Go back to picking the flowers off the wallpaper, Brian.
>
>Clean up your "snack bar" mess first.

I can see Brain has found yet another opportunity to hide his own inadequacies behind a meaningless comment.

Figgers.

Steve, K4YZ

3795. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 18:59:38 UTC
From: Krell1215@NOSPAMyahoo.com
Message-ID: <b8jtmq01olm@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 66037

In article <b8jj3pth1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com says...
>
>
>"Krell" <Krell1215@NOSPAMyahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:b8i4lc02rug@enews1.newsguy.com...
>> In article <20030427151756.26508.00000162@mb-m19.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com
>> says...
>>
>> >Well most Women refer to me as a GOD or a STUD.
>>
>> ...as in, "GOD! Do you need a pair of tweezers to put that STUD away?"
>>
>>
>> > I will also be carrying an HT and listening on 449.85 Simplex. Thats a
>> private
>> >Freq used by myself and some closely guarded freinds.
>>
>> Closely guarded friends? Sounds like they might be riding a short bus to
>> Dayton.
>>
>
>My GAWD don't you folks know anything? 449.85.....15 KHZ from the top of
>the band? Wonder what mode that HT is using?
>
>Dan/W4NTI

So, what's that have to do with Brucie's friends being "closely guarded?"

3796. CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 19:00:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428150044.16121.00000152@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 66032

Would like to set up a time and a Net at Dayton, for the Hamfest. Do we have any one that would like to run the NET, preferable someone Local.
The Net could be a place where all CBplussers could check in, and us real Hams could listen and laugh at them. Maybe we could even use the Net for a way to setup meetings for us real Hams to meet the CBplussers.
I will also be selling"Down With CBplussers" T Shirts at Dayton, if you dont see me in the crowd, you can call me on 449.98 and I will give you my location at that time, so you can Purchase your Shirt. And if we get the NET setup, I will also give my location on it.
Hope to see you all at Dayton, and bring lots of Money for your own Shirts.

3797. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 19:09:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428150929.21264.00000373@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66033

>Subject: Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)
>From: Vito vito@crosslink.net
>Date: 4/28/2003 12:21 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EAD630D.27CAFD57@crosslink.net>

>First, 1000s of CBrs find themselves crowded into 40 channels.

If they were used correctly and within the scope of Part 95, they'd be far more utilitarian.

>Predictable, the more enterprising among them discovered the almost
>empty (by comparison) freq's between their band and our 10M band. And
>who here has never heard the siren call of DX?

Illegal is illegal. It's illegal for a reason, the reason being that there are other radio services in that part of the spectrum who are now unable to use those frequencies due to all the trash.

>Second, CBs are far too easily mod'd to work outside the band. Any
>40-chan PLL CB is naturally a 64 (or 128 or ...) channel CB.

So...we go back to crystal controlled radios with sealed "modules" that prevent opening and "reversing" the crystals to go out-of-band?

Just because something can be MADE illegal means it must?

>IMHO the answer is to reallocate the 11m band back to us, this over a
>period of say 5 years to be fair.

I say we put 10KW wideband noise generators on there for a year to force the abandonment of that part of the spectrum first.

>The new bands better serve CBs
>original intentions without all of the inherent problems. It would also
>allow FCC to relax RF ampl rules imposed on us.

The Japanese have a neat little 900Mhz "CB" service that we should emulate. Take out 2 Mhz of the present 33cm band and load it with low-power (10 w or less), 6.25Khz channels.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3798. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 19:11:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428151118.21264.00000374@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 66034

>Subject: Re: Dayton Hamfest?
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 4/28/2003 12:39 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.he21e64.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>

>On 28 Apr 2003 00:43:02 GMT, WA8ULX wrote:
>
>>>No amateur frequency is "private". Trust me on that... <ggg>
>
>>It is private, trust me on that

Not since you put it in here, Brucie.

>>>Why are they closely guarded? Are they in witness protection,
>>> have death threats been made against them, or does the DA want
>>> them as material witnesses?
>
>> All of the above.
>
> Did you go to school to learn how to be a schmuck or were you
> always that way without mentoring?

The result of procreation gone amuck.

Steve, K4YZ

3799. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 19:18:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428151820.26326.00000205@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 66035

>The result of procreation gone amuck.
>
>Steve, K4YZ

Is that reason we have so many CBplussers anymore?

3800. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 19:19:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428151903.26326.00000206@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 66036

> Not since you put it in here, Brucie.
>

Most of these guys will not remember it anyway.

3801. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 19:20:54 UTC
From: Krell1215@NOSPAMyahoo.com
Message-ID: <b8juum01s1e@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 66040

In article <20030428095639.25728.00000153@mb-m21.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com says...
>
>>So, do you or any of your "closely guarded friends" wear hockey equipment,
>>but
>>don't play on any team?
>>
>
>NO, why do you ask?

I'm just trying to figure out why they're so "closely guarded." I guess if I go to Dayton and see a group of people smiling for no reason, like they've had some sort of head injury, then I know I'll have found your friends.

>>"I'm of rubber,
>>you're of glue" comeback.
>
> No you got me on that one

Do I have to explain everything? Okay, pay attention - The full phrase is "I'm of rubber, you're of glue. It bounced off me, and sticks to you." If you go through the the past few mesages of this thread, maybe you'll be able to figure it out. If you can't, that's okay. I understand how people in your condition can get a little confused sometimes.

3802. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 19:21:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428152144.26326.00000207@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 66038

> The Japanese have a neat little 900Mhz "CB" service that we should
>emulate. Take out 2 Mhz of the present 33cm band and load it with low-power
>(10 w or less), 6.25Khz channels.
>
>73
>
>Steve, K4YZ
>
No need for all this, the FCC in its wisdom has already started a NEW CB
Service, its called Ham Radio, with more than enough freqs to go around.

3803. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 19:28:13 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428152813.26469.00000208@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 66039

>My GAWD don't you folks know anything? 449.85.....15 KHZ from the top of
>the band? Wonder what mode that HT is using?
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

It doesnt matter Dan, even if we splatter out of the Band, and if the FCC would catch us, all we would have to say was that we were CBplussers and they would lets us go.

3804. Re: Repeater Autopatch vs. Telemarketer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 20:05:46 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0304282003500.1601@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 66043

On Mon, 28 Apr 2003, Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Bull.... where the hell is the control op for the repeater?? What, a person
> is expected to carry around a 3x5 card with that message???

The control operator is the one who commanded the patch to answer (by entry of
the appropriate command code). He is the one on the radio side of the patch.

> > Seems to me that instructing all repeater users to give the message
> >
> > "You're in violation of 47 CFR 97.113. Do not call this number again. Take
> > this number off your list and inform your superiors to remove it from all of
> > their lists."
> >
> > or something similar, then hanging up, and having them actually do it would
>
> Seems to me that the repeater should be designed in a manner that incoming
> calls do not come in to the point of where they are heard over the air and
> only come across the air if triggered by a set amount of DTMF tones to
> access that in the first place. Or something along the lines of a
> pre-recorded "announce-only" message that plays, (not over the air either)
> and to get past that the control op's would have to type in whatever tone
> sequence.

That condition was GIVEN in the original question (a code to answer the phone).

That still doesn't mean that the incoming call isn't a telemarketer....

Obviously, you need to read the original question of the thread, not just jump
into the middle.

3805. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 20:06:29 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428160629.04942.00000410@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 66044

>I'm just trying to figure out why they're so "closely guarded." I guess if I
>go
>to Dayton and see a group of people smiling for no reason, like they've had
>some sort of head injury, then I know I'll have found your friends.

They will be smilling but not because of Head Injury

>I'm
>of rubber, you're of glue. It bounced off me, and sticks to you."

Are you sure your not just a CBer, maybe I have given you to much CREDIT.

3806. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 20:08:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428160820.04942.00000411@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 66045

>They'd leave for the same reason most of them avoid our 10M band;
>because hams can and do DF them then turn them in.
>
>K3DWW

Get real, most New Hams would have a hard time speeling "DF", let alone know what it meant.

3807. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 20:14:27 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428161427.04942.00000412@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 66046

>Looks like you have a hard time 'speeling' too.
>
>--
>GO# 40

Yea your right, I was in a hurry trying to answer to many posts and wasnt watching.

3808. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 20:15:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428161508.18775.00000384@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 66047

In article <20030427175245.20983.00000393@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/27/2003 2:33 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20030427153315.18755.00000313@mb-m06.aol.com>
>
>>How much of a military man was Miccolis? Where did he fight?
>
> Where did YOU fight? When was your CIB (Combat Infantry Badge) awarded?
>Do you rate the basic award or award with wreath?

I just asked a question.

I was never qualified to wear the blue rifle, never claimed that.

I gave explicit details of where I was assigned in the US Army and the duties performed, including dates. No exaggeration. All of that is not only backed up by paperwork but is archived at the National Archives and Records Administration in St. Louis, MO. That includes an Honorable Discharge received in April, 1960.

Not only that, but a Long Island radio amateur (N2JTV) was assigned to the same Army unit at the same time I was, doing the same duties.

What do we get from the Gang of Four in here? This is what -

Steamy Stalker: "I was in seven hostile actions." No details, no dates, no descriptions, nothing. He was in "seven hostile actions." His first discharge was Medical...later "amended" to "honorable."

Herr Robust: "I was in Vietnam." No details, no dates, no descriptions, nothing else. Just he was "in Vietnam."

Reverend Jimmie: Null personal comment...he didn't serve in any US military branch at any time...but he feels compelled to be the military expert in equipment, doctrine, training and isn't hesitant to lecture others on what they should know or do. Perfect description of the ultimate REMF.

Katapult Kellie: Lots of Tuff Tawk about shooting bears from an aircraft carrier but that's it. Never served in the US military, any branch...but won't hesitate to shoot off his mouth without ammo. Says he was sponsored by USN intelligence...which is an insult

to USN and M.I. everywhere.

> Or are you yet again trying to present yourself as some kind of "expert"
>on yet another field of human endeavor for which you have no practical
>experience yourself?

I've had over 50 years IN radio, Steamy. I can design them, build them, test them, evaluate them, fix them if they become inoperative and, yes, operate them. Hands-on experience, tube burns and RF arc burns, with the best DX of a station ON the moon. In military service, commercial service, and some government service...all with enough evidence to stand up in any court, plus in-person testimony from witnesses.

I have NO experience in lying, cheating, gross exaggeration, or doing errors by deliberate omission as you do in here about your personal or amateur radio "experiences."

> I just think you're a putz.

You MUST think that. You don't have a lot of experience. You LIE and exaggerate beyond reasonable bounds.

You MUST do the Tuff Tawk thing because that is all you can present in any arguments on subjects. You don't know the subjects, so you do the personal attack thing with insults and name-calling. That seems to give you self-esteem, but only from bullying others, pushing them around. You appear to love bullying and pushing others around.

You aren't Yiddish, don't know that ethnic language or what the words mean. You use them without thinking, hoping they have the desired effect. They don't. They reflect back on you, not on anyone else.

This outright stalking of individuals makes your image worse, not better.

3809. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 20:15:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428161515.18775.00000385@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 66048

In article <BAD26287.17CC5%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) The greater Los Angeles area (includes
>> over 70 incorporated cities) has done this and
>> it works out well. That covers a population of
>> about 10 to 12 million. (snip)
>>
>> California is one of the larger states in the
>> union and the most populous of all of them with
>> about 30 million.
>
> Len, you don't have to lecture me on California. I grew up in Sacramento,
>later lived in Ontario (near LA), and have family living in Southern
>California now (the LA area).

That's nice. I posted in public, not private.

I wasn't born in California and don't have any blood kin living here.
I just reside here and experienced a few emergencies first-hand.

There has been considerable geographic bigotry exhibited by
others in here. My "lecture" (as you quaintly put it) is to THEM,
not you.

>> A Richter 6.3 earthquake with a total cutoff of
>> all electrical power is classified as a "small,
>> isolated incident?!?"
>
> Do remember "small" and "isolated" are relative terms.

That's not all. I "must remember" that relative importance and
magnitude of anything depend on the ego and exaggeration of
outraged individuals living elsewhere who love to heap contempt
and scorn on others who are not their "neighbors."

>Compared to the
>damage done by some hurricanes along the East coast, or compared to some
>previous earthquakes in California, that earthquake was indeed a "small,
>isolated incident." Of course, no disaster is small when you're living
>through it.

Of course. "Small, isolated" because it didn't happen at the center
of the known universe called the east coast. Uh, huh.

"Small, isolated" because it didn't happen in 1909 in San Francisco
or the Loma Prieta general area or on the New Madrid Fault in MO.

That "small, isolated" Northridge Earthquake was so insignificant that
over 50 (perhaps 63) died directly because they were insignificant
"left coasters" who didn't deserve to live? "Small, isolated" outage of
ALL primary electrical power in a population area of at least 10
million? Of course. "Small, isolated" because the damage area
was confined to a square of roughly 50 by 50 miles? Of course, not
a Vast Area of Devastation as always happening on the east coast.

Anything out here along the Pacific ocean seems "small, isolated,"
doesn't it? Of course it is. We aren't a part of the United States,
are we? Of course not. We don't get hurricanes out here, a fact
making us the "lesser" compared to easties.

>> The telephone SWITCHING SYSTEM is simply overloaded
>> by callers trying to dial out. That isn't "failure,"
>
> It is a failure of communications, one that directly affects the ability
>of disaster personnel to reliably use that system (that's what we're talking
>about here, not telephone calls from your uncle in Florida).

Forgive me, your royal whatever. I've only seen emergency
personnel use a lot of different ways to communicate in "small,
isolated" events. Out here in that foreign territory that is "small
and isolated," we don't rely solely on the telephone system OR
amateur radio for prime communications.

> You're looking at the small picture, Len.

Yes, a foreign territory that is "small, isolated." Nothing at all
compared to Horry County, South Carolina.

>Disaster response is not limited to just your immediate area.

That's nice. I'm sure that Canada or Mexico can hop to aid
next time a hurricane strikes the Pacific coast. Just think,
ambulances all the way from Vancouver, BC, summoned by
ham radio net!

>It's wonderful your town is so well prepared.

It's a little "town," "small and isolated." 10-12 million or so folks.

>Can you say the same for smaller towns and communities throughout
>California?

Yes, but everything out here is "small and isolated," Dwight.
You've said so yourself. We can't know the Big Picture, can we?

People on the Pacific coast aren't prepared for hurricans that strike
every year. We would retreat to our "small, isolated" towns and
other places, not being prepared for anything MAJOR.

<some lecturing omitted since we are so "small, isolated">

> You're confused about how National Guard units work. In general, they
>rarely go to war as a unit.

Of course. Please explain what happened to the Joint Chiefs, the
President, and the news media who seem to differ on your
"explanation." Maybe they don't see the Big Picture due to living
in the "small, isolated" region known as the District of Columbia.
Air Guard units steal planes in the USA to fly off-shore? Of course.
All Guard units are under-prepared.

> If that is so, why didn't you step forward to volunteer?

I did but that's irrelevant to the Big Picture. After all, we were in
a "small, isolated" event not anywhere close to the Massive
Devastation of an East Coast Hurricane!

>Did you even make an effort to see if your services could be useful?

According to your "criterion," I couldn't possibly have done anything
"useful." I don't have an amateur radio license. I used my
commercial license.

>Did you check to see if
>there were hams helping other services, such as the Red Cross?

Saw no sign of them until 20 January 1994, three days after the
first quake...on one TV broadcast channel for a video byte.

Please remember that this was a "small, isolated" event that
wasn't of great importance (such as an east coast hurricane).

The President of the USA flew in for a first-hand inspection,
FEMA flew in a bunch of equipment. It was just a "small,
isolated" event of no real significance. You said so.

> And exactly how much coverage have you seen of any radio communications
>during a disaster by the media?

Stock shots of various comm centers makes up most of it out here
in "small, isolated" areas. We don't have much, only 13+ TV
broadcast channels, over 40 radio stations serving the Greater
Los Angeles area of a few million folks. We are "small, isolated."

>This stuff is not exactly major news or exciting film footage.

That's a problem with earthquakes...no advance warning for all
to get ready over a 2 to 3 day period, no dramatic pictures of
journalists braving the wild winds and driven rain. All we get
are pictures of damaged buildings and road structures, some
dogs sniffing at wreckage trying to find bodies, earth-moving
equipment moving wreckage out of the way. Dull stuff.

No real entertaining drama or emotional highs from a "small,
isolated" town. Sorry, Dwight.

>Nevertheless, coverage in the mainstream media does
>occur occasionally.

It does? Gosh, Dwight, living in this "small, isolated" town
we don't get out enough. Weekly copies of the Podunk
Hollow Gazette sometimes miss the stagecoach...

> I've never seen that. Everything I've read, everyone I've talked to,
>focuses on ham radio as supplemental communications for existing
>communications systems. The ham volunteers I've seen seem to understand this
>concept very well.

ARRL newletter give the other impression.

> Again, something I've never seen.

You've never seen an ARRL newsletter? It's on their website.

>Can you provide an example of a real
>life emergency where this (aggressively competitive behavior by hams) has
>actually occurred?

Yes.

>Can you quote one civil defense person who has complained
>about a lack of experience, organization, or training, by ham operators?

Yes.

>Hams are included in the disaster planning of towns and cities throughout
>the United States.

All of them?

>Can you name one town or city that has excluded hams from
>that planning because of a lack of experience, organization, or training?

No, but only because, living in a "small, isolated town," I can't
get out enough to visit every single urban community that has
some kind of emergency planning for communications.

I do hope your US Passport is up to date so that you can visit your
family here in this "small, isolated town." I'm sure many of us want
to hear all about the terrible hurricanes that ravage the east coast
almost yearly. We don't have anything like that in this "small,
isolated town." We are, after all, "small and isolated."

3810. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 20:15:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428161521.18775.00000386@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 66049

In article <BAD24CEE.17CC3%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
>> Just the same, us in other parts of the USA could
>> watch TV journalists' video and sound from INSIDE
>> the hurricane area, night scenes still lit by
>> street lighting still operational despite terrible
>> winds.
>
> Yes, we saw those images leading up to the storm's arrival also, just
>before the power failed. In fact, there were several press trucks here with
>built-in generators, battery operated remote cameras, and satellite dishes.
>Sadly, none of that helped the local residents' situation. Most also cleared
>out several hours before the storm hit, to broadcast pictures from inland
>areas.

Complain to the news media. Don't start whining about "all
commercial facilities FAIL during an emergency." News media
obviously was there and operating.

>> Did "most" amateur radio antennas miraculously
>> remain standing while all those commercial towers
>> fell?
>
> Probably very few did. Regardless, that wasn't a concern for disaster
>response - none of those home based antennas were located where they were
>needed.

Sorry, Dwight, you get a failing grade in the ham emergency
mantra. You are supposed to say "commercial communications
always fails during an emergency!" Repeat that over and over
until you get like all the other tale-tellers.

>Instead, what was needed were temporary antennas set up at
>communications centers, storm shelters, hospitals, and so on.

Of course all radio amateurs are trained and experienced in
erecting antennas in storm and wind conditions, right?

>> For how many decades have communities in this region
>> experienced other hurricanes? How much planning and
>> organization have gone into emergency preparation?
>
> Len, you don't seem to have a very realistic view of these situations.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. What you really meant to say was that I don't have the syncophant's "view" in proper phraseology of boosting general amateur radio capability far beyond credibility.

The common mythology is for all NON-participants in real emergency work to equate their hobby with some kind of heroism and noble sacrifice that others do and therefore pin a hero medal on themselves. I'd call that "pride by association" which is another side of the coin that also says "guilt by association." Both have no basis in reality but is just bullshit braggadoccio.

Yes, I do NOT take all of the self-serving propaganda output of ARRL to be "truth without question."

>Yes, larger towns do fairly well when it comes to emergency preparation. Of
>course, there are always surprises, but they are usually handled with
>relative ease.

Here come the excuses...

"Larger towns" have about the same expenditures of tax monies as smaller towns all over the country.

Higher-population areas have a larger group of level-headed planners who know how to get the job done properly AND REALISTICALLY. They don't go into self-promoting bullshit about fantasies of noble, valorous service to the country by constant repetition of self-serving propaganda.

>Sadly, such is not the case for smaller towns, isolated
>communities, isolated residents, and unexpected situations. The drain on
>disaster resources can be staggering. In some parts of South Carolina
>following Hurricane Hugo, for example, whole towns and communities were cut
>off for days with no state or federal assistance. Neighboring communities
>jumped in to help where they could, placing a further burden on their own
>resources.

Okay, you've now made the Emotional Appeal. Everyone wipe their eyes and continue...

>> We are waiting for the announcement that the HF antennas
>> were all still up having miraculously survived the winds
>> and rain while all the commercial towers fell, damaged
>> beyond repair...
>
> Again, you're not being very realistic, Len.

I was being SARCASTIC, Dwight. How often have you heard hams say "the cell phones always FAIL!" in emergencies?

Do they "fail?" No. They get overloaded.

>Antennas at home (whether
>they stand or fall) are of little use to disaster personnel. Instead, ham

>operators volunteer to set up temporary radio facilities where needed, help
>to put fallen antennas back up, and help to set up temporary antennas where
>restoring fallen antenna is not immediately possible.

During high wind and storm conditions? I don't think so.

Evidently you know some amateur radio groups that have "antenna
kits" ready and waiting for such emergencies, "kits" of ready-to-put-
up antennas, available at quick notice. I've not heard of those.
Please describe who or which group has them and what those kits
contain, bands, etc.

>> Did they get through the gridlock on highways or did
>> they go cross-country to get there?
>
> Actually, by the time the national guard arrived, a major roadway was
>cleared of traffic and patrolled by police to keep it clear. Cars attempting
>to enter that road were turned around at road stops manned by state police.
>In the future, that is the plan from the very start.

If there was a "plan from the start" by police, why did the gridlock
occur at the start?

Military humvees CAN go cross-country, Dwight. Most military
field vehicles can.

>> So far, Dwight, all you've done is a lot of "pep
>> rally rah-rah" about US amateur radio largely to
>> an audience mostly made up of other radio amateurs.
>> That's the wrong audience for addressing REAL
>> emergency planning, organization, preparation,
>> and training.
>
> Len, you're placing the burden of emergency planning, organization,
>preparation, and training, on ham operators.

No, no, no, Dwight. The "burden" of emergency planning, organization,
preparation, and training has ALREADY BEEN DONE BY OTHERS.

Radio amateurs have to learn that they must INTEGRATE with the
rest of the emergency groups that already exist. They have to work
WITH them, not as some separate, stand-alone organization. Few
amateurs want to do that according to the stories in here and
elsewhere...the olde-tymers in ham radio want to be the "bosses"
unilaterally.

>That is neither our job or our emphasis.

Whoa! That is contradictory to the ham mantra in here and other
places!

Haven't you heard the patriotic slogan, "ham radio is a SERVICE?"

Haven't you read all the tales in ARRL newsletters where hams
always fall out for duty, aid, help, over and above all other groups
involved in emergencies?

According to the output of the Gang of Four in here, copying the
Word from Newington, amateur radio is NOT just a hobby...it is
a vital service to the nation, indespensible in times of peace or
war, able to operate when all the commercial communications fail.

>States, Cities, and regional governments have their own disaster
>planning, into which ham radio fits. Our involvement goes solely to the
>proper operation of our equipment and working properly with other civil
>defense personnel.

Sounds like "standard boilerplate" phrasing, Dwight.

Try being original.

> I'm sorry, but I've never seen that following any disaster where hams were
>involved, Len. During Hugo, hams ignored their own situation to volunteer
>many hours of effort without pay (unlike most other disaster personnel) and
>without recognition in many cases.

Of course hams did exemplary work over and above anyone else.
I wouldn't expect any other phrasing in here.

You really ought to find another venue for such promotional out-
pouring. Try the national news media. They haven't glommed onto
such magnificent volunteer work in times of need from amateurs.
"60 Minutes" is always looking for such stories as one example.
"Dateline" on NBC is another.

> Let me give you an example. One manager and a station employee of a local
>radio station decided to stay on the air during the storm. Several hours
>before the storm hit, that station lost all outside communications. A local
>ham, hearing their situation on the radio, drove through the storm, still
>hours before landfall, to join them at the station. That ham operator
>quickly established communications with ham operators outside the area. One
>of those hams drove to the disaster staging command center and fed
>communications about the storm (and other info from disaster personnel) back
>to the ham at the radio station, which was then broadcast to local
>residents.
>
> As the storm approached, it was clear the station's tower was not going to
>stand. They responded by spreading a wire antenna throughout the building
>and operating with reduced power. With that, and several trips to a shed
>outside to refill the generator, they remained on the air throughout the
>entire storm. About 2am, the tower did eventually fall. The parking lot was
>also flooded with about a foot of water, but the storm surge never made its
>way into the station.
>
> I went to bed that night listening to this radio station. As the storm
>raged outside, with the danger still uncertain, their voices were very
>comforting. You might dismiss this ham operator with nonsense about

>"over-inflated egos" and "imaginary nirvana of self-importance," but I'll be
>darn glad to shake his hand any day of the week.

There you have the first draft, the outline of the story. Great stuff!

News media ought to lap it up. National news media, that is.

A dozen column-inches on page 5 of some Podunk Hollow weekly
gazette isn't going to get wide exposure.

Fantastic emotion-appeal content of the tale. Ought to make a lot
young people all fired up to "join the service" and Save Humanity
for Truth, Justice, and the Amateur Way!

High-fives all around for Hams everywhere...

3811. Re: Repeater Autopatch vs. Telemarketer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 20:19:21 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0304282008290.1601@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 66050

On Mon, 28 Apr 2003, Robert Casey wrote:
> "D. Stussy" wrote:
> > In the exact situation I am thinking of, the repeater answers the phone by
> > saying (synthesized voice), "This is the <club-callsign> amateur radio club
> > repeater autopatch," then waits for about 30 seconds for a command before the
> > reverse patch ringout on the radio. No audio is gated to or from the radio
> > side until the reverse patch answer command is input. The speech board doesn't
> > have a DVR nor the vocabulary to tell telemarketers to hang up up front.
> >
> > Comments?
>
> I had heard that the FCC didn't like it if a caller (possibly a non licensed
> person) does something that causes a ham transmitter to transmit
> (even if his voice never reaches the air). I would expect that each
> member of the repeater club would have a password that he would
> key in via the touch tone pad on the phone. And when a valid password
> is entered, that only then is the repeater transmitter keyed up.

Why isn't that what I said: The control op. answers the phone (by entry of the code)? However, that in no way prevents the fact that the incoming call IS from a telemarketer....

Did you understand what "inputting the reverse patch answer command" meant?

> Thus a telemarketer would never get past. Besides, most telemarketers use
> automated dialing equipment that screens for answering machines, busy signals
> and no answers. That equipment will think the repeater is an answering
> machine and dump the call.

Apparently not in this case. The telemarketer's equipment could be faulty and/or simply not recognize the repeater's synthesized outbound message to telco as an "answering machine."

> You could install one of those telemarketer zappers you see at radio
> shack....

Why? That costs money ($40 on the average)! :-)

The repeater controller is capable of generating the tones itself. I simply didn't know that telemarketers equipment looked for the tones and which sequence to use. [They weren't documented in my reference book which lists all the various tones for coins and other telco mischief.] However, that still will not kill a telemarketer who is calling in person (i.e. not using his demon dialer) - for he will immedately hear the voice after the tones, recognize that it's not a phone company message, and stay on anyway.

From other responses, the best sequence to use is apparently called the "no circuit" response: 985.2Hz for 380ms, 1428.5/380, and 1776.7/380. However, the "vacant circuit" response might also be valid: 985.2/380, 1370.6/274, and 1776.7/380.

3812. Re: Repeater Autopatch vs. Telemarketer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 20:20:17 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0304282021450.1601@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 65951

On Mon, 28 Apr 2003, Robert Casey wrote:
> "D. Stussy" wrote:
> > The only suggestion I have received in e-mail was to somehow generate the tone
> > sequence that comes out at the beginning of the "disconnected number message."
> > (I have yet to find out what that sequence of three [multi-]tones is.)
>
> I have a wav file of this at the bottom of my page:
> http://www.geocities.com/wa2ise/wav.html

Which helps how? I stated that there is NO DVR on the repeater.

3813. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 20:50:40 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8k46t$17j$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65952

"Krell" <Krell1215@NOSPAMyahoo.com> wrote in message
news:b8jtmq01olm@enews3.newsguy.com...
> In article <b8jj3pth1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>,
w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com
> says...
> >
> >
> >"Krell" <Krell1215@NOSPAMyahoo.com> wrote in message
> >news:b8i4lc02rug@enews1.newsguy.com...
> >> In article <20030427151756.26508.00000162@mb-m19.aol.com>,
wa8ulx@aol.com
> >> says...
> >>
> >> >Well most Women refer to me as a GOD or a STUD.
> >>
> >> ...as in, "GOD! Do you need a pair of tweezers to put that STUD away?"
> >>
> >>
> >> > I will also be carrying an HT and listening on 449.85 Simplex. Thats
a
> >> private
> >> >Freq used by myself and some closely guarded freinds.
> >>
> >> Closely guarded friends? Sounds like they might be riding a short bus
to
> >> Dayton.
> >>
> >
> >My GAWD don't you folks know anything? 449.85.....15 KHZ from the top of
> >the band? Wonder what mode that HT is using?
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> So, what's that have to do with Brucie's friends being "closely guarded?"
>

I'm sorry I don't send pictures to usenet groups.

Dan/W4NTI

3814. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 20:52:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8k49t$cf6$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65953

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030428152813.26469.00000208@mb-m19.aol.com...
> >My GAWD don't you folks know anything? 449.85.....15 KHZ from the top of
> >the band? Wonder what mode that HT is using?
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> It doesnt matter Dan, even if we splatter out of the Band, and if the FCC
would
> catch us, all we would have to say was that we were CBplussers and they
would
> lets us go.

Silly me....I keep thinking this is a 'real' Amateur radio group.

Dan/W4NTI

3815. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 20:57:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8k4j4eml1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65954

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030428150044.16121.00000152@mb-m25.aol.com...
> Would like to set up a time and a Net at Dayton, for the Hamfest. Do we
have
> any one that would like to run the NET, preferable someone Local.
> The Net could be a place where all CBplussers could check in, and us real
Hams
> could listen and laugh at them. Maybe we could even use the Net for a way
to
> setup meetings for us real Hams to meet the CBplussers.
> I will also be selling"Down With CBplussers" T Shirts at Dayton, if you
dont
> see me in the crowd, you can call me on 449.98 and I will give you my
location
> at that time, so you can Purchase your Shirt. And if we get the NET setup,
I
> will also give my location on it.
> Hope to see you all at Dayton, and bring lots of Money for your own
Shirts.

I recommend 146.520 plus 600.

Dan/W4NTI

3816. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 20:59:56 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428165956.22069.00000402@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 65955

```
>I recommend 146.520 plus 600.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Not a bad Idea Dan
```

3817. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 21:02:49 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8k4tn$6cp$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65956

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EADB379.AB2BA022@crosslink.net...
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >
> > >Subject: Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)
> > >From: Vito vito@crosslink.net
> > >Date: 4/28/2003 12:21 PM Central Daylight Time
> > >Message-id: <3EAD630D.27CAFD57@crosslink.net>
> >
> > >First, 1000s of CBrs find themselves crowded into 40 channels.
> >
> > If they were used correctly and within the scope of Part 95, they'd
be far
> > more utilitarian.
> >
> > Illegal is illegal. It's illegal for a reason, the reason being
that
> > there are other radio services in that part of the spectrum who are now
unable
> > to use those frequencies due to all the trash.
>
> Speeding is also illegal, but most drivers speed. I'm not saying it's
> right, just that it's a fact of life that law enforcement hasn't been
> able to curtail because it's so tempting. My solution is to remove the
> temptation by moving CB to family radio or a new band as you suggest,
> and leave 11m to us law abiding hams (c;
>
> tnx, K3DWW

I have been reading this thread with interest. I am just curious....why
would a ham want 11 meters back again ?

We were not using it in the first place. Which is one of the reasons it was
taken and turned into the CB cesspool. And now that the pool is ruined
WORLDWIDE...what possible good would it do a real ham?

Oh wait a minute.. I understand. Your all returning to your
'roots'...right?

Dan/W4NTI Never a CBer and Never will.

3818. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 21:03:29 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428170329.22069.00000404@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 65957

I cant wait to see how many of these guys i meet there. More important I hope
I ordered enough T Shirts.

3819. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 21:06:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428170603.22033.00000356@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 65958

>Oh wait a minute.. I understand. Your all returning to your
>'roots'...right?
>

Your right Dan, its like there birthplace dan, and they really want to make
things whole.

3820. Re: Repeater Autopatch vs. Telemarketer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 21:25:28 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EAD9C47.3866B529@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 65959

"D. Stussy" wrote:

> On Mon, 28 Apr 2003, Robert Casey wrote:
> > "D. Stussy" wrote:
> > > In the exact situation I am thinking of, the repeater answers the phone by
> > > saying (synthesized voice), "This is the <club-callsign> amateur radio club
> > > repeater autopatch," then waits for about 30 seconds for a command before the
> > > reverse patch ringout on the radio. No audio is gated to or from the radio
> > > side until the reverse patch answer command is input. The speech board doesn't
> > > have a DVR nor the vocabulary to tell telemarketers to hang up up front.
> > >
> > > Comments?
> >
> > I had heard that the FCC didn't like it if a caller (possibly a non licensed
> > person) does something that causes a ham transmitter to transmit
> > (even if his voice never reaches the air). I would expect that each
> > member of the repeater club would have a password that he would
> > key in via the touch tone pad on the phone. And when a valid password
> > is entered, that only then is the repeater transmitter keyed up.
>
> Why isn't that what I said: The control op. answers the phone (by entry of the
> code)? However, that in no way prevents the fact that the incoming call IS
> from a telemarketer....

How does the control operator know when an incoming call is happening
unless the repeater transmitter does something? I thought that was
the part the FCC didn't like, that a non licensed caller can cause a ham
transmitter to key up (even though his voice doesn't get thru). As if
some kids with a scanner and who somehow know the phone number
decide to have a little fun by kerchunking the repeater via the phone?
Maybe I'm worrying about nothing.....

>
>
>
>
> > You could install one of those telemarketer zappers you see at radio
> > shack....
>
> Why? That costs money ($40 on the average)! :-)
>
> The repeater controller is capable of generating the tones itself. I simply
> didn't know that telemarketers equipment looked for the tones and which
> sequence to use. [They weren't documented in my reference book which lists all
> the various tones for coins and other telco mischief.] However, that still will

> not kill a telemarketer who is calling in person (i.e. not using his demon
> dialer) - for he will immedately hear the voice after the tones, recognize that
> it's not a phone company message, and stay on anyway.
>
> From other responses, the best sequence to use is apparently called the "no
> circuit" response: 985.2Hz for 380ms, 1428.5/380, and 1776.7/380. However,
> the "vacant circuit" response might also be valid: 985.2/380, 1370.6/274, and
> 1776.7/380.

I took a look with Cool Edit Pro my wav file, and it looks like 985Hz/274, 1428/380, and about1810Hz duration 380msec. Not 1776Hz, so maybe my wav file is incorrect?...

I should try dialing a disconnected number with the PC's modem and have Cool Edit capture the sound. Then look at it like I did my wav file. Let me know if that would be useful or not.... Now to find a disconnected number without annoying people with valid numbers.... Maybe if I make an error like not dialing a 1 in front of an area code? But that might not get me the right sequence.

3821. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 22:14:25 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8k93t$b62$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65960

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030428170603.22033.00000356@mb-m12.aol.com...
> >Oh wait a minute.. I understand. Your all returning to your
> >'roots'...right?
> >
>
> Your right Dan, its like there birthplace dan, and they really want to
make
> things whole.

Have you ever noticed and wondered how these exCB types keep wanting to return to their beginings in radio? I don't understand why it is Ham radio seems to be the only 'hobby' that does this.

In the model building hobby...no one wants to go back to their first pathetic attempt at building a boat, a plane, a car...etc.

In fishing...no one that I know enjoys going back to a stick and a string and a bent pin for a hook.

ETC.

Why is it that in ham radio once they bust loose from the madness of CB they keep wanting to go back to it? Help me here if you can.

Dan/W4NTI

3822. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 22:31:52 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428183152.24076.00000319@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 65961

>Why is it that in ham radio once they bust loose from the madness of CB they
>keep wanting to go back to it? Help me here if you can.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Dan I think what it amounts to is once a CBer always a CBer.

3823. Re: internet voice gateways - taking your handheld overseas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 22:43:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428184329.18772.00000246@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65962

In article <b8j8f2$ab847$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Damn..... that's even worse.....
>
>Ryan
>
>
>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030424231029.18769.00000187@mb-m20.aol.com...
>> In article <3EA70C78.3080307@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Ryan Lughermo, KC8PMX wrote:
>> >> Now I know where tune-a-fish comes from! How do ya tuna fish?? :)
>> >
>> > I give up, how do you tuna fish (I just know I'm going to regret this!
>> 8^)
>>
>> Practice your scales...

You are in it up to your gills now, no chance to swim away... :-)

3824. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 22:55:16 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EADB154.B307C0CD@crosslink.net>
Source record: 66041

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> > The new bands better serve CBs
> >original intentions without all of the inherent problems.
>
> BS, all that would do would be shift the problem to another area. Secondly what
> makes you think Millions of CBers would leave 11 Meters they are already
> operate Illegal.

FCC's main problem was (is?) TVI from overamplified CBs used to "shoot
skip" - a problem not likely to occur where "skip" is impossible.

They'd leave for the same reason most of them avoid our 10M band;
because hams can and do DF them then turn them in.

K3DWW

3825. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 23:04:25 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EADB379.AB2BA022@crosslink.net>
Source record: 66042

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)
> >From: Vito vito@crosslink.net
> >Date: 4/28/2003 12:21 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3EAD630D.27CAFD57@crosslink.net>
>
> >First, 1000s of CBrs find themselves crowded into 40 channels.
>
> If they were used correctly and within the scope of Part 95, they'd be far
> more utilitarian.
>
> Illegal is illegal. It's illegal for a reason, the reason being that
> there are other radio services in that part of the spectrum who are now unable
> to use those frequencies due to all the trash.

Speeding is also illegal, but most drivers speed. I'm not saying it's
right, just that it's a fact of life that law enforcement hasn't been
able to curtail because it's so tempting. My solution is to remove the
temptation by moving CB to family radio or a new band as you suggest,
and leave 11m to us law abiding hams (c;

tnx, K3DWW

3826. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 23:26:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EADB90F.8B81DA6A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65963

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EAB50D5.8FE12384@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA88AD9.BC4BC6C9@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA7E71E.C3FD13F1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA74120.60BE136D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Len Over 21 wrote:

> > > Look, Dave, Len said something about where you were stationed.
> > >
> > No, he didn't. I was never stationed at any place called "Tan Son Hut".
>
> Do you think he might have been one character off, and you chose to
> trip and skin your knee?

I didn't make the error. If any tripping or skinning was done, check
Len for blood or bruises.

> > I was never in the supply field.
>
> Please stay on topic.

You're forgetful. Len wrote of my being at a supply depot, moving
boxes.

> > > You
> > > started talking about a snack bar. Were you or were you not stationed
> > > at a snack bar?
> > >
> > That's been answered. This is the kind of crap you pulled with Ed Hare.
>
> You didn't bring up the words "snack bar" when Len talked of where you
> were stationed? I think you did.

I wrote nothing about being stationed at a snack bar. The problem is
your notorious reading comprehension problem.

> And leave Ed out of this. He's absent by his choice, not anything I
> did.

His choice was made over last encounter with you.

> > > > > QSL?
> > > >
> > > > Anyone who says this on the ham bands is a stupendous lid.
> > >
> > > Ahem, no license required to operate here.
> >
> > That's how Len got here.
>
> Then at which point did you confuse usenet with ham bands?

At no point did I confuse the two. As a matter of fact, the very point
that I made was Len is here writing about amateur radio rather than
being a participant in amateur radio.

> > > > > Getting back to the snack bar in Vietnam. Why you keep bringing it
> > > > > up? It must have been a significant part of your life while
> > > > > in-country.
> > > > >
> > > > > It's your reading comprehension thing again.
> > > >
> > > > So there was no snack bar???
> >
> > Why did you bring up a snack bar?

Reread the exchange and see if it comes to you.

> > > > > What did your orders say? Did they put you in a snack bar or an Air
> > > > > Base?
> > > > >
> > > > > The answers are there. Go back and attempt reading them.
> > > >
> > > > I'm not clairvoyant.
> > >
> > > Clairvoyant? You're not even coherent.
> >
> > Explain your "snack bar" comment.

Been there. Done that. Don't intend to do it again.

> > > You really need to learn to be more direct, and quit bringing up
> > > things that are off topic and confound the line of discussion.
> > >
> > > Go back to picking the flowers off the wallpaper, Brian.
> >
> > Clean up your "snack bar" mess first.

The amusing part of all this is that you likely think you're being
clever.

Dave K8MN

3827. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 23:27:39 UTC
From: Krell1215@NOSPAMyahoo.com
Message-ID: <b8kddb01j08@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 65965

In article <20030428165956.22069.00000402@mb-m12.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com says...
>
>>I recommend 146.520 plus 600.
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>>
>>
>
>Not a bad Idea Dan

A contingency from the W8AL group might have something to say about it, but everyone is a QRMer at Dayton, so take your chances.

3828. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 23:33:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EADBABB.9DC1E307@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65964

No CW Test wrote:
>
> >> > Look, Dave, Len said something about where you were
> >> > stationed.
> >>
> >> No, he didn't. I was never stationed at any place called
> >> "Tan Son Hut".
> >
> >Do you think he might have been one character off
> ...
> >?
> >
> Impossible.
>
> Len doesn't make mistakes.

He may make miscalculations. He likely thought his anti-League, anti-amateur radio, anti-children, anti-morse testing views would be embraced by some significant percentage of readers. He likely didn't count on his condescent, pontification and lack of interpersonal skills alienating a large number of the particpants in this forum. His reception has likely been somewhat cooler than the one he envisioned.

The jeers and tomatoes must make Len feel like Susan Sarandon at VFW convention.

Dave K8MN

3829. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-28 23:56:02 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428195602.21747.00000274@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 65966

Are you for real, What does the Canton Amateur Radio Club have to do with what goes on in Dayton, get real. But I tell you what. I will give all the W8AL Members who come up to me at the Hamfest a discount on the T shirts.

3830. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 00:03:18 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8kfg5doi1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65967

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030428183152.24076.00000319@mb-m27.aol.com...
> >Why is it that in ham radio once they bust loose from the madness of CB
they
> >keep wanting to go back to it? Help me here if you can.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> Dan I think what it amounts to is once a CBer always a CBer.

I was afraid of that...

Dan/W4NTI

3831. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 00:09:41 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428200941.26815.00000199@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 65968

>I was afraid of that...
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Dan I wanted to get me 1 of them there CBplusser Licenses, but the FCC said I would have to give up a real HAM licenses to get one.

3832. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 00:48:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EADCC31.966F95DB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65969

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EAB4AE7.F27BC86C@earthlink.net>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3EA976DD.B1FE97F4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > writes:
> > >

> > I used to love SS but haven't even given it a shot since returning to
> > the states. CQ WW (both modes) is still my favorite, followed by the CQ
> > 160 'test.
>
> I leave the big contests to those who know what they are doing. W3RV
> would translate that as "yer a wuss..."

The fun factor doesn't go down if you're antenna or power limited--only
the score goes down.

> We gotta do a road trip one of these years...do Dayton and pick you
> guys up on the way or somethin...

We'd have to host you for a night to allow you to regenerate before the
Hamvention. It'd be a great time to fire up the grill and the sauna.

> > > 2003 will be FD
> > > #36 for me.
> >
> > That's quite a run. I missed '71-'75 and '85-'01.
>
> You had good reasons to miss those! And as you said, some of those
> years "every day was Field Day"

The only African tour where that wasn't true was Botswana, where the
city power was on all of the time and one could safely drink the water
from the tap. Sometimes the swimming pool in the front yard was more
tempting than the pileups.

> > Pretty nice lash up. I'd like to try a vintage Field Day using a QSL 60
> > and the FB-7 or mebbe even the pre-war HRO.
>
> How many xtals ya got that would tolerate the QSL 60?

I actually have a handful of the round Bliley holders with the large
pins (and some adapters so they'll plug into the FT-243-style sockets).
W4JBP's (pre-war W9DGJ) 1941 homebrew rig which I now own is a QSL Sixty

on a larger chassis with the masonite front panel painted to look like
bakelite. Come to think of it, I could use that one and pair it up with
his SX-15 Sky Challenger. That might slow the rate down on FD.

> > > Whole thing was built in the case from a defunct National FB-7. Back then
> > >BAs
> > > were a dime a dozen. Betcha he wishes he'd left the FB-7 alone!
> >
> > Lord, yes!
>
> I shudder to think how much stuff was hacked up and/or tossed out in
> those days. Of course that was when they were looked upon as old junk
> and not worth the shelf space.
>
> Of course if nobody had hacked them up or tossed them out, they'd be
> all over the place, and very cheap.

I'd like that part. My dad used to know a jeweler who had a great line.
Pop showed him a ring and asked what it was worth. The answer was, "Am
I buying or am I selling?"

> > I love the old National stuff.
>
> You ever been to the AWA museum near Rochester?

No, I've only seen some of the AWA mags. The Jack Gray "History of
Wireless" museum is housed in the Cincinnati building which houses
WCET-TV (PBS) and WGUC (NPR) radio. I've visitied it a number of times.

> > I still run my SW-3 on a
> > homebrew supply but an OT sold me an original FB-7 supply a few years
> > back so I retired its homebrew power supply.
>
> I had an NC-173 for a number of years, paired up with a Viking 2/122.
> Nice AM setup, got it for almost nothing. They "needed work"... Sold
> the pair for a bit more than I paid, back in '98 or '99.
>
> It occurs to me that I actually own very few BA sets anymore, but lots
> of BA-type parts. Lessee...BC-342-N, BC-453, some test gear. Rest is
> homebrew or modern. If I want to do VFD it'll be with homebrew!

I made a replica of a single 210 job from a '29 or '30 issue of QST
while in Botswana. The parts came from one of W8MN's early transmitters
in the town of Hinton, WV. Andy had stored the old stuff in the Hinton
Ice plant along the New River. It flooded in '37 and when his widow
gave the parts, I had to scrub the river silt from them. There were
loads of brown beehive insulators, big Fleuron insulators, King and
Cardwell variables, the original copper tubing coils for 40 and 80 and
some appropriate knobs. Instead of a breadboard, I used a really pretty
piece of African mahogany for a base. I'd be almost afraid to put the
thing on the air.

Dave K8MN

3833. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 00:59:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EADCECD.AE5CD09B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 65970

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030427175245.20983.00000393@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>Date: 4/27/2003 2:33 PM Central Daylight Time
> >>Message-id: <20030427153315.18755.00000313@mb-m06.aol.com>

> I was never qualified to wear the blue rifle, never claimed that.

Neither did anyone else.

> What do we get from the Gang of Four in here? This is what -

> Herr Robust: "I was in Vietnam." No details, no dates, no
> descriptions, nothing else. Just he was "in Vietnam."

Wasn't it clear to you, Len? I was there in uniform during the war. I
was in the Air Force. I operated radio equipment. I drew combat pay.
I never visited a supply depot or moved boxes.

> Reverend Jimmie: Null personal comment...he didn't serve in
> any US military branch at any time...but he feels compelled to
> be the military expert in equipment, doctrine, training and isn't
> hesitant to lecture others on what they should know or do.

You've never been a radio amateur but it doesn't stop you from
commenting on amateur radio matters.

> Perfect description of the ultimate REMF.

No, Len. That title belongs to you. Did you draw combat pay during
your Korean War action from Japan?

> Katapult Kellie: Lots of Tuff Tawk about shooting bears from an
> aircraft carrier but that's it. Never served in the US military, any
> branch...but won't hesitate to shoot off his mouth without ammo.
> Says he was sponsored by USN intelligence...which is an insult
> to USN and M.I. everywhere.

Everything you don't know seems an insult to someone, somewhere.

> I have NO experience in lying, cheating, gross exaggeration, or doing
> errors by deliberate omission...

I wouldn't be too hasty, Leonard. Such claims could have you Googled to death.

Dave K8MN

3834. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 02:08:23 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030428220823.04869.00000428@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 65971

From K4YZ:
> You're being PRESSURED to NOT go to Dayton, Vipul?
>
> Sounds to ME like you're in a cult, alright, but it's NOT Amateur Radio.

No, just some people that see Hams as weird. From my observations, I cannot dispute that.

>Once you have earned your degree in the field,
>it's yours unless removed for cause or surrendered cor cancellation.

One is still in their profession if they take a temporary leave. I am switching to another field from now onwards, so I am no longer an EE.

> I would have won with a 10 minute bet.

I was going for something amateur radio related bet:
In 4 yrs, event X will happen or I will do task Y.

I dont want to start club anymore. Pointless since I am no longer an EE. Also, I don't want to learn Morse code.

>>I have another event I have to go to in May. It is a some kind of ceremony
>>and
>>some things must be followed. For example, the ceremony must be done facing
>>the
>>East direction.
>
> Are you embarrased to be Muslim, Vipul? Can't say the words?

I didn't say I believe. I just said I will <have to> attend.

3835. Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 04:15:12 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8lr93$bags9$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 65979

Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die, so I am trying to think of some other threads or come up with other threads from others I have heard discussing such matters.....

So, here goes the first one..... Should call sign districts change to reflect census data like other things when the census rolls around like congressional districts etc.?

Discuss.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3836. Re: Repeater Autopatch vs. Telemarketer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 04:19:04 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0304290400560.1774@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 65972

On Mon, 28 Apr 2003, Robert Casey wrote:
> "D. Stussy" wrote:
> > On Mon, 28 Apr 2003, Robert Casey wrote:
> > > "D. Stussy" wrote:
> > > > In the exact situation I am thinking of, the repeater answers the phone by
> > > > saying (synthesized voice), "This is the <club-callsign> amateur radio club
> > > > repeater autopatch," then waits for about 30 seconds for a command before the
> > > > reverse patch ringout on the radio. No audio is gated to or from the radio
> > > > side until the reverse patch answer command is input. The speech board doesn't
> > > > have a DVR nor the vocabulary to tell telemarketers to hang up up front.
> > > >
> > > > Comments?
> > >
> > > I had heard that the FCC didn't like it if a caller (possibly a non licensed
> > > person) does something that causes a ham transmitter to transmit
> > > (even if his voice never reaches the air). I would expect that each
> > > member of the repeater club would have a password that he would
> > > key in via the touch tone pad on the phone. And when a valid password
> > > is entered, that only then is the repeater transmitter keyed up.
> >
> > Why isn't that what I said: The control op. answers the phone (by entry of the
> > code)? However, that in no way prevents the fact that the incoming call IS
> > from a telemarketer....
>
> How does the control operator know when an incoming call is happening
> unless the repeater transmitter does something? I thought that was
> the part the FCC didn't like, that a non licensed caller can cause a ham
> transmitter to key up (even though his voice doesn't get thru). As if
> some kids with a scanner and who somehow know the phone number
> decide to have a little fun by kerchunking the repeater via the phone?
> Maybe I'm worrying about nothing.....

Because the system indicates that it has an incoming call. Yes, that does
cause the repeater to transmit a short message (voice or tone) - but remember
that repeaters are permitted to be under AUTOMATIC control. As long as that
act is identified (within 10 minutes) and cannot lock the transmitter on for
more than 3 minutes (97.213(b)), I don't see a problem within the regulations.
Since the landline side itself can't talk out until a code is entered, it meets
the protection requirement in 97.213(c). The problem I'm initally asked about
is when the landline side does start talking (because a control op. has entered
the code to answer the patch), the transmission quickly becomes a prohibited
one (due to content) because of the telemarketer - and what to do about that.

In the configuration I suggested above, it's hardly a kerchunk, because that
would require the caller to call back to make the next key-up, and by

operation, those would be practically a full minute apart. That's not in any sort several "quick-keys" in succession.

> > > You could install one of those telemarketer zappers you see at radio
> > > shack....
> >
> > Why? That costs money ($40 on the average)! :-)
> >
> > The repeater controller is capable of generating the tones itself. I simply
> > didn't know that telemarketers equipment looked for the tones and which
> > sequence to use. [They weren't documented in my reference book which lists all
> > the various tones for coins and other telco mischief.] However, that still will
> > not kill a telemarketer who is calling in person (i.e. not using his demon
> > dialer) - for he will immedately hear the voice after the tones, recognize that
> > it's not a phone company message, and stay on anyway.
> >
> > From other responses, the best sequence to use is apparently called the "no
> > circuit" response: 985.2Hz for 380ms, 1428.5/380, and 1776.7/380. However,
> > the "vacant circuit" response might also be valid: 985.2/380, 1370.6/274, and
> > 1776.7/380.
>
> I took a look with Cool Edit Pro my wav file, and it looks like 985Hz/274, 1428/380,
> and about1810Hz duration 380msec. Not 1776Hz, so maybe my wav file is incorrect?...

That sequence more closely resembles the one labelled "reorder." What that means is beyond me. The other basic choices were labelled "no circuit," "vacant circuit," and "operator intercept."

> I should try dialing a disconnected number with the PC's modem and have Cool Edit
> capture the sound. Then look at it like I did my wav file. Let me know if that
> would be useful or not.... Now to find a disconnected number without annoying
> people with valid numbers.... Maybe if I make an error like not dialing a 1 in
> front of an area code? But that might not get me the right sequence.

3837. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 04:21:04 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8lr94$bags9$7@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 65980

Might as well... the hams sure aren't using it. I hear more cordless
telephones there than anything else.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> >The new bands better serve CBs
> >original intentions without all of the inherent problems. It would also
> >allow FCC to relax RF ampl rules imposed on us.
>
> The Japanese have a neat little 900Mhz "CB" service that we should
> emulate. Take out 2 Mhz of the present 33cm band and load it with
low-power
> (10 w or less), 6.25Khz channels.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
>

3838. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 04:23:29 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8lr95$bags9$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 65981

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EADB154.B307C0CD@crosslink.net...
> WA8ULX wrote:
> >
> > > The new bands better serve CBs
> > >original intentions without all of the inherent problems.
> >
> > BS, all that would do would be shift the problem to another area.
Secondly what
> > makes you think Millions of CBers would leave 11 Meters they are already
> > operate Illegal.
>
> FCC's main problem was (is?) TVI from overamplified CBs used to "shoot
> skip" - a problem not likely to occur where "skip" is impossible.
>
> They'd leave for the same reason most of them avoid our 10M band;
> because hams can and do DF them then turn them in.
>
> K3DWW

We can "turn them in" all we want, but until the FCC actually bothers to get
serious about it, I doubt much would happen. There are thousands of cases
that could be dealt with but aren't, I am sure of that.... Most likely the
budgetary concerns are even worse with Dubya in there since the economy has
backslid in the past 18-24 months.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3839. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 04:28:35 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8lr97$bags9$9@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 65982

"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EAD630D.27CAFD57@crosslink.net...
> Somebody wrote
> > >
> > > >Seems to me that one of the biggest headaches FCC has in the area of
> > > >noncommercial radio is the issue of freebanders and those who abuse
cb.
> > > >
>
> Comes from misunderstanding human nature. People will always "hop-up"
> their cars, radios, what ever; especially if the Government forbids it.
> It's as American as apple pie, speeding and mod'ing your ham rig to
> transmit out of band. The problem is two sided.

And it is how you use it that matters..... I can modify my scanners to pick up cell phones. No big deal. It is how or if I use that information that is the key problem. And I sure am not gonna blab around if I did modify my scanners.

>
> First, 1000s of CBrs find themselves crowded into 40 channels.

Good... serves them right. Thank god we don't have that in ham radio..... lucky to find a dozen people out there except for contests.

>
> Second, CBs are far too easily mod'd to work outside the band. Any
> 40-chan PLL CB is naturally a 64 (or 128 or ...) channel CB.

And ham rigs are not too much different.... They can be "modded" as well.

>
> IMHO the answer is to reallocate the 11m band back to us, this over a
> period of say 5 years to be fair. The new bands better serve CBs
> original intentions without all of the inherent problems. It would also
> allow FCC to relax RF ampl rules imposed on us.
>

The challenge there is to make the band undesirable to the existing CB'ers. I still think every one of us should start using the band, following existing laws for that band, and take it over by mere usage.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.

.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3840. Re: Repeater Autopatch vs. Telemarketer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 04:39:54 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8lr98$bags9$10@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 65983

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.55.0304282003500.1601@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Mon, 28 Apr 2003, Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > Bull.... where the hell is the control op for the repeater?? What, a
person
> > is expected to carry around a 3x5 card with that message???
>
> The control operator is the one who commanded the patch to answer (by
entry of
> the appropriate command code). He is the one on the radio side of the
patch.
>

The control op or trustee has the ability to shut down the call as well as the repeater if deemed necessary if any other undesireable or problematic operation. He/she is ultimately responsible for the use and operation of the repeater.
For example, the closest repeater to me is the W8KEA repeater. Along with the trustee, there are 3 others that have the access codes to the repeater and entry authorization to the site where the repeater is located if there is a problem.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3841. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 05:30:44 UTC
From: Ray Lamb AG4DR <lamboray@netrox.net>
Message-ID: <c_nra.5385$C5.5342@fe01.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 65973

What is a CBplusser?

--
Ray Lamb AG4DR
From Sunny Fort Lauderdale
"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030428150044.16121.00000152@mb-m25.aol.com...
> Would like to set up a time and a Net at Dayton, for the Hamfest. Do we
have
> any one that would like to run the NET, preferable someone Local.
> The Net could be a place where all CBplussers could check in, and us real
Hams
> could listen and laugh at them. Maybe we could even use the Net for a way
to
> setup meetings for us real Hams to meet the CBplussers.
> I will also be selling"Down With CBplussers" T Shirts at Dayton, if you
dont
> see me in the crowd, you can call me on 449.98 and I will give you my
location
> at that time, so you can Purchase your Shirt. And if we get the NET setup,
I
> will also give my location on it.
> Hope to see you all at Dayton, and bring lots of Money for your own
Shirts.

3842. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 09:12:28 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns936C34F80ECEAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 65974

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in
news:20030428150929.21264.00000373@mb-m15.aol.com:

>>Subject: Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)
>>From: Vito vito@crosslink.net
>>Date: 4/28/2003 12:21 PM Central Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <3EAD630D.27CAFD57@crosslink.net>
>
>>First, 1000s of CBrs find themselves crowded into 40 channels.
>
> If they were used correctly and within the scope of Part 95,
> they'd be far
> more utilitarian.
>
>>Predictable, the more enterprising among them discovered the almost
>>empty (by comparison) freq's between their band and our 10M band. And
>>who here has never heard the siren call of DX?
>
> Illegal is illegal. It's illegal for a reason, the reason being
> that
> there are other radio services in that part of the spectrum who are now
> unable to use those frequencies due to all the trash.
>
>>Second, CBs are far too easily mod'd to work outside the band. Any
>>40-chan PLL CB is naturally a 64 (or 128 or ...) channel CB.
>
> So...we go back to crystal controlled radios with sealed "modules"
> that
> prevent opening and "reversing" the crystals to go out-of-band?
>
> Just because something can be MADE illegal means it must?
>
>>IMHO the answer is to reallocate the 11m band back to us, this over a
>>period of say 5 years to be fair.
>
> I say we put 10KW wideband noise generators on there for a year to
> force
> the abandonment of that part of the spectrum first.
>
>>The new bands better serve CBs
>>original intentions without all of the inherent problems. It would also
>>allow FCC to relax RF ampl rules imposed on us.
>
> The Japanese have a neat little 900Mhz "CB" service that we should

> emulate. Take out 2 Mhz of the present 33cm band and load it with
> low-power (10 w or less), 6.25Khz channels.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
>
>

Europe has CB on 934 MHz, although they also have FM CB on 27 MHz, and some EU countries allow AM as well on some channels.

Then again the US already has GMRS and FRS on 462 MHz, and I understand that Canada and Australia have some form of CB on 462 as well, and yet they also still have 27 MHz.

The trouble is, 27 MHz will always be cheaper than UHF. This is why I don't think it will go away, and also why it attracts the worst sort of person (as well as some decent people too, don't forget). UHF isn't really in the budget if you flip burgers at McDonald's. The middle classes choose UHF already, and the blue collar masses select the cheaper alternative.

All the same, the Japanese UHF CB falls inside the US 902 MHz ham band, and making the same CB allocation in the US at 905-906 (I think that's where it is?) has some merit. It would allow unlicenced people a spot to talk to hams if the rules were made to allow it. Just don't expect it to take any share away from 27 MHz. Instead it would compete with 462.

73 de N3KIP

3843. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 10:06:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304290206.518dcce5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65975

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EADB90F.8B81DA6A@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EAB50D5.8FE12384@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA88AD9.BC4BC6C9@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA7E71E.C3FD13F1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA74120.60BE136D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > > > > Look, Dave, Len said something about where you were stationed.
> > > >
> > > > No, he didn't. I was never stationed at any place called "Tan Son Hut".
> > >
> > > Do you think he might have been one character off, and you chose to
> > > trip and skin your knee?
> >
> > I didn't make the error. If any tripping or skinning was done, check
> > Len for blood or bruises.

I think you're not being truthful.

> > > I was never in the supply field.
> > >
> > > Please stay on topic.
> >
> > You're forgetful. Len wrote of my being at a supply depot, moving
> > boxes.

And you wrote of a snack bar. Now you deny it.

> > > > You
> > > > started talking about a snack bar. Were you or were you not stationed
> > > > at a snack bar?
> > > >
> > > > That's been answered. This is the kind of crap you pulled with Ed Hare.

> >
> > You didn't bring up the words "snack bar" when Len talked of where you
> > were stationed? I think you did.
>
> I wrote nothing about being stationed at a snack bar. The problem is
> your notorious reading comprehension problem.

It's in Google. You're making yourself notorious.

> > And leave Ed out of this. He's absent by his choice, not anything I
> > did.
>
> His choice was made over last encounter with you.

It was still his choice.

> > > > > > QSL?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Anyone who says this on the ham bands is a stupendous lid.
> > > > >
> > > > > Ahem, no license required to operate here.
> > > >
> > > That's how Len got here.
> >
> > Then at which point did you confuse usenet with ham bands?
>
> At no point did I confuse the two. As a matter of fact, the very point
> that I made was Len is here writing about amateur radio rather than
> being a participant in amateur radio.

Dave, do try to stay on topic. You were commenting on something I
said here on rrap, not something that Len said. And you confused it
with operating on the ham bands.

> > > > > > Getting back to the snack bar in Vietnam. Why you keep bringing it
> > > > > > up? It must have been a significant part of your life while
> > > > > > in-country.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > It's your reading comprehension thing again.
> > > > >
> > > > > So there was no snack bar???
> > >
> > Why did you bring up a snack bar?
>
> Reread the exchange and see if it comes to you.

No thanks. I'm good.

> > > > > > What did your orders say? Did they put you in a snack bar or an Air
> > > > > > Base?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > The answers are there. Go back and attempt reading them.
> > > > >

> > > > I'm not clairvoyant.
> > >
> > > Clairvoyant? You're not even coherent.
> >
> > Explain your "snack bar" comment.
>
> Been there. Done that. Don't intend to do it again.

Will you at least admit that it was your comment, and not mine or
Len's?

> > > > You really need to learn to be more direct, and quit bringing up
> > > > things that are off topic and confound the line of discussion.
> > >
> > > Go back to picking the flowers off the wallpaper, Brian.
> >
> > Clean up your "snack bar" mess first.
>
> The amusing part of all this is that you likely think you're being
> clever.

I didn't make the mess. Its yours to clean up.

3844. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 10:08:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304290208.7c00eef4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65976

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EADBABB.9DC1E307@earthlink.net>...

> The jeers and tomatoes must make Len feel like Susan Sarandon at VFW
> convention.
>
> Dave K8MN

Maybe Ted Turner will marry her.

3845. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 10:28:30 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAD3CC0E.17D7E%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 65977

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> That's nice. I posted in public, not private. (snip)
>
> There has been considerable geographic bigotry exhibited
> by others in here. My "lecture" (as you quaintly put it)
> is to THEM, not you.

And I also wanted readers to know I'm just as familiar with California as you are - that I'm not involved in the "geographic bigotry" you describe.

> Of course. "Small, isolated" because it didn't happen at
> the center of the known universe called the east coast.
> Uh, huh.

Of course, in spite of what I've said, you're still going to try hard to suggest exactly that anyway.

> Forgive me, your royal whatever. I've only seen emergency
> personnel use a lot of different ways to communicate in
> "small, isolated" events. Out here in that foreign territory
> that is "small and isolated," we don't rely solely on the
> telephone system OR amateur radio for prime communications.

No single system, the telephone or whatever, is solely relied on. Instead, communications involves all that is available. As systems fail, more and more traffic is carried by the remaining systems. For example, leading up to disaster, area disaster personnel spend hours on the phone making arrangements. As the phones fail (fail as a reliable means of communications), personnel fall back on other communications systems. As parts of those systems fail, a still larger burden is placed on the remaining systems. Soon, since the very last remaining systems are limited to only the most critical communications, more and more lower priority communications is cut off.

> That's nice. I'm sure that Canada or Mexico can hop to
> aid next time a hurricane strikes the Pacific coast.
> Just think, ambulances all the way from Vancouver, BC,
> summoned by ham radio net!

Don't be silly, Len. My point is that larger cities are often called on to help neighboring communities, placing an additional burden on their resources. For example, in the example I gave, Myrtle Beach ended up helping smaller towns and communities throughout the county. Since Myrtle Beach did not plan on that, the additional burden on resources was substantial.

> Of course. Please explain what happened to the Joint Chiefs,
> the President, and the news media who seem to differ on
> your "explanation." (snip) Air Guard units steal planes in
> the USA to fly off-shore? Of course. All Guard units are
> under-prepared.

Len, I gave you the facts based on almost 40 years living and working around the military. One of my wife's last jobs with the military was scheduling training for Army National Guard personnel joining active duty units in the SETAF command area (Southern Europe and Africa). She did the same thing while working at HQ USAREUR (HQ, United States Army Europe) for the Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans, Operations, and Security. Some Guard units are called to active duty as a unit. But, in general, most Guard personnel instead join existing active duty units when called to active duty. Likewise, Guard units generally do not maintain war fighting materials at the local Guard facility, nor do they maintain all the equipment they might use during war at those facilities. Instead, only what is needed for peacetime activities and training is maintained at most facilities.

> According to your "criterion," I couldn't possibly have done
> anything "useful." I don't have an amateur radio license. I
> used my commercial license.

The fact that you've used your commercial license to help others is wonderful. I hope you continue to do so. Heck, I have a few personal projects you could help me on. Of course, since I'm sure you don't want to burden yourself with my personal projects, the organization I'm a member of (USCGA) certainly could use your help instead. If you're interested, I can have someone contact you within a few days.

Of course, on a personal note, I do wonder why you spend so much time in the Amateur Radio newsgroups if you have no real interest in ham radio. Passing a ham license exam should be child's play for you, which makes me wonder why you haven't done so.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3846. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 11:50:44 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAD3DF54.17D80%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 65978

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> Complain to the news media. Don't start whining
> about "all commercial facilities FAIL during an
> emergency." (snip)

I would never make such a claim, Len. What I said is that commercial facilities are unreliable during and in the hours immediately after a disaster because employees evacuate, towers fall, stations go off the air because of power failures, and so on.

> Sorry, Dwight, you get a failing grade in the ham emergency
> mantra. You are supposed to say "commercial communications
> always fails during an emergency!" (snip)

A substantial percentage of those systems do fail - fail as a reliable means of communications. That's what we're talking about here. The issue is not whether some remain on the air after a disaster. Instead, the issue is whether those systems can be relied on when it comes to disaster planning.

> Of course all radio amateurs are trained and experienced
> in erecting antennas in storm and wind conditions, right?

Far more so than most dispatchers at a 911 call center, or most personnel at disaster staging areas, or most personnel at disaster command centers, or most employees at a hospital, or most volunteers at shelters, or most volunteers at Red Cross aid stations, and so on.

> I was being SARCASTIC, Dwight. How often have you heard
> hams say "the cell phones always FAIL!" in emergencies?
>
> Do they "fail?" No. They get overloaded.

They fail as a reliable means of communications. Note the key words in that - "reliable means of communications." When we're talking about disaster planning and disaster communications, reliability is the critical issue.

> Evidently you know some amateur radio groups that have
> "antenna kits" ready and waiting for such emergencies,
> "kits" of ready-to-put-up antennas, available at quick
> notice. I've not heard of those. Please describe who
> or which group has them and what those kits contain,
> bands, etc.

Every disaster oriented group, from ARES to the local civil defense office here in this small town, has their own guidelines and recommendations for how members should prepare. For example, chapter seven of the ARES Emergency

Coordinator's Manual contains guidance on both communications (radio equipment, etc) and personal (hygiene, etc) preparedness. Member's manuals contain similar material, but I don't have a copy of those anymore to give chapter and verse quotes. ARES Coordinators then work with local disaster personnel to establish frequencies, bands, equipment, and other such preparedness planning.

> Military humvees CAN go cross-country, Dwight. Most
> military field vehicles can.

As I said, by the time the National Guard arrived, a major roadway was cleared of traffic.

> Radio amateurs have to learn that they must INTEGRATE
> with the rest of the emergency groups that already exist.
> They have to work WITH them, not as some separate, stand-
> alone organization. Few amateurs want to do that
> according to the stories in here and elsewhere...the
> olde-tymers in ham radio want to be the "bosses"
> unilaterally.

Len, perhaps if you read up on the actual programs in place, you might realize that is not the case. For example, the ARES Emergency Coordinator's Manual exhaustively covers interaction with other agencies. This includes establishing "a viable working relationship with all federal, state, county, city governments and private agencies" and working to set up "mutual respect and understanding and a coordination mechanism for the good of the public." The ARES member's manuals covers individual interaction with the individuals in those agencies.

> Haven't you heard the patriotic slogan, "ham radio is
> a SERVICE?" (snip)
>
> According to the output of the Gang of Four in here,
> copying the Word from Newington, amateur radio is NOT
> just a hobby...it is a vital service to the nation,
> indespensible in times of peace or war, able to operate
> when all the commercial communications fail.

Ham radio is both a hobby and a service. One does not have to exclude the other.

> Of course hams did exemplary work over and above anyone else.
> I wouldn't expect any other phrasing in here.

Stop trying to endlessly put words into my mouth, Len. I've never talked about anything "over and beyond anyone else."

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!

-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3847. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 12:19:42 UTC
From: Krell1215@NOSPAMyahoo.com
Message-ID: <b8lqku01i4t@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 65984

In article <c_nra.5385$C5.5342@fe01.atl2.webusenet.com>, lamboray@netrox.net says...
>
>What is a CBplusser?
>
>--
>Ray Lamb AG4DR

They are a figment of Babbling Brucie's imagination.

3848. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 12:56:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030429085638.16083.00000315@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 65985

>Subject: Re: Dayton Hamfest?
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/28/2003 9:08 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030428220823.04869.00000428@mb-m05.aol.com>

>From K4YZ:
>> You're being PRESSURED to NOT go to Dayton, Vipul?
>>
>> Sounds to ME like you're in a cult, alright, but it's NOT Amateur
>Radio.
>
>No, just some people that see Hams as weird. From my observations, I cannot
>dispute that.

Considering your "knowledge base" of Amateur Radio, I don't doubt this.
You've not demonstrated a very horough understanding of what it's about.

>>Once you have earned your degree in the field,
>>it's yours unless removed for cause or surrendered cor cancellation.
>
>One is still in their profession if they take a temporary leave. I am
>switching
>to another field from now onwards, so I am no longer an EE.

Have you returned your diploma to the college from which you allegedly
graduated?

If not, you will still be an "EE". you may not WORK as one, but it's
still there.

>> I would have won with a 10 minute bet.
>
>I was going for something amateur radio related bet:
>In 4 yrs, event X will happen or I will do task Y.

Uh huh.

>I dont want to start club anymore. Pointless since I am no longer an EE.
>Also,
>I don't want to learn Morse code.

Let's see....You don't want to be an EE anymore...You hate Amateur
Radio...You don't want to learn Morse Code...You think that any gathering of
Amateurs is meant to keep you from meeting "preety fems" or to conscript you
into a cult...You insist you want to commune with others who are also
interested in "experimenting" or "homebrewing", but you don't want to do
anything to create the circumstances in which you can accomplish that.

All I see in here is what you "can't do", "won't do", or "don't do". Not a single word of "can do", "will do" or "want to do". You are in need of some really potent mood elevators, Vippy. Try to not be such a loser.

>>>I have another event I have to go to in May. It is a some kind of ceremony
>>>and
>>>some things must be followed. For example, the ceremony must be done facing
>>>the
>>>East direction.
>>
>> Are you embarrased to be Muslim, Vipul? Can't say the words?
>
>I didn't say I believe. I just said I will <have to> attend.

Ohhhh! I see! Just like you "support" Amateur Radio, you SAY you support it, but then when it comes down to putting some action behind it, you're just a lot of hot air.

There's nothing wrong with being Muslim, Vippy. Unfortunately right now Islam is smeared with the murderous acts of Osama bin Laden, Saddam Hussein, and such historical characters as Ayatollah Kohmeini. Christianity has it's share of idiots, thieves and charlatans too. We call them "TV Evangelists" Jim and Tammy Bakker, Jimmy Swaggert, etc. Some are even meglomaniac murderers, ie: Jim Jones.

Do you not believe in the Five Pillars? If not, don't go and pretend. It's a lie if you do.

Steve, K4YZ

3849. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 13:22:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030429092210.28067.00000240@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 65986

>They are a figment of Babbling Brucie's imagination.
>

Krell is a good example

3850. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 13:29:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030429092937.16083.00000317@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 65987

>Subject: Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/28/2003 3:15 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030428161508.18775.00000384@mb-m02.aol.com>

>> Where did YOU fight? When was your CIB (Combat Infantry Badge) awarded?
>
>>Do you rate the basic award or award with wreath?
>
> I just asked a question.
>
> I was never qualified to wear the blue rifle, never claimed that.

No, you only insinuate that you are somehow qualified to make judgements
on what one person's military career is "worthy" and anothers was wasted or
insignificant.

>I gave explicit details of where I was assigned in the US Army and...(SNIP)

Yada Yada Yada.

Here's where Lennie goes into one of his "I Did Better Than You" rants
over military service:

>Steamy Stalker: "I was in seven hostile actions." No details,
> no dates, no descriptions, nothing. He was in "seven hostile
> actions." His first discharge was Medical...later "amended"
> to "honorable."

Sorry, Lennie. It was Honorable from the very beginning. And you ahve no
need to know the actions I was involved in. Why should I tell you? I do wish
you'd get your act right.

> Herr Robust: "I was in Vietnam." No details, no dates, no
> descriptions, nothing else. Just he was "in Vietnam."

Why does he need to validate this to you? He's given more than enough
information to validate his claims. And not one attempt to embellish his
duties at the expense of American KIA's.

>Reverend Jimmie: Null personal comment...he didn't serve in
> any US military branch at any time...but he feels compelled to
> be the military expert in equipment, doctrine, training and isn't
> hesitant to lecture others on what they should know or do.
> Perfect description of the ultimate REMF.

I love it when you go "Pot/Kettle/Black" on us, Lennie. You always insist
it's your Constitutional right to be arrogant and assinine in this forum even

though you are not licensed in nor a participant in any way, shape of form of Amateur Radio.

Yet when someone effectively challenges YOUR knowldege on matters military, YOU feel compelled to try and dismiss their comments because they aren't aor weren't "in" the military.

Sheeeesh.

>Katapult Kellie: Lots of Tuff Tawk about shooting bears from an
> aircraft carrier but that's it. Never served in the US military, any
> branch...but won't hesitate to shoot off his mouth without ammo.
> Says he was sponsored by USN intelligence...which is an insult
> to USN and M.I. everywhere.

No more than your frequent catapult shots of verbal dung are embarrasing to REAL EE's and "radio professionals", Your Scumminess. And I've never seen Kelly say anything he couldn't back up or could be verified by some intrepid investigating.

That you're too stupid or ignorant to find out on your own is tribute to the kind of loser you are.

>> Or are you yet again trying to present yourself as some kind of
>"expert"
>>on yet another field of human endeavor for which you have no practical
>>experience yourself?
>
> I've had over 50 years IN radio, Steamy.

Not in AMATEUR RADIO you haven't, Smoky. (As in blowing smoke...AGAIN...)

>I can design them, build them,
> test them, evaluate them, fix them if they become inoperative and, yes,
> operate them.

Only as long as they fall into Part 15, 18 or 95, or you are "operating" as an employee of a radio station license holder, Lennie.

Ohh...By the way...I can do all of those too. Didn't require 15 years of night school to do, either.

AND...I have an FCC Station License under which I CAN operate them!

>Hands-on experience, tube burns and RF arc burns,
> with the best DX of a station ON the moon.

Gee, Lennie, I've worked DX >>VIA<< the moon. With my own station, without supervision...Imagine that...

>In military service,
> commercial service, and some government service...all with enough
> evidence to stand up in any court, plus in-person testimony from
> witnesses.

Witnesses? Stevie Wonder, Ray Charles and Jeff Healy?

>I have NO experience in lying, cheating, gross exaggeration, or doing
> errors by deliberate omission as you do in here about your personal
> or amateur radio "experiences."

Yes you do, Lennie. YOU may not be willing to accept it, but it's been
PROVED that you have by more than one person...Actually, by more than a dozen.
Pathological liars generally DO beleive what they say, even though it's
obviously incorrect.

>> I just think you're a putz.
>
> You MUST think that. You don't have a lot of experience. You LIE
> and exaggerate beyond reasonable bounds.

You ARE a putz, Lennie.

>You MUST do the Tuff Tawk thing because that is all you can present
> in any arguments on subjects. You don't know the subjects, so you
> do the personal attack thing with insults and name-calling. That seems
> to give you self-esteem, but only from bullying others, pushing them
> around. You appear to love bullying and pushing others around.

I am not "bullying" or "pushing others around", Lennie. I read what you
say, compare it against either (a) what I know to be true or (b) against what
you have said in other posts, and then rub your nose in it.

You ARE a liar. This has been archived in USENET for years.

You DO denigrate and humiliate others for your own entertainment when they
show the least amount of emerity in adressing yuor rants.

You ARE profane and irresponsible. Twenty-plus referals to Jim Miccolis
as a "bullshit artist" in one post is a prime example.

>You aren't Yiddish, don't know that ethnic language or what the words
> mean. You use them without thinking, hoping they have the desired
> effect. They don't. They reflect back on you, not on anyone else.

I am NOT Yiddish...Yes, I DO know what certain ethnic phrases mean, and I
DO use the word PUTZ when refering to you.

You have yet to conduct yourself in any manner that would make me re-think
that as inappropriate or inaccurate.

>This outright stalking of individuals makes your image worse, not
> better.

This is a public forum, Lennie. Nothing I have said here is covert,
clandestine or intended to deceive.

You, however, continue to post here even though you have openly admitted
you have no licensure or vested interest in being a licensed Amateur.

Who do you think a judge would say is stalking who? Where will all the headers lead if I pull up the posts by "MegHz" and several other anonymous posters in here, Lennie?

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

3851. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 13:38:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030429093833.16083.00000318@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 65988

>Subject: Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton
>From: "Ray Lamb AG4DR" lamboray@netrox.net
>Date: 4/29/2003 12:30 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <c_nra.5385$C5.5342@fe01.atl2.webusenet.com>

>What is a CBplusser?

Hi Ray and I hope you brought your Asbestos Undies if you hang with us for long!

A "CBPlusser" is a derogatory term used by one of the more profane, immature and basically bigoted regulars to this newsgripe named Bruce Beynon, WA8ULX.

Bruce, originally from Canton Ohio and as of late from some podunk parish in Louisiana, is one of those idiots who, by reason of profanity and poor gene pool reserves, finds it necessary to make inflammatory comments about pre-Restructuring Technician class licensees.

Engage him at your own discretion. He is, to his credit, an equal opportunity bigot. He hates everyone and everything.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3852. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 13:40:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030429094046.16083.00000319@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 65989

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/28/2003 6:33 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EADBABB.9DC1E307@earthlink.net>

>The jeers and tomatoes must make Len feel like Susan Sarandon at VFW
>convention.

She was my favorite actress until recent events. Ever see her in "White Castle"...?!?! Wheeew....I couldn't stand up for an hour!

Steve, K4YZ

3853. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 13:41:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030429094145.16083.00000320@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 65990

>Subject: Re: YI approved with written permission
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 4/29/2003 5:08 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0304290208.7c00eef4@posting.google.com>

>Maybe Ted Turner will marry her.

I think Ted learned...But I hear Jane's giving her the eye!

SR

3854. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 14:24:54 UTC
From: Ray Lamb AG4DR <lamboray@netrox.net>
Message-ID: <AOvra.6034$C5.1184@fe01.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 65991

OK Thanks for info. Have a nice day all. I will stay clear of this
newsgroup.

--
Ray Lamb AG4DR
From Sunny Fort Lauderdale
"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030429093833.16083.00000318@mb-m25.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton
> >From: "Ray Lamb AG4DR" lamboray@netrox.net
> >Date: 4/29/2003 12:30 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <c_nra.5385$C5.5342@fe01.atl2.webusenet.com>
>
> >What is a CBplusser?
>
> Hi Ray and I hope you brought your Asbestos Undies if you hang with
us for
> long!
>
> A "CBPlusser" is a derogatory term used by one of the more profane,
> immature and basically bigoted regulars to this newsgripe named Bruce
Beynon,
> WA8ULX.
>
> Bruce, originally from Canton Ohio and as of late from some podunk
parish
> in Louisiana, is one of those idiots who, by reason of profanity and poor
gene
> pool reserves, finds it necessary to make inflammatory comments about
> pre-Restructuring Technician class licensees.
>
> Engage him at your own discretion. He is, to his credit, an equal
> opportunity bigot. He hates everyone and everything.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>

3855. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 14:43:17 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030429104317.26511.00000215@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65992

>A "CBPlusser" is a derogatory term used by one of the more profane,
>immature and basically bigoted regulars to this newsgripe named Bruce Beynon,
>WA8ULX.

And proud of it.

>Bruce, originally from Canton Ohio and as of late from some podunk parish

Wrong again, Bruce is not from Canton, he use to live there but not from
there. An no he did not move fron Canton to La, he moved from Albq,NM to La.
Come on Nursie BOY get your stuff straight.

>He is, to his credit, an equal
>opportunity bigot. He hates everyone and everything.
>
>73

And proud of it,wrong again Nurseie Boy, I dont hate everybody just a select
few.

3856. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 14:44:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030429104418.26511.00000216@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 65993

>OK Thanks for info. Have a nice day all. I will stay clear of this
>newsgroup.
>
>--
>Ray Lamb AG4DR

Stevie look what you did, you chased another one away.

3857. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 15:40:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8m6dg$8i3$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 65994

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b8lr93$bags9$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die, so I
am
> trying to think of some other threads or come up with other threads from
> others I have heard discussing such matters.....
>
>
> So, here goes the first one..... Should call sign districts change to
> reflect census data like other things when the census rolls around like
> congressional districts etc.?
>
>
> Discuss.
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>

No

Dan/W4NTI

3858. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 16:36:30 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304290836.6f327ddd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65996

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EADCC31.966F95DB@earthlink.net>...
(N2EY wrote):

> > I leave the big contests to those who know what they are doing. W3RV
> > would translate that as "yer a wuss..."
>
> The fun factor doesn't go down if you're antenna or power limited--only
> the score goes down.

Agreed! But considering what my limited setups have been able to do in
domestic 'tests, I'm pretty happy to focus on them. Couple years back
I was able to do second-place A-power in EPA, which is not a small or
noncompetitive section. Last two years the K2 has done a decent job.

> > We gotta do a road trip one of these years...do Dayton and pick you
> > guys up on the way or somethin...
>
> We'd have to host you for a night to allow you to regenerate before the
> Hamvention. It'd be a great time to fire up the grill and the sauna.

mmmmmmmmmmm.....sauna.....

> > > > 2003 will be FD
> > > > #36 for me.
> > >
> > > That's quite a run. I missed '71-'75 and '85-'01.
> >
> > You had good reasons to miss those! And as you said, some of those
> > years "every day was Field Day"
>
> The only African tour where that wasn't true was Botswana, where the
> city power was on all of the time and one could safely drink the water
> from the tap.

Who'd a thunk it, huh?

> Sometimes the swimming pool in the front yard was more
> tempting than the pileups.

Dirty job, but somebody's gotta do it

> > > Pretty nice lash up. I'd like to try a vintage Field Day using a QSL 60
> > > and the FB-7 or mebbe even the pre-war HRO.
> >
> > How many xtals ya got that would tolerate the QSL 60?
>

> I actually have a handful of the round Bliley holders with the large
> pins (and some adapters so they'll plug into the FT-243-style sockets).

I sold off all of those some years back.

> W4JBP's (pre-war W9DGJ) 1941 homebrew rig which I now own is a QSL Sixty
> on a larger chassis with the masonite front panel painted to look like
> bakelite. Come to think of it, I could use that one and pair it up with
> his SX-15 Sky Challenger. That might slow the rate down on FD.

Indeed!

The only attraction of xtal control for me is the simplicity of the
rigs, and with the ease of VFO/ECO construction it's not worth it for
me.

Example of a no-budget VFO:

Look around for a trashed ARC-5 transmitter or two. They are still
around cheap if you get aluminum ones that are beyond restoration.
Strip the chassis down, clean and save all usable components including
the chassis. Drill out the six big and four small rivets that hold the
front panle to the chassis, cut down the chassis to just behind the
1635 sockets and reassemble with 6-32 screws, nuts and washers. On
this "cut and channeled" chassis use the PA tuning cap with dial, the
oscillator padder and coil, and shield. Power plug on rear, ceramic
tube socket for a new 'SK7 or equivalent oscillator in the classic
Hartley circuit. Pad the grid circuit down to half frequency and use a
plug-in plate tuned circuit. Do it right and it will drive almost any
BA rig.
>
> > > > Whole thing was built in the case from a defunct National FB-7.
> > > >Back then
> > > >BAs
> > > > were a dime a dozen. Betcha he wishes he'd left the FB-7 alone!
> > >
> > > Lord, yes!
> >
> > I shudder to think how much stuff was hacked up and/or tossed out in
> > those days. Of course that was when they were looked upon as old junk
> > and not worth the shelf space.
> >
> > Of course if nobody had hacked them up or tossed them out, they'd be
> > all over the place, and very cheap.
>
> I'd like that part. My dad used to know a jeweler who had a great line.
> Pop showed him a ring and asked what it was worth. The answer was, "Am
> I buying or am I selling?"

'zactly. I bought the K2 kit and accessories by selling off tubes and
sockets that were in excess of my foreseeable needs"...
>

> > > I love the old National stuff.
> >
> > You ever been to the AWA museum near Rochester?
>
> No, I've only seen some of the AWA mags.

Me neither, and I used to live up there. Did not know about the museum
at the time.

They got W3WRE's key collection, which is a good thing because that
way it was not broken up. I am glad I got to know Lou back in the
'70s.

> The Jack Gray "History of
> Wireless" museum is housed in the Cincinnati building which houses
> WCET-TV (PBS) and WGUC (NPR) radio. I've visitied it a number of times.

COOL!

Cinci has a special place due to WKRP....
>
> > > I still run my SW-3 on a
> > > homebrew supply but an OT sold me an original FB-7 supply a few years
> > > back so I retired its homebrew power supply.
> >
> > I had an NC-173 for a number of years, paired up with a Viking 2/122.
> > Nice AM setup, got it for almost nothing. They "needed work"...

Clarification: They needed work when I got 'em. They were really
perking when I sold 'em.

> > Sold
> > the pair for a bit more than I paid, back in '98 or '99.
> >
> > It occurs to me that I actually own very few BA sets anymore, but lots
> > of BA-type parts. Lessee...BC-342-N, BC-453, some test gear. Rest is
> > homebrew or modern. If I want to do VFD it'll be with homebrew!
>
> I made a replica of a single 210 job from a '29 or '30 issue of QST
> while in Botswana. The parts came from one of W8MN's early transmitters
> in the town of Hinton, WV. Andy had stored the old stuff in the Hinton
> Ice plant along the New River. It flooded in '37 and when his widow
> gave the parts, I had to scrub the river silt from them. There were
> loads of brown beehive insulators, big Fleuron insulators, King and
> Cardwell variables, the original copper tubing coils for 40 and 80 and
> some appropriate knobs.

And you hauled all that stuff to Botswana and back?!?

That's so wild it has to be true.

> Instead of a breadboard, I used a really pretty
> piece of African mahogany for a base.

HAW! But over there it's prolly like white pine is here.

> I'd be almost afraid to put the
> thing on the air.
>
Chowpy chowpit
Chow chow chi chow
Something's wrong
With my radiow....

73 de Jim, N2EY

3859. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 17:46:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030429134639.08359.00000295@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 65997

>Subject: Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton
>From: "Ray Lamb AG4DR" lamboray@netrox.net
>Date: 4/29/2003 9:24 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <AOvra.6034$C5.1184@fe01.atl2.webusenet.com>

>OK Thanks for info. Have a nice day all. I will stay clear of this
>newsgroup.

Don't do that! We could use some new ideas here!

Stay a while!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3860. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 18:00:47 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304291000.352d6f4b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 65998

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EADCC31.966F95DB@earthlink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >

> > I leave the big contests to those who know what they are doing. W3RV
> > would translate that as "yer a wuss..."
>
> The fun factor doesn't go down if you're antenna or power limited--only
> the score goes down.

Absolutely. Particularly in the case of the CQ WW the strategizing,
all the minutia ya hafta know going in (10**3 memorzed prefixes), the
huge number of mults available, the strain it puts on the "ears", both
the op's and the rcvr's and a bunch of other factors put the dx tests
on a plane well above the domestic contests. And ya have to be able to
accept the fact that yer gonna get reapeatedly pounded into the ground
like a bug even by yer buddies and still enjoy the brawl. I'm
targeting the CQ WW CW this year with a really lame station but I'll
be in there mixing it up and having a blast. Maybe I'll manage 300 q's
via the search & pounce mode. Immediately after the scores become
known I fully expect one of the neighborhood Big Guns to tell me to
turn my rcvr on next year.

> > It occurs to me that I actually own very few BA sets anymore, but lots
> > of BA-type parts. Lessee...BC-342-N, BC-453, some test gear. Rest is
> > homebrew or modern. If I want to do VFD it'll be with homebrew!
>
> I made a replica of a single 210 job from a '29 or '30 issue of QST
> while in Botswana. The parts came from one of W8MN's early transmitters
> in the town of Hinton, WV. Andy had stored the old stuff in the Hinton
> Ice plant along the New River. It flooded in '37 and when his widow
> gave the parts, I had to scrub the river silt from them. There were
> loads of brown beehive insulators, big Fleuron insulators, King and
> Cardwell variables, the original copper tubing coils for 40 and 80 and
> some appropriate knobs. Instead of a breadboard, I used a really pretty
> piece of African mahogany for a base. I'd be almost afraid to put the
> thing on the air.

Sick pups. Somebody would have to put a gun to my head before I'd
actually go on the air with a Drake 2B and a Johnson Ranger . . .

Is Google FUBARED or what? A lotta posts made within the last few days
have disappeared - and not just in RRAP.

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

3861. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 19:09:58 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EAECE06.9DA5F81C@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65995

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> I still think every one of us should start using the band, following
> existing laws for that band, and take it over by mere usage.
>
Can't. They'll jump on you 100-1 and QRM you with their "killer-watt"
linears.

73, K3DWW

3862. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 20:32:20 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EAEE154.A96C8388@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 66000

> >What is a CBplusser?
>
> Hi Ray and I hope you brought your Asbestos Undies if you hang with us for
> long!
>
> A "CBPlusser" is a derogatory term used by one of the more profane,
> immature and basically bigoted regulars to this newsgripe

As if he was born holding an amateur extra license. Newbies will
make errors, we were all there. Most will learn, but it takes a
while for them to get it together.

And some never get it, as witness 14313 and that was before
restructuring.... And they had to pass 13 WPM to get privs
for that band....

3863. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 20:35:12 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3EAEE200.8645CD3D@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 66051

WA8ULX wrote:

> >A "CBPlusser" is a derogatory term used by one of the more profane,
> >immature and basically bigoted regulars to this newsgripe named Bruce Beynon,
> >WA8ULX.
>
> And proud of it.
>
> >Bruce, originally from Canton Ohio and as of late from some podunk parish
>
> Wrong again, Bruce is not from Canton, he use to live there but not from
> there. An no he did not move fron Canton to La, he moved from Albq,NM to La.
> Come on Nursie BOY get your stuff straight.
>

Unless that's a vanity callsign, you must have lived in "8" land at some
point. Which includes Ohio and also the back woods of WV among
other areas..

3864. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 20:35:17 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <vatog5b1all060@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 66052

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in
news:b8lr93$bags9$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de:

> Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die, so
> I am trying to think of some other threads or come up with other
> threads from others I have heard discussing such matters.....
>

Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for tech &
general, and 20 WPM for extra. And make all those new and down graded
nickle extra's retest at 20.

KB7ADL

3865. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 20:58:41 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8mp1t$2rt$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66053

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3EAEE154.A96C8388@ix.netcom.com...
> > >What is a CBplusser?
> >
> > Hi Ray and I hope you brought your Asbestos Undies if you hang with
us for
> > long!
> >
> > A "CBPlusser" is a derogatory term used by one of the more profane,
> > immature and basically bigoted regulars to this newsgripe
>
> As if he was born holding an amateur extra license. Newbies will
> make errors, we were all there. Most will learn, but it takes a
> while for them to get it together.
>
> And some never get it, as witness 14313 and that was before
> restructuring.... And they had to pass 13 WPM to get privs
> for that band....
>

Gotta admit he has a point on that one.

Dan/W4NTI

3866. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 21:01:15 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304291301.69009bd1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66054

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b8m6dg$8i3$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b8lr93$bags9$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> > Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die, so I
> am
> > trying to think of some other threads or come up with other threads from
> > others I have heard discussing such matters.....
> >
> >
> > So, here goes the first one..... Should call sign districts change to
> > reflect census data like other things when the census rolls around like
> > congressional districts etc.?
> >
> >
> > Discuss.

"It's like buttah"...

> No

I agree w/Dan.
>
In fact, I say not just no but [expletive deleted] no!

No real benefit to anybody that I can see, and a real paperwork
headache for all involved.

73 de Jim "I'm getting verklempt!", N2EY

3867. Crowded Grouches

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 21:02:20 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EAEE85C.39B9082@crosslink.net>
Source record: 65999

The ARRL net survey is showing that less than 1/4 of hams have an acre
or more for antennae. No wonder the rest are so grumpy.

(c:

K3DWW

3868. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 21:09:03 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86llxt8100.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 66055

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Vince" == Vince Fiscus <Vince> writes:

[...]

Vince> Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for
Vince> tech & general, and 20 WPM for extra. And make all those new
Vince> and down graded nickle extra's retest at 20.

Speaking as a nickle Extra, I'd welcome the opportunity to retest. I
don't yet have a working station that can key up, but I've been
practicing the code the best I can, and the challenge would help me
keep going. In fact, I'd welcome a requirement that all amateurs pass
their tests again before an application to renew a license would be
approved. This will take the old farts who have forgotten everything
but how to key up a transmitter and encourage them to learn again, as
well as keep those who wish to polish their skills motivated.

Vince> KB7ADL

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.1 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE+ruoJGPFSfAB/ezgRAufGAKCQXJYJ4Yd7cOYVrQkuoHMVodixJQCgrY0X
YHzuwVqUKAtUJ6sR/+AMkBo=
=OwqV
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3869. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 21:27:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EAEEE5D.4090503@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66056

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die, so I am
> trying to think of some other threads or come up with other threads from
> others I have heard discussing such matters.....

Good idea. You run the risk of turning this into a useful newsgroup. ;^)

> So, here goes the first one..... Should call sign districts change to
> reflect census data like other things when the census rolls around like
> congressional districts etc.?

Yes, but.... I only think it should be done over the long term, like
every 30 years or so.

I wonder if there is hams per capita by division data out there?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3870. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 21:40:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EAEF184.5060000@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66057

Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL wrote:
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in
> news:b8lr93$bags9$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de:
>
>
>>Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die, so
>>I am trying to think of some other threads or come up with other
>>threads from others I have heard discussing such matters.....
>>
>
>
>
> Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for tech &
> general, and 20 WPM for extra. And make all those new and down graded
> nickle extra's retest at 20.

Better yet, mandatory re-testing every year. You have to increase your
CW speed by 5WPM every year. After ten years licensing, the extra would
have to be working at 65 wpm. After 17 years, the ham would be at 100 wpm!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3871. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 22:35:47 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <0mvtavg0hna2laokbsj182tcqcde73mncs@4ax.com>
Source record: 66058

On Tue, 29 Apr 2003 00:15:12 -0400, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote:

>Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die, so I am
>trying to think of some other threads or come up with other threads from
>others I have heard discussing such matters.....
>
>
>So, here goes the first one..... Should call sign districts change to
>reflect census data like other things when the census rolls around like
>congressional districts etc.?
>
>
>Discuss.

Call sign districts indicate geographic regions, not demographic.
When they start shuffling state borders according to census results,
then you can start talking about redisctricting callsign regions.
Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

3872. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 22:41:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030429184145.26620.00000267@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66059

>Subject: Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton
>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>Date: 4/29/2003 3:35 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3EAEE200.8645CD3D@ix.netcom.com>
>
>WA8ULX wrote:
>
>> >A "CBPlusser" is a derogatory term used by one of the more profane,
>> >immature and basically bigoted regulars to this newsgripe named Bruce
>Beynon,
>> >WA8ULX.
>>
>> And proud of it.
>>
>> >Bruce, originally from Canton Ohio and as of late from some podunk parish
>>
>> Wrong again, Bruce is not from Canton, he use to live there but not from
>> there. An no he did not move fron Canton to La, he moved from Albq,NM to
>La.
>> Come on Nursie BOY get your stuff straight.
>>
>
>Unless that's a vanity callsign, you must have lived in "8" land at some
>point. Which includes Ohio and also the back woods of WV among
>other areas..

That's alright, Robert. His last FCC address was Canton, OH, which means
he's either lying about the ABQ residence now, or he lied to the FCC as to his
real address for some period of time.

Either way, he's lying.

And we are surprised....why?

73

Steve, K4YZ

3873. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 22:59:09 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <3MucnWp1yc0knjKjXTWcow@crocker.com>
Source record: 66060

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b8lr93$bags9$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die, so I
am
> trying to think of some other threads or come up with other threads from
> others I have heard discussing such matters.....
>
>
> So, here goes the first one..... Should call sign districts change to
> reflect census data like other things when the census rolls around like
> congressional districts etc.?
>

no. anyone can request any number in their call now with the vanity
program, you don't have to change calls to reflect a new address when you
move, so why bother changing the boundaries of things that don't mean much
any more any way.

3874. Re: Crowded Grouches

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 23:00:42 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <tuDra.395700$OV.410944@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 66061

Naw Vito .....I have 140 by 60 feet and worked the world many times over ....I am moving to a new home with a 70by 80 ft lot and guess what .....I have a lot less grass to cut and more time for CW!

God Bless Tom KI3R Port Vue Pa nr Pittsburgh ...
"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message news:3EAEE85C.39B9082@crosslink.net...
> The ARRL net survey is showing that less than 1/4 of hams have an acre
> or more for antennae. No wonder the rest are so grumpy.
>
> (c:
>
> K3DWW

3875. Re: Crowded Grouches

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 23:06:01 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <ozDra.131882$Si4.112176@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 66062

On second thought Vito ...Maybe I should have got 10 acres and hired you to cut it ..... oh well just a thought.

73 Tom nr Pittsburgh
"garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:tuDra.395700$OV.410944@rwcrnsc54...
> Naw Vito .....I have 140 by 60 feet and worked the world many times over
> ....I am moving to a new home with a 70by 80 ft lot and guess what I
> have a lot less grass to cut and more time for CW!
>
> God Bless Tom KI3R Port Vue Pa nr Pittsburgh ...
> "Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
> news:3EAEE85C.39B9082@crosslink.net...
> > The ARRL net survey is showing that less than 1/4 of hams have an acre
> > or more for antennae. No wonder the rest are so grumpy.
> >
> > (c:
> >
> > K3DWW
>
>

3876. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 23:26:04 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86ade89983.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 66063

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "David" == David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net> writes:

[...]

David> no. anyone can request any number in their call now with the
David> vanity program, you don't have to change calls to reflect a new
David> address when you move, so why bother changing the boundaries of
David> things that don't mean much any more any way.

This is only one of the things that bugs me about the vanity call sign
concept. Personally, I like having a 2 in my call sign even though
I'm in 6 land. When I operate on HF, I plan on using "/6" even
thought I don't have to do it, because it seems to me to be good
operating practice.

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.1 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE+rwoUGPFSfAB/ezgRAuiGAKDEKKVSJuKCGcTpai6BnncyCoFOLwCbBXjw
hHVVItbQ+OzXw/gEc7j3f4k=
=qlMw
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3877. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 23:50:44 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8n34f$b3b$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66064

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:86llxt8100.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Vince" == Vince Fiscus <Vince> writes:

[...]

Vince> Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for
Vince> tech & general, and 20 WPM for extra. And make all those new
Vince> and down graded nickle extra's retest at 20.

Speaking as a nickle Extra, I'd welcome the opportunity to retest. I
don't yet have a working station that can key up, but I've been
practicing the code the best I can, and the challenge would help me
keep going. In fact, I'd welcome a requirement that all amateurs pass
their tests again before an application to renew a license would be
approved. This will take the old farts who have forgotten everything
but how to key up a transmitter and encourage them to learn again, as
well as keep those who wish to polish their skills motivated.

Vince> KB7ADL

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.1 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE+ruoJGPFSfAB/ezgRAufGAKCQXJYJ4Yd7cOYVrQkuoHMVodixJQCgrY0X
YHzuwVqUKAtUJ6sR/+AMkBo=
=OwqV
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

Now wait a minute....I resemble that old fart stuff. And I dont wanna
retest...so there.

Dan/W4NTI

3878. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 23:52:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8n378$ub9$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66065

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EAEEE5D.4090503@adelphia.net...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die, so I
am
> > trying to think of some other threads or come up with other threads from
> > others I have heard discussing such matters.....
>
> Good idea. You run the risk of turning this into a useful newsgroup. ;^)
>
>
> > So, here goes the first one..... Should call sign districts change to
> > reflect census data like other things when the census rolls around like
> > congressional districts etc.?
>
>
> Yes, but.... I only think it should be done over the long term, like
> every 30 years or so.
>
> I wonder if there is hams per capita by division data out there?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Why? What is the benifit of a change? What purpose would it serve?

Dan/W4NTI

>

3879. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 23:53:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8n38qvfq1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66066

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EAEF184.5060000@adelphia.net...
> Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL wrote:
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in
> > news:b8lr93$bags9$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de:
> >
> >
> > >>Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die, so
> > >>I am trying to think of some other threads or come up with other
> > >>threads from others I have heard discussing such matters.....
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for tech &
> > > general, and 20 WPM for extra. And make all those new and down graded
> > > nickle extra's retest at 20.
> >
> > Better yet, mandatory re-testing every year. You have to increase your
> > CW speed by 5WPM every year. After ten years licensing, the extra would
> > have to be working at 65 wpm. After 17 years, the ham would be at 100 wpm!
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -

What should I be at 43 years???

Dan/W4NTI

>

3880. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-29 23:56:58 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <ejEra.36$7c3.12@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 66067

Maybe not. I let all of my tickets expire sometime around 1982. I decided to get back my tickets (well, the GROL is all that is left after the demise of the 1st phone; the telegraph ticket isn't worth the time to go and test out for) in 1993. Hadn't copied CW since 1969 (except for 'fantastic voyage' in which real CW is used and I found I could copy that). I called to find out when the next testing session is and it turned out to be four hours later the same day. So, with no preparation, I merely spent 3 hours testing out. Be very careful what you wish for; you just might get it. :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message news:86llxt8100.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Vince" == Vince Fiscus <Vince> writes:

[...]

Vince> Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for
Vince> tech & general, and 20 WPM for extra. And make all those new
Vince> and down graded nickle extra's retest at 20.

Speaking as a nickle Extra, I'd welcome the opportunity to retest. I don't yet have a working station that can key up, but I've been practicing the code the best I can, and the challenge would help me keep going. In fact, I'd welcome a requirement that all amateurs pass their tests again before an application to renew a license would be approved. This will take the old farts who have forgotten everything but how to key up a transmitter and encourage them to learn again, as well as keep those who wish to polish their skills motivated.

Vince> KB7ADL

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.1 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE+ruoJGPFSfAB/ezgRAufGAKCQXJYJ4Yd7cOYVrQkuoHMVodixJQCgrY0X
YHzuwVqUKAtUJ6sR/+AMkBo=
=OwqV

-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.476 / Virus Database: 273 - Release Date: 4/24/03

3881. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 00:03:14 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <6pEra.217$2I.57@news02.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 66068

Perhaps we should follow the telephone and increase the number of call sign districts. With 100 districts, more folks can have a 1X2 or 2X1 call. Gee, with a 6 digit number, we can have a 1 letter call sign! CQ dx cq dx cq dx de W401236 W401236 W401236. Think of the possibilities! Of course, with A, N, K, or W at the start, we could almost do with only 4 numbers in the call. Maybe force the codeless techs to make do with a 1X1 call sign while the 'important' folks get just a single letter. Fact is that most folks can get just about any single digit in their call now so it would appear that this thread is moot. Nice try, however, to come up with something different :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.476 / Virus Database: 273 - Release Date: 4/24/03

3882. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 00:17:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EAF1628.5070208@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66069

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3EAEF184.5060000@adelphia.net...
>
>>Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL wrote:
>>
>>>"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in
>>>news:b8lr93$bags9$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die, so
>>>>I am trying to think of some other threads or come up with other
>>>>threads from others I have heard discussing such matters.....
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for tech &
>>>general, and 20 WPM for extra. And make all those new and down graded
>>>nickle extra's retest at 20.
>>
>>Better yet, mandatory re-testing every year. You have to increase your
>>CW speed by 5WPM every year. After ten years licensing, the extra would
>>have to be working at 65 wpm. After 17 years, the ham would be at 100 wpm!
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> What should I be at 43 years???

rilly, rilly good! 8^)

Wow - you've been a ham almost as long is I've simply "been"!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3883. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 00:23:22 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <_HEra.37$wH3.32@news01.roc.ny.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 66070

Good grief, you got me to counting. I was first licensed as WN2CJV in 1962.
Gad, has it been that long? Geeze, where's my cane? My glasses? Oh ...
I'm wearing them. Better get my iron lung ready just in case. Dang, you've
got me beat by two years. You must be in *terrible* shape :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b8n38qvfq1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3EAEF184.5060000@adelphia.net...
> > Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL wrote:
> > > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in
> > > news:b8lr93$bags9$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de:
> > >
> > >
> > >>Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die, so
> > >>I am trying to think of some other threads or come up with other
> > >>threads from others I have heard discussing such matters.....
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for tech &
> > > general, and 20 WPM for extra. And make all those new and down
graded
> > > nickle extra's retest at 20.
> >
> > Better yet, mandatory re-testing every year. You have to increase your
> > CW speed by 5WPM every year. After ten years licensing, the extra would
> > have to be working at 65 wpm. After 17 years, the ham would be at 100
wpm!
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> What should I be at 43 years???
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> >
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.476 / Virus Database: 273 - Release Date: 4/24/03

3884. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 01:56:38 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030429215638.05100.00000365@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 66071

>That's alright, Robert. His last FCC address was Canton, OH, which means
>he's either lying about the ABQ residence now, or he lied to the FCC as to
>his
>real address for some period of time.

Or maybe he had 2 different residence at the same time, I know some of you guys are Lucky to own just 1 home at a time, but some of us own more than 1 at a time. Maybe he is just lying to you guys, Maybe not, Either way, I know for a fact he didnt lie to the FCC.

3885. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 01:58:06 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030429215806.05100.00000366@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 66072

>As if he was born holding an amateur extra license.

Your right, it wasnt an Extra, I was born holding the Advanced

3886. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 02:00:51 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030429220051.05100.00000367@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 66073

>> And some never get it, as witness 14313 and that was before
>> restructuring.... And they had to pass 13 WPM to get privs
>> for that band....
>>
>
>Gotta admit he has a point on that one.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Dan I cant answer to that. I never operate or listen to 20 Meters.
By the way Dan worked a guy in Dallas last night on 50.125, Cw pure ground
Wave, no enhacement

3887. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 02:03:01 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030429220301.05100.00000368@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 66074

>Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for tech &
>general, and 20 WPM for extra.

Never happen, to many New Whinning Hams would say they were being treated
unfair.

3888. Re: Dayton Hamfest?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 03:28:00 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030429232800.13060.00000470@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 66075

From K4YZ:

>>No, just some people that see Hams as weird. From my observations, I cannot
>>dispute that.
>
> Considering your "knowledge base" of Amateur Radio, I don't doubt this.
>You've not demonstrated a very horough understanding of what it's about.

No amateur radio knowledge base is needed to know that Hams are weird. One can see that at their first visit to a Hamfest. I noticed that Hams are mostly male at my first Hamfest, which a coworker, who is a Ham, invited me.

Also, there are certain social norms. Hams, as a group, tend not to follow these norms. Hams speak in codewords, tend to be larger sized, obsessed with antennas, contesting, CW, DX.

I can often recognize Hams. In antenna class, I knew antenna lab person was a Ham well before he came out and said it. He used certain phrases. He bragged about certain antennas he built. He called some of his lab notes "Hints and Kinks", etc.

With the exception of antennas and propagation conditions, Hams are usually not technical. However, in this technical area, Hams are often very skilled.

>Have you returned your diploma to the college from which you allegedly
>graduated?
>
> If not, you will still be an "EE". you may not WORK as one, but it's
>still there.
>

I have not turned in my degree. I no longer work as an EE.

Amateur radio is a specialized area within EE. Having EE degree does not imply radio or rf knowledge unless one studied that area. I happened to get good grades in difficult rf specific courses. However, no longer in the EE field, I can no longer say my EE knowledge helped me in amateur radio.

Even when I was EE, one of my rules is: make sure certain vendors recognizes YOU, not just the company you work for. That vendor relationship should carry onto another company should you work somewhere else. This should be especially true of those vendors in your desired field. This benefits you professionally.

One Ham in local club happens to be agent in same field I switched to. I would be his buyer. Good to have some contact with someone in my new field. I recognize this person as the Ham in my local club, not the company he works for.

>You don't want to be an EE anymore.

I truly enjoy the EE field. I know that's not the most profitable field for me.

>You hate Amateur
>Radio..

No, I don't. I enjoy amateur radio. One summer, I tuned some radios and saw waveforms. Also communicated with others over the radio. This before I even heard of "Ham" radio.

Ham radio seem to be a very different experience from what I experienced before. Sadly, I don't see much of the stuff that got me initially interested in amateur radio, in the Ham radio clubs.

>You don't want to learn Morse Code.

That's right. I don't

>You think that any gathering of
>Amateurs is meant to keep you from meeting "preety fems" or to conscript you
>into a cult.

Ham demographics is 95% male. Hams don't keep you there. Ham radio cannot entirely be a cult. It does have mostly technical aspect. Certain aspects of Ham radio, often called traditions, really are cult-like. Hams don't "conscript". One can join if one wants to.

>You insist you want to commune with others who are also
>interested in "experimenting" or "homebrewing", but you don't want to do
>anything to create the circumstances in which you can accomplish that.

I did put in some time trying. Finding a location was no problem. I just used the same location as the club. The expense was not too great. Town gives very low rate for non-profit groups.

They do not just give it to you. One needs to set up a business license for a non-profit organization. Also, you need to detail an organizational chart. You need to come up with a purpose statement.

Mostly, it takes some time to get new members. I do not have the resources to do this. Two people showed up. Actually, I was surprised that anyone showed up.

One of them was a real Ham. He insisted that the way to get new members is to recruit current Hams. I knew, from my experience, most Hams would not be interested. Otherwise, I would not need to form this type of club. I could just talk to Hams at my local club.

Anyway, the "club" could not maintain itself. Even before it started, I could not continue it. Now, since I am not in the EE field, its pointless to try again.

>All I see in here is what you "can't do", "won't do", or "don't do". Not
>a single word of "can do", "will do" or "want to do".

Lets make a (4 year) bet and you will see what I can do.

>the ceremony must be done facing the East direction.
>>> Are you embarrased to be Muslim, Vipul? Can't say the words?

That's Hindu tradition.

One of my relatives is in the "IND" gang. He refuses to give details about what they do when we ask. We don't know what that is. It may be some kind of...

>>I didn't say I believe. I just said I will <have to> attend.
>
> Ohhhh! I see! Just like you "support" Amateur Radio, you SAY you
>support
>it, but then when it comes down to putting some action behind it, you're just
>a
>lot of hot air.

No, this is an event I have to attend. No support is implied.

Also, I may have exaggerated when I said I support amateur radio. I lent someone a copy of my ARRL handbook. I mentioned a Hamfest to someone else. I mentioned I was a Ham in social situation.

Not in the EE field, I would still give my honest opinion if someone asked me. If an EE asked me about Ham radio, I would not recommend it, even if they are interested in the rf field. However, if they are interested in antennas, I would recommend Ham radio.

No longer in the EE field, I will no longer want to support amateur radio. I will defend it, but not go as far as to support it.

3889. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 03:51:44 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8odn8$btubt$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66092

Just a follow up to this thread.... My opinion is that it doesn't matter either way to me. That never was the intent of the posting. Just heard this discussed somewhere and thought that it might be a good one for the newsgroup.
Not that we would every have enough hams anyways where a district could theoretically run out of available callsigns anyways. Not enough promotion for that to happen.....

A callsign is just a callsign... that's it. It is the operating privileges allowed by the license that makes the difference.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:86ade89983.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "David" == David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net> writes:

[...]

David> no. anyone can request any number in their call now with the
David> vanity program, you don't have to change calls to reflect a new
David> address when you move, so why bother changing the boundaries of
David> things that don't mean much any more any way.

This is only one of the things that bugs me about the vanity call sign concept. Personally, I like having a 2 in my call sign even though I'm in 6 land. When I operate on HF, I plan on using "/6" even thought I don't have to do it, because it seems to me to be good operating practice.

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.1 (FreeBSD)

```
iD8DBQE+rwoUGPFSfAB/ezgRAuiGAKDEKKVSJuKCGcTpai6BnncyCoFOLwCbBXjw
hHVVItbQ+OzXw/gEc7j3f4k=
=qlMw
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3890. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 03:53:08 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8odna$btubt$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66093

I am not proposing this as a reality. Just as a discussion point.

>
> >Discuss.
>
> Call sign districts indicate geographic regions, not demographic.
> When they start shuffling state borders according to census results,
> then you can start talking about redisctricting callsign regions.
^^^^^

> Raymond Sirois AB2HR
> SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
> 607-733-5745
> telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

3891. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 03:53:31 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030429235331.13060.00000479@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 66076

From wa8ulx

>if you dont
>see me in the crowd, you can call me on 449.98

Great. Once we hear someone with a limited vocabulary, only speaks in short phrases, makes constant insults to some imaginary group called "CBplussers", and shows little knowledge of anything - then, we will know its you.

The word "CBplusser" shows how you speak. Sort of like a child.

>>As if he was born holding an amateur extra license.
>
>Your right, it wasnt an Extra, I was born holding the Advanced

And this is proof that even an idiot can become an Extra.

3892. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 04:01:32 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8odnb$btubt$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66094

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EAEEE5D.4090503@adelphia.net...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die, so I
am
> > trying to think of some other threads or come up with other threads from
> > others I have heard discussing such matters.....
>
> Good idea. You run the risk of turning this into a useful newsgroup. ;^)

God forbid that actually would happen eh? The old morse/no-morse thing is
getting to be like a dog chasing it's tail but never catching it anymore....

>
>
> > So, here goes the first one..... Should call sign districts change to
> > reflect census data like other things when the census rolls around like
> > congressional districts etc.?
>
>
> Yes, but.... I only think it should be done over the long term, like
> every 30 years or so.
>

I don't think it is gonna be an issue at least for a while as there are not
enough hams to fill up the existing callsigns we have already. Unless there
is some major promotion, the growth rate we currently have won't make that
an issue.

> I wonder if there is hams per capita by division data out there?

Good question..... wonder if the FCC would release data of that sort??

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3893. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 04:08:11 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430000811.13060.00000486@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 66077

>KC8PMX wrote:
>> > Let the Novice class go, ...
>> >
>> > As far as semantics of naming of the license class, why not make the
>> > following apply in the meantime?
>> >
>> > Extra Class=1st Class Amateur Radio license
>> > Advanced Class=2nd Class " "
>> > General Class=3rd Class " "
>> > Tech with Code=4th Class
>> > Tech w/o Code=5th Class
>> > Novice Class=6th Class

The "Class" name is wrong. This would make the dummies that just learned code and not the technical material, "only" coders, higher "class".

>The way I look at it is, if a person wants the privileges they will earn
>them.

Not when an unfair, irrelevant barrier such as Morse code is put there. Its unneeded bacause one can operate on HF without Morse code.

How about a special test for the microwave bands, above say 2.4 GHz? Once one passes this test, they can operate above this freq.

3894. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 04:18:44 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8odnc$btubt$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66095

> > Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for tech &
> > general, and 20 WPM for extra. And make all those new and down graded
> > nickle extra's retest at 20.
>
> Better yet, mandatory re-testing every year. You have to increase your
> CW speed by 5WPM every year. After ten years licensing, the extra would
> have to be working at 65 wpm. After 17 years, the ham would be at 100 wpm!
>

Now that would make it an effective communications mode! 100wpm! Whew!

Since we obviously can't get away from the morse issue, I would actually support retesting after every 10 year chunk of time. If you haven't been active or taken the time to learn more than the minimum basic amount of learning to pass the tests. This re-testing would also include morse testing as well. If it is as important as some hold it here, then it is something that should have at least been maintained or improved upon within ten years, above original testing results. Definitely would weed out some of the ones that get the license and then do not do anything with it. Hell, drivers licenses are retested on a regular basis.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3895. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 04:25:20 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8odne$btubt$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66096

What's a 100-1??

I would say simple change frequency then.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Vito" <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message
news:3EAECE06.9DA5F81C@crosslink.net...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
> >
> > I still think every one of us should start using the band, following
> > existing laws for that band, and take it over by mere usage.
> >
> Can't. They'll jump on you 100-1 and QRM you with their "killer-watt"
> linears.
>
> 73, K3DWW

3896. Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 04:30:51 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8odnf$btubt$7@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66097

Since the ARRL roughly estimated has about 25% of the total amount of
licensed hams as members, should they have an equal amount to that as their
level of representation to the FCC? i.e. 25% representation?

If yes, why?

If no, why?

Have fun with this one as well.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3897. Bandplans

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 04:33:40 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8odng$btubt$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66098

Should band plans be mandatory as required by the FCC? In other words, should they dictate what license, mode, power level etc., we operate for each specific band instead of the "gentlemen's agreements" we are working with now, that are defined by a non-regulatory agency?

If yes, why?

If no, why?

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3898. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 04:44:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430004439.18775.00000278@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66079

In article <BAD3CC0E.17D7E%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>> That's nice. I posted in public, not private. (snip)
>>
>> There has been considerable geographic bigotry exhibited
>> by others in here. My "lecture" (as you quaintly put it)
>> is to THEM, not you.
>
> And I also wanted readers to know I'm just as familiar with California as
>you are - that I'm not involved in the "geographic bigotry" you describe.

Okay, you aren't. Others are. Others' problem, not ours.

>> Of course. "Small, isolated" because it didn't happen at
>> the center of the known universe called the east coast.
>> Uh, huh.
>
> Of course, in spite of what I've said, you're still going to try hard to
>suggest exactly that anyway.

Stop being so sensitive, Dwight. :-)

> No single system, the telephone or whatever, is solely relied on. Instead,
>communications involves all that is available.

That's what I've been trying to point out.

That's the way the ACS plans their operations.

>As systems fail, more and
>more traffic is carried by the remaining systems. For example, leading up to
>disaster, area disaster personnel spend hours on the phone making
>arrangements. As the phones fail (fail as a reliable means of
>communications), personnel fall back on other communications systems. As
>parts of those systems fail, a still larger burden is placed on the
>remaining systems. Soon, since the very last remaining systems are limited
>to only the most critical communications, more and more lower priority
>communications is cut off.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. That's over-pessimistic.

> Don't be silly, Len. My point is that larger cities are often called on to
>help neighboring communities, placing an additional burden on their
>resources. For example, in the example I gave, Myrtle Beach ended up helping

>smaller towns and communities throughout the county. Since Myrtle Beach did
>not plan on that, the additional burden on resources was substantial.

Okay, so you've used the same area as another example.

Is that one of the "small, isolated incidents" you labeled the
Northridge Earthquake of 1994? I can't imagine that beach area
having a population of 10 million...

> Len, I gave you the facts based on almost 40 years living and working
>around the military.

Okay, I can only claim 37 years (1952-1989). :-)

>One of my wife's last jobs with the military was
>scheduling training for Army National Guard personnel joining active duty
>units in the SETAF command area (Southern Europe and Africa). She did the
>same thing while working at HQ USAREUR (HQ, United States Army Europe) for
>the Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans, Operations, and Security.

Gosh, Dwight, you brought in your WIFE to this discussion.
I can't say anything against WIVES or direct kin without that
becoming instant condemnation! :-)

Ahem, there are no US National Guard units having home bases
in Europe or Africa. They only deploy there. :-)

>Some Guard units
>are called to active duty as a unit. But, in general, most Guard personnel
>instead join existing active duty units when called to active duty.
>Likewise, Guard units generally do not maintain war fighting materials at
>the local Guard facility, nor do they maintain all the equipment they might
>use during war at those facilities. Instead, only what is needed for
>peacetime activities and training is maintained at most facilities.

You are wandering away from the thread. It isn't about the NG.

I can give a lot of examples where entire Guard units were activated
and deployed with nearly their entire TO&E intact and performed
well. But that is thread wandering and doesn't involve amateur radio
even indirectly.

> The fact that you've used your commercial license to help others is
>wonderful. I hope you continue to do so.

Why? I don't need any license to help others.

>Heck, I have a few personal projects you could help me on.

Outline the task and I will quote on the cost.

So far you've not been as nice and polite as you could have been
so I have to revert to the professional.

>Of course, since I'm sure you don't want to
>burden yourself with my personal projects, the organization I'm a member of
>(USCGA) certainly could use your help instead.

Just what kind of role-playing are you doing in here? The last thing
anyone needs is noblesse oblige laid on by amateurs trying to
parade around like professionals...but much more arrogant about it.

>If you're interested, I can
>have someone contact you within a few days.

...and shortly after that, either a process server or some law
officer can "contact you," too.

Try not to threaten. You can't have my boat impounded...don't
have one.

> Of course, on a personal note, I do wonder why you spend so much time in
>the Amateur Radio newsgroups if you have no real interest in ham radio.

I've said it many times: My interest in here is solely the elimination
of the morse code test for any radio license.

Unfortunately, a lot of radio amateurs have their mighty manhood
all tied up with an amateur radio license and act like children when
professionals do not gush and admire their amateur
accomplishments. That makes up the majority of messaging in
here.

>Passing a ham license exam should be child's play for you, which makes me
>wonder why you haven't done so.

I'm not a child, Dwight.

I don't need any "test" that six-year-olds can pass in order to prove
my "manhood." Several other amateurs in here have their "manhood"
all wrapped up in that amateur license.

Why are you auditioning to become a member of the Gang of Four?

3899. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 04:44:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430004441.18775.00000280@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66080

In article <b8n38qvfq1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>> > Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for tech &
>> > general, and 20 WPM for extra. And make all those new and down graded
>> > nickle extra's retest at 20.
>>
>> Better yet, mandatory re-testing every year. You have to increase your
>> CW speed by 5WPM every year. After ten years licensing, the extra would
>> have to be working at 65 wpm. After 17 years, the ham would be at 100 wpm!
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>What should I be at 43 years???

Guess. :-)

3900. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 04:44:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430004441.18775.00000279@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66081

In article <BAD3DF54.17D80%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>> Complain to the news media. Don't start whining
>> about "all commercial facilities FAIL during an
>> emergency." (snip)
>
> I would never make such a claim, Len. What I said is that commercial
>facilities are unreliable during and in the hours immediately after a
>disaster because employees evacuate, towers fall, stations go off the air
>because of power failures, and so on.

It isn't my concern what happens in South Carolia disaster and
emergency services. I'm sure they have someone there who can
restore reliability, allow workers to stay on the job safely, reinforce
tower structures, and provide power generation facilities.

The picture you paint of such facilities in South Carolina is not a
good one. If that is part of your local government, you should be
taking action in your community instead of arguing in an amateur
newsgroup.

>> Sorry, Dwight, you get a failing grade in the ham emergency
>> mantra. You are supposed to say "commercial communications
>> always fails during an emergency!" (snip)
>
> A substantial percentage of those systems do fail - fail as a reliable
>means of communications. That's what we're talking about here. The issue is
>not whether some remain on the air after a disaster. Instead, the issue is
>whether those systems can be relied on when it comes to disaster planning.

No, that is NOT what you are "talking about."

You are directly charging South Carolina disaster and emergency
services with failure to secure safety for its citizens. That's not nice.

>> Of course all radio amateurs are trained and experienced
>> in erecting antennas in storm and wind conditions, right?
>
> Far more so than most dispatchers at a 911 call center, or most personnel
>at disaster staging areas, or most personnel at disaster command centers, or
>most employees at a hospital, or most volunteers at shelters, or most
>volunteers at Red Cross aid stations, and so on.

I'm not convinced of that. You are implying that none of these
people know anything about antenna erection in storm and wind
conditions.

You have NOT answered my question about radio amateurs.

The only "answer" given is a lot of waffling, trying to misdirect
into something else.

>> I was being SARCASTIC, Dwight. How often have you heard
>> hams say "the cell phones always FAIL!" in emergencies?
>>
>> Do they "fail?" No. They get overloaded.
>
> They fail as a reliable means of communications. Note the key words in
>that - "reliable means of communications." When we're talking about disaster
>planning and disaster communications, reliability is the critical issue.

...and, again by implication, you've made the charge that the
organizations involved can't do the job.

Also, by omission, you've implied that amateurs ARE reliable.

To carry that absurd condition further, it would be logical to have
the professionals doing all that "unreliable" step down, quit, and
give the job over to an all-amateur organization that has all the
ARES manuals containing all the answers.

You are waltzing all around the subject, not making any sense
with all the suppositions, assumptions, and non-answers.

>> Military humvees CAN go cross-country, Dwight. Most
>> military field vehicles can.
>
> As I said, by the time the National Guard arrived, a major roadway was
>cleared of traffic.

Then what was all that emotional hoopla about all major roads
being overcrowded and no one getting through?

Such gridlock would have stopped radio amateurs as much as
anyone.

With a clear roadway all can get through. There's no real problem
there, only the embellishment of a tale with something that didn't
apply to the argument.

> Len, perhaps if you read up on the actual programs in place, you might
>realize that is not the case. For example, the ARES Emergency Coordinator's
>Manual exhaustively covers interaction with other agencies.

Yes, propaganda noted. Now, to be "reliable" in the crunch, all that
planning by that book should have been proven. How and where was
that proven...other than a lot of loud emotional patriotic statements
about the bestness of amateur radio?

The California Auxilliary Communications System HAS been proven
in several crunches in this state. ACS doesn't feature ham radio as
the star of all radio services for "reliability." The Greater Los Angeles
disaster and emergency communications planning, organization, and
training has already been tested and passed several times...it is a bit
older than California ACS but integrates with them just the same.

> Ham radio is both a hobby and a service. One does not have to exclude the
>other.

The term "service" is a regulatory one, used throughout Title 47 CFR
to denote the type and kind of radio activity being regulated.

Good citizenship is a true service and doesn't require any ham license.

> Stop trying to endlessly put words into my mouth, Len. I've never talked
>about anything "over and beyond anyone else."

Then stop with all the gratuitous implications and not-nice comments
yourself.

If you see a real problem with disaster and emergency organizations
in South Carolina, take your case to the administration of South
Carolina. This isn't the place for it.

Ask around if anyone has any unused ARES manuals. Use those to
beat on the South Carolina administrators to show them the good,
true way through amateurs alone saving the day. No problem. Until
the next bad hurricane when it all seems to start over.

3901. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 04:44:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430004442.18775.00000281@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 66078

In article <3EAEEE5D.4090503@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>> So, here goes the first one..... Should call sign districts change to
>> reflect census data like other things when the census rolls around like
>> congressional districts etc.?
>
> Yes, but.... I only think it should be done over the long term, like
>every 30 years or so.
>
> I wonder if there is hams per capita by division data out there?

Joe Speroni's website has a chart of licenses by state.

3902. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 05:20:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAD4D55C.17DF8%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 66082

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> ...and shortly after that, either a process server or
> some law officer can "contact you," too.
>
> Try not to threaten. You can't have my boat impounded...
> don't have one.

I apologize if what I wrote sounded like a threat, Len. There was no threat intended. You said you've used your commercial license to help others. Since you have an interest in helping others, and the USCGA has a need for people with such skills, I took the opportunity to invite you to join. That invitation still stands.

> I've said it many times: My interest in here is solely
> the elimination of the Morse Code test for any radio
> license.

But if you're not involved in Amateur Radio, why should it even concern you that Morse Code exists in Amateur Radio? Notice I'm not arguing in defense of code (note my license class), simply extending an honest question to a person I'm involved in a conversation with.

However, after reading the above (your interest here is solely the elimination of the Morse Code test), I now have to wonder why we're now having this long, drawn out, discussion about emergency communications. There is almost no link between Morse Code and emergency communications today.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3903. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 05:29:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430012928.25654.00000268@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66083

>And this is proof that even an idiot can become an Extra.
>

Now doesnt that make you fell good about the Present system of testing Hams?

3904. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 05:37:12 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430013712.25654.00000269@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66084

>Not when an unfair, irrelevant barrier such as Morse code is put there.

Oh I really fell sorry for you, that mean old 5 WPM Test is holding you back, so sad. Maybe if you cry a little more, and little more Whinning, the FCC will fell sorry for you, pat you on the back, and say, here is a Brand New HF License. Now toddle of little boy and pretend to be a real Ham on HF. That is what you want isnt it?

3905. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 05:55:21 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BAD4DD88.17DFA%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 66085

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> You are directly charging South Carolina disaster and
> emergency services with failure to secure safety for
> its citizens. That's not nice.

Nonsense! The paragraph you replied to with the above had to do with commercial communications facilities, not South Carolina disaster or emergency services systems. Commercial facilities have no legal mandate to provide communications following a disaster - if they do so, they do so only as a service to their commercial customers.

> To carry that absurd condition further, it would be
> logical to have the professionals doing all that
> "unreliable" step down, quit, and give the job over
> to an all-amateur organization that has all the
> ARES manuals containing all the answers.

I think this conversation is just about over. You're not even making an honest effort to discuss this issue. In one message you're talking about reinstalling fallen antennas following a storm and in the next message you've twisted that into having 911 dispatchers (and others) step down.

> Then what was all that emotional hoopla about all major
> roads being overcrowded and no one getting through?

See what I mean about no honest effort to discuss this issue. The "hoopla" was clearly explained when this issue was first brought up - the traffic prevented initial responders from quickly returning to the area following the storm (hindering initial assistance to the area). That situation was resolved by the time the National Guard arrived days later.

> Good citizenship is a true service and doesn't require
> any ham license.

But, when it comes to radio, it does require at least basic skills and knowledge about radio. The Ham Radio service is one means of providing that.

> If you see a real problem with disaster and emergency
> organizations in South Carolina, take your case to the
> administration of South Carolina. This isn't the place
> for it.

The storm in South Carolina was offered as a single example. The situations I described could occur in any state threatened by hurricanes. Similar situations could occur in many other types of disasters.

> Then stop with all the gratuitous implications and not-
> nice comments yourself.

You're reading things into my comments that simply don't exist. I've tried to remain as polite as possible during this discussion and there have been no implications (gratuitous or otherwise).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

3906. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 10:26:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430062631.18770.00000349@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66088

In article <3EAEEE5D.4090503@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>I wonder if there is hams per capita by division data out there?
>
Listing by license class and state at:

http://www.arrl.org/fcc/stats.html

73 de Jim, N2EY

3907. Re: Crowded Grouches

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 10:26:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430062632.18770.00000351@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66086

In article <3EAEE85C.39B9082@crosslink.net>, Vito <vito@crosslink.net> writes:

>The ARRL net survey is showing that less than 1/4 of hams have an acre
>or more for antennae.

Don't you mean "antennas"? "Antennae" are those things on insects.

>No wonder the rest are so grumpy.

HAW! Good one!

Let's do our own poll:

Present QTH here is 60x120 feet. Previous QTH was 57.5x100 feet.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3908. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 10:26:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430062632.18770.00000350@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 66087

In article <b8n38qvfq1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:3EAEF184.5060000@adelphia.net...
>> Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL wrote:
>> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in
>> > news:b8lr93$bags9$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de:
>> >
>> >
>> >>Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die, so
>> >>I am trying to think of some other threads or come up with other
>> >>threads from others I have heard discussing such matters.....
>> >>
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> > Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for tech &
>> > general, and 20 WPM for extra. And make all those new and down graded
>> > nickle extra's retest at 20.
>>
>> Better yet, mandatory re-testing every year. You have to increase your
>> CW speed by 5WPM every year. After ten years licensing, the extra would
>> have to be working at 65 wpm. After 17 years, the ham would be at 100 wpm!
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>What should I be at 43 years???
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Right where you are, Dan.

(I know Dan's CW skills from direct experience on the air)

73 de Jim, N2EY

3909. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 10:28:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430062836.24150.00000276@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66089

>Subject: Re: The need to save the Novice Class license
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 4/29/03 11:08 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030430000811.13060.00000486@mb-m10.aol.com>

>The "Class" name is wrong. This would make the dummies that just learned code
>and not the technical material, "only" coders, higher "class".

Obviously you've not opened the Extra Class study guide, Vipul.

>>The way I look at it is, if a person wants the privileges they will earn
>>them.
>
>Not when an unfair, irrelevant barrier such as Morse code is put there. Its
>unneeded bacause one can operate on HF without Morse code.

The Morse Code is not a barrier.

Knowledge of Morse Code is required under international treaty, to which
the United States is signatory.

>How about a special test for the microwave bands, above say 2.4 GHz? Once one
>passes this test, they can operate above this freq.

I already "operate" at 2.4Ghz, and WITHOUT a license...On the cordless
telephone, the baby monitor, the microwave oven...!

Steve

3910. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 10:37:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430063700.24150.00000277@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 66090

>Subject: Re: ARS Advertisement
>From: Dwight Stewart stewart@say.net
>Date: 4/30/03 12:20 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <BAD4D55C.17DF8%stewart@say.net>

>However, after reading the above (your interest here is solely the
>elimination of the Morse Code test), I now have to wonder why we're now
>having this long, drawn out, discussion about emergency communications.
>There is almost no link between Morse Code and emergency communications
>today.

That's because Lennie's not truthful.

Steve, K4YZ

3911. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 12:26:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430082647.18755.00000509@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 66099

In article <20030427153315.18755.00000313@mb-m06.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030427122609.18772.00000228@mb-m16.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>I say we let them have the kind of country they really want, as long as it
>>doesn't threaten the USA. How many Americans fought, died and were injured
>to
>>prop up Thieu's govt.? How much of a threat has Vietnam been since that
>govt.
>>fell a quarter century ago?
>
> How much of a military man was

(N2EY)

>? Where did he fight?
>
I have never claimed to be any sort of "military man", Len. Nor have I claimed any military or military-related service of any kind.

Nor have I claimed to be an "expert" on military matters.

For some reason, my knowledge of military history, limited as it is, bothers you a great deal. That's your problem, not my problem.

Dan, W4NTI, served in Vietnam. He answered my question. (Thanks, Dan).

You did neither.

Dan doesn't seem very bothered by my knowledge and opinions, nor my way of expressing them. Same for Dave, K8MN. Why are you so bothered?

You might want to look up Vice President Dick Cheney's military service record - particularly in the Vietnam era.

3912. Re: Crowded Grouches

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 13:33:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EAFD0B2.906E47FC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66151

N2EY wrote:

> Let's do our own poll:
>
> Present QTH here is 60x120 feet. Previous QTH was 57.5x100 feet.

Present QTH, one acre, rural hilltop with absolutely no antenna zoning regs. Previous (Tanzania) app. 100 x 150 feet, suburban coastal.

Dave K8MN

3913. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 13:45:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EAFD3E7.659A9884@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66152

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EADB90F.8B81DA6A@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EAB50D5.8FE12384@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA88AD9.BC4BC6C9@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA7E71E.C3FD13F1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA74120.60BE136D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > > > > > > Look, Dave, Len said something about where you were stationed.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > No, he didn't. I was never stationed at any place called "Tan Son Hut".
> > > > >
> > > > > Do you think he might have been one character off, and you chose to
> > > > > trip and skin your knee?
> > >
> > > I didn't make the error. If any tripping or skinning was done, check
> > > Len for blood or bruises.
> >
> > I think you're not being truthful.

Fact: Len wrote of "Tan Son Hut".
Fact: I was never assigned at a place called "Tan Son Hut".
Fact: Len wrote of my moving boxes at a supply depot.
Fact: I never moved boxes or even visited a supply depot in Viet Nam.

> > > > I was never in the supply field.
> > > >
> > > > Please stay on topic.
> > >
> > > You're forgetful. Len wrote of my being at a supply depot, moving
> > > boxes.

>
> And you wrote of a snack bar. Now you deny it.

No, I deny being assigned to a snack bar.

> > > > > You
> > > > > started talking about a snack bar. Were you or were you not stationed
> > > > > at a snack bar?
> > > > >
> > > > > That's been answered. This is the kind of crap you pulled with Ed Hare.
> > > >
> > > You didn't bring up the words "snack bar" when Len talked of where you
> > > were stationed? I think you did.
> > >
> > I wrote nothing about being stationed at a snack bar. The problem is
> > your notorious reading comprehension problem.
>
> It's in Google. You're making yourself notorious.

...and you continue to make yourself look foolish.

> > > And leave Ed out of this. He's absent by his choice, not anything I
> > > did.
> > >
> > His choice was made over last encounter with you.
>
> It was still his choice.

...and you were still the factor governing the decision.

> > > > > > > QSL?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Anyone who says this on the ham bands is a stupendous lid.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Ahem, no license required to operate here.
> > > > > >
> > > > > That's how Len got here.
> > > >
> > > Then at which point did you confuse usenet with ham bands?
> > >
> > At no point did I confuse the two. As a matter of fact, the very point
> > that I made was Len is here writing about amateur radio rather than
> > being a participant in amateur radio.
>
> Dave, do try to stay on topic. You were commenting on something I
> said here on rrap, not something that Len said. And you confused it
> with operating on the ham bands.

Grow up, Brian.

Dave K8MN

3914. Re: Bandplans

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 14:04:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3EAFD806.4060102@psu.edu>
Source record: 66154

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Should band plans be mandatory as required by the FCC? In other words,
> should they dictate what license, mode, power level etc., we operate for
> each specific band instead of the "gentlemen's agreements" we are working
> with now, that are defined by a non-regulatory agency?
>
>
> If yes, why?
>
> If no, why?

They seem to work pretty well now. As long as people respect them, I don't see much reason to make them mandatory. We do occasionally have an RTTY person working in PSK31 land on 20 meters, but even that isn't much problem.

If we made the bandplans mandatory, any changes would probably have to go through the same rigamarole that we have to do with say the 6 meter band.

I appreciate what you're trying to do here, Ryan. This is the moral equivalent of families taking over bad neighborhoods by using them! 8^) Call it the rrap block party.

- mike -

3915. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 14:09:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EAFD974.D9209E8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66153

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EADCC31.966F95DB@earthlink.net>...
> (N2EY wrote):
>

> > The fun factor doesn't go down if you're antenna or power limited--only
> > the score goes down.
>
> Agreed! But considering what my limited setups have been able to do in
> domestic 'tests, I'm pretty happy to focus on them. Couple years back
> I was able to do second-place A-power in EPA, which is not a small or
> noncompetitive section. Last two years the K2 has done a decent job.

I've heard so many good things about the Elecraft rigs but I've not yet
had the opportunity to test drive one. They certainly enjoy a great
reputation and the published specs are excellent.

> > > We gotta do a road trip one of these years...do Dayton and pick you
> > > guys up on the way or somethin...
> >
> > We'd have to host you for a night to allow you to regenerate before the
> > Hamvention. It'd be a great time to fire up the grill and the sauna.
>
> mmmmmmmmmm.....sauna.....

The sauna building and the added birches and pines are my effort to make
the Finn in the house feel more at home.

> > > > > 2003 will be FD
> > > > > #36 for me.
> > > >
> > > That's quite a run. I missed '71-'75 and '85-'01.
> > >
> > You had good reasons to miss those! And as you said, some of those
> > years "every day was Field Day"
> >
> > The only African tour where that wasn't true was Botswana, where the
> > city power was on all of the time and one could safely drink the water
> > from the tap.
>
> Who'd a thunk it, huh?

We were a bit dismayed upon arrival after having done two tours in West
Africa prior to arrival. I wondered why the compound walls were so low

and had no razor wire atop them and I looked in vain for a backup
generator and the water filters.

Botswana is the only African nation to wean itself of US aid.

>
> The only attraction of xtal control for me is the simplicity of the
> rigs, and with the ease of VFO/ECO construction it's not worth it for
> me.

I understand your thinking. I have a number of vintage VFOs and a
couple of boxes full of crystals. I'd hate to think of using xtal
control on FD!

> Example of a no-budget VFO:
>
> Look around for a trashed ARC-5 transmitter or two. They are still
> around cheap if you get aluminum ones that are beyond restoration.
> Strip the chassis down, clean and save all usable components including
> the chassis. Drill out the six big and four small rivets that hold the
> front panle to the chassis, cut down the chassis to just behind the
> 1635 sockets and reassemble with 6-32 screws, nuts and washers. On
> this "cut and channeled" chassis use the PA tuning cap with dial, the
> oscillator padder and coil, and shield. Power plug on rear, ceramic
> tube socket for a new 'SK7 or equivalent oscillator in the classic
> Hartley circuit. Pad the grid circuit down to half frequency and use a
> plug-in plate tuned circuit. Do it right and it will drive almost any
> BA rig.

I seem to recall such a beast from a CQ mag anthology. I have the full
sized modified BC-458 VFO for my Central 20-A.

> 'zactly. I bought the K2 kit and accessories by selling off tubes and
> sockets that were in excess of my foreseeable needs"...

I've been gradually selling off my excess as well.

> > > You ever been to the AWA museum near Rochester?
> >
> > No, I've only seen some of the AWA mags.
>
> Me neither, and I used to live up there. Did not know about the museum
> at the time.

> They got W3WRE's key collection, which is a good thing because that
> way it was not broken up. I am glad I got to know Lou back in the
> '70s.

That'd be worth the visit. Since my sis moved from NYC to the West
Coast, I've not had as many occasions to spend time up that way.

> > The Jack Gray "History of
> > Wireless" museum is housed in the Cincinnati building which houses
> > WCET-TV (PBS) and WGUC (NPR) radio. I've visitied it a number of times.

>
> COOL!
>
> Cinci has a special place due to WKRP....

We all thought it interesting that "WKRP" was chosen since there was a real WKRC operating at 550 KHz in Cincy.

> > I made a replica of a single 210 job from a '29 or '30 issue of QST
> > while in Botswana. The parts came from one of W8MN's early transmitters
> > in the town of Hinton, WV. Andy had stored the old stuff in the Hinton
> > Ice plant along the New River. It flooded in '37 and when his widow
> > gave the parts, I had to scrub the river silt from them. There were
> > loads of brown beehive insulators, big Fleuron insulators, King and
> > Cardwell variables, the original copper tubing coils for 40 and 80 and
> > some appropriate knobs.
>
> And you hauled all that stuff to Botswana and back?!?
>
> That's so wild it has to be true.

That was prior to our buying this house. We were on holiday from Botswana and putting a month's worth of miles on a rental car. We'd been to Cincinnati, were visiting this area and stopped in the southern portion of the state on our way to Savannah, where my folks were living at the time. Andy's widow gave me the old parts and all of Andy's logs. My only option was to box 'em and mail them to Botswana. The stuff went with us to Finland and to Tanzania before we came back to the U.S. on a permanent basis.

> > Instead of a breadboard, I used a really pretty
> > piece of African mahogany for a base.
>
> HAW! But over there it's prolly like white pine is here.

That's pretty much true. The standoff I use at the base of one tower (for my 160m inverted "L") is a hardwood 2 x 4 purchased in Dar es Salaam. It looks like it will outlast me.

> > I'd be almost afraid to put the
> > thing on the air.
> >
> Chowpy chowpit
> Chow chow chi chow
> Something's wrong
> With my radiow....

I wasn't so much worried about the short term stuff as I was about my frequency changing with the antenna swinging in the wind. This hilltop is as windy as a Len Anderson post.

Dave K8MN

3916. Re: Max Morse speed? (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 14:20:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3EAFDC1C.84A0E950@earthlink.net>
Source record: 66155

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EADCC31.966F95DB@earthlink.net>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
>
> > > I leave the big contests to those who know what they are doing. W3RV
> > > would translate that as "yer a wuss..."
> >
> > The fun factor doesn't go down if you're antenna or power limited--only
> > the score goes down.
>
> Absolutely. Particularly in the case of the CQ WW the strategizing,
> all the minutia ya hafta know going in (10**3 memorzed prefixes), the
> huge number of mults available, the strain it puts on the "ears", both
> the op's and the rcvr's and a bunch of other factors put the dx tests
> on a plane well above the domestic contests. And ya have to be able to
> accept the fact that yer gonna get reapeatedly pounded into the ground
> like a bug even by yer buddies and still enjoy the brawl.

Careful now, Brian. Vipul will mark you as a cult member. The CQ WW DX
'test is the ultimate whether one is a casual participant chasing new
ones or is going for a big score.

> I'm
> targeting the CQ WW CW this year with a really lame station but I'll
> be in there mixing it up and having a blast. Maybe I'll manage 300 q's
> via the search & pounce mode. Immediately after the scores become
> known I fully expect one of the neighborhood Big Guns to tell me to
> turn my rcvr on next year.

I haven't decided what to do for this year. I think my days of
operating 45 out of 48 hours are behind me. I lean more toward a single
band effort on 160, 80 or 40m. That way I can get enough sleep.

>
> Sick pups. Somebody would have to put a gun to my head before I'd
> actually go on the air with a Drake 2B and a Johnson Ranger . . .

Funny that you'd mention those two rigs. When I first got to
Guinea-Bissau, I'd received my household goods surface shipment but my
air freight had not arrived from the U.S. It contained my brand new
Paragon. I'd sold its Drake TR-7 predecessor in Finland before leaving.
The only rig I could put on the air during the first couple of weeks of

operation was a Johnson Ranger and a Drake 2-B/2B-Q combo. It worked surprisingly well though I was putting out only 40 watts or so.

Dave K8MN

3917. Experiences (another topic for the group)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 14:22:24 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8on35$c62c0$1@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66156

What has been your most memorable amateur radio-related experience since you
have had your license?
Most interesting, best/worst experience, unusual etc.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3918. Contributions To Amateur Radio (yet another topic...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 14:25:41 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8on3m$c62c0$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66157

Have you as a ham, come up with an invention, or process, or a better way of doing something, etc.? Have you published anything related to ham radio? (ouside of the newsgroups that is...) Been an Elmer?

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3919. Elmering (still yet even another topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 14:27:31 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8on43$c62c0$3@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66158

Have you "Elmered" someone into the hobby? If so, how many? Any special teaching techniques used or tips to share? If not, why?

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3920. Public Service (yeah, it's another one..)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 14:30:47 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b8on4h$c62c0$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 66159

What public service activities, both in amateur radio and outside of amateur radio, do you participate in?? Any special experiences from doing so? Anything learned from it? Which activity was your most favorite? Which one was the least favorite?

(was thinking about this one after that World Radio article thread a little while back......)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3921. Re: Crowded Grouches

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 14:49:21 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EAFE271.4B05F6C8@crosslink.net>
Source record: 66091

garigue wrote:
>
> Naw Vito .....I have 140 by 60 feet and worked the world many times over
> ....I am moving to a new home with a 70by 80 ft lot and guess what I
> have a lot less grass to cut and more time for CW!

Grass?? Isn't that what hippies used to smoke? Well I don't have any!
That's my story and I'm sticking to it!

73, K3DWW

3922. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 15:29:27 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EAFEBD7.C0E27E86@crosslink.net>
Source record: 66100

Len Over 21 wrote: ...
>
> It isn't my concern what happens in South Carolia disaster and
> emergency services. ...
>
> The picture you paint of such facilities in South Carolina is not a
> good one. If that is part of your local government, you should be
> taking action in your community instead of arguing in an amateur
> newsgroup.....

Different strokes for different folks, Len. The reason I left SoCal decades ago is that the residents live in a "Hotel California" wherein all crimes are done by transients, all storms and diseases come up from Mexico and government not only takes care of everybody, but does it perfectly. By the same reasoning I'm sure California ACS works better than ARES. But please understand that back in America we still rely on ourselves instead of Government. We have volunteer fire and rescue squads, elected sheriffs and ARES/RACES volunteers to provide backup communications and we like it like that. If you're comfortable living where one town's (El Monte) SWAT team drives 20+ miles to Compton to murder an old man for living in a house a drug dealer once rented 25 years before then be my guest but I'll stay in America even tho I have to do a few ARES/RACES drills in case I need to help the good old boys out some day.

Sincere 73, K3DWW

3923. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 15:52:02 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8orh0ifq1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66160

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3EAF1628.5070208@adelphia.net...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3EAEF184.5060000@adelphia.net...
> >
> >>Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL wrote:
> >>
> >>>"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in
> >>>news:b8lr93$bags9$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die, so
> >>>>I am trying to think of some other threads or come up with other
> >>>>threads from others I have heard discussing such matters.....
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for tech &
> >>>general, and 20 WPM for extra. And make all those new and down graded
> >>>nickle extra's retest at 20.
> >>
> >>Better yet, mandatory re-testing every year. You have to increase your
> >>CW speed by 5WPM every year. After ten years licensing, the extra would
> >>have to be working at 65 wpm. After 17 years, the ham would be at 100
wpm!
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >
> > What should I be at 43 years???
>
> rilly, rilly good! 8^)
>
> Wow - you've been a ham almost as long is I've simply "been"!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

See....told you I resembled that 'old fart' stuff.

Dan/W4NTI

3924. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 15:53:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8ori8$v3r$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66161

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030430004441.18775.00000280@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <b8n38qvfq1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> > Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for tech &
> >> > general, and 20 WPM for extra. And make all those new and down
graded
> >> > nickle extra's retest at 20.
> >>
> >> Better yet, mandatory re-testing every year. You have to increase your
> >> CW speed by 5WPM every year. After ten years licensing, the extra would
> >> have to be working at 65 wpm. After 17 years, the ham would be at 100
wpm!
> >>
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >What should I be at 43 years???
>
> Guess. :-)

Thats way to easy 'Len over 21' ...The answer is Way Way better than you.

Dan/W4NTI

3925. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 15:54:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8ork4qag1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66162

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030430062632.18770.00000350@mb-m22.aol.com...
> In article <b8n38qvfq1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> >news:3EAEF184.5060000@adelphia.net...
> >> Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL wrote:
> >> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in
> >> > news:b8lr93$bags9$6@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de:
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >>Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die,
so
> >> >>I am trying to think of some other threads or come up with other
> >> >>threads from others I have heard discussing such matters.....
> >> >>
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for tech &
> >> > general, and 20 WPM for extra. And make all those new and down
graded
> >> > nickle extra's retest at 20.
> >>
> >> Better yet, mandatory re-testing every year. You have to increase your
> >> CW speed by 5WPM every year. After ten years licensing, the extra would
> >> have to be working at 65 wpm. After 17 years, the ham would be at 100
wpm!
> >>
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >What should I be at 43 years???
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Right where you are, Dan.
>
> (I know Dan's CW skills from direct experience on the air)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Thanks Jim...and your right up there too...congrats!

Dan/W4NTI

3926. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 16:00:19 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8orug$162$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66164

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b8odn8$btubt$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> Just a follow up to this thread.... My opinion is that it doesn't matter
> either way to me. That never was the intent of the posting. Just heard
> this discussed somewhere and thought that it might be a good one for the
> newsgroup.
> Not that we would every have enough hams anyways where a district could
> theoretically run out of available callsigns anyways. Not enough
promotion
> for that to happen.....

Well we dang near ran out of W and K prefixes sometime back. Why do you
think we have this alphabet soup of calls now?

>
>
> A callsign is just a callsign... that's it. It is the operating
privileges
> allowed by the license that makes the difference.

You have been brainwashed by Incentive Licensing. The class is the thing.
Bull crap.

The callsign of a person is like his name. Unique to that person alone.
But alas in the great wisdom of the great FCC all that is trashed too.

Lets go buy a dead mans call.

Dan/W4NTI

>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>

3927. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 16:01:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8os3b$lf8$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66163

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b8odnb$btubt$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3EAEEE5D.4090503@adelphia.net...
> > Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > > Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die, so
I
> am
> > > trying to think of some other threads or come up with other threads
from
> > > others I have heard discussing such matters.....
> >
> > Good idea. You run the risk of turning this into a useful newsgroup. ;^)
>
> God forbid that actually would happen eh? The old morse/no-morse thing is
> getting to be like a dog chasing it's tail but never catching it
anymore....
>
>
> >
> >
> > > So, here goes the first one..... Should call sign districts change to
> > > reflect census data like other things when the census rolls around
like
> > > congressional districts etc.?
> >
> >
> > Yes, but.... I only think it should be done over the long term, like
> > every 30 years or so.
> >
>
> I don't think it is gonna be an issue at least for a while as there are
not
> enough hams to fill up the existing callsigns we have already. Unless
there
> is some major promotion, the growth rate we currently have won't make that
> an issue.
>
>
> > I wonder if there is hams per capita by division data out there?
>
> Good question..... wonder if the FCC would release data of that sort??
>

>
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>

As soon as the FCC goes to the next step. No license testing at all....we
can ALL have a ham call. Boy that will be fun.

Dan/W4NTI

>

3928. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 16:05:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8os79ijs1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66165

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b8odnc$btubt$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> > > Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for tech &
> > > general, and 20 WPM for extra. And make all those new and down
graded
> > > nickle extra's retest at 20.
> >
> > Better yet, mandatory re-testing every year. You have to increase your
> > CW speed by 5WPM every year. After ten years licensing, the extra would
> > have to be working at 65 wpm. After 17 years, the ham would be at 100
wpm!
> >
>
> Now that would make it an effective communications mode! 100wpm! Whew!
>
> Since we obviously can't get away from the morse issue, I would actually
> support retesting after every 10 year chunk of time. If you haven't been
> active or taken the time to learn more than the minimum basic amount of
> learning to pass the tests. This re-testing would also include morse
> testing as well. If it is as important as some hold it here, then it is
> something that should have at least been maintained or improved upon
within
> ten years, above original testing results. Definitely would weed out some
> of the ones that get the license and then do not do anything with it.
Hell,
> drivers licenses are retested on a regular basis.
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>

Drivers licenses are retested on regular basis? Where? No place I've been
in the last 40 years.

As for ham retesting. To prove what? Every ten years the test becomes even
more non relevant.....how would that help ham radios technical standards?

Dan/W4NTI

3929. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 16:11:06 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8osin$8nh$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66166

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030429220051.05100.00000367@mb-m05.aol.com...
> >> And some never get it, as witness 14313 and that was before
> >> restructuring.... And they had to pass 13 WPM to get privs
> >> for that band....
> >>
> >
> >Gotta admit he has a point on that one.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Dan I cant answer to that. I never operate or listen to 20 Meters.
> By the way Dan worked a guy in Dallas last night on 50.125, Cw pure
ground
> Wave, no enhacement

Good show....six is perking up a bit. Im hearing V31MD right now on
50.125/USB 11.09Central/Wednesday 30 Apr 03.

Dan/W4NTI

3930. Re: D.I.Y. "Hi-Fi" SSB links

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 17:02:12 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0304300902.6a00a8fd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66167

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030426162044.16173.00000055@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <20030426082619.18821.00000227@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <20030425232756.18771.00000181@mb-m18.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> >>In article <c2356669.0304251111.2f81f2f@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> >>(N2EY) writes:
> >>>The phasing idea was kept alive by a few hams even before the
> >>>developments of the past few decades. For example:
> >>>
> >>>QST Sep 1969 p 11 "A Direct-Conversion SSB Receiver" by Richard S.
> >>>Taylor, W1DAX, uses the venerable 2Q4 network in a solid-state 20
> >>>meter receiver.
> >>
> >> Who are writing a reply to?!?
> >
> >What does that mean, Len?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, you've run out of comprehension skills, have you?

Nope. It seems you have run out of proofreading skills, though.

You wrote:

"Who are writing a reply to?!?"

which doesn't make much sense.

Try to stay focused.
>
> You need to focus on who you are replying to.

I'm replying to the newsgroup.
Specifically, to a newsgroup posting.

> >> If you want to mention a venerable 34-year-old article, fine,
> >
> >Then why are you so critical?
>
> You live in the past too much.

I'm not the one repeatedly citing his expired patents and
half-century-old RTTY experience, Len - you are.

> Not only that, your resources
> of information are too tightly bound to old ARRL publications.

Says who?

Why is it OK to cite an article over 25 years old but not one 34 years
old?

Do I sense some anti-ARRL bias in your postings?
>
> >> but
> >> the essential component, a metal tube shell enclosed network
> >> that dates back at least 42 years is NOT anything new...or
> >> even close to being "state of the art."
> >
> >Who said it was? The 2Q4/350 isn't available new any more.
>
> Hasn't been "new" for a long time. That was my point.
>
> There HAVE been "new" networks publicized for a quarter
> century. RSGB publications has had them repeatedly.

If they've been around for over a quareter century, they're not new.

> >Why all the sarcasm, Len? Is it a bad thing that Gingell's work was
> >recognized and published here in the USA?
>
> "Recognized and published here" some 13 years after it appeared
> in RSGB's Radio Communication magazine. :-)

The 1988 Handbook reference I gave was not the first one. Just one I
had handy.

> European amateurs were already trying out and (successfully)
> using the Gingell polyphase network in SSB equipment before
> it was "recognized and published" in the USA.

That's nice. Nobody denies that.
>
> >> Imagine that...29 years ago someone in Europe tried something
> >> NEW, a network that didn't need special 1% value components.
> >> Didn't use some "venerable" old part from the USA.
> >
> >Isn't that obvious?
>
> Not to you.

You're wrong about that.

> You keep promoting some old component manufactured
> by a Pennsylvania company long ago...as if it were the final word on
> state of the art.

Where have I done that? Mentioning is not promoting. I used to have
one of those networks, but sold it long ago.

And the Gingell network is hardly the "final word on state of the
art".

> Can anyone understand geographic bias on your
> part? [of course they can]

You often see things that are not there. Len. You've repeatedly
written things about others' posts which you have failed to prove.
>
> Concentrate on the analysis done by Yoshida in the QEX article.

Why? You are not empowered to give orders.

> Note: Wideband performance is part and parcel of possible
> "Hi-Fi" SSB, aka wide audio modulation in radio.

6 kHz is not "hi-fi" (an ancient '50s term) by any stretch of the
imagination.

> >> Humans get born, grow, and
> >> die. All of us will die...except maybe the immortal morsemen.
> >
> >What is the significance of your unprovoked snide remarks like that last
> >sentence?
>
> One of the Gang of Four has already stated in here that he "will
> live forever."

Who are "the Gang of Four"?

I never claimed to be immortal.

> That's evidentiary in a search of Google, is it not?

Show us.

> >> How does your statement "invalidate" the article's findings? Does
> >> mathematics die with the mathematician?
> >
> >It doesn't and they don't.
>
> Then try to discuss the contents of Yoshida's QEX article, not his
> apparent lack of QRZ listing.

Why?
>
> >> Europeans have tried out the Yoshida article values and those
> >> WORK very well.
> >
> >Have YOU tried them out? Have YOU built any phasing-type SSB receivers or
> >transceivers, Len? The information has been out there for over a quarter
> >century...
>
> Yes, I've built them.

You have built phasing-type SSB receivers and transceivers?

> I've analyzed them with analysis programs
> written by others AND myself.

Bully for you!

Did any of them exceed 45 dB unwanted sideband rejection? 50 dB?

>
> You want "proof" of that? :-) Go to the RSGB's Radio Communication
> issue almost a year after the 1970s mention and look in Pat Hawker's
> "Technical Topics" column.

Why? Did any of them exceed 45 dB unwanted sideband rejection? 50 dB?

> >So what? Why are you stuck in the past? Do those old designs have better
> >performance? Are the parts and boards for them still available?
>
> Don't try this misdirection route, ancient one, you get lost.

I just asked some questions. You don't want to answer them. Perhaps
you don't want to admit that those old designs did not do better than
newer designs such as the KK7B R2. Perhaps you don;t want to admit
that parts and boards for those old designs are as hard to come by as
the old B&W PSN network....
>
> I'm not the one who has running bibliographies of old ARRL
> publication sources...YOU are.

So? Is that wrong?

> I'm not the one touting the
> glories of a long-out-of-date Barker & Williamson component,
> YOU are. [that's in Google too]
>
"Touting the glories"? You do imagine things.

> [on the Tayloe Mixer...]
>
> >Yet for some reason you did not include his callsign in your post.
> >You included the callsign of everyone else mentioned. Perhaps you
> >do not like to admit that the inventor is a 1x2 Extra.
>
> Misdirection on your part again, Jimmie. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Then WHY did you omit his callsign and include everyone else's?

> Dan Tayloe wasn't born with his amateur radio callsign, was he?

Nope. Neither were any of the other people you mentioned. But you
omitted his callsign and included all the others.

> He has an uncommon surname which should be noticeable.

He has a unique callsign, too.
>
> The elegant innovation/invention of the Tayloe Mixer is applicable
> to ANY radio-electronics situation involving heterodyning, not just
> amateur radio. Dan Tayloe has much to his credit in invention
> and innovation and much of that work is not just for ham radio.

Nobody disputes that.

But the FACT is that the first practical use of that innovation was in
a high performance, CW-only, direct-conversion amateur radio
transceiver.

That fact really seems to bother you.
>
> Try recognizing the PERSON, not the callsign, Jimmie.

I recognize both. You suppress the callsign, even in an amateur radio
newsgroup.
>
> >> You can't seem to recognize that, can you?
> >
> >You couldn't be more wrong, Len.
>
> I think I'm right in my assessment of you and your "qualifications."

No, you're completely wrong. But you will never admit it, no matter
what qualifications are presented. You've already demonstrated that
behavior in here many times.

> >Does that bother you? It sure seems to. You carefully avoided all mention of
> >the inventor's callsign, Red Hot Radio and the Pacificon paper.
>
> "Carefully avoided?" :-)

Yep.
>
> I identify people, human beings, by their names. That is the convention
> in most world societies.

This is an amateur radio newsgroup. In amateur radio, identification
is primarily by callsign. Callsigns are unique, names are not. First
names are
used rather than last names in conversations and correspondence.

This simple convention really seems to bother you, Len. You want to
impose
your convention of last names and invented nicknames on others, rather
than
callsigns.
>
> >> Yes, there are. Hans is a relatively young lad (under 30)
> >
> >Why do you talk down to him, then?

>
> "Talking down?!?" :-)

Yes, you call him a "lad".

> Hans is a very active electronics hobbyist, is degreed in physics,
> and works professionally as an investment broker for a large
> UK investment firm. He has described a number of electronics
> and amateur radio projects very well and in detail on his web
> site. He and his wife have just become parents for the first time
> so all of his hobby activities have been on hiatus. :-)

That's nice. His projects are quite interesting. It's also interesting
that you do not criticize his projects the way you criticize others.
>
> >A lot of us are ACTIVE in trying out both new and old things. Some of us
> >also like to work CW with our homebuilt, homedesigned equipment.
>
> Of course all of you "us" do. We've all been informed of your
> "homebuilt, homedesigned" Elecraft K2. :-)

I don't have a "homebuilt, homedesigned" Elecraft K2. Only a few of
those exist, and they are used by their builder/designers.

My K2 was built from a kit. I have never claimed otherwise. You seem
to have a reading comprehension problem about that.

The K2 is not my only HF rig.
>
> >No, it's correct. How many superhet receivers with crystal filters have you
> >built at home, Len?
>
> Only two for HF. :-)

I've designed and built at home three receivers and three
transceivers, all HF, with crystal filters. That does not include the
K2 or other nonhomebrew equipment.
>
> As an electronics design engineer (retired but only from regular hours),
> I've had to do cost evaluations for both R&D and production projects.
> Such activity instills unbiased evaluation of the task at hand. Hobby
> desires don't enter into such work.

You don't seem to adapt too well to the amateur environment, though.
>
> As far as a comparison of crystal filter versus R-C phasing methods
> of SSB generation or demodulation, anyone can take examples of
> already-built projects and cost them out. Crystal filter components
> are more expensive than an entire sub-assembly of polyphase
> networks and its attendant op-amp circuits and its heterodyne
> oscillator phasing sub-circuit. That's the way it is.

Your cost analysis methods are too narrowly focused. The amateur
requirement is for a transceiver, not just a receiver. There is also
the matter of performance, particularly unwanted-sideband rejection in
reception.

In simple direct-conversion designs, the phasing method has obvious
advantages. But in a superheterodyne transceiver, more performance is
expected.

And if there is a cost example, why didn't the manufacturers convert
to the phasing method long ago? The Gingell networks you promote have
been around for over a quarter century.
>
> >In case you hadn't noticed, many homebrew designs use either commercially
> >available filters or homebrew ladder filters.
>
> I'm very aware of the "commercially available filters" having procured
> several from different vendors while working regular hours. That
> includes procurement from Collins Radio's filter division in California
> while working at Rocketdyne Division of Rockwell International.
> Collins Radio was then another Division of Rockwell International. :-)
>
> As to "homebrew ladder filters" using separate quartz crystal units,
> I've only done one of those.

So you have only a tiny bit of experience with them.

> I have the literature on design that
> appeared in QST and QEX as well as other places. The time and
> trouble of matching crystal characteristics, exact resonances, and
> accurate measurement of results is inordinately time-consuming.

For you, anyway.

> Anyone doing that needs a stable, accurate frequency counter
> AND stable generator; I designed and built my own counter

That's nice. I did the same thing in 1975. My counter can also
function as a "digital dial" for an HF receiver or transmitter, of
almost any heterodyning scheme.

> and
> have both an HP 606 and HP 608 signal generator to use in my
> workshop.

And it took you all that time?

> Such "homebrew (crystal) ladder filters" are NOT
> weekender projects nor are they cheap to make for one-of hobby
> applications.

You're behind the times, Len.

Microprocessor crystals are available in quantity for low prices. If a
filter is intended for use in a receiver, it can be tested in the

receiver and a simple fixed-frequency signal source used.

For verification and measurement of the passband amplitude, simply
feed noise from a noise generator into the receiver and feed the
resulting audio into the soundcard of a PC. Audio analysis software
will chart the result. Of course this method tells nothing about the
unwanted-sideband rejection, nor the phase characteristics, but it
does work for its intended purpose.

The amateur builder has other sources, too. For example, Inrad sells
high-performance well-documented monolithic filters in the $100 range.
They also sell matched filter crystal/capacitor sets for $24.

And if even that is too much, surplus and used filters are available
through various sources such as hamfests, eBay, etc. While their use
may offend your "professional" sensibilities, they work just fine for
amateurs building one-of-a-kind rigs for their own use.

Yet another source is "basket case" amateur equipment. It is not
unusual to see worn-out parts-units examples of ham gear such as Tempo
Ones, FT-101s and Heath SB/HW series going for low prices. Fixing them
up isn't worth the effort but as
parts sources they can be gold mines.
>
> >That's nice, Len. But it's not a receiver or a transceiver.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, the tassel of your MSEE cap and gown must have
> worn out long ago. :-)
>
> The subject of this thread was the METHOD of wideband SSB
> generation and whether or not it was applicable to amateur radio
> use. It was NOT about "a receiver or a transceiver."

If you don't have hardware, it's just an academic exercise.
>
> Try to stay focussed on the SUBJECT.

Try a spellchecker ;-)

> >> Phasing SSB generation requires two major things: Extremely
> >> good relative 90 degree phase relationships across the modulation
> >> bandwidth done by the phasing network (of whichever kind);
> >> extremely good relative 90 degree phase relationships of the
> >> heterodyning oscillator source.
> >>
> >> If either one of those two major quadrature conditions deviates
> >> from 90 degrees (quadrature), both the unwanted sideband
> >> suppression and carrier suppression suffer. That has a calculable
> >> value as given in the "Collins SSB Book."
> > >
> > >We KNOW, Len.
> >

> No, you apparently don't know.

Yes, I do. You hate to admit that, however.

> >> With quadrature errors so low, the amount of suppression of
> >> unwanted spectral components requires more care in layout to
> >> avoid capacitive cross-coupling. 40 db suppression is quite easy
> >> to do and 50 db suppression is possible with good attention to
> >> PC board layout.
> >
> >Have you done it? You say it's "easy".
>
> Relatively easy to observe with the right test equipment. I have
> the test equipment, the experience.

But you haven't done it, have you?

Have any of these pahsing receivers exceeded 45 dB unwanted sideband
rejection? 50 dB?
>
> >Because you lecture endlessly on other's work and theoretical possibilities,
> >but don't give practical details.
>
> I don't "lecture endlessly." :-)

Yes, you do.

> >No, I want to actually BUILD something and put it on the air.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Did your Elecraft K2 fail? :-)

Nope. Works fine.
>
> YOU are the one with both BSEE and MSEE degrees and
> "working as an electrical engineer."

Yup.

> You should be able to
> do that by yourself without help from others.
>
I have done it. Many times. Doesn't mean I have to reinvent the wheel,
though.

> Elecraft has some other products in kit form, several other
> manufacturers do, too. Those would allow you to "build"
> something and get it on the air.

Been there, done that.

> >You're avoiding the central issue: Are there practical phasing type receiver
> >implementations that result in better than 50 dB of unwanted sideband
> >suppression?
>

> Is that the "central issue?"

When comparing methods to be used in receivers of the type being
discussed, YES.

> I don't claim to have seen every phasing type SSB application, so
> all I've done is mention SOME of them. Anyone can "do the
> numbers" in conceptual design for evaluation. Design engineers
> DO that for a living. Hobbyists can do the same if they apply
> themselves. I've done both.

But you haven't actually built any phasing-type HF SSB receivers that
exceed 50 dB unwanted sideband rejection, have you?

> "50 db unwanted sideband suppression" limitations or exceedances
> apply equally to crystal filter SSB subsystems. Their frequency
> responses can be upset in circuit applications by mismatching
> from manufacturer's specifications, circuit layout, incorrect driving
> and output active stages. In order to accurately measure such
> suppression levels, one needs the equipment in an accurate test
> equipment setup.

But it can be done, and has been done, with crystal filters.
>
> >You obviously don't know of any, either, but don't want to admit
> >it. Seems like you are so emotionally attached to the phasing concept that
> >you can tolerate no rational discussion of its limitations.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

The truth hurts, doesn't it?
>
> Phasing method of SSB modulation or demodulation is inherently
> capable of wideband modulation...IF a wideband phasing network
> is used. Crystal filter method of SSB modulation or demodulation
> has a bandwidth firmly fixed by the filter's bandwidth. Relatively
> wide bandwidths of crystal filters - as components - are more
> costly than relatively narrow bandwidth units according to many
> filter manufacturer's listings.
>
> Crystal filter SSB subsystems have fewer components than the
> polyphase quadrature phasing subsystems but both occupy
> approximately the same PC board area. Crystal filter components
> have greater insertion loss than polyphase audio filters.
>
> The thread subject concerned the relative wideband applicability
> of SSB modulation-demodulation. An objective engineering-
> style evaluation should cover the many differences and similarities
> between systems to achieve a proper comparison. The emotion
> of the evaluator has no place in the picture.
>
Seems to me that you are the one emotionally linked, though.

> >> Oh, my, now you are the Judge, Jury, Arbiter, and Decision-Maker
> >> on Who Should Speak About What?!?
> >
> >No, that is obviously your role, Len. It's what you do...
>
> I have both training and experience in objective evaluation of
> electronics projects.

But you don't behave in an objective manner here.

> >> If you would bother to really wear all those ivy-covered degrees
> >
> >Where are your degrees from, Len? What institutions? Are they accredited?
> >What date is on the diploma(s)?
>
> Irrelevant to "Hi-Fi" SSB links, the subject title above. :-)
>
> This isn't about academic institutions or degrees or certificates.
> Yet, you've reminded everyone of yours from time to time.

You remind us of your CV at every opportunity.
>
> >Perhaps the LAW should be changed. This is a policy newsgroup, remember?
>
> Why should the LAW be changed?

Because wideband SSB may be a good idea. Or it may be a bad idea.
>
> What is IN this LAW about wideband SSB emission that bothers
> you so much?

The law may be stifling innovation. Maybe it should be changed.
>
> So, tell us all about how you "homedesigned" that Elecraft K2?

I have never claimed that.

Can you show us a post where I claimed to have done so? I don't think
you can. Which makes you either a liar or mistaken.

Which is it?

3931. Great site for ALL 75 Meter goofballs and code-less geeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 17:54:21 UTC
From: Hambone The Magnifico <daradiofuncrew@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3eb00dc8@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 66170
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Attn all you bored 75 and 20M goofballs!

Here is the website for YOU !!!!!!!!!

clikk here: http://www.upsitedown.co.il/anim/rest40.html

C'mon......don't be shy! DO IT!! DO IT!!

(be sure to click on the plate of brown gumbo on the bottom left several
times and watch the reaction)

3932. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 18:26:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304301026.51b32188@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66172

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BAD4DD88.17DFA%stewart@say.net>...
> "Len Over 21" wrote:

> I think this conversation is just about over. You're not even making an
> honest effort to discuss this issue. In one message you're talking about
> reinstalling fallen antennas following a storm and in the next message
> you've twisted that into having 911 dispatchers (and others) step down.

You're slowly getting his real drift . . . no matter what you post
he'll jump all over it and twist it sometimes to completely irrational
extremes. The more you post your views or even facts the better he
likes it, there is no end to his circles, you'll never "win" when you
post anything positive about ham radio for one. This is one of few NGs
in which his trolls gather any attention at all which is the only
reason he lurks here. It's all juvenile gamesmanship on his part and
nothing more.

> You're reading things into my comments that simply don't exist. I've tried
> to remain as polite as possible during this discussion and there have been
> no implications (gratuitous or otherwise).

I hope you learned your lesson about how far being polite to him gets
you.

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

w3rv

3933. Re: Great site for ALL 75 Meter goofballs and code-less geeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 18:48:57 UTC
From: Scott <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb>
Message-ID: <3EB01A99.E42B67BB@yahoo.bomb>
Source record: 66173
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

http://www.upsitedown.co.il/anim/Upd-rest40.swf

and then you can save it!

BTW, is it 75 meter and CB Plussers or 75 and 20 meter GBs?

Hambone The Magnifico wrote:
>
> Attn all you bored 75 and 20M goofballs!
>
> Here is the website for YOU !!!!!!!!!
>
> clikk here: http://www.upsitedown.co.il/anim/rest40.html
>
> C'mon......don't be shy! DO IT!! DO IT!!
>
> (be sure to click on the plate of brown gumbo on the bottom left several
> times and watch the reaction)

--
Relevant rec.radio.cb web pages:
http://www.a1antennas.com/
http://www.cbtricks.com/~kd6tas/
http://www.geocities.com/aarronvoobner/
http://www.geocities.com/scott_unit_69/

3934. Rename Newsgroup

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 19:44:00 UTC
From: mwb <mwb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <8m90bvo730lqbmr645a1m624dmnj1gs3fa@4ax.com>
Source record: 66174

It seems like this newsgroup should be renamed
'rec.radio.amateur.bitchingandmoaning'. With some exception, I don't
see much 'policy' discussed... just a lot of complaining and flaming.
Sounds like 75 meters, or 14,313!

Good Grief!

3935. Re: Reallocate 11M (was Article in World Radio)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 20:47:01 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB03645.AC756BF4@crosslink.net>
Source record: 66168

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> What's a 100-1??

Prefer 100:1?
73, K3DWW

3936. Re: Elmering (still yet even another topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 20:51:51 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB03767.9BDF889@crosslink.net>
Source record: 66169

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> Have you "Elmered" someone into the hobby? If so, how many? Any special
> teaching techniques used or tips to share? If not, why?
>
Yes, 10+/-, no, no need, K3DWW

3937. Re: Public Service (yeah, it's another one..)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 20:55:05 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3EB03829.6FC7A5A0@crosslink.net>
Source record: 66171

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> What public service activities, both in amateur radio and outside of amateur
> radio, do you participate in?? Any special experiences from doing so?
> Anything learned from it? Which activity was your most favorite? Which one
> was the least favorite?

ARES/RACES, teach gun safety. No. No. Riding my motorcycle. ARES
politics.
73, K3DWW

3938. Re: CBplussers Net at Dayton

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 20:55:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430165558.13134.00000325@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 66175

>Good show....six is perking up a bit. Im hearing V31MD right now on
>50.125/USB 11.09Central/Wednesday 30 Apr 03.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

I worked him this morning Dan, were hearing the Zeros right now

3939. Re: Great site for ALL 75 Meter goofballs and code-less geeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 21:00:26 UTC
From: PhilC <philC@cranium.com>
Message-ID: <YCKdnVldZfLspC2jXTWcpQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 66176
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Not at all let me know when you plan on doing it so I can record you for
nostaliga and evidance to send to Riley.

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030430162103.340$Ev@newsreader.com...
> Scott <scott_unit_69@yahoo.bomb> wrote:
> > http://www.upsitedown.co.il/anim/Upd-rest40.swf
> >
> > and then you can save it!
> >
> > BTW, is it 75 meter and CB Plussers or 75 and 20 meter GBs?
> >
> If I load up the long wire,and use N8SUX as a call,will
> I draw too much attention with my Collins? <g>
>
> --
> GO# 40
> ---
> http://NewsReader.Com/
> 50 GB/Month

3940. Re: Crowded Grouches

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 21:06:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430170649.18769.00000304@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66177

In article <3EAFE271.4B05F6C8@crosslink.net>, Vito <vito@crosslink.net> writes:

>garigue wrote:
>>
>> Naw Vito .....I have 140 by 60 feet and worked the world many times over
>> ....I am moving to a new home with a 70by 80 ft lot and guess what I
>> have a lot less grass to cut and more time for CW!
>
>Grass?? Isn't that what hippies used to smoke? Well I don't have any!
>That's my story and I'm sticking to it!

A ham (writing on a BBS) once said that "electronics runs on
smoke...if the smoke leaks out, it won't work!" :-)

3941. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 21:06:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430170649.18769.00000305@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66178

In article <b8os3b$lf8$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>As soon as the FCC goes to the next step. No license testing at all....we
>can ALL have a ham call. Boy that will be fun.

That's the way it was before 1912 in the USA. :-)

Are you striking for some retro time, like returning to the good old
days before World War One?

3942. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 21:06:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430170650.18769.00000306@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66181

In article <b8odnc$btubt$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>> > Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for tech &
>> > general, and 20 WPM for extra. And make all those new and down graded
>> > nickle extra's retest at 20.
>>
>> Better yet, mandatory re-testing every year. You have to increase your
>> CW speed by 5WPM every year. After ten years licensing, the extra would
>> have to be working at 65 wpm. After 17 years, the ham would be at 100 wpm!
>>
>
>Now that would make it an effective communications mode! 100wpm! Whew!
>
>Since we obviously can't get away from the morse issue, I would actually
>support retesting after every 10 year chunk of time. If you haven't been
>active or taken the time to learn more than the minimum basic amount of
>learning to pass the tests. This re-testing would also include morse
>testing as well. If it is as important as some hold it here, then it is
>something that should have at least been maintained or improved upon within
>ten years, above original testing results. Definitely would weed out some
>of the ones that get the license and then do not do anything with it. Hell,
>drivers licenses are retested on a regular basis.

Driving ability DIRECTLY affects public safety.

A hobby activity involving radio does NOT directly affect public safety.

It's as simple as that...

3943. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 21:06:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430170651.18769.00000307@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66179

In article <b8odnb$btubt$4@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:3EAEEE5D.4090503@adelphia.net...
>> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>> > Tired of the whole code/no-code thing which will never seem to die, so I
>am
>> > trying to think of some other threads or come up with other threads from
>> > others I have heard discussing such matters.....
>>
>> Good idea. You run the risk of turning this into a useful newsgroup. ;^)
>
>God forbid that actually would happen eh? The old morse/no-morse thing is
>getting to be like a dog chasing it's tail but never catching it anymore....
>
>> > So, here goes the first one..... Should call sign districts change to
>> > reflect census data like other things when the census rolls around like
>> > congressional districts etc.?
>>
>> Yes, but.... I only think it should be done over the long term, like
>> every 30 years or so.
>
>I don't think it is gonna be an issue at least for a while as there are not
>enough hams to fill up the existing callsigns we have already. Unless there
>is some major promotion, the growth rate we currently have won't make that
>an issue.
>
>> I wonder if there is hams per capita by division data out there?
>
>Good question..... wonder if the FCC would release data of that sort??

I don't think the FCC has data covering ARRL "divisions."

The FCC does provide a publicly-accessible database of ALL US
amateur radio licenses which includes last-known postal address.
That database has been publicly available for decades...but has
only been free without cost of reproduction since the FCC got
Internet access.

3944. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 21:06:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430170652.18769.00000308@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66180

In article <b8odn8$btubt$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Just a follow up to this thread.... My opinion is that it doesn't matter
>either way to me. That never was the intent of the posting. Just heard
>this discussed somewhere and thought that it might be a good one for the
>newsgroup.
>Not that we would every have enough hams anyways where a district could
>theoretically run out of available callsigns anyways. Not enough promotion
>for that to happen.....

The 6th callsign district is getting fairly full of licensed amateurs.

According to a K8 in here it isn't part of the United States.

>A callsign is just a callsign... that's it. It is the operating privileges
>allowed by the license that makes the difference.

According to Jim Kelley in here, he said said the callsign "is what
we are!"

That's fairly telling of personal opinions. Callsigns are a TITLE
surrogate. Titles are much beloved by the nobility. Callsigns
show that amateurs have conquered the ultimate peak in proving
manhood, proving genius level knowledge of radio, and are
generally superior to ordinary mortals. Always. :-)

3945. Re: We apologize about Chirac position on Iraq

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 21:06:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430170653.18769.00000309@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66182

In article <20030430082647.18755.00000509@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030427153315.18755.00000313@mb-m06.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20030427122609.18772.00000228@mb-m16.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>>
>>>I say we let them have the kind of country they really want, as long as it
>>>doesn't threaten the USA. How many Americans fought, died and were injured
>>to
>>>prop up Thieu's govt.? How much of a threat has Vietnam been since that
>>govt.
>>>fell a quarter century ago?
>>
>> How much of a military man was
>
>(N2EY)
>
>>? Where did he fight?
>>
>I have never claimed to be any sort of "military man", Len. Nor have I
>claimed any military or military-related service of any kind.

Ah, but you know all about "rear echelon" activites, don't you?

>Nor have I claimed to be an "expert" on military matters.

Sure you have. Google has many posts where you want to
"correct" others military-related experiences or elevate certain
ones above certain others. Especailly in times before your
life existance.

>For some reason, my knowledge of military history, limited as it is, bothers
>you a great deal. That's your problem, not my problem.

Noooo, mighty warrior, it is YOUR problem.

I did my US military service long ago.

You've NEVER done any.

>Dan, W4NTI, served in Vietnam. He answered my question. (Thanks, Dan).
>
>You did neither.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. The FRENCH were busy getting their colonial
butts kicked in Southeast Asia when I was on active duty.
I was in Northeast Asia.

YOU never served your country anyplace.

>Dan doesn't seem very bothered by my knowledge and opinions, nor my way of
>expressing them. Same for Dave, K8MN. Why are you so bothered?

You are all Mighty Morsemen. :-)

Why are YOU so bothered that you reply at all about "anti-morse"
comments?

You should feel snug and secure in your Mighty Morsemanship
as an Amateur. Why do you trouble yourself so?

>You might want to look up Vice President Dick Cheney's military service
>record - particularly in the Vietnam era.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Why? Did Cheney have a ham call? Did he or could
he do morse code?

I looked up the record of everyone in my General Election sample
ballot. I didn't vote for Bush and Cheney. Get the picture or do you
need more than a pound of flesh?

Why don't you look up Herb Hoover's record. His son had a ham
license, didn't he? Hoover kept us out of Vietnam. :-)

Come to think of it, Millard Fillmore kept us out of Vietnam, too. :-)

How have you been doing with 97.1.(e)? Stopped any wars yet
with all that international goodwill?

3946. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 21:06:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430170658.18769.00000310@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66185

In article <3EAFEBD7.C0E27E86@crosslink.net>, Vito <vito@crosslink.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote: ...
>>
>> It isn't my concern what happens in South Carolia disaster and
>> emergency services. ...
>>
>> The picture you paint of such facilities in South Carolina is not a
>> good one. If that is part of your local government, you should be
>> taking action in your community instead of arguing in an amateur
>> newsgroup.....
>
>Different strokes for different folks, Len. The reason I left SoCal
>decades ago is that the residents live in a "Hotel California" wherein
>all crimes are done by transients, all storms and diseases come up from
>Mexico and government not only takes care of everybody, but does it
>perfectly.

That is an extremely biased "opinion" which is untrue as to the
charges you've made.

Such "charges" are disproven by reading the area newspapers,
listening/watching local broadcasting, attending City Hall and
County Council meetings and hearing the debates. Such
"charges" are untrue according to public police logs, several
local health and medical service agency statements, the
Immigration and Naturalization Service, local county sheriffs
and California Highway Patrol.

>By the same reasoning I'm sure California ACS works better
>than ARES.

I'm sure you think so...but we can all see evidence of how
biased you are. California ACS, the Greater Los Angeles
emergency communications organizations have been
PROVED BY EXAMPLE in many and varied examples.

>But please understand that back in America we still rely on
>ourselves instead of Government.

I'm sure you do in that separate mythical nation that lives
in your head.

California is still a State within the Union and citizens of this
state are also very much citizens of the United States of
America. There are more citizens of the USA in California
than any other state in the Union.

Yes, everyone in the United States of America has seen your mythical country's "reliance on self" from the seasonal hurricane disasters where all the commercial facilities "fail" only to be miraculously "saved" by hobbyists. Also, all of us citizens have seen/heard of the east-coast sniper randomly killing people in the east for at least a month of time, the mysterious eastern anthrax mailer who has yet to be identified, the schoolboy murderer/suicide in Pennsylvania, the double agents in the CIA and FBI who had done their work for years, CWO Walker of the USN doing his dirty deeds also for years selling secrets of US military cryptography to the USSR, the riots and fires in Jersey City, the crime rampant on the streets of NYC and Philadelphia, the vote-count debacle in Florida during the last General Election, the Columbine High School massacre, the Oklahoma City bombing, rampaging shootings in eastern post offices and at least one business, gang rapes in NYC's Central Park, the Daley Dynasty's politics in Chicago, seasonal tornado devastation in the Midwest, flooding rivers from the Dakotas on down to the Mississippi, bridges struck or damaged on major eastern rivers sufficient to shut down interstate highways requireing those bridges. That's just a few happenings east of California.

>We have volunteer fire and rescue
>squads, elected sheriffs and ARES/RACES volunteers to provide backup
>communications and we like it like that.

That's nice. Enjoy being a separate "nation" of all amateurs.

>If you're comfortable living
>where one town's (El Monte) SWAT team drives 20+ miles to Compton to
>murder an old man for living in a house a drug dealer once rented 25
>years before then be my guest but I'll stay in America even tho I have
>to do a few ARES/RACES drills in case I need to help the good old boys
>out some day.

No problem. Feel comfortable on the highways with a couple of roving snipers randomly killing people in a couple states for months. Feel comfortable about the FBI killing the wife of a militant or burning down the Koresh kompound or destroying the Muraugh Building with homemade explosives.

Feel comfortable with the seasonal hurricanes and tornados and their devastation. A couple centuries of direct experience ought to prepare everyone, right? With the incredibly powerful five-point Richter in Alabama now you can enjoy earthquakes as well!

Now go out to your militia compound and play sojer in da woods and keep a good group in the bull. [you've shown enough bull in here] You sound like your militia is working on a separatist movement to break away from the United States of America.

Here's a nice Latin phrase for you Separatists: "E Pluribus Dum Dum."

>Sincere 73, K3DWW

Hardly.

3947. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 21:07:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430170700.18769.00000311@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66183

In article <BAD4DD88.17DFA%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>> You are directly charging South Carolina disaster and
>> emergency services with failure to secure safety for
>> its citizens. That's not nice.
>
> Nonsense! The paragraph you replied to with the above had to do with
>commercial communications facilities, not South Carolina disaster or
>emergency services systems. Commercial facilities have no legal mandate to
>provide communications following a disaster - if they do so, they do so only
>as a service to their commercial customers.

You should really look into other Parts of Title 47 CFR besides
Part 97. Try Part 1, especially the Definitions.

"Commercial facilities" have every bit of a "legal mandate" to provide
communications facilities during as well as following a disaster or
emergency as do US radio amateurs. The "legal mandate" applying
to US radio amateurs is very general and rather ambiguous.

Your "legal mandate" concept just shows you, too, are a product
of ARRL's long, long self-serving, self-promotional wordsmithing that
has erected much patriotic bunting glorifying amateurism over the
years.

> I think this conversation is just about over. You're not even making an
>honest effort to discuss this issue.

My "honest efforts" are as "honest" as yours when you claim that
all "commercial" facilities (including government) "fail" in a disaster.
[you should have included 'emergencies' since 'disaster' is a
catastrophic event]

You've labeled an Earthquake as "small, isolated" when it affects
10 million citizens, leaving them without electrical power. That's a
very regional-biased description and depreciatory.

>In one message you're talking about
>reinstalling fallen antennas following a storm and in the next message
>you've twisted that into having 911 dispatchers (and others) step down.

You've made the claim that "commercial facilities fail." As a
generality.

You've not, repeat NOT, shown that amateur facilities will succeed
or even work better than commercial facilities in disasters.

You've stated that National Guard units are underequipped, late
on the scene, and of little use.

> See what I mean about no honest effort to discuss this issue.

You can't redefine "honesty" to suit your personal tastes.

You can't redefine "honesty" when you aren't honest to begin with.

>> Good citizenship is a true service and doesn't require
>> any ham license.
>
> But, when it comes to radio, it does require at least basic skills and
>knowledge about radio. The Ham Radio service is one means of providing that.

But...only ONE means.

You've already charged that "commercial facilities fail" during disasters.

Note: There is NO "Ham Radio service" in the law of US civil radio.
There IS the "Amateur Radio Service." Throughout all of Title 47 CFR
the word "service" is a regulatory term denoting a type and kind of
radio being regulated in the different Parts.

> The storm in South Carolina was offered as a single example. The
>situations I described could occur in any state threatened by hurricanes.
>Similar situations could occur in many other types of disasters.

Hurricanes aren't the only "disasters" to befall the United States.

You've labelled the 1994 Northridge Earthquake as "small, isolated"
even though it affected 10 million people suddenly and without any
warning.

>> Then stop with all the gratuitous implications and not-
>> nice comments yourself.
>
> You're reading things into my comments that simply don't exist. I've tried
>to remain as polite as possible during this discussion and there have been
>no implications (gratuitous or otherwise).

You've made the claim that "commercial facilities fail during disasters"
yet you've made NO claim that amateur facilities will succeed.
Indeed, you've hardly mentioned amateur radio in comparison with
commercial or government radio.

Do I have to reiterate your label of a large earthquake being "small,
isolated" again? That is NOT a nice label to any of the 10 million
who survived the quake or the 50+ who died as a direct result of
that earthquake.

You are following the many-years tone of ARRL "news," that of
Sinning By Omission. ARRL has consistently emphasized,

spotlighted, practically underlined the role played by amateurs while carefully deemphasizing or outright omission all the work done by other non-amateurs during disasters and emergencies. That is NOT "news" by any journalistic standards. It is just self-serving propaganda designed to make amateurs feel "proud" of "their service" even though the vast majority have never participated whatsoever in any disaster or emergency. It paints an extremely biased, almost jaundiced view of activites done by those who engage in a hobby for recreational purposes.

Such one-side propaganda is NEVER "honest."

3948. Re: ARS Advertisement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 21:07:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430170701.18769.00000312@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 66184

In article <BAD4D55C.17DF8%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>> ...and shortly after that, either a process server or
>> some law officer can "contact you," too.
>>
>> Try not to threaten. You can't have my boat impounded...
>> don't have one.
>
> I apologize if what I wrote sounded like a threat, Len. There was no
>threat intended. You said you've used your commercial license to help
>others. Since you have an interest in helping others, and the USCGA has a
>need for people with such skills, I took the opportunity to invite you to
>join. That invitation still stands.

Why the US Coast Guard Auxilliary?

>> I've said it many times: My interest in here is solely
>> the elimination of the Morse Code test for any radio
>> license.
>
> But if you're not involved in Amateur Radio, why should it even concern
>you that Morse Code exists in Amateur Radio?

As the person who works at his Stealth job puts it, "you don't have
a need to know!" :-)

Lots of folks in this newsgroup have a LOT of opinions NOT about
amateur radio and express themselves volubly. Ask THEM, okay?

>Notice I'm not arguing in
>defense of code (note my license class), simply extending an honest question
>to a person I'm involved in a conversation with.

The only "conversation" in here is between three of the Gang of
Four currently using this newsgroup as a nice Chat Room about
old radio sets.

> However, after reading the above (your interest here is solely the
>elimination of the Morse Code test), I now have to wonder why we're now
>having this long, drawn out, discussion about emergency communications.
>There is almost no link between Morse Code and emergency communications
>today.

Impossible, Dwight! How many times have you heard the trite old expression "morse code gets through when nothing else will!" How many times have you heard the bus driver shouting that "morse code is an "effective, valuable skill?" :-)

Morse code is put on par with teaching all hams the very best in radio skills, theory, knowledge, experience, and everything. Once they know code they know everything!

3949. Re: Bandplans

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 21:50:08 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.55.0304302148060.2137@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 66186

On Wed, 30 Apr 2003, Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Should band plans be mandatory as required by the FCC? In other words,
> should they dictate what license, mode, power level etc., we operate for
> each specific band instead of the "gentlemen's agreements" we are working
> with now, that are defined by a non-regulatory agency?
>
> If yes, why?
>
> If no, why?

1) Some parts of the plans are dictated by the FCC already.

2) Where not dictated, local usage should dominate. The current arrangement allows for that. That also allows for experimentation, which is one of the premises of amateur radio.

3950. Re: YI approved with written permission

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 22:27:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304301427.2192d824@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66187

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3EAFD3E7.659A9884@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EADB90F.8B81DA6A@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EAB50D5.8FE12384@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA88AD9.BC4BC6C9@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA7E71E.C3FD13F1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3EA74120.60BE136D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > > > > > > > Look, Dave, Len said something about where you were stationed.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > No, he didn't. I was never stationed at any place called "Tan Son Hut".
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Do you think he might have been one character off, and you chose to
> > > > > > > trip and skin your knee?
> > > > >
> > > > > I didn't make the error. If any tripping or skinning was done, check
> > > > > Len for blood or bruises.
> > >
> > > I think you're not being truthful.
> >
> > Fact: Len wrote of "Tan Son Hut".

Yes, he did.

> Fact: I was never assigned at a place called "Tan Son Hut".

Was the spelling -real- close to "Tan Son Hut?"

> Fact: Len wrote of my moving boxes at a supply depot.

You've never moved boxes while in the service?

You must have been very special when you were in Vietnam. Did you
serve with Algore?

> Fact: I never moved boxes or even visited a supply depot in Viet Nam.

I guess everything was FEDEX'd to you.

Fact: moving boxes is a part of military life. I've moved boxes at a
supply depot. I've moved boxes on and off airplanes. I've moved
boxes at remote airfields.

Fact: my AFSC was not "box kicker."

Fact: You've got more cuts, skinned knees, and bruises as a result of
throwing yourself to the floor every time you encounter a misspelled
word, such as "Tan Son Hut." Don't go blaming Len for your poor
behavior.

> > > > > I was never in the supply field.
> > > >
> > > > Please stay on topic.
> > >
> > > You're forgetful. Len wrote of my being at a supply depot, moving
> > > boxes.
> >
> > And you wrote of a snack bar. Now you deny it.
>
> No, I deny being assigned to a snack bar.

Do you also deny bringing it up?

> > > > > > You
> > > > > > started talking about a snack bar. Were you or were you not stationed
> > > > > > at a snack bar?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That's been answered. This is the kind of crap you pulled with Ed Hare.
> > > > >
> > > > > You didn't bring up the words "snack bar" when Len talked of where you
> > > > > were stationed? I think you did.
> > >
> > > I wrote nothing about being stationed at a snack bar. The problem is
> > > your notorious reading comprehension problem.
> >
> > It's in Google. You're making yourself notorious.
>
> ...and you continue to make yourself look foolish.

Only in your eyes. Keep tripping up.

> > > > And leave Ed out of this. He's absent by his choice, not anything I
> > > > did.
> > >
> > > His choice was made over last encounter with you.
> >

> > It was still his choice.
>
> ...and you were still the factor governing the decision.

I think Ed's words and actions took him out of the picture.

> > > > > > > > QSL?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Anyone who says this on the ham bands is a stupendous lid.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Ahem, no license required to operate here.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That's how Len got here.
> > > > >
> > > > > Then at which point did you confuse usenet with ham bands?
> > >
> > > At no point did I confuse the two. As a matter of fact, the very point
> > > that I made was Len is here writing about amateur radio rather than
> > > being a participant in amateur radio.
> >
> > Dave, do try to stay on topic. You were commenting on something I
> > said here on rrap, not something that Len said. And you confused it
> > with operating on the ham bands.
>
> Grow up, Brian.

Pffft! Quit throwing yourself to the floor and having tantrums,
David. Everyone's staring at you.

Brian

3951. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 22:28:19 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <p1CdndRac5Se0y2jXTWcog@crocker.com>
Source record: 66188

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b8odnf$btubt$7@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de...
> Since the ARRL roughly estimated has about 25% of the total amount of
> licensed hams as members, should they have an equal amount to that as
their
> level of representation to the FCC? i.e. 25% representation?

the arrl has no 'representation' on the fcc so the question is moot. they
are just another group who submits petitions and comments.

3952. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 22:36:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0304301436.1e4cec2b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66189

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b8odnc$btubt$5@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...
> > > Yes, we need to increase CW speeds back up again. 13 WPM for tech &
> > > general, and 20 WPM for extra. And make all those new and down graded
> > > nickle extra's retest at 20.
> >
> > Better yet, mandatory re-testing every year. You have to increase your
> > CW speed by 5WPM every year. After ten years licensing, the extra would
> > have to be working at 65 wpm. After 17 years, the ham would be at 100 wpm!
> >
>
> Now that would make it an effective communications mode! 100wpm! Whew!
>
> Since we obviously can't get away from the morse issue, I would actually
> support retesting after every 10 year chunk of time. If you haven't been
> active or taken the time to learn more than the minimum basic amount of
> learning to pass the tests. This re-testing would also include morse
> testing as well. If it is as important as some hold it here, then it is
> something that should have at least been maintained or improved upon within
> ten years, above original testing results. Definitely would weed out some
> of the ones that get the license and then do not do anything with it. Hell,
> drivers licenses are retested on a regular basis.

The PCTA doesn't want to kill off amateur radio that badly. Besides,
there is a limit to their ability to continually improve, and they
would soon find themselves w/o a license. Its OK when other people
cannot get licenses bexcause of an arbitrary and unnecessary
requirement, and another matter entirely when their own licnse is
threatened.

3953. Re: Bandplans

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 22:40:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0304301440.78909c18@posting.google.com>
Source record: 66190

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b8odng$btubt$8@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>...
> Should band plans be mandatory as required by the FCC? In other words,
> should they dictate what license, mode, power level etc., we operate for
> each specific band instead of the "gentlemen's agreements" we are working
> with now, that are defined by a non-regulatory agency?
>
>
> If yes, why?
>
> If no, why?

It ain't broke so don't fix it.

-OR-

Who needs even more regulation?

-OR-

"They" can't enforce the regs already on the books, why bother with more regs?

w3rv

3954. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 22:46:14 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8pjngnpv1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66191

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030430170649.18769.00000305@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <b8os3b$lf8$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >As soon as the FCC goes to the next step. No license testing at
all....we
> >can ALL have a ham call. Boy that will be fun.
>
> That's the way it was before 1912 in the USA. :-)
>
> Are you striking for some retro time, like returning to the good old
> days before World War One?

Yeah buddy....bring up some that remotely connects and see how it flies.
No....it is not like it was in 1912. From what I understand those folks
were actually improving the state of the art. Now they are trashing the ham
bands.

Dan/W4NTI

3955. Re: Call sign redistricting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 22:50:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b8pjuu$1is$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 66192

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030430170652.18769.00000308@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <b8odn8$btubt$2@ID-189073.news.dfncis.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Just a follow up to this thread.... My opinion is that it doesn't matter
> >either way to me. That never was the intent of the posting. Just heard
> >this discussed somewhere and thought that it might be a good one for the
> >newsgroup.
> >Not that we would every have enough hams anyways where a district could
> >theoretically run out of available callsigns anyways. Not enough
promotion
> >for that to happen.....
>
> The 6th callsign district is getting fairly full of licensed amateurs.
>
> According to a K8 in here it isn't part of the United States.
>
> >A callsign is just a callsign... that's it. It is the operating
privileges
> >allowed by the license that makes the difference.
>
> According to Jim Kelley in here, he said said the callsign "is what
> we are!"
>
> That's fairly telling of personal opinions. Callsigns are a TITLE
> surrogate. Titles are much beloved by the nobility. Callsigns
> show that amateurs have conquered the ultimate peak in proving
> manhood, proving genius level knowledge of radio, and are
> generally superior to ordinary mortals. Always. :-)

Gee Len over 21....thanks for the clarification...And for all these years I
thought it was a means of identifying my station.

Dan/W4NTI

3956. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 22:59:01 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430185901.26815.00000312@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 66193

ARRL representation

From: "Ryan, KC8PMX"

>Since the ARRL roughly estimated has about 25% of the total amount of
>licensed hams as members, should they have an equal amount to that as their
>level of representation to the FCC? i.e. 25% representation?

No way. The ARRL helps and represent all licensed radio amateurs, whether or not they become a member. ARRL acts for Hams when the Hams themselves are unable to. The other 75% are an unorganized group. Acting on their own, the other 75% will not be as effective and will weaken the ARRL's position.

If one has a difference of opinion, they can bring this up to the ARRL. If they are not happy with that, other groups can be formed.

Also, the ARRL represents a more balanced view, supporting all aspects. If it were up to the current Hams, the hobby will be concentrated in a few areas.

3957. Re: ARS Advertisement - Big media

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 23:07:33 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430190733.26815.00000315@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 66194

There was a significant story on amateur radio today. On WNPR public radio, they had a half-hour story on Ham radio. They mentioned making contacts, mobile operations, Hams helping with Columbia disaster.

This half-hour story, on Ham radio, by a credible news organization, was surely heard by many.

3958. Re: Great site for ALL 75 Meter goofballs and code-less geeks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 23:10:16 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430191016.26815.00000316@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 66195

>I'll send you a bag of fecal matter for DNA purposes too.
>
>Always glad to help.

I didn't know they could do that.

3959. Re: The need to save the Novice Class license

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 23:24:29 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030430192429.26815.00000319@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 66196

From K4YZ:

> Obviously you've not opened the Extra Class study guide, Vipul.

I have a copy of the Extra Class study guide. Hate to sound like WA8ULX, but the Extra Class is question pool format, and can be learned in a day.

>Knowledge of Morse Code is required under international treaty, to which
>the United States is signatory.

And who came up with this Morse code requirement that requires one to learn English?

>I already "operate" at 2.4Ghz, and WITHOUT a license...On the cordless
>telephone, the baby monitor, the microwave oven...!

Comercial products, such as TV, do not require a license to operate.
Amateur radio operation, such as ATV, requires a license.

I don't know of any 2.4 GHz baby monitor.

3960. Re: Another "policy" question/discussion/debate topic for the group.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 23:44:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB05FD9.9040307@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66197

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Since the ARRL roughly estimated has about 25% of the total amount of
> licensed hams as members, should they have an equal amount to that as their
> level of representation to the FCC? i.e. 25% representation?

hmmm, sounds about like how many people vote also! 8^(

If not the ARRL, then who would represent hams?

Things like band threats are real.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3961. Re: Experiences (another topic for the group)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 23:53:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB06205.6070100@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66198

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> What has been your most memorable amateur radio-related experience since you
> have had your license?
> Most interesting, best/worst experience, unusual etc.....

One of the better social experiences was helping to track down a child who had become separated from her mother at an event. It was quite an experience trying to calm the mother. Fortunately the kid had just biked Waaay ahead, and we got the next ham who saw her to get her to stay put. Not much compared to a big disaster I guess, but the mother was quite happy that we were there to help.

On a ham note, I just found out I placed third in my division in the NEQP. Not too bad for a (mostly)deaf guy! ;^)

I suppose This isn't all that much, but then I've only been a ham for 4 years now.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3962. Re: Contributions To Amateur Radio (yet another topic...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 23:54:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB06233.2020500@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66199

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Have you as a ham, come up with an invention, or process, or a better way of
> doing something, etc.? Have you published anything related to ham radio?
> (ouside of the newsgroups that is...) Been an Elmer?

Not yet........

- Mike KB3EIA -

3963. Re: Elmering (still yet even another topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-30 23:58:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3EB0634F.2020309@adelphia.net>
Source record: 66200

Vito wrote:
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
>>Have you "Elmered" someone into the hobby? If so, how many? Any special
>>teaching techniques used or tips to share? If not, why?
>>
>
> Yes, 10+/-, no, no need, K3DWW

I run the GOTA station for my club at field day. I've found this to be a big help. So many people are intimidated to get on the air because theoy aren't sure what to say. The structure of the contest exchange and a person there to walk them through the experience may end up getting them more involved. One fellow I worked through the process had his general, but was kind of shy. By the end of the weekend he was hooked. After the experience, he's become a rabid ham, and is on HF all the time.

- Mike KB3EIA -